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This Faculty Evaluation Policy, required by the Collective Agreement (CA 19), outlines the criteria and processes for evaluating all faculty members in the Social Sciences (as defined in CA 16) for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and annual salary awards. To facilitate the evaluation process, faculty members are required to update three items biennially: the University curriculum vitae (CA 19.19), the teaching dossier (CA 19.21; see FEP 2.2.6(b), the scholarship dossier (see FEP 2.2.6 (a)), and their four-year activity summary (see FEP 4.2).

This policy will be revised as may be required after any modification to the Collective Agreement.

In all cases where Department is used, School will be included if appropriate, and references to Chair will include Director of School as appropriate.

List of abbreviations

- CA : Collective Agreement
- MI : Merit Increment
- CPI : Career Progress Increment
- ARPT : Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure [Committee]
- RPT : Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure [Committee]
- FEP : Faculty Evaluation Policy (this document)

1. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

- According to CA 19.5 to 19.11 for Faculty members (other than Assistant or Associate Teaching Professors and Teaching Professors), tenured and tenure-track faculty members are evaluated for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and salary adjustment on the basis of teaching performance, scholarly and professional achievement, and other contributions (referred to below as 'other contributions/service').
- According to CA 19.5, 19.6 and 25.5 for Assistant or Associate Teaching Professors and Teaching Professors, these members are evaluated on the basis of teaching performance and other service and professional activities. 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. However, Teaching Professors will be expected to make contributions to scholarship related to teaching on an ongoing basis.
- According to CA 16.14 and 16.15 for Grant-Tenured Faculty, these members are evaluated on the same basis as Faculty Members appointed with tenure or with eligibility for tenure, except where external funding to pay more than 50% of the salary is no longer available. In such cases, the appointments with tenure or eligibility for tenure will be terminated by the university.
- According to CA 19.14 for Academic Administrators, these members are evaluated on the basis of administrative contributions, and where the
appointment includes such duties, teaching performance and scholarly and professional contributions.

- Evaluation criteria also include criteria set out in each unit’s “Departmental Standard for attaining tenure and any other Departmental policies further developing the criteria as relevant to the practice of the particular discipline. See also FEP 1.1.2, 1.2.3 and 1.3.2.
- Each unit in the Faculty of Social Sciences will have a written description of the mechanism or process by which recommendations will be made with regard to allocating merit increments (MIs) to members of the unit (see CA 19.2 to 19.4).
- According to CA 23.4 for part-time faculty members, the expected quality of teaching, scholarship/professional activities, and other contributions/service is the same as for full-time appointments. The quantity of scholarly activity and other contributions/service is expected to be in proportion to a full-time appointment.
- Faculty members should be assessed taking into account their years of experience (CA 19.17).
- Any adverse effect of sick leave, long-term disability, maternity, parental and adoption leave, or compassionate care leave, compassionate leave without salary, or special leave should be taken into account in the evaluation process (CA 19.5.7). In such cases candidates should consult their Chair or Dean as soon as possible. Faculty may include an impact statement describing the effect of the leave on their performance. For reappointment or tenure decisions, CA 48 describes the relevant terms and conditions for "Stopping the Clock".
- Period of review for evaluation of faculty members on leave (except leave without pay) is set out in CA 19.29.3.
- Procedural fairness requires that due process and natural justice be observed and that Departmental criteria and those in this FEP be applied fairly. Due process requires that candidates have the right to know what committees and other individuals say about them by way of evaluation, to respond to what is said, and to be judged without bias by the persons who hear the case.

1.1 EVALUATION OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE

The following criteria should be applied when evaluating teaching performance [as required by CA 19.6 and 19.7].

1.1.1 Components of teaching performance to be evaluated

- Preparation, respect for and encouragement of students, clarity of class presentations, knowledge of and enthusiasm for the subject, a capacity to arouse interest in the subject among students, an ability to motivate students to attain high standards, and if appropriate, statements of expected learning outcomes.
- Availability and helpfulness to students outside class time (e.g. office hours availability, electronic and telephone availability). In order to protect faculty members’ time for other responsibilities, reasonable limits on availability are acceptable.
• Openness to innovation and change, (e.g. development of new courses, updating of existing courses, new modes of delivery, participation in teaching workshops). Contribution to the unit’s teaching responsibilities: consideration is given to such matters as willingness to teach core as well as elective courses, lower as well as upper division courses, undergraduate as well as graduate courses, large as well as small sections, and directed studies as well as scheduled courses. Consideration is also given to observance of scheduled class meeting times and Senate/Faculty-approved policies regarding course outlines and grading procedures.

• Effort and effectiveness in supervising students: consideration is given to (a) supervisory role (main supervisor, committee member, external examiner, chair of examination committee), (b) type of degree or program (doctoral, masters with/without thesis, honours, practicum/co-op), and (c) the standards outlined in Faculty of Graduate Studies’ document on Responsibilities in the Supervisory Relationship (see http://web.uvic.ca/gradstudies/students/documents/SupervisoryRelationshipApr19-07.pdf). Post-doctoral supervisions may be included here.

• Methods of student performance evaluation: consideration is given to whether student understanding of subject matter is fairly tested.

• Teaching awards (including nominations for awards).

• Evidence of contributions toward the University’s goals of diversity, inclusivity in the classroom, and internationalization of the curriculum.

• Scholarly works, presentations, and addresses relating to teaching, curriculum development or learning that would not normally constitute part of the Faculty member’s scholarly and professional achievement.

• Where appropriate, demonstrated abilities to integrate a faculty member’s program of scholarship and teaching.

1.1.2 Assessment techniques
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. Individual units determine the importance of dossier items relative to one another, recognizing that student evaluations cover several of the dimensions of good teaching outlined in FEP 1.1.1, and are therefore to be included among the most important components of the dossier (CA 19.21 to 19.24). However, evaluation of teaching performance must not be based solely on student evaluation scores and must consider all materials in the teaching dossier. Statements of relative importance, which may explain general rankings or give specific numerical weights, are developed in consultation with the Dean. In their statements, units will 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).

Dossier items for the period under review comprise:

• Statement of teaching interests and philosophy, including teaching objectives and methods.
• Expected learning outcomes (if available).
• Courses taught, listed by course number, title, contact hours in lectures/labs, and number of students taught.
• Student evaluations from each regular (other than pro forma) section taught each term. At the discretion of the Chair, courses with low enrolment may be exempted from this requirement.
• According to CA 19.22 and 19.23, only complete aggregated statistical results of all course experience surveys administered during the period of review are required; qualitative student comments are optional. Where qualitative comments are included in the dossier, all such comments from the course in question must be included (CA 19.24). Assessments of faculty members should take into account the fact that average scores on student evaluations vary systematically between certain types of courses, notably required versus elective courses.
• Supervisions (post-doctoral, graduate, honours, practicum/co-op).
• Peer evaluations by colleagues, staff of the Learning and Teaching Centre or other qualified reviewers.
  The Faculty requires 2 peer evaluations of teaching in cases of reappointment, tenure, and promotion. However, faculty members may request evaluations at any time. The Learning and Teaching Centre is a good resource for guidance regarding peer teaching evaluations. Faculty members should include these evaluations in their dossiers with the effect that they are taken into account in the appropriate window of assessment for salary purposes. Peer evaluations can include an assessment of whether expected learning outcomes were met.
• Course materials such as course outlines, assignments, and examinations. Optional/additional materials concerning teaching performance.

1.1.3 Achievements with regard to teaching
• An Assistant Teaching Professor who applies for promotion to an Associate Teaching Professor must have the appropriate academic credentials or evidence of appropriate professional achievement and must demonstrate excellence in teaching, initiative in the development of delivery of the academic program of the unit or the University, and service and professional activities that further the goals of the University and the discipline (CA 25.5); an Assistant Teaching Professor with a continuing appointment or an Associate Teaching Professor who applies for promotion to Teaching Professor must have the appropriate academic credential or evidence of appropriate achievement and must demonstrate a record of outstanding achievement in teaching and 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 as well as service and professional activities that further the goals of the University and the discipline (CA 25.7).
• An Associate Professor can apply for promotion to Professor based in part on outstanding achievements with regard to teaching as an alternate ground to
s qualify than quantity.

