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1. **PREAMBLE AND DEFINITIONS**

This Faculty Evaluation Policy, required by the Collective Agreement (CA 25), outlines the criteria and processes for evaluating all Faculty Members in the Faculty of Social Sciences (as defined in CA 20) for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and the Biennial Salary Evaluation Process.

All Faculty Members should familiarize themselves with the Collective Agreement (CA) in its entirety. Where there is a conflict between this Faculty Evaluation Policy and/or University and Department policies and procedures and the Collective Agreement, the provisions of the Collective Agreement shall apply.

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

**Definitions**

Definitions used in this Faculty Evaluation Policy are consistent with those as defined in the CA (2). In all references to Department, this will include School, and references to Chair of a Department will include Director of a School. Faculty Member and Member means a person holding an academic appointment as in CA s.20.1 – s.20.7, which includes Limited-Term Faculty with an academic appointment exceeding one year in duration.

2. **STANDARDS AND WORKLOAD (CA 13)**

2.1 **Unit Standards**

Each unit will have a written Standard (CA s.13.1) setting out expectations for Academic Responsibilities and the distribution of assigned duties of Faculty Members (hereafter, the “Standard”). Refer to CA s.13.2 – s.13.8 for processes for preparing and revising the Standard.

2.2 **Workload Distribution (CA 13.9)**

**Normal Workload (NWL):**

A Faculty Member’s Workload consists of activities undertaken in fulfilment of their Academic Responsibilities, as defined in CA 12 Academic and Professional Responsibilities and the Unit Standard. Refer to CA s.13.9 - 13.14 for details.

Normal Workloads in the Faculty of Social Sciences are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of position</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Scholarly Activity</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Stream (all ranks)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Stream (all ranks)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A normal teaching load in the Faculty of Social Sciences is considered to be four courses per academic year for Research Stream faculty and seven courses per academic year for Teaching Stream faculty. New hires in the Faculty of Social Sciences are given one or more course release(s) by their Units in their initial year(s) of appointment to provide support in getting established in their new positions. Such course releases do not constitute an Alternative Workload. The standard for the Faculty is one course release in the first academic year for new hires, with deviations based on Unit needs. Unit Standards shall address Normal Workload, including for new appointments.
**Alternative Workload (AWL):**

It is recognized that the balance of components in the Normal Workload may be altered for a specified period under the provisions of the CA. A Faculty Member seeking an Alternative Workload should apply in writing through their Chair or Director to the Dean, at least six months before the proposed arrangement is to take effect. Refer to the process outlined in CA s.13.25 - 13.40.

The Workload of a Member who is a Department Chair or Director of a School or Research Centre shall be adjusted at the time of the administrative appointment to express the proportion of Service in the Workload (CA s.13.35). The provisions of the Alternative Workload Article in the CA shall be used for this adjustment.

**Reduced Workload:**

A Reduced Workload is one in which the Workload of a full-time Member is reduced from one FTE (but to not less than 50%) on a regular basis, either temporarily or permanently. A Faculty Member may apply through their Chair or Director to the Dean for Reduced Workload. The Member should refer to CA s.13.41 – s.13.56 for information and process.

3. **EVALUATION OF MEMBERS**

Members are evaluated for the purposes of Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, Continuing Appointment and salary adjustment (CA s. 25.1).

For the purposes of Reappointment (including Reappointments of Limited Term appointments as defined in CA s.20.10), Tenure, Promotion and Continuing Appointment, the Faculty requires evaluations, as applicable, of Teaching performance, Research (including Scholarship and Creative Activity), Scholarly Activity, and Service of Faculty Members following what is detailed in the sub-sections below.

For the purpose of biennial Salary Evaluation Process, the following sub-sections provide guidance to Faculty Members on what to address and include in the summary of accomplishments mentioned in section 5.2 of this policy.

For each of the following types of evaluations, Faculty Members should be assessed in relation to stage of career (CA s.25.17) and taking into consideration Alternative and Reduced Workload arrangements and leaves as specified in CA s.25.18. Stage of career means rank and years in rank.

