

# Faculty Evaluation Policy

July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2025

# Contents

1. PREAMBLE .....	4
2. WORKLOAD DISTRIBUTIONS .....	4
2.1. Introduction .....	4
2.2. Normal Workloads .....	4
2.3. Alternative and Reduced Workloads.....	5
3. CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION.....	5
3.1. Introduction .....	5
3.2. The evaluation criteria.....	5
3.3. Evaluation of Teaching .....	6
3.3.1. Peer Reviews of Teaching.....	6
3.3.2. Reviews of Course Materials.....	7
3.4. Evaluation of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity .....	8
3.4.1. Evaluation of Research (Research Stream).....	9
3.4.2. Evaluation	





recommended to include a minimum of 40% Service for Department Chairs and a minimum of 30% Service for Associate Chairs.

The constitution of each component of the Workload is defined in Unit Standards, as described in sections 13.1-13.10 of the Agreement.

In assessing Teaching Workload, Departments will consider all forms of a Member's Teaching portfolio including both graduate and undergraduate, classroom or otherwise. The weighting of these components in the evaluation of Teaching is specified within the Unit Standard.

According to the Agreement section 13.15 it is recognized that minor, short-term fluctuations in the Workload associated with Teaching and Service may occur from year to year based on the operational needs of the Department. The Workload of each Faculty

- b) Research, scholarship and creative activity (for Research Stream Faculty) as described in sections 25.16-25.18; and Scholarly Activity (for Teaching Stream Faculty) as described in section 25.19-25.21.
- c) Service, as described in section 25.22 of the Agreement.

### 3.3. Evaluation of Teaching

UVic, through its Division of Learning and Teaching Support and Innovation, LTSI, provides support and resources to faculty and instructors at all career stages to enhance student learning and further develop teaching. Details can be found at <https://www.uvic.ca/learningandteaching/faculty/index.php>.

Resources within the Faculty include assigned mentors, other faculty members, faculty peer evaluators,

review of teaching, it is required that at least one of these courses should, if applicable, be at the 100 or 200 level. It is also preferable that different courses taught

University's expectations and standards. The feedback by the pedagogy committee shall lie on mentorship and constructive feedback on teaching pedagogy (Art 25.5c and 25.15).

Expectations and standards regarding course syllabi and course outlines are provided in the [university calendar](#). University Course Outline regulations are currently (Summer 2023) under review and are likely to evolve in the coming months and years.

The Member provides the following materials to members of the pedagogy committee for each respective course:

1. The most recent course outline, including the methods and weights of assessment, and a list of learning outcomes for the course.
2. Any other material required according to the Unit Standards, such as examples of final exams, lecture materials, or the final grade distribution.
3. The Member may choose to provide a brief explanation of their contribution to course development, delivery and administration, including a description of the role in developing the course materials, if applicable.
4. The Member may choose to include a description of the instructor's attention to pedagogical best practices, such as universal design methods, equity principles, decolonization and Indigenization, and optimal assessment methods.

The deadline for submission of these materials is December 1<sup>st</sup>, to be included in the annual evaluation.

The unit pedagogy committee shall provide their assessment of the course to the Member and to the Chair or Director within 20 working days of the scheduled review date.

The assessment by the pedagogy committee must include their assessment of:

- the course's suitability to meet the stated learning objectives,
- the adequacy of the assessment methods,
- contributions of the instructor to the course development, delivery, and administration, if applicable and provided, and
- the instructor's attention to pedagogical best practices such as universal design methods, equity principles, decolonization and Indigenization, if applicable and provided.

The Member shall respond on the pedagogy committee's assessment in writing to the Chair or Director to address any areas indicated for improvement, and may provide commentary on their views of the assessment. Comments by the Member must be received by the Chair or Director within 5 working days of receiving the course evaluation, and will be included with their assessment in the Teaching Dossier.

The enforcement and extension of deadlines for this process are at the discretion of the Chair or Director.