At the discretion of the academic unit, research output may be counted from the time of acceptance for publication as long as unambiguous evidence of final acceptance is provided. For reappointment, tenure, and promotion, consideration may be given to other unpublished work that is represented by tangible output (e.g. discussion paper, completed draft) and is expected to be published. Each unit shall have a policy, which will be applied to all cases, concerning the treatment of research output accepted for publication.

In order not to discourage collaborative effort, the assessment process should recognize the value of collaborative as well as individual scholarship.

In order to provide a framework for evaluation of scholarship and professional achievements in cases of reappointment, tenure, and promotion, faculty members are expected to provide a statement of research interests as part of their Scholarship Dossier.

1.2.1 Components of research activity to be evaluated
(These are not necessarily in order of importance.)
• Refereed articles in scholarly journals
• Refereed books and monographs (authored/edited)
• Refereed book chapters
• Refereed conference proceedings
• Academic software and multi-media materials
• Community-based research activities
• Research/government reports
• Non-refereed articles, books/monographs, chapters, and conference proceedings
• Book reviews
• Discussion/working papers
• Scholarly recognition awards (including nomination for awards)
• Miscellaneous Other contributions relevant to the faculty member’s discipline

1.2.2 Other professional activities to be evaluated
(These are not necessarily in order of importance.)
• Research grants awarded
• Research contracts (as distinct from paid consulting contracts that involve no research)
• Presentations to academic or professional conferences/workshops
• Discussant status at academic or professional conferences/workshops
• Organization of conference/session at academic or professional conferences/workshops
• Membership of conference/workshop program committees
• Service on committees of professional bodies in the discipline
• Professional input to the policy-making or judicial processes not included in 1.2.1 above e.g. submissions at hearings, expert witness testimony
• Invited academic addresses
• Membership of academic or professional panels or roundtables
• Editorships of scholarly journals
• Membership on editorial boards
• Refereeing activities (for presses, journals, tenure and promotion cases)
• Professional recognition awards (including nomination for awards)
• Other relevant contributions which the candidate wishes to have considered

1.2.3 Assessment techniques
Individual units determine the importance of the items listed in FEP 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 above relative to one another, subject to the principle that advancement, preservation and interpretation of the state of knowledge through scholarly output is generally more important than other activity within the profession, and that special consideration should be given to impact and relevance of scholarly output. Statements of relative importance describing either general rankings or numerical weights are developed in consultation with the Dean. In developing these statements, units may opt to transfer selected items from FEP 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 into FEP 1.3.1 if such items are defined more appropriately as other contributions/service. Faculty members should be assessed taking into account their years of experience. The evaluation policy must specify that expectations for a member’s performance must be consistent with the member’s FTE (CA 19.17 and 19.18).
1.3 EVALUATION OF OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS/SERVICE

For purposes of this policy, other contributions/service comprise contributions within and outside the University other than contributions included in FEP 1.1 and 1.2 above.

1.3.1 Components of other contributions/service to be evaluated

**Internal**
- Contributions to the administration and development of the unit or Faculty through participation in committees/task forces or other assignments
- Contributions to University administrative and committee assignments
- Contributions to institutional governance (e.g. membership of Senate or the Board of Governors, other contributions/service to the Faculty Association)
- Contributions to student life
- Miscellaneous contributions that foster the success and well-being of colleagues, the unit, and the university.

**External**
Other contributions/service that is external to the university is recognized insofar as it relates to a faculty member's professional expertise.
- Attainment of extra-university recognition (other than awards acknowledged in FEP 1.1 and 1.2 above) which reflects to the advantage of the University
- Community outreach on behalf of the unit, Faculty or University, e.g., community engagements, media contributions, public addresses
- Other contributions/service to organizations conducting business of relevance to university life
- Other contributions/service to the community, province or nation in a capacity which reflects to the advantage of the University of Victoria not covered in FEP 1.2.1 and 1.2.2.

1.3.2 Assessment techniques

Individual units determine the importance of the items listed in FEP 1.3.1 relative to one another. Statements of relative importance describing general rankings or numerical weights are developed in consultation with the Dean. Faculty members should be assessed taking into account their years of experience. The evaluation policy must specify that expectations for a member’s performance must be consistent with the member’s FTE (CA 19.17 and 19.18).
2. REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION PROCESSES

The principal documents governing reappointment, promotion, and tenure are the Collective Agreement [http://www.uvic.ca/vpacademic/] and this Faculty Evaluation Policy and Procedures document (as required by the CA). In the case of inconsistency between the CA and this Policy, the CA will prevail.

Standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion of faculty members with tenure or with eligibility for tenure are outlined in CA 22 to 25. Specifically, reappointment is covered in CA 22, tenure in CA 23, and promotion in CA 25. Processes for reappointment, tenure and promotion are set out in CA 31 to 42. CA 16.13 indicates that the processes for appointment, grant-tenure or promotion of grant-tenured faculty members are the same as for faculty members appointed with tenure or eligibility for tenure (CA 22 to 25). Appointment of academic administrators (who are not eligible for tenure or promotion) is covered in CA 17.44. The general rights and responsibilities of faculty members, with respect to academic freedom, are described in CA 4.

The principal bodies involved in decisions concerning reappointment, promotion, and tenure are:

- **RPT Committee and Department Chair**
  The department’s Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) committee forwards the Department’s recommendations for reappointment, promotion, and tenure to the Dean.

- **Dean**
  The Dean makes recommendations to the President (through the Vice President Academic) concerning reappointment, promotion and tenure.

- **Vice President Academic**
  The Vice President Academic reviews the Dean’s recommendation and advises the President concerning reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

- **President**
  The President makes recommendation to the Board of Governors concerning reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

- **Board of Governors**
  The Board of Governors grants reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

- **University Academic Appointments Committee**
  The UAAC will review applications if the recommendation of the Dean and the department committee are not both positive (CA 41.4 to 41.18).

2.1 Timelines for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

For all relevant dates, please see Appendix “G” in the Collective Agreement. Provisions for “stopping the clock” for faculty members granted maternity, parental or adoption leave, special leave, sick leave or long term disability are outlined in CA 48.
2.2 Information & Procedures for the Candidate

[In CA, see especially 32 to 34, 39 and 40]

2.2.1 Overview
A faculty member newly appointed as a full-time Assistant Professor with eligibility for tenure receives a first contract of three years. If reappointment is approved during the third year, then a second contract of three years is received. The tenure decision is made no later than the final year of the second contract (i.e., no later than the sixth year in this rank at UVic; see CA 23.6). If tenure is granted then an appointment with tenure begins the following year.

For faculty members with initial appointments at UVic at the Associate Professor and Professor rank and eligible for tenure, the tenure decision must be made not later than the fourth year in the respective rank (CA 23.8 and 23.9). If tenure or reappointment is not granted then a terminal one-year contract is granted. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor or from Associate Professor to Professor may occur at any time. An untenured Associate Professor who is promoted to Professor is granted tenure (CA 25.2).

Assistant Teaching Professor appointments are without tenure (CA 17.10). An initial appointment at the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor is for a term of three years and reappointments, if approved in the third year, are for a term of four years (CA 17.11 and 22.5). If the Assistant Teaching Professor is reappointed after the four year term, the Assistant Teaching Professor receives a continuing appointment. Where a Faculty Member is appointed at the rank of Associate Teaching Professor, he or she must be considered for a continuing appointment in the final year (fourth year) of the initial appointment term (CA 22.12).

2.2.2 Standards of Evaluation
Departments should notify untenured faculty members of the expectations and of the contents of the Collective Agreement, with special reference to the evaluation criteria for tenure and promotion as described in CA 19. In their initial letter to the Chair indicating their intention to apply for promotion, candidates for promotion to Professor should specify whether they wish to be considered under CA 23.18.1 or 23.18.2 and candidates for promotion to Teaching Professor should specify which option they wish to be considered under as stipulated in CA 25.7.2.

Faculty of Social Sciences evaluation standards and assessment techniques are governed by this Faculty Evaluation Policy, Section 1, as well as related departmental documents.

2.2.3 Timeline/Important Dates for the Candidate
See CA Appendix “G” or FEP 2.1 above.

2.2.4 External Referees (see Appendix A for template letters)
See CA 32.3, 32.4 and 33
For Reappointment

External referees are not consulted in reappointment cases.