3.1 **Evaluation of Teaching Performance**

Teaching performance requires the evaluation of all of a Faculty Member’s methods and forms of teaching and student supervision including research-enriched, Clinical and community-engaged teaching that are described and evaluated in accordance with the FEP and Unit Standard applicable to the Faculty Member (CA s.25.5).

Where a Unit has one or more Members who under CA s.21.27 are designated as Clinical, the Unit Standard must contain criteria for evaluating Clinical teaching (CA s.25.4).

Where a Unit has one or more Members engaged in community-engaged teaching, the Unit Standard must contain criteria for evaluating community-engaged teaching.

Teaching performance is assessed based primarily on the evidence in a Faculty Member’s teaching dossier (as noted below and in s. 4.3 of this policy).
Each Unit Standard details the components of teaching to be evaluated and determines the importance of the various components relative to one another.

For the Faculty of Social Sciences, components of teaching to be evaluated include, but are not limited to, consideration of evidence in the teaching dossier related to CA s.25.7a - s.25.7j. In addition, for the Faculty, further components of teaching to be evaluated and included in the teaching dossier are:

- supervisions (post-doctoral, graduate, honours, other undergraduate, practicum/co-op);
- contributions toward the University’s goals of diversity, inclusivity in the classroom, indigenization and decolonization of the curriculum, and internationalization of the curriculum.

Peer Review Requirements

The Faculty of Social Sciences considers peer reviews of teaching to be an essential component in assessing teaching performance of its members.

Peer reviews are deemed current if conducted within 18 months from the time of submission to or the time of assessment by the Unit’s ARPT committee.

Peer review requirements differ by rank and stream and are as follows.

**Teaching Stream Faculty**

- Reappointment – two current peer reviews
- Continuing appointment – three current peer reviews
- Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor – three current peer reviews

In the case of a consideration for Tenure and/or Promotion of a Teaching Stream Faculty Member, the Faculty of Social Sciences accepts two additional teaching peer reviews, no older than 18 months, for one of the external letters of reference. The peer reviewer(s) must be approved by the Dean. (CA s.33.7.1.)

**Research Stream Faculty**

- Reappointment – two current peer reviews
- Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor – two current peer reviews

**Limited-Term Appointments** (as defined by CA s.20.10)

- Reappointment – two current peer reviews

**Peer Review Process**

To ensure consistency, fairness, rigour and transparency through the peer review process, the Faculty of Social Sciences recommends *Guidelines for Peer-review Process for Teaching Enhancement* (objectives, process, and forms), developed by the Division of Learning and Teaching Support and Innovation (LTSI) and available on their website (CA s.12.10).

Each Unit’s Standard shall determine the Unit’s specific process related to peer reviews.
Peer reviewers must be chosen by the Chair and deemed acceptable as reviewers by the member being evaluated. For Teaching Stream faculty members as well as Limited Term appointments, the peer reviewer(s) must be approved by the Dean (CA s.27.15. and s.27.19).

It is the responsibility of both the candidate and the Chair to ensure that the required peer reviews are carried out in a timely manner. Courses evaluated should cover the breadth of the Member's teaching and where possible, should be separate courses taught by the Member and also not multiple sections of the same course. Where possible, the evaluations of each course are to be performed by different peers. Peer reviewers will normally be colleagues from the Member’s own unit but they can also be staff of LTSI or other qualified reviewers.

Peer reviews must be based on one or more class visits by each reviewer as well as an examination of the course itself – its overall content, organization, supporting material (textbook, web-based material, handouts). Ideally, a single peer review is one faculty member reviewing one course. In the case of one faculty member reviewing two courses, it is possible to provide a single report as long as it is clearly indicated that it is a review of two courses and hence constitutes two peer reviews. Further guidance on recommended peer review process can be found in the LTSI document mentioned above.

3.2 Evaluation of Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity (Research Stream)

Research, scholarship and creative activity (“Research”) means continuing mastery of one’s field of knowledge and the awareness of current scholarship in one’s own and closely related fields, and the nature, quality, and extent of one’s research, scholarship and creative activity as described in the FEP (CA s.25.8) and Unit Standard applicable to the Faculty Member. For purposes of this policy, Research refers to contributions within and outside the University other than contributions already included in FEP 3.1 (Teaching) and 3.3 (Service). Each Unit Standard details the components of Research to be evaluated and determines the importance of the various components relative to one another. Statements of relative importance describing general rankings or numerical weights are developed in consultation with the Dean.