As articulated in section 25.16

international);

- d) the delivery of invited seminars or lectures at scientific conferences or at other universities or institutions;
- e) the securing of external, peer-reviewed research funding; the percent contribution to a Member's research from multi-applicant grants should be clearly stated;
- f) contributions to knowledge mobilization, as indicated by, for example, patents obtained or research partnerships with non-academic collaborators;
- g) documented activities and outputs related to clinical scholarship, including clinical practice, conducting of clinical trials, development of technology that impacts health and well-being;
- h) other evidence, including external non-peer reviewed funding, patents applied for but not yet issued, and non-refereed publications.

A Unit Standard may expand the evaluation of Research provided any expansion





electronic documents, without hardcopy, as a MS Word document, an rtf file, or a pdf file.  
The Teaching D

As a matter of disciplinary and departmental practice, evaluation committees may refer to reliable sources of external information that are not included in the applicant's application, to support the rigorous academic review of the application, provided the sources to be considered are identified in the Unit Standard. Examples of appropriate sources include, but are not limited to, journal impact factors and citation indices, course experience survey frequency distributions (as per 25.32-25.35 of the Agreement), and any other sources identified in the Unit Standards.

In assessing research, the evaluation committees should consult the [Declaration on Research Assessment \(DORA\)](#) for guidance, and recognize that the scientific content of the research output is more important than publication metrics, or the identity or the journals in which it is published. In addition, the committees should consider a broad range of impact measures including qualitative indicators of research impact, such as influence on policy and practice.

### 5.2. Evaluation-based salary adjustments

The three possible salary adjustments based on Evaluation of Members are:

- (a) Career Progress Increment (CPI) (see Agreement sections 50.13-50.18);
- (b)



this Policy and CA Article 50), the assessment of achievement is, in fact, an exercise in determining the relative ranking within the faculty; that is, in determining who in the Faculty is most deserving of PPI and OPR. If, or as, the levels of performance in the Faculty increase, so will the effort and achievement required to attain a given salary adjustment. As such, a Member who receives a PPI and/or an OPR in a particular year may not necessarily receive either or both in the subsequent evaluation period, even if their performance remains at a similar level.

#### 5.7. *Dean's evaluation and recommendation*

In accordance with section 50.37 of the Agreement, the Dean will make recommendations to the Provost



### 6.1. Introduction

This Policy provides guidance to a Member on the attainment of Reappointment, Continuing Appointment, Tenure and Promotion. Alongside the Unit Standard and the Agreement, it provides the basis for discussion between a Member and their Chair about their responsibilities and evaluations of achievement. The FEP is not a comprehensive reference and the Faculty Member is responsible for reviewing and following the relevant provisions in the Agreement and expectations set out in this FEP and the Member's Unit Standard.

Although the Chair and, possibly, peer-mentors are expected to provide guidance, the responsibility for successful performance – and the articulation and demonstration of said success – rests with the Member. Whenever a Faculty Member is appointed with eligibility for Tenure or Continuing Appointment, the Department Chair is responsible for providing the Faculty Member with a written statement of current performance expectations. By May 15 of each year, the Chair will meet with the eligible Faculty Member to discuss performance as described under sections 26.1-26.10 of the CA. Notwithstanding this statement, the FEP and Unit Standards, which may change from time to time, define the criteria that will be applied in considerations for granting Reappointment, Continuing Appointment, Promotion and Tenure.

### 6.2. General considerations

#### *6.2.1. Documentation to be considered by ARPT committees*

In addition to the CV, Teaching Dossier, and Research Statement or Teaching Statement in the case of Teaching Stream faculty, up to five publications, chosen by the candidate to best represent their scholarly contributions, are to be included in the candidate's submission to the by the candidat

The candidate also has to demonstrate a record of positive performance for at least two years in current rank at the University of Victoria, unless an exception was granted by the Dean (see 28.12, 28.14, 29.12 and 33.23.1).

A candidate on an approved leave who will be able to engage in all aspects of the consideration process may apply for consideration during their period of leave (CA 33.4.1).