For Tenure and Promotion

External referees are consulted in all tenure and promotion cases (except for initial appointment with tenure). Since complete dossiers (see FEP 2.2.6 below) are not made available to external referees, the following items are to be prepared by tenure and promotion candidates for presentation to external referees:

- the statement summarizing the candidate's case for promotion that is included in the Scholarship dossier and/or Teaching dossier, as appropriate (CA 33.14 and 33.15).
- an up-to-date copy of the candidate's UVic curriculum vitae, and
- a selected set of the candidate's publications and/or supporting documentation related to outstanding teaching.

The candidate is to provide the Chair with one copy of each of the above-mentioned items for each of the external referees who are to write letters of evaluation.

Selection of Referees

CA 33 governs the selection of referees.

- CA 33.5 specifies that both the candidate and the RPT Committee will independently nominate at least six referees by May 15 and simultaneously exchange their lists.
- By June 1 the candidate will select a minimum of two (or three in the case for promotion to Full Professor) referees from the RPT’s list and notify the RPT in writing.
- After receiving the candidate’s written notice (CA 33.9) and before June 15, the RPT will select a minimum of two (or three in the case for promotion to Full Professor) referees from the candidate's list and notify the candidate in writing (CA 33.10).
- For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the minimum number of referees is four; for promotion to Full Professor, the minimum number of referees is six. If replacements become necessary, the final list should normally maintain balance between the two nomination lists (CA 33.9).
- For promotion to Associate Teaching Professor, the Dean can waive the requirement that all referees hold academic appointments external to the University (CA 33.4).
- In selecting referees, the RPT Committee and the candidate shall avoid potential conflicts of interest, including those identified in CA 33.4 (e.g., co-authors, former supervisors, former students), and ensure the referee is at arm’s length.
- The candidate shall disclose any previous or current relationship between the candidate and a person nominated as a referee including being a co-author or co-investigator. The candidate shall provide a written justification of the extent of the relationship and the reasons why each such referee the candidate nominates or intends to select should be used (CA 33.12).
- It is equally important that those asked to provide a recommendation have sufficient expertise in the specific field of the candidate's research to be able to
provide a detailed evaluation of that scholarship. All candidates for tenure and promotion are asked to provide information about the referees in their application for tenure or promotion.

- Referees may also be selected to provide assessment relevant to teaching performance, professional achievement, and other criteria (CA 33.1).
- For candidates seeking promotion to Teaching Professor, referees should have appropriate qualifications and sufficient expertise regarding the assessment of teaching to provide a detailed evaluation of the candidate’s contribution to teaching.
- For candidates seeking promotion to Full Professor under CA 23.18.1, referees should have appropriate qualifications and sufficient expertise to assess both 1) the candidate’s specific field of research to be able to provide a detailed evaluation of that scholarship and 2) teaching to provide a detailed evaluation of the candidate’s contribution to teaching. In the event that six referees cannot be found who are qualified to cover both areas, at least four referees must be qualified to evaluate each of the two criteria. If fewer than six letters have been obtained, documentation demonstrating every effort has been made to secure six letters, must be submitted.

2.2.5 Bias
Candidates who have concerns about potential bias in the RPT Committee should consult the Chair and CA 31.12 and 61.1. A question under section 31.12 must be provided to the Dean in writing within ten working days after the Faculty Member has been advised of the composition of the committee, or of a change in the composition of the committee. The Dean will determine within five working days whether a change to the composition of the committee is warranted (see CA 31.13 and 31.14).

2.2.6 Dossiers
CA 32.6 requires that candidates present documentation of their activities to the Departmental RPT, one part of which is their standard University curriculum vitae. Candidates are expected to submit scholarship, teaching, and other/service contributions dossiers, as described below. All dossiers are reviewed by the department RPT, and then also reviewed by the Dean.

- It is the responsibility of the candidate to ensure that the information is complete and accurate.
- It is recommended that a mentor be chosen by the candidate to assist in the preparation of the dossiers, at least for junior faculty members.

a) Scholarship Dossier
- Table of contents.
- For tenure or promotion cases only: a 3-4-page statement prepared by the candidate summarizing the candidate’s case for tenure or promotion, including a statement of primary research interests, the relation between research and teaching and other activities, the direction that the candidate’s work is likely to take in the future, and summary of the strengths of the candidate’s scholarship.
The candidate should also offer insight into rankings of the journals in which he or she has published. (This statement will be sent to external referees.)

- Up-to-date UVic curriculum vitae (this is the version that will be sent to external referees in tenure or promotion cases).
- Statement summarizing the collaborative relationship between the candidate and co-authors of publications; for each co-authored publication indicate whether the co-authors were involved in a student-supervisor relationship with the candidate, and indicate the candidate's relative contribution to the publication. Refer to Appendix E for samples on how to report relative contributions.
- A copy of all published articles, chapters, and books; for items in press or accepted for publication but not yet in print, a provided preprint will be accompanied by a copy of the letter of acceptance.
- If applicable, a copy of any manuscript submitted for publication including documentation regarding its publication status.
- Components of research activity to be evaluated, as listed in FEP 1.2.1.
- Other professional activities to be evaluated, as listed in FEP 1.2.2.

**b) Teaching Dossier**

As a guide to preparing teaching dossiers, faculty members are referred to “The Teaching Dossier Kit” available from the Learning and Teaching Centre or at [http://web.uvic.ca/terc/resources/publications/teaching.htm](http://web.uvic.ca/terc/resources/publications/teaching.htm). The Faculty does not require more than the previous six years of teaching materials in tenure and promotion cases, therefore it is not necessary to retain materials in the dossier for more than six years.

The teaching dossier is updated each year to 31 December. The dossier includes the following, annually updated items:

- Brief statement of teaching interests and philosophy, including teaching objectives and methods.
- Expected learning outcomes (if available).
- Summary of courses taught by course number, title, contact hours in lectures/labs, and number of students taught (as on curriculum vitae).
- Summary of supervisions, including post-doctoral, honours, and practicum/co-op supervisions as well as graduate supervisions by type of graduate student supervision (as on curriculum vitae).
- Numerical summary of student ratings by course (details of how these are to be presented are determined by the department).
- Peer evaluations as required for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, or as requested by the faculty member.
- Summary of evidence of openness to instructional innovation and change during the year, e.g. development of new courses, updating of existing courses, new modes of delivery, participation in teaching workshops.
- Teaching awards (including nominations for awards).
- Brief summaries of other optional material included in the Annex of the teaching dossier.
- Annex: Examples of other optional materials.
o Course materials: e.g., course outline/syllabi, assignments, and examinations.
o Detailed numerical results of student evaluations.
o Qualitative student comments from student evaluations.
o If any comments from a course are included, ALL comments from the course must be included (CA 9.24).
o Evidence of student consultation and advising concerning program or career planning.
o Self-reflection on teaching performance in light of learning objectives, challenges faced in particular courses etc.
o Unsolicited letters written by students or others regarding teaching performance.
o Other evidence concerning teaching accomplishments.

For candidates for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor, Teaching Professor or for promotion to Professor based, in part, on outstanding teaching, the teaching dossier will typically include additional documentation of teaching scholarship, teaching innovation, educational leadership, and the like.

c) Other Contributions/Service Dossier
- Table of contents.
- Statement describing the importance of the most significant other contributions/service and the activities associated with these contributions.
- Components of other contributions/service to be evaluated, as described in FEP 1.3.1 above.

2.2.7 Other Information Provided on behalf of the Candidate
The candidate may supply the Departmental RPT and the Dean with any information deemed relevant to the case. This extends beyond the original submission of documentation. Specifically, the candidate may make both written and oral presentations to the Departmental RPT (CA 34.5 and 34.6) and a written response to the Dean (CA 40). In making an oral presentation, the candidate may be assisted by another member chosen by the candidate (CA 34.6 and 34.8). Letters of support may be included with the candidate’s submission, but will not be considered if submitted directly to the RPT or the Dean by anyone other than the candidate.