For the Faculty of Social Sciences, components of Research to be evaluated may include, but are not limited to CA s.25.9a through s.25.9g for Research Stream faculty. In addition, components of Research may also include contributions to knowledge mobilization in the Faculty Member’s discipline or Research area (e.g., media contributions, public addresses and community engagements, which are related to a Faculty Member’s research program). Each Unit Standard details how this statement is taken up in the assessment of the Faculty Member’s output.

Research is assessed in terms of both quality (including impact and relevance) and quantity of output. Quality of publications is generally deemed to be more important than quantity. Each Unit Standard details how this statement is taken up in the assessment of the Faculty Member’s output.

At the discretion of the academic Unit, Research and Scholarly 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 statement in the Unit
Standard, which will be applied to all cases, concerning the treatment of Research and Scholarly output accepted for publication.

In order to support community-engaged or lab-based work, the assessment process should recognize the value of collaborative as well as individual Research activities. For community-engaged work, Unit Standards may draw on the eight criteria for evaluating community-engaged scholarship and impact articulated in the report to the OVPR titled “Recognizing Excellence in Community-Engaged Scholarship”. These are: (1) Clear academic and community change goals; (2) Adequate preparation in content area and grounding in the community; (3) Appropriate methods; (4) Impact on the field and in the community; (5) Effective presentation/dissemination to academic and community audiences; (6) Reflective critique; (7) Leadership and personal contributions; and (8) Socially responsible conduct of research and teaching. Each Unit Standard details how these principles are taken up in the assessment of the Faculty Member’s output.

In order to provide a framework for the evaluation of Research in cases of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion, Faculty Members are expected to provide a Research statement as part of their research dossier, components of which are described under FEP 4.4.

3.3 Evaluation of Scholarly Activity (Teaching Stream)

Scholarly Activity means activities which enhance teaching ability or effectiveness including continuing mastery of one’s field of knowledge and the awareness of current Scholarship in one’s own and closely related fields, and the nature, quality, and extent of one’s own work; independent research on the scholarship of teaching and learning; and activities enhancing one’s ability to engage in research-enriched teaching, as described in the FEP (CA s.25.11) and Unit Standard applicable to the Faculty Member. For purposes of this policy, Scholarly Activity refers to contributions within and outside the University other than contributions already included in FEP 3.1 (Teaching) and 3.3 (Service). Each Unit Standard details the components of Scholarly Activity to be evaluated and determines the importance of the various components relative to one another. Statements of relative importance describing general rankings or numerical weights are developed in consultation with the Dean.

For the Faculty of Social Sciences, components of Scholarly Activity to be evaluated may include, but are not limited to CA s.25.12a through s.25.12g for Teaching Stream faculty. In addition, components of Scholarly Activity may also include contributions to knowledge mobilization in the Faculty Member's discipline or Research area (e.g., media contributions, public addresses and community engagements, which are related to a Faculty Member’s Research program). Each Unit Standard details how this statement is taken up in the assessment of the Faculty Member’s output.

Scholarly Activity is assessed in terms of both quality (including impact and relevance) and quantity of output. Quality of Scholarship is generally deemed to be more important than quantity. Each Unit Standard details how this statement is taken up in the assessment of the Faculty Member’s output.

At the discretion of the academic Unit, Scholarly 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 statement in the Unit Standard, which
will be applied to all cases, concerning the treatment of Scholarly output accepted for publication.

In order to support community-engaged work, the assessment process should recognize the value of collaborative as well as individual Scholarship. Unit policies may draw on the eight criteria for evaluating community-engaged scholarship and impact articulated in the report to the OVPR titled “Recognizing Excellence in Community-Engaged Scholarship”. These are (1) Clear academic and community change goals; (2) Adequate preparation in content area and grounding in the community; (3) Appropriate methods; (4) Impact on the field and in the community; (5) Effective presentation/dissemination to academic and community audiences; (6) Reflective critique; (7) Leadership and personal contributions; and (8) Socially responsible conduct of research and teaching. Each Unit Standard details how these principles are taken up in the assessment of the Faculty Member’s output.