As per section 28.15 of the Agreement, if an application for Promotion to Professor is denied, the Faculty Member can reapply only after two years.

#### *6.2.3. Evaluation of prior employment (CA 33.23.1)*

CA 33.23.1 states that the ARPT Committee shall consider the candidate's record of Research or Scholarly Activity since inception; and will consider performance in Teaching and Service since appointment at the University of Victoria.

#### *6.2.4. Referees (Agreement sections 33.5-33.22)*

For Tenure and Promotion of Research Stream and Teaching Stream Faculty, the Faculty of Science requires at least four external letters of reference solicited by the department's ARPT Committee. To ensure that four letters are available in a timely fashion, at least six letters should be solicited.

As described in Section 33.7.1. of the Agreement, in the case of a consideration for Tenure and/or Promotion of a Teaching Stream Faculty Member, two teaching peer reviews, no older than 24 months, can be used as a substitute for one of the letters of reference. The peer review of teaching process must be done in accordance with the guidelines established in the Faculty Evaluation Policy art. 3.3.1. The peer reviewer(s) must be approved by the Dean.

As described in Section 33.10.1. of the Agreement, in the case of Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor or Teaching Professor, one of the four letters of reference may be supplied by a referee who holds an academic appointment at UVic, but who must be external to the candidate's unit.

The letter sent to referees should clearly state that Promotion and Tenure are coupled, and that Promotion to Associate Professor or Associate Teaching Professor will be granted with Tenure. Letters to referees should follow closely the forms given in Appendices B-D of this Policy.

Reference letters are deemed to be current if they are less than one year old. Where a Member has been on an approved leave, other than a Leave Without Salary or Political Leave, and that leave resulted in a reference letter(s) being older than one year, the Member may request the letter(s) be used in the current submission provided the letter(s) is not older than 24 months at the time of submission to the ARPT committee.

#### *33. Reappointment processes for Research Stream and Teaching Stream Faculty (CA 27)*

An Assistant Professor or Assistant Teaching Professor who holds an appointment with eligibility for tenure is eligible for Reappointment for a term that does not extend beyond the year in

which the Faculty Member must formally be considered for tenure. Sections 27.2-27.3 and sections 27.6-27.7 describe the evaluation criteria and evaluation standards that must be applied by the Department of the Assistant Professor or Assistant Teaching Professor, respectively.

An Assistant Professor or an Assistant Teaching Professor under consideration for Reappointment must demonstrate a record of performance that meets or exceeds expectations as described in CA 27.3 or 27.7, respectively. Section 3 of this Policy outlines the criteria to be utilized for this evaluation.

The Member must also demonstrate reasonable progress toward meeting the written expectations of the Department with regard to the granting of Tenure.

In the Faculty of Science, Reappointment recommendations of the Department's ARPT committee are submitted to the Dean, who uses this input to make recommendations to the Provost.

#### **6.4. *Tenure/Promotion processes for Research***

their disciplinary field or Scholarship of Teaching; and/or leadership in the improvement of teaching at the Department, Faculty or University level” and “Service that furthers the goals of the University and the Member’s academic discipline” (29.12).

Agreement sections 33.23-33.35 outline the information considered by the ARPT committee in its deliberation and the assessment process to be followed. Section 4 of the FEP provides a description of the documentation to be used for the evaluation in the Faculty of Science.

7. APPENDIX A1: DEPARTMENT ARPT CHECKLIST

Reappointment of Assistant Professor (Research      Teaching Stream)

Please submit all documentation to the Dean of Science in the order of the checklist

Candidate: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

	Position Status Change Request Form
--	-------------------------------------

---

---

---

---







Protection of Privacy legislation, if your response is designated confidential, and if Dr [Name] requests the information, I would be required to



encl: CV, up to 5 research papers, summary statement, other supporting documents (if applicable)

12. Appendix D Sample Letter to Referee for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Re: Promotion of Dr. [       ] to Professor

I am writing to request your