Tenure
In addition to the dossiers described in FEP 2.2.6, for non-tenured faculty members eligible for tenure, the following additional information provided by the Chair is reviewed:
- Copies of annual performance reviews (CA 20.1 and 34.1).
- Copies of written responses made by candidates to those reviews (CA 20.7).
2.2.8 Information Available to the Candidate before RPT’s Decision is Made

The department chair will supply the candidate with a list of documents to be considered by the Departmental RPT ten (10) days in advance of the committee’s deliberation. The candidate has a right to request and receive copies of any document, including the referees’ letters. If a referee has requested confidentiality the letters will be prepared in a manner to conceal the identity of the referee (CA 34.3). The candidate then has a right to respond to that information (CA 40).

2.2.9 Information Available to the Candidate Following the RPT’s Decision

Once the RPT has made a decision, the candidate has a right to receive a copy of the recommendation forwarded by the Departmental RPT to the Dean (which includes an explanation of the RPT’s decision) and a list of all of the documents considered by the RPT (CA 37.3 and 39). See CA 34.3 for availability of confidential letters of reference or evaluation report.

If the recommendations of both the Dean and RPT Committee are positive, they must be transmitted to the candidate at the same time that they are sent to the President. If the recommendation of the Dean and the RPT Committee are not both positive, the Dean will transmit the recommendations and all the materials forwarded by the RPT Committee to both the candidate and the University Academic Appointments Committee (UACC) (see CA 41.3 to 41.5).

See CA 41.6 to 41.18 for UAAC recommendation to the President. See CA 41.19 to 41.23 for President’s recommendation.

2.2.10 Grieving Negative Decisions

According to CA 41.24, the Association, on the candidate’s behalf, can grieve the recommendation of the President, pursuant to the provisions of section 59 and subject to the provisions of the University Act

2.3 Information & Procedures for Department Chair

2.3.1 Overview

The Department Chair

- By the spring deadline of April 15th, requests faculty members in his/her unit for notification if they wish to or will be considered for tenure and/or promotion (CA, Appendix G).
- Forwards the list of candidates who wish to or will be considered for tenure and/or promotion to the Dean by April 30, and a list of candidates who will be considered for reappointment by September 30.
- Strikes and chairs the RPT committee (CA 31 and FEA 2.4 below)
- Convenes RPT Committee to nominate referees by May 15 and ensures that the list is agreed to by June 15 (CA 33).
• Reviews candidate’s documentation and ensures that it is complete.
• Provides candidate with
  o a list of documents other than those submitted in the candidate’s
dossier that will be considered by the RPT committee (CA34.1) – see
  Appendix D in this FEP;
  o any addenda to this list (CA 34.2); and
  o any copies of such documents if requested by the candidate (CA 34.3.).
• Provides copies of any ensuing written response by the candidate to the RPT
  (CA 34.5).
• Notifies the candidate of the RPT’s vote and provides copies (2) to candidate,
one to sign and one to keep. See CA 37 regarding the preparation of the
department’s recommendation; template recommendation forms are provided
in Appendices B and C in this FEP.
• Ensures that the documents submitted to the Dean are complete and that the
candidate has agreed to the List of Documents (Appendix D in this FEP).
• Forwards all materials to the Dean’s office.

In helping the candidate prepare his or her materials, please refer also to FEP 2.5.7
(Questions to Consider When Preparing Application).

2.3.2 Timeline/Important Dates for the Chair
See CA Appendix G.

2.3.3 Letters of Reference from External Referees
• For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor: Chairs will include with each
  Departmental RPT recommendation for tenure and promotion to Associate
  Professor at least four external letters of reference solicited by the Departmental
  RPT Committee from a list of persons mutually agreed to by the candidate and
  the RPT Committee in accordance with CA 33, and a copy of the letter sent to the
  referees.
• For promotion to Professor: In the case of candidates for promotion to the rank of
  Professor, the Department will make every effort to secure six letters of
  reference: three chosen by the Department from the list of referees developed by
  the candidate and three chosen by the candidate from the list developed by the
  RPT Committee, then to be approved by the Dean. Where the promotion is based
  on outstanding teaching as per CA 23.18.1 both the candidate and the RPT must
determine whether referees are qualified to assess criteria 1) or 2) or both as per
  FEP 2.2.4; a minimum of four letters must be received and submitted covering
each of the two criteria. The refusal of a person to serve as a referee must not be
  construed as a negative assessment of the candidate’s scholarly achievements or
teaching effectiveness (CA 33.13). In the case of a non-response, the RPT must
  include an explanation. A minimum of four letters must be obtained for a
  promotion file to be considered.
• For promotion to Associate Teaching Professor: Chairs will include with each
  Departmental RPT recommendation for tenure and promotion to Associate
  Teaching Professor at least four external letters of reference solicited by the
Departmental RPT Committee from a list of persons mutually agreed to by the candidate and the RPT Committee in accordance with CA 33, and a copy of the letter sent to the referees. The Dean can waive the requirement that all referees must be external to the University (CA 33.4).

• **For promotion to Teaching Professor:** The Department will make every effort to secure six letters of reference: three from the list of referees developed by the candidate and three chosen by the candidate from the list developed by the RPT Committee, then to be approved by the Dean. A minimum of four letters must be obtained for a promotion file to be considered. The refusal of a person to serve as a referee must not be construed as a negative assessment of the candidate’s scholarly achievements or teaching effectiveness (CA 33.13).

• **If a candidate submits to the Chair copies of or citations to scholarly or creative works that he or she wishes to be made available to the referees by the deadline of June 15, the Chair will forward these to a referee as soon as the referee agrees to serve.**

• **All letters of reference will be available to both the Departmental RPT Committee and the Dean.**

• **When a candidate re-applies for promotion in a subsequent year and a letter is sought from the same referee a second time, then an update of the original letter may be requested.**

• **All letters requested and received must be submitted.**

• **An English translation of a referee’s letter which is not in English should be provided through the Dean’s office, as well as the original letter.**

• **Unsolicited letters directed to the RPT or the Dean will not normally be considered by the Committee. When they are considered, the candidate must be provided with a copy of the letter (with the author’s identifying information removed) and be given an opportunity to respond.**

### 2.4 Information & Procedures for Unit RPT Committee

#### 2.4.1 Membership

Membership in Departmental RPT committee is to be determined according to the procedures presented in CA 31.

**Conflict of Interest**

Conflict of interest on RPT is to be avoided. This is interpreted to include the conflict that would occur as a result of having as committee members people who are themselves candidates for tenure and/or promotion in the same year. Conflict of interest might also occur if a research collaborator is called upon to evaluate her/his own research where such research forms a substantial part of the candidate’s dossier. Examples of research collaborators include co-authors, former supervisors, and former students.

When in doubt, consult CA 31.3, 31.12, and 61 (Conflict of Interest and Reasonable Apprehension of Bias) for procedures.
Outside Member(s)
CA 31.3.3 provides Departments with the option of adding a member or members from other Departments or Faculties.

Participation
Members of the RPT should participate fully in discussions and voting. Individuals should not vote if absent from any part of substantive deliberations concerning the merits of a case.

2.4.2 Procedures
Procedures are governed by CA 33 to 38. The RPT typically follows the following steps:

1. The RPT meets to establish general procedures for cases of reappointment, tenure, and promotion.
2. All procedures are confidential.
3. Before deliberations on a case begin, members review the available documentation.
4. When meetings on a case begin, any procedural issues specific to that case will be discussed first and the manner of dealing with them established.
5. When deliberations begin, the Chair will (i) review the criteria to be used, as presented in CA 19 and in this FEP, and (ii) provide a factual summary of the available materials. This is followed by discussion among all members of the RPT. Discussion may be completed within one meeting, although additional meetings may be necessary.
6. Candidates may make a written or an oral presentation to the RPT (CA 34.5 and 34.6). When making an oral presentation, the candidate may be assisted by a faculty member chosen by the candidate (CA 34.8).
7. At its discretion, the RPT may request an interview with the candidate (CA 34.7).
8. Voting will be a simple expression of “yes” or “no” by secret ballot (CA 35). Abstentions are not permitted.
9. A vote is taken and the written statement of reasons is prepared according to CA 37. Template recommendation forms are provided in Appendices B and C in this FEP.

2.4.3 Timeline/Important Dates for the RPT Committee
See CA Appendix G.

2.4.4 Materials considered by the Dean for Tenure and Promotion
- Candidate’s Dossiers, as described in FEP 2.2.6 above.
- Checklist of Documents: The files for tenure and promotion cases must be accompanied by a completed checklist (see Appendix D in this FEP), signed off by the Chair of the Department’s RPT Committee and the candidate.
• Departmental RPT Committee Recommendation form (Appendix B or C in this document), signed by all parties.