In order to provide a framework for the evaluation of Scholarly Activity in cases of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion, Faculty Members are expected to provide a scholarship statement as part of their scholarly activity dossier, components of which are described under FEP 4.3.

3.4 Evaluation of Service

Service means contributions to the Department, Faculty, University, one’s profession, or the community that are described in the FEP and the Standard for the Unit in which the Faculty Member holds an appointment (CA s.25.14). For purposes of this policy, Service comprises contributions within and outside the University other than contributions included in FEP 3.1 and 3.2 above.

Each Unit Standard details the components of Service to be evaluated and determines the importance of the various components relative to one another.

For the Faculty of Social Sciences, components of Service to be evaluated may include, but are not limited to CA s.25.14a - s.25.14f. In addition, components of Service may also include miscellaneous contributions that foster the success and well-being of colleagues, the Unit, and the University (e.g. mentoring colleagues in research and professional development).

4. REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION

The principal documents governing Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure are the Collective Agreement, this Faculty Evaluation Policy and the Unit Standard (as required by the CA). In the case of inconsistency between the CA and this Policy or a Unit Standard, the CA will prevail. The FEP prevails over the Unit Standard.

4.1 Standards of Evaluation

Faculty of Social Sciences evaluation standards and assessment techniques are governed by the Collective Agreement, the Faculty Evaluation Policy, and the Unit Standard. Faculty Members should familiarize themselves with these documents before they begin the process of Reappointment, Tenure and/or Promotion.

Standards for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion of Faculty Members with Tenure or with eligibility for Tenure are outlined in CA Part 6, FEP section 2 and the Unit Standard. Specifically,
Reappointment is covered in CA 27, Tenure in CA 28, and Promotion in CA 29. Processes for Reappointment, Continuing Appointment, Tenure and Promotion are set out in CA 33. All materials and resources to be considered by the RPT Committee must be stated in the Unit Standard (see also CA s.46.7).

CA s.20.19 – s.20.22 outlines that the processes for Faculty Members appointed with Grant-Tenure or with eligibility for Grant-Tenure are the same as those that apply to Faculty Members appointed with Tenure or eligibility for Tenure Reappointments of Limited-Term appointments are covered in Article 27.18 – 27.19. A person holding a Limited-Term appointment is eligible to be considered for Reappointment; however, there is no right of renewal or Reappointment.

4.2 Consideration Processes

- **Committee Structures**
  Refer to CA 32 for committee structure and membership processes. Candidates who have concerns about potential bias in the RPT Committee should refer to the process outlined in CA s.32.10 - 32.14.

- **Timelines**
  The Faculty of Social Sciences follows the timelines as outlined in CA 33 and Resource: Deadlines for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Continuing Appointment. Chairs of Departments and RPT Committees, Faculty Members, and any staff members assisting with these processes are expected to familiarize themselves with the timelines in the CA and this resource and are expected to adhere to all deadlines. It is important to be aware of CA s.33.25 when setting the RPT’s meeting schedule.

**Stopping the Clock:**

Refer to CA s.31.1 – s.31.2 for the provisions for “stopping the clock” for Faculty Members granted Maternity, Parental or Adoption Leave, Special Leave, Sick Leave or Long-Term Disability Leave (LTD) or any combination thereof for 15 weeks for more.

- **Referees**
  Letters of reference are used primarily to gain an external assessment of candidates for Promotion and Tenure (CA s.33.6); they are not used for Reappointment cases. Selection of referees, invitations to serve and material sent to referees is covered in CA s.33.5 - s.33.21.

  **Research Stream:** For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor, the minimum number of referees is four; for Promotion to Professor, the minimum number of referees is six.

  **Teaching Stream:** A minimum of three references is required for applications for Tenure and/or Promotion of a Teaching Stream Faculty Member. As per CA s.33.7.1, this Faculty Evaluation Policy allows for the substitution of two additional teaching peer reviews, no older than 18 months, for one of the external letters of reference. The peer reviewer must be approved by the Dean. Details on peer review requirements and process are given in section 3.1 of this policy.