2.4.5 Questions to Consider When Preparing Application

In addition to the criteria listed in FEP 1 and in the accompanying Unit documents, the candidate and/or Chair may wish to consider and strive to answer the following questions in the submitted materials.

About Teaching
- At what levels does the candidate teach? If only at the lower or upper level, why?
- Is there anything unusual about the courses taught by the candidate?
- Does the candidate teach at the graduate level? Is this of any special significance to the department?
- Does the candidate have special strengths as a teacher? How are these strengths regarded by the department?
- Has the department identified any problems in the candidate's teaching? How have the problems been addressed? Have they been resolved?
- Where does the candidate rank in the department as a teacher?

About Scholarship
In assessing applications for tenure, particularly from colleagues who have only recently completed the PhD, the Committee expects to find evidence of scholarly achievement but will consider, to some extent, scholarly promise. Questions that tend to arise in this consideration might include the following:
- To what extent do the candidate's publications derive from the PhD?
- Has the candidate embarked on new directions of research since the PhD?
- Is the rate of publication of significance in the candidate's field or are other considerations more important?
- What is the typical rate of publication in the candidate's field?
- What is the rank of the publishers (books) and journals (articles) in which the candidate has published?
- Is the candidate publishing in the appropriate journals given the field?
- What weight is given to books in the candidate's field? What distinction is made between monographs and textbooks?
- What is the candidate's relative contribution to multi-authored publications?
- What are the Unit's expectations regarding the mix of single and multi-authored publications?
- Is there something unusual about the candidate's research program that requires unusual lead time before translating into publication?
- Is the candidate engaged in community-based research for which knowledge dissemination and translation is better suited in other than peer reviewed scholarly outlets?
- What is the impact and relevance of the program of scholarship?
In some disciplines research grants are regarded as one measure of scholarly achievement; in other disciplines research grants are not a significant indicator of scholarly progress. Since there is no uniformity of practice in weighing research grants, each candidate's departmental chair and RPT Committee should address research grants in the application for tenure or promotion. For example:

- What is the pattern of research funding in the candidate's specialized field?
- To what extent are external research grants in the candidate's field (including amount, source, review process) esteemed as a mark of scholarly achievement?
- What is the standing of the candidate's grant record compared to colleagues of comparable rank and experience at the University of Victoria and in other universities in Canada?

**About Other/Service Contributions**

The committee looks for evidence of other contributions/service to the candidate’s discipline, the community, the university, the faculty, or the unit that reflects to the advantage of the University of Victoria. Questions that may arise include:

- Have the items under consideration also been counted as scholarship under the heading of “other professional activities”?
- How are the activities related to the candidate’s professional life?
- Has the candidate made exceptional contributions? How?
- What is the significance of extra-university awards or recognition?
- What has been the impact of public presentations made on behalf of the university, the discipline, the faculty, or the unit?
- What has been the impact of the candidate’s business involvements?
- Have the candidate’s other contributions reflected to the advantage of the University of Victoria, and if so, how?

### 2.5 Information & Procedures for the Dean

See CA 41 (especially CA 41.1 and 41.2).

#### 2.5.1 General Considerations

The Dean

- Makes recommendations on reappointment, tenure, and promotion to the President through the Vice President Academic.

#### 2.5.2 Timelines/Important Dates for the Dean

See CA Appendix G.
3. GUIDELINES FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF A NEW FACULTY MEMBER WITH TENURE

Sometimes appointments are made for which it is appropriate to consider awarding tenure at the time of appointment. This would be the case, for example, for more senior faculty members who have held academic appointments elsewhere, or for special appointments such as Canada Research Chairs, Centre Directors, or senior administrators. Because the letter of offer to such an individual will spell out the conditions of appointment, including rank and provision of tenure, the academic unit and the Dean must determine, beforehand to the degree possible, the appointment rank and whether or not tenure is appropriate.

In the case of a regular appointment of a more senior faculty member who has held an academic appointment elsewhere, the Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure (ARPT) committee of the candidate’s academic unit should assess the candidate’s eligibility for tenure and make its recommendation to the Dean before the offer letter is sent out.

The following considerations will apply to cases of appointment with tenure:

- The academic unit putting forward the recommendation for appointment with tenure should attempt to have the candidate submit as much relevant information as possible. This should include records and evaluations of the candidate’s performance in all three categories – research, teaching and other contributions – in previous positions held.
- The ARPT committee should attempt to translate available documentation (e.g., letters of reference) into terms that apply to an appointment with tenure in the Faculty of Social Sciences at UVic as per our evaluation criteria described in FEP 1.
- When an appointment with tenure is essentially a lateral move (e.g., the recruitment of a Professor with tenure from a recognized academic institution to the same position at UVic), this would normally constitute a strong basis for the UVic appointment to be with tenure.
- Where the appointment represents a de facto promotion (e.g., a non-tenured Assistant Professor from another institution being appointed as Associate Professor at UVic), the ARPT must make every effort to determine whether the standards for such a position in the Faculty of Social Sciences at UVic have been met. This does not require that the exact documentation described for normal internal promotion or tenure cases need to be provided, but the documentation available must enable the ARPT to determine that the candidate meets the Department, Faculty, and UVic standards in place.
- Notwithstanding any special circumstances of such an appointment, the ARPT committee must exercise due diligence before recommending an appointment with tenure.
4. RECOMMENDATION PROCESSES FOR SALARY REVIEW

4.1 General Principles

- According to CA 19.25.1, faculty members other than Assistant or Associate Teaching Professors and Teaching Professors are evaluated on the basis of criteria of teaching performance, scholarship and professional achievements, 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 an individual faculty member and the Chair, approved by the Dean, in advance for a fixed period. Variations from the 40:40:20 ratio can be considered only in cases where institutional expectations differ from the normal distribution of faculty responsibilities and must be approved by the Chair and the Dean. With regard to Chairs, such an agreement is made between the Dean and the Chair, normally at the time of appointment of the Chair and for the term of the appointment.

- According to CA 19.25.2, Assistant Teaching Professors, Associate Teaching Professors and Teaching Professors are evaluated on the basis of teaching performance and other contributions in the recommended ratio of 80:20 respectively. An alternative ratio in which no criterion is weighted less than 20% may be agreed between the Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, or Teaching Professor and the Chair, approved by the Dean, in advance for a fixed period. Variations from the 80:20 ratio can be considered only in cases where institutional expectations differ from the norm.

- According to CA 16.15 Grant-Tenured Faculty are evaluated on the same basis as faculty members other than Assistant Teaching Professors, Associate Teaching Professors, and Teaching Professors (see above, CA 19.5).

- According to CA 19.15 Academic Administrators are evaluated on the basis of administrative contributions as determined by the nature of the position and teaching performance, or scholarly and professional achievement, or both, where the appointment includes such duties. Normally an Academic Administrator will be assigned duties relating to teaching, research or both and the Chair, with the approval of the Dean, will provide a written description of the criteria according to which his/her performance will be evaluated.

- Period of review is set out in CA 19.29.1, and is the four years preceding January 1st of the year in which the member is evaluated. For faculty members whose standard ratio has changed during the four year period of review, the evaluation criterion needs to be agreed upon between the Chair and the Dean. In cases where a faculty member has been on leave, including sick leave, except leave without salary for non-compassionate reasons, for more than one teaching term during the four-year period, the review of the teaching performance and other contributions shall be extended by one year (see CA 19.29.3). A teaching term typically refers to a fall or spring term (unless the faculty member has negotiated a “swap”). For example, if a faculty member is sick January to August but would not normally teach in the summer, this implies that the member has been on
leave for one teaching term; whereas a member who has been sick October to February and usually teaches in the Fall and Spring terms would be on sick leave for two teaching terms.

- In cases where a faculty member has been on leave without salary in any of the four years preceding January 1st of the year in which the review is made, see CA 19.29.5.