- **Information Considered**
  A committee must not require a candidate to submit any material not in the candidate’s official performance file (CA s.33.20). Refer to CA article 18 for details of the member’s
The information to be considered by the RPT Committee and the process for the committee’s recommendation to the Dean is covered in CA s.33.22 to s.33.34.

As per CA s.33.19, this Faculty Evaluation Policy establishes the guidelines for the format and organization of the material to be submitted by the candidate to the Chair for review by the unit RPT Committee and the Dean. See FEP section 4.3 for required documentation. The expectations and evaluation criteria are outlined in section 3 of this FEP and in the relevant sections of the Unit Standard.

- **Post-Unit Processes** (CA s.33.35-33.60)
  - **Dean**
    The Dean makes recommendations to the President (through the Office of Faculty Relations and Academic Administration).
  - **President**
    The President makes decisions on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure. The President shall consider the recommendations of the RPT Committee and the Dean and, where applicable, the advice of the Vice-President Academic and Provost, the Vice-President Research and the University Academic Appointments Committee (UAAC), in making a decision.
  - **University Academic Appointments Committee**
    The President shall refer the file to the UAAC if the President is considering a decision which differs from that of the Unit Committee. The UAAC will forward their report and recommendation to the President, with copy to the candidate, the chair of the Unit RPT committee, the Dean, the Vice-President Academic and Provost, and the Faculty Association.

- **Grievance**
  Refer to CA s.33.60 and CA 47 *Dispute Resolution*.

**4.3 RPT Assessment Documentation**

Documentation is to be provided to the Dean’s Office in the format and order listed on the Faculty of Social Sciences checklist (available on the Faculty website). Required documentation includes:

a) **Curriculum Vitae**

As per CA s.25.19, Faculty Members shall maintain a curriculum vitae and each Faculty Member is required to provide a copy to their Chair and Dean annually, no later than January 31. This FEP requires that the UVic standard format be used.

b) **Teaching Dossier**

Faculty Members shall maintain a teaching dossier in a format as outlined in this policy. The primary purpose of the teaching dossier is for the annual review of career progress (pre-Tenure and pre-Continuing appointment) and for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (RPT).
For the annual review of career progress, Faculty Members shall provide their current teaching dossier to the Chair of the Unit prior to the required meeting date (CA s.26.4).

For RPT, the teaching dossier is part of the set of required documents to be submitted according to the relevant dates in the CA (See p. 191, Resources: Deadlines for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Continuing Appointments).

Units may additionally require the teaching dossier be submitted for biennial salary evaluation but that is not required by the Faculty.

As a guide to preparing teaching dossiers, Faculty Members are referred to the teaching dossier resources available on the Learning and Teaching Support and Innovation website.

Because the Faculty does not require more than the previous six years of teaching material in Tenure and Promotion cases, the information in the teaching dossier should be current and should only include material from the last six years unless there is a strong rationale for inclusion of older material. Peer reviews included in the teaching dossier must follow the guidelines in section 3.1 of this policy.

The teaching dossier is updated each year to 31 December. The teaching dossier should include, but is not limited to the following information:

1. Table of Contents
2. Teaching Statement (or Perspective)
   - Brief statement of philosophy, objectives, interests and methods for teaching and supervisions.
3. Teaching Experience
   - List of courses taught, and self-reflections and documentation of associated actions.
   - List of supervisions (including post-doctoral, honours, other undergraduate and practicum/co-op supervisions as well as graduate supervisions) and/or committee membership.
   - Peer evaluations, as required for RPT, and self-reflections and documentation of associated actions.
   - Student Evaluations, and self-reflections and documentation of associated actions.

Results from Course Experience Surveys are to be used in accordance with CA s.25.22 - s.25.25. Details on how the results are to be presented are determined by Unit Standard.

Unit Standard will indicate the relative weight that would be assigned to CES scores and/or how the CES scores will be used as part of the overall assessment of teaching.
4. Teaching Development and Innovation

- Summary of evidence of participation in panels, presentations and addresses related to teaching, curriculum development or learning (if available).

- Summary of evidence of contributions related to the Unit’s teaching program (e.g. curriculum development, course co-ordination, program assessment or development, course design) (if available).

- Summary of evidence of innovative teaching, including research-enriched, Clinical and/or community engaged teaching on behalf of the University including, but not limited to: creative and artistic works, productions and performances, web publishing, including the production of archives and blogs, and use of on-line teaching contexts (if available).

5. Professional Development and Awards

- Examples of professional development supporting growth as a teacher, supervisor or scholar of teaching and learning (e.g., attendance at LTSI workshops, EQHR workshops, ICAT or other such development activities within or outside the University) (if available).

- Summary of teaching awards (including nominations for awards) and grants (if available)

6. Other Contributions

- Summary of mentoring to support the development of other faculty in the area of teaching, or as a member of the Unit, including through peer reviews of teaching (if available).

- Evidence of student consultation, mentoring and advising concerning program or career planning (if available)

- Other relevant information (if available)

7. Teaching Material (Annex)

- Examples of course outlines, lecture material, lab material etc.

- Other supporting material to support discussion in section 1 – 5 above; For example,
  - Qualitative student comments from student evaluations provided in accordance with CA s.25.25
  - Unsolicited letters written by students or others regarding teaching performance.
  - Other evidence concerning teaching accomplishments.

For candidates 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) Research/Scholarly Activity Dossier

For the purposes of career progress, Faculty Members in the Faculty of Social Sciences are required to submit a dossier that summarizes research, scholarship and creative activity and includes copies of, or citations to the candidate's scholarly or creative works.

1. Research Stream Faculty:

Refer to CA s.25.8-25.10 and FEP section 3.2 for evaluation criteria and examples of material to include. The format of the research dossier is as follows:

- Table of contents.

- For Tenure or Promotion cases only: typically, 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: (1) rankings of the journals in which they have published; and (2) the collaborative relationship between the candidate and co-authors of publications, i.e., 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. (This statement will be sent to external referees.)

- Copies of, or citations to all published articles, chapters, and books; for items in press or accepted for publication but not yet in print, a provided electronic 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, Scholarship and Creative Activity to be evaluated, as listed in FEP 3.2. Other professional activities to be evaluated, as listed in FEP 3.2.

2. Teaching Stream Faculty:

Refer to CA s.25.11 – s.25.13 and FEP section 3.2 for evaluation criteria and examples of material to include. The format of the scholarly activity dossier is as follows:

- Table of contents

- Copies of, or citations to, material as outlined in CA s.25.12.

- Any additional material as required by the Unit Standard

d) Service Dossier

- Table of contents

- List of activities
• Statement describing the most significant Service contributions and the activities associated with these contributions.

• Any additional material as required by the Unit Standard

e) Summary of Major Achievements

At the option of the candidate, this may include a statement of any special circumstances during the period under review which may have affected the candidate’s achievements during the period under review.

Faculty Members may also elect to submit a brief statement to provide context to the submission to the referees if they feel this is necessary to convey an adequate picture of their achievements.

5. SALARY REVIEW

For the purpose of salary evaluation, Research Stream faculty will be evaluated for Teaching (CA s.25.7), Research (CA s.25.9) and Service (CA s.25.14). Teaching Stream faculty will be evaluated for Teaching (CA s.25.7), Scholarly Activity (CA s.25.12) and Service (CA s.25.14). The specific standards and expectations used to guide evaluation for each category are contained in each Academic Unit’s written Standard.

5.1 Salary Adjustments

Types of salary adjustments related to performance as defined under “Increment Structure” (CA s.50.11- s.50.23) comprise:

   a) Career Progress Increment (CPI);
   b) Performance Pay Increment (PPI);
   c) Outstanding Performance Recognition (OPR)

Members with a regular academic appointment are eligible to receive adjustments as outlined in CA s.50.7. Members with Limited-Term appointments are eligible to receive adjustments under CA s.50.7 a) and s.50.7 c).

The process of awarding salary adjustments related to performance will be undertaken in accordance with the provisions of CA 50, Salary. Members should familiarize themselves with all aspects of salary adjustment evaluation as outlined in the CA and the FEP.

5.2 Biennial Salary Evaluation Process

Salary evaluation in the Faculty of Social Sciences occurs biennially during odd years (i.e., 2021, 2023). Each unit is required by the FEP to have, as a section of its written Standard, a Salary Evaluation Policy (SEP) which lays out the unit’s process for assessing performance and making salary adjustment recommendations in accordance with CA 50, with reference to standards described above (FEP 3.1-3.4) and as detailed in the individual unit’s Standards.