### 4.2 Activity Summaries

- The Activity Summary is submitted biennially for the purpose of salary evaluation.
- The Activity Summary provides a synopsis of relevant information from the curriculum vitae about the teaching, scholarship and professional achievements, and other contributions/service during the four years preceding January 1st of the year of review (or five years for teaching and other contributions/service in the cases of faculty members who have been on specified types of leave (including sick leave), other than leave without salary, during the relevant four-year period). See CA 19.29, especially as it relates to different types of leaves.
- In order to facilitate the review and recommendation process, at the call of the Chair, faculty members are asked to submit to their Chair an Activity Summary of their teaching, scholarly and professional achievements, and other contributions/service in the period of review.
- The Activity Summaries of all members of a unit are forwarded with the recommendations of the Chair to the Dean.
- The general format and contents of Activity Summaries are outlined below. Individual units may wish to provide further details and clarifications on what to include and how to weight the various sub-components.
- Faculty members who choose not to submit any section of an Activity Summary of their achievements in the period of review normally forfeit a positive score in the appropriate section of the weighting ratio.
- The Activity Summary is contained in a faculty member’s Official Performance File as an additional item of information to those listed in CA 21.3.

**Contents of the Activity Summary:**

1. **Teaching**
   - Items of the Teaching Dossier for the relevant period of review (as noted above).
   - Detailed materials from the Annex of the Teaching Dossier are not required unless requested by either the Chair or the Dean.

2. **Scholarship and Professional Achievements**
   - Items in sections 7(a) - 7(c) of the University of Victoria curriculum vitae for the period of review, showing contributions organized according to their relative importance as determined in the unit’s document.
   - Only scholarship that is published or accepted for publication (with documented evidence) is recorded.
• Research grants and scholarly professional recognition awards (including nominations for awards) during the period of review.

3. Service
• Items in sections 9(a) and 9(b) of the University curriculum vitae for the period of review, organized to separate internal from external other contributions/service.

4.3 Allocation of Biennial Merit Increments (MIs)
• Faculty members are reviewed for career progress increments (CPI) and MIs every two years (the exception is new appointments; see CA 19.39).
• A fixed number of merit increments (MIs) are allocated to each unit. The aggregate allocation of MIs to the Faculty equals twice the number of regular faculty members excluding limited term appointments (the primary pool) plus a number equal to the number of Chairs (the supplementary pool, currently equal to seven) (CA 63.18). The Dean retains for distribution 2 MIs per Chair (plus 7% of the number of MIs received by the Faculty in order to ensure equity between units and in the Faculty overall, allocating the remainder to units on a pro rata basis.
• A faculty member must receive a CPI in order to receiving merit. MI allocations above zero indicate meritorious performance. According to CA 63.12, the maximum number of MIs that may be awarded to a faculty member in one year is four, the minimum number is zero, and MIs are awarded only as whole or half increments. A MI allocation of zero or 0.5 requires the Chair/Director to write to the member, explaining the reasons for the allocation (CA 63.15).

CA 63.17 specifies how MIs must be distributed among faculty members within the Faculty. Normally the distribution of MIs within each Department and School must also follow the same formula, though the Dean retains sufficient flexibility to allow some individual departments to deviate from this distribution where such distribution can be justified.

4.4 Policy for the Biennial Evaluation of Chairs and Directors

Chairs and Directors do not fall under the category of excluded positions as per Collective Agreement (7.2) and therefore have all the rights of a Member under this Agreement. Chairs and Director are evaluated by the Dean.

Chairs and Director will annually submit for approval a statement of goals.

CA 63.7 to 63.25 explains salary adjustment procedures for all regular faculty members. Chairs and Directors have higher service responsibilities and reduced teaching and research responsibilities. This shall be reflected in the evaluation ratio (see CA 19.25.1) during their term of office which shall be 20:20:60 (teaching, scholarship, service) unless negotiated otherwise with the Dean.
Chairs and Directors are expected to follow the same activity summary reporting as regular faculty members as outlined in the Collective Agreement.

The Dean’s Office may also biennially solicit feedback on administrative performance from those reporting to the administrative position. In the case of Chairs this could be in the form of an e-mail to all regular ongoing members of faculty and staff in the relevant Unit. In the case of Directors this could be an e-mail to support staff reporting to the Director and a request for comment from the Office of the Vice President Research.

### 4.5 Other Matters

- As a necessary basis for application of the weighting ratio, each unit is responsible for developing a system of rating faculty members in the separate categories of teaching performance, scholarship (including community engaged scholarship) and professional achievements, and other contributions/service.
- At the time of making recommendations to the Provost, the Dean provides to the Chair information concerning the Dean's recommendations on behalf of the unit and of the Chair.
- Other procedures are outlined in CA 19 “Evaluation of Members.”
5. APPENDICES

Appendix A: Template letters to Referees

TENURE AND PROMOTION

Dear ______________,

I am writing to request your assistance in evaluating the scholarship and professional achievements of Dr. ________, Assistant Professor in the Department/School of ______________, who is being considered separately for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor at the University of Victoria. I would appreciate independent insights regarding your evaluation for tenure and promotion since they will be considered separately by the University of Victoria using the criteria noted below.

There are various criteria considered in the evaluation of a candidate for tenure and promotion. The assessment of a faculty member's teaching performance and other contributions to the University, the academic profession, and the community can be made within the University. For the assessment of scholarship we seek the assistance of external referees. This assessment will complement that of the candidate's department whose members are not normally present during consideration of the case beyond the department itself.

Candidates for tenure at the University of Victoria must demonstrate:

- a record of performance that meets or exceeds the written expectations of her or his department and that are in accord with the Evaluation Policy of the Faculty in which the Faculty Member holds an appointment;
- continued development with regard to scholarly or creative achievements of high quality that are normally but not necessarily demonstrated by presentation or publication in a suitable academic forum.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor at the University of Victoria must demonstrate:

- scholarship that has made a substantial contribution to an academic discipline.

I would be grateful therefore if you would provide me with your evaluation of the scholarly and professional achievements of Dr. ________. In your assessment it would be helpful if you would indicate:

- whether you are acquainted personally or professionally with the candidate and, if so, the extent and nature of the acquaintance;
- the candidate's calibre relative to other individuals with the same length of experience with whom you are acquainted;
- the quality of the journals and/or publishers the candidate has published with;
- typical rates of publication in the candidate’s areas of research;
• the relative importance of individual versus collective authorship in the candidate’s field;
• comments on any other aspect of the candidate’s qualifications you consider relevant.

For your guidance I am enclosing the candidate’s curriculum vitae, statement of research, a selection of publication reprints provided by the candidate, and a list of the components of research activity considered in our Faculty Evaluation Policy.

Your reply will be made available to committees and individuals at the University involved in considering Dr. ______ for tenure and promotion and will be treated as confidential. However, in accordance with the BC Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy legislation, Dr. ______ will, upon request, be provided with a summary of all referees’ comments written so as not to disclose the identity of the referees.

I would appreciate receiving your response by ______. If you choose to fax the response, please send it to the following number: ___________. If you would prefer, you may send your response via email to __________________.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Chair/Director
PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Dear Dr. __________,

I am writing to request your assistance in evaluating the scholarship and professional achievements of Dr. ________, Assistant Professor in the Department/School of ________, who is being considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

There are various criteria which are considered in the evaluation of a candidate for promotion. The assessment of a faculty member’s teaching performance and contributions to the University, the academic profession and the community can be made within the University. For the assessment of scholarship we seek the assistance of external referees. This assessment will complement that of the candidate’s department whose members are not normally present during consideration of the case beyond the department itself.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor at the University of Victoria must demonstrate:
- scholarship that has made a substantial contribution to an academic discipline.

I would be grateful therefore if you would provide me with your evaluation of the scholarly and professional achievements of Dr. ________. In your assessment it would be helpful if you would indicate:
- whether you are acquainted personally or professionally with the candidate and, if so, the extent and nature of the acquaintance;
- the candidate's calibre relative to other individuals with the same length of experience with whom you are acquainted;
- the quality of the journals and/or publishers the candidate has published with;
- typical rates of publication in the candidate’s areas of research;
- the relative importance of individual versus collective authorship in the candidate’s field;
- comments on any other aspect of the candidate’s qualifications you consider relevant.

For your guidance I am enclosing the candidate’s curriculum vitae, statement of research, a selection of publication reprints provided by the candidate, and a list of the components of research activity considered in our Faculty Evaluation Policy.