No later than January 31 in an evaluation year, each eligible member of a unit must submit to the unit’s Chair the following documents:
• an updated curriculum vitae in UVic format

• a summary of accomplishments in a form specified by the unit’s SEP and consistent with the review periods described in CA s.50.27.

• A signed Conflict of Interest form as required by CA s.49.5.

A Member who chooses not to submit the required documentation cannot be considered for award of a CPI, PPI or OPR, except as covered by CA s.50.29.

Members with joint appointments will submit their documents to their home unit (CA s.20.17) and will be evaluated according to processes laid out in their home unit’s SEP.

Earlier submission deadlines may be set by a Chair as long as these are communicated well in advance to members in the unit. Chairs will submit documents for their own review to the Dean by January 31 of each evaluation year. Evaluation of Chairs by the Dean will be as outlined in CA s.54.27.

Each member shall meet with their Chair or, in the case of Chairs with the Dean, to discuss their accomplishments during the review period. The Member and Chair or Dean may mutually agree to a communication format other than an in-person meeting where warranted (CA s.50.28).

The Chair will review each Member’s submitted documents in accordance with the department’s SEP. The Chair may seek the advice of an advisory committee on salary review regarding the recommendations to be made as provided for in the unit’s SEP. In developing their recommendations, Chairs must consider the provisions in CA s.50.27 and CA s.50.30.

By April 1, the Chair will forward to the Dean a report of recommended assessments (CA s.50.30) for each Member in each area (as applicable, Teaching, Research, Scholarly Activity, Service), along with a summary of recommended salary increments (CPI, PPI, OPR; CA s.50.11-22) for each Member. Where applicable, recommendations must be accompanied by supporting materials as described in CA s.50.31.1 and s.50.31.2 for OPRs or for eligible members deemed as not meeting expectations for a CPI. Together these documents are referred to below as the department’s report.

How CPIs are awarded shall be detailed in the Unit Standard.

Members recommended for a PPI must be deemed through the unit’s evaluation process to have exceeded expectations relative to career stage (CA s. 50.17, 50.18 and 50.30) and take into account any Alternative Workload or Reduced Workload agreements (CA s.50.27.5). The Dean’s recommendations for allocation of PPIs will draw on departmental reports, and those Members recommended for a PPI will normally not exceed thirty percent of the unit’s regular Faculty Member headcount. The Chair’s recommendation should take into account distribution among ranks and Streams (CA s.50.19).

In forming recommendations of Members who should be considered for PPIs, the following principle holds: a Member who is deemed in the evaluation process to “not meet expectations” in any one of the areas of evaluation (for Research Stream: Research, Teaching, Service; for Teaching Stream: Teaching, Scholarly Activity, Service) may not be considered for a PPI, despite exceeding expectation in other areas.
To aid the Dean’s assessments and recommendations, as part of the department’s report, the Chair’s ranked recommendations for PPI distribution should include a brief statement of rationale for each Member recommended. Should more than thirty percent of a unit’s Members be deemed to have exceeded performance expectations, a Chair may forward the names of additional Members to be considered by the Dean for PPI allocation as a ranked list up to forty percent of a unit’s membership.

As part of the report forwarded to the Dean, Chairs should make explicit the areas in which a Member has exceeded expectations. The recommendations submitted to the Dean (above), should take into account whether a Member has exceeded expectations in all or only some areas.

The Dean will evaluate the recommendations made in the departments’ reports and assess these across units. The Dean will also evaluate Chairs (CA s. 50.32). The Dean is ultimately responsible for judgements as to the final percent allocation of PPIs to units, particularly as it relates to rounding to an integer and taking account of salary increments recommended for Chairs. The Dean will submit recommendations for each unit for approval by the Vice-President Academic and Provost on or before May 1 of the year of evaluation (CA s.50.32). Following approval by the Vice-President Academic and Provost, the Chairs shall notify their Members of their assessments (CA s.50.34). In the case of Chairs, or other Faculty Members occupying administrative positions, the Dean will inform the members of their recommendation.