Your reply will be made available to committees and individuals at the University involved in considering Dr. ______ for promotion to Associate Professor and will be treated as confidential. However, in accordance with the BC Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy legislation, Dr. ______ will, upon request, be provided with a summary of all referees’ comments written so as not to disclose the identity of the referees.

I would appreciate receiving your response by ________. If you choose to fax the response, please send it to the following number: ____________. If you would prefer, you may send your response via email to __________________.
Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Chair/Director
Department/School
PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Dear Dr. ____________,

We are writing to request your assistance in evaluating the scholarship and professional achievements of Dr. ____________, Associate Professor in the Department/School of ____________, who is being considered for promotion to the rank of Professor. This assessment will complement that of the candidate’s department.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor at the University of Victoria must demonstrate:

a) scholarship that has made a substantial contribution to an academic discipline;
b) teaching performance at or above a level of quality appropriate to the Faculty member’s experience and with a continuing commitment to excellence in teaching;
c) a record of other contributions/service and professional activities, and
d) outstanding achievements with regard to either teaching or scholarship that has attained recognition at a national or international level.

Dr. __________ has asked to be considered for promotion on the basis of (one of two options: outstanding scholarship or outstanding teaching), criterion d above. The assessment of a faculty member’s teaching performance (criterion b) and contribution to the University, the academic profession and the community (criterion c) can be made within the University although we would value additional insights you might be able to offer. We would be grateful if you would provide us with your evaluation of the scholarly contributions (criterion a) and outstanding achievements with regard to ________ (one of two options: scholarship, teaching) (criterion d) of Dr. ____________. In your assessment it would be helpful if you would indicate:

• whether you are acquainted personally or professionally with the candidate and, if so, the extent and nature of the acquaintance;
• the candidate's calibre relative to other individuals with the same length of experience with whom you are acquainted;
• the quality of the journals and/or publishers the candidate has published with;
• typical rates of publication in the candidate’s areas of research;
• the relative importance of individual versus collective authorship in the candidate’s field;
• comments on any other aspect of the candidate's qualifications you consider relevant.

For your guidance I am enclosing the candidate’s curriculum vitae, statement of research (where appropriate substitute or add “statement of teaching”), a selection of publication reprints (where appropriate add “and other evidence of outstanding achievement”) provided by the candidate, and a list of the components of research activity (where appropriate add “and teaching activity”) considered in our Faculty Evaluation Policy.
Your reply will be made available to committees and individuals at the University involved in considering Dr. _____ for promotion to Professor and will be treated as confidential. However, in accordance with the BC Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy legislation, Dr. ______ will, upon request, be provided with a summary of all referees’ comments written so as not to disclose the identity of the referees.

I would appreciate receiving your response by ________. If you choose to fax the response, please send it to the following number: _____________. If you would prefer, you may send your response via email to __________________.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Chair/Director
Department/School
PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE TEACHING PROFESSOR

Dear Dr. __________,

Re: Promotion of Dr. __________ to Associate Teaching Professor

We are writing to request your assistance in evaluating the teaching performance and service/professional achievements of Dr. __________, Assistant Teaching Professor in the Department of __________, who is being considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Teaching Professor.

The criteria for granting of promotion to Associate Teaching Professor, in the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Victoria are defined by the terms laid down in the Collective Agreement between the University and its faculty members. The Collective Agreement states that:

An Assistant Teaching Professor may apply for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor at the time of second reappointment or in any year thereafter.

To become an Associate Teaching Professor, an Assistant Teaching Professor must have the appropriate academic credentials or evidence of appropriate professional achievement and must demonstrate: (a) excellence in teaching; (b) initiative in the development or delivery of the academic program of the Assistant Teaching Professor’s unit or the University; and (c) service and professional activities that further the goals of the University and the Assistant Teaching Professor’s discipline.

Evaluation of teaching performance must not be based solely on student evaluation scores and must consider all materials in the teaching dossier.

We would be grateful for your evaluation on the quality of teaching performance and service/professional achievements of Dr. __________. To help you do this, a curriculum vitae, a teaching dossier and supporting documentation are included with this letter. It would be helpful if you could compare Dr. __________ to other individuals of similar experience with whom you are acquainted. Can you also indicate whether you are acquainted personally or professionally with the candidate and, if so, the extent and nature of the acquaintance. Please feel free to comment on any aspect of the candidate’s qualifications.

Your comments will be made available to the Departmental Committee on Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure and administrative officers responsible for consideration of promotion cases. Under the British Columbia Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy legislation, Dr ________ may be request access to your letter, which would normally be kept confidential unless you specify otherwise. If Dr. ________ requests the information, I would be required to provide a summary of your letter without revealing its authorship.
I would appreciate receiving your response by ________. If you choose to fax the response, please send it to my attention at the following number: (250) _______. If you prefer, you may send your response via e-mail to ___________.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Chair/Director
Department/School

Enclosures: CV, Teaching Dossier, evidence of teaching scholarship, summary of teaching achievements
PROMOTION TO TEACHING PROFESSOR

Dear Dr.__________,

Re: Promotion of Dr. __________ to Teaching Professor with Tenure

We are writing to request your assistance in evaluating the teaching performance, [the teaching scholarship or teaching leadership], and service/professional achievements of Dr. __________, [Assistant/Associate] Teaching Professor in the Department of __________, who is being considered for promotion to the rank of Teaching Professor at the University of Victoria. An Associate Teaching Professor who is promoted to Teaching Professor is granted tenure automatically.

The criteria for granting of promotion to Teaching Professor with tenure, in the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Victoria are defined by the terms laid down in the Collective Agreement between the University and its faculty members. The Collective Agreement states that:

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: (a) they do not apply for promotion to Teaching Professor with tenure before their eleventh year of service in the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor; and (b) the application is made prior to June 30, 2019.

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. An Associate Teaching Professor who is promoted to Teaching Professor is granted tenure.

To become a Teaching Professor, an Associate Teaching Professor must have the appropriate academic credentials or evidence of appropriate professional achievement and must demonstrate: (a) a record of outstanding achievement in teaching; (b) 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 (c) service and professional activities that further the goals of the University and the Associate Teaching Professor’s discipline.

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.
[Include the following for candidates choosing to be assessed on scholarship of teaching]

Scholarship related to teaching includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- 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 achievement;
- 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
- 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.

We would be grateful for your evaluation of the teaching performance and professional achievements of Dr. __________. To help you do this, a curriculum vitae, a teaching dossier and supporting documentation are included with this letter. It would be helpful if you could compare Dr. __________ to other individuals of similar experience with whom you are acquainted. Can you also indicate whether you are acquainted personally or professionally with the candidate and, if so, the extent and nature of the acquaintance. Please feel free to comment on any aspect of the candidate’s qualifications.

Your comments will be made available to the Departmental Committee on Appointments, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and administrative officers responsible for consideration of promotion cases. Under the British Columbia Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy legislation, Dr __________ may request access to your letter, which would normally be kept confidential unless you specify otherwise. If Dr. __________ requests the information, I would be required to provide a summary of your letter without revealing its authorship.

I would appreciate receiving your response by __________. If you choose to fax the response, please send it to my attention at the following number: (250) __________. If you prefer, you may send your response via e-mail to __________.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Chair/Director
Department/School

Enclosures: CV, Teaching Dossier, evidence of teaching scholarship, summary of teaching achievements
Appendix B: Recommendation Form for Reappointment of Assistant Professor

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
Recommendation Form
For REAPPOINTMENT of Assistant Professor

NOTE: To accompany the "Position Status Change Request Form All Employee Groups"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To: Dean of Social Sciences</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This file is to recommend that

who was initially appointed to the University of Victoria

On ___________________________ at the rank of ___________________________

and who is presently at the rank of ___________________________

be re-appointed at the rank of ___________________________

for a three-year period effective ___________________________

SIGNED BY ALL MEMBERS OF THE ARPT COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINTED NAME and SIGNATURE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINTED NAME and SIGNATURE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of whom ___ voted in support of this recommendation

___ voted against this recommendation

Attach to form a statement of evaluation by the ARPT Committee of the candidate’s teaching performance, scholarship and other contributions.
Appendix C: Recommendation Form for Promotion and/or Tenure
UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Recommendation Form
Relating to PROMOTION and/or TENURE

1. CANDIDATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Unit:</th>
<th>Present Rank:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date of first appointment at University of Victoria:

Date of appointment to present rank:

2. RECOMMENDATION OF ARPT COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ARPT Committee recommends</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>does not recommend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That be granted tenure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ARPT Committee recommends</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>does not recommend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That be promoted to the rank of

Vote of ARPT Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number in favour of tenure</th>
<th>Number in favour of promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number against tenure</td>
<td>Number against promotion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED TO BE SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM (CA 32.6)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Vitae – updated</td>
<td>updated (unless already returned to Dean’s Office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Teaching Dossier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship and Professional Achievements Dossier</td>
<td>(including copies of scholarly or creative works that the candidate wants to have considered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributions/Service Dossier</td>
<td>(including copies of other documents that the candidate wants to have considered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional: A statement of any special circumstances during the period of review which may have affected the candidate’s achievements during the period under review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Checklist of documents, and the documents listed on the checklist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. LIST OF REFEREES

(i)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested by Candidate</th>
<th>Suggested by ARPT Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of expertise and standing in the discipline:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested by Candidate</th>
<th>Suggested by ARPT Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of expertise and standing in the discipline:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (iii)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested by Candidate</th>
<th>Suggested by ARPT Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Area of expertise and standing in the discipline:**

### (iv)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested by Candidate</th>
<th>Suggested by ARPT Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Area of expertise and standing in the discipline:**

### (v)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested by Candidate</th>
<th>Suggested by ARPT Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Area of expertise and standing in the discipline:**

### (vi)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested by Candidate</th>
<th>Suggested by ARPT Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Area of expertise and standing in the discipline:**
(vii)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested by Candidate</th>
<th>Suggested by ARPT Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area of expertise and standing in the discipline:

(viii)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested by Candidate</th>
<th>Suggested by ARPT Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area of expertise and standing in the discipline:
6. TEACHING PERFORMANCE
(Present in as much detail as possible a statement relating to all aspects of the candidate's teaching performance. Include information about typical teaching loads, expectations for graduate supervision, any nominations for teaching awards, etc.)
7. SCHOLARSHIP

(Present in as much detail as possible a statement relating to the candidate’s scholarship and professional achievement. Please provide information about the relative importance of referred journal articles vs. other outlets, such as book chapters. Also, as appropriate, discuss the importance of solo-authored vs. multi-authored vs. first-authored works, and refereed vs. non-refereed book chapters, as well as the importance of publishing with graduate students and of obtaining external funding. Finally, please address disciplinary expectations with respect to other contributions/service to the profession (e.g., journal reviews, grant panel review committees, etc.).)
8. OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS

(1) Unit

(2) University

(3) Other
9. STATEMENT OF ARPT COMMITTEE

We have carefully read the above submission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typed/Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. DATE OF SUBMISSION OF THIS RECOMMENDATION TO DEAN OF SOCIAL SCIENCES:


11. SIGNATURE OF THE CANDIDATE:

(a) I have been given the opportunity to read this recommendation. To the best of my knowledge the supporting documentation provided by the unit is accurate and complete.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Signature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) I have been given the opportunity to read this recommendation. I find the supporting documentation provided by the unit to be inaccurate/incomplete and will communicate my concerns in writing to the Dean within ten working days of this day, as per the Collective Agreement Section 40.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Signature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Checklist of Documents to Accompany Candidate’s Materials to the Dean’s Office

Checklist for (name) __________________ (unit) __________________

Recommendation for □ Tenure and/or □ Promotion

Items included:
□ This checklist itself.

CANDIDATE’S MATERIALS:

□ Candidate’s memo agreeing to be considered for promotion (not required for tenure unless it is an early consideration).
□ Candidate’s UVic curriculum vitae (please check particularly the following items).
  Item 7a:
  □ Are all listed in refereed journals with specific dates and pages?
  □ Are reprints of all publications in dossier?

  Item 7b:
  □ Is the percentage of work accounted for and explained on co-authored or multi-authored publications in the cv or a separate document?
  □ Are copies of books in the dossier?

  Items 7c-e:
  □ Is the information specific?
  □ Are there items that should be in the dossier (e.g., book reviews or chapters)?
  Items 5 and/or 10:
  □ Are grant dates, sources and amounts specific?

□ Dossier on scholarship.
□ Dossier on teaching.
□ Dossier on other/service contributions.
□ Candidate’s written submission to the RPT committee summarizing his/her case for tenure or promotion.

DEPARTMENT’S MATERIALS:

□ Status of the journals in which the candidate’s work has been published
□ List of Documents considered by the RPT Committee [CA 34.1]
□ Copy of letter sent to referees asking for an assessment of the candidate.
□ Copy of additional communication with referees (when applicable).
□ Copy of messages from potential referees declining to provide an assessment (when applicable).
□ Letters from external referees (a minimum of four for tenure and promotion to Associate; six for promotion to Professor). (note particularly the following FAQs).
☐ Are all letters present, or are missing letters explained?
☐ If fewer than six letters have been obtained for promotion to professor (a minimum of four is necessary), documentation indicating that every effort has been made to obtain six.
☐ Is the status of the referee clear?
☐ Is the referee's relation to the candidate at arm's length? If not, is an explanation of the relationship provided?
☐ Signed copy of the RPT Committee's recommendation (Note particularly the following FAQs):
   ☐ Is it completely filled in and signed by all members of the RPT (9) and the candidate (11)?
   ☐ Is the information about teaching performance clear? Are relevant materials in the dossier, if appropriate?
   ☐ Are all references to scholarship consistent with section 7 of the curriculum vitae? Are all publications referred to in the dossier?
   ☐ If grant reviews or publishers' reviews of the candidate's work exist, have they been included in the dossier?
   ☐ If the unit's recommendation is split, is this explained?
   ☐ Are anomalies explained (e.g., publication gaps, incomplete or unpublished manuscripts, relation to referees, relation to PhD thesis, etc.)?
   ☐ If the composition of RPT committee is different for different cases in the department, is this explained?

☐ Copies of Annual Performance Reviews and candidate's responses to them.

If applicable,
   ☐ additional documents considered by RPT [CA 34.2]
   ☐ candidate's written response to the completed list of documents [CA 34.5]

If applicable,
   ☐ candidate's written submission in response to Department's statement of reasons [CA 40]

☐ Copy of unit's document regarding expectations for tenure and promotion.

Chair of Department/School signature: ______________________________

Chair of RPT Committee signature (not required if Chair of RPT Committee and Chair of Department/School are the same person): ______________________________

I have had an opportunity to examine all the material listed above.

Candidate signature: _______________________ Date:________________________
Appendix E: Samples of documenting collaborative relationships between the candidate and co-authors of publications

Cooper, M., G. Johnson and J. Gibson (2012) Accounting for the economic impact of unaccounted small-scale fisheries, Sabah island, Comoros. Marine Policy accepted (Supervisor, her project/funding, my approach/methods, 20% writing)

Samantha Blackstone, Bob Leonard and James Clearwater (2012) Pillars for progress on the right to health: Human rights through a Framework convention on Global Health The Canadian Journal for Geographers 59(3):460-474. (Supervisor, her project/funding, my approach, methods, 50% writing)

Jackson, B., C. Gibson and A. Nelson (2012) A study of Environmental Practices of South American Corporations West Coast Management 70: 45-72 (Supervisor, joint project/funding/methods/writing, 40%)


   Jones, J. [50%] Most of design work on survey; analyzed survey data; wrote results section.
   Smith, A. [25%] Constructed literature review
   Mugwump, G. [25%] Wrote conclusions; substantial revisions in final draft

   Contributions: Jones – Analyzed census data on religion, sole author 3 of 9 chapters.
   Smith - Constructed historical analyses using textual data, 50% author on 5 of 8 chapters
   Wombat-Overall project co-ordination; sole author of 1 chapter, 50% author on 5 units.

Refereed Journal Articles
      I served as project coordinator (PI: Edson) of the work this publication represents. I influenced the design of the study, collected and processed all of the data, and assisted with editing the manuscript.

      My role was mainly as consultant on the statistical analysis. I also reviewed and contributed to the overall manuscript. Fletcher was Berkley postdoc, Calla was Berkley HDFS PhD student. Fletcher and I were both members of his committee.

      I was a graduate research assistant on this project, working under Dragert and Simpson. My main role was to conduct all the statistical analyses for this publication.