



# FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING — UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

June 2016



## Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	4
1.1	Origin of the Faculty Evaluation Policy .....	4
1.2	Purpose of the Faculty Evaluation Policy.....	4
1.3	Criteria for evaluating performance.....	4
1.4	Overview of this Faculty Evaluation Policy .....	5
1.5	Departmental evaluation policies .....	6
1.6	Revisions of this Faculty Evaluation Policy .....	7
2	Teaching performance .....	7
2.1	Description of teaching performance.....	7
2.1.1	Teaching effectiveness.....	8
2.1.2	Innovative teaching .....	8
2.1.3	Scholarship related to teaching .....	8
2.1.4	Leadership related to teaching .....	8
2.2	Documentation of teaching performance.....	9
2.2.1	Essential content .....	9
2.2.2	Optional content.....	10
2.3	Evaluation of teaching performance.....	10
3	Scholarship and professional achievements .....	11
3.1	Description of scholarship and professional achievement.....	11
3.1.1	Refereed publications.....	12
3.1.2	Other publications and presentations .....	12
3.1.3	Recognition of research and research stature.....	12
3.1.4	Other measures.....	12
3.2	Documentation of scholarship and professional achievement.....	13
3.3	Evaluation of scholarship and professional achievement.....	13
4	Other contributions .....	14
4.1	Description of other contributions .....	14
4.1.1	Internal to the University .....	14
4.1.2	External to the University .....	15
4.2	Documentation of other contributions .....	15
4.3	Evaluation of other contributions .....	15
5	Updating of required documentation .....	16
5.1	Biennial updating in odd numbered years .....	16
5.2	Annual updating and review of career progress for non-tenured faculty members .....	16

5.3	Official performance files .....	16
6	Biennial salary adjustment evaluation and awarding of career progress increments (CPI) and merit increments (MI) .....	17
6.1	General procedures with regard to evaluation .....	17
6.1.1	Evaluation ratio .....	18
6.1.2	Circumstances to be taken into account .....	19
6.2	Career progress increment (CPI) recommendations .....	19
6.2.1	General procedures .....	19
6.2.2	Expected standard of career progress .....	20
6.2.3	Expected standards for each criterion .....	20
6.2.4	Documentation .....	21
6.3	Merit increment (MI) recommendations .....	21
6.3.1	Level of merit.....	21
6.3.2	Merit score .....	22
6.3.3	Merit increments .....	22
6.3.4	Distribution of merit increments to Departments .....	23
6.3.5	Feedback to faculty members .....	24
7	Reappointment, promotion and tenure .....	24
7.1	Procedures from the CA .....	24
7.2	Additional procedures and considerations.....	25
7.2.1	Guidelines for promotion of Assistant Teaching Professors and Associate Teaching Professors.....	25
7.2.2	Evaluation of prior service.....	25
7.2.3	Guidelines for the appointment of a new faculty member with tenure.....	25
7.2.4	Referees.....	25
	Appendix A: Annual salary evaluation materials .....	27
	A-1 Teaching dossier .....	27
	A-2 Scholarship and professional achievements report.....	28
	A-3 Other contributions report .....	28
	Appendix B: Principal criteria for merit assessment .....	29
	B-1 Teaching performance .....	29
	B-2 Scholarship and professional achievements .....	32
	B-3 Other contributions .....	33
	Appendix C: Reappointment, tenure & promotion materials .....	34

# **1 Introduction**

## **1.1 Origin of the Faculty Evaluation Policy**

This Faculty of Engineering document satisfies the requirement that each University of Victoria Faculty produce and maintain a “Faculty Evaluation Policy” consistent with Article 19.5 of the 2015 Collective Agreement (hereafter referred to as CA) between the University of Victoria Faculty Association and the University of Victoria. The CA can be found on the web at the following [link](#).

This Faculty Evaluation Policy applies to the Faculty of Engineering at the University of Victoria and supplements the CA. Note that the CA always takes precedence in all academic matters. For ease of reference, selected CA articles are repeated in this document and appear as GIF inserts.

This document replaces all previous versions of the Faculty Evaluation Policy documents of the Faculty of Engineering at the University of Victoria.

## **1.2 Purpose of the Faculty Evaluation Policy**

According to CA Article 19.1:

19.1 Members are evaluated for the purposes of reappointment, tenure, promotion, continuing status, salary adjustment, or removal of probationary status for Librarians.

The criteria and procedures in this Faculty Evaluation Policy aim to promote excellence and encourage creativity in our faculty members’ range of University and related endeavors.

## **1.3 Criteria for evaluating performance**

According CA Article 19.2, criteria for evaluating performance can be found in the following documents:

19.2 Criteria for the evaluation of Members are further elaborated in the Faculty or Libraries Evaluation Policy created pursuant to this section, the departmental standard for attaining tenure, and any other departmental policies further developing the criteria as relevant to the practice of any particular discipline.

The Faculty Evaluation Policy includes the following components:

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

- 19.5.2 a description of the assessment techniques to be used in making evaluations;

#### 1.4 Overview of this Faculty Evaluation Policy

For each criterion to be evaluated, this Policy contains a description of the components to be evaluated as well as the required documentation and assessment techniques to be used in making evaluations. The relevant section numbers are summarized in [Table 1-1](#) below.

**Table 1-1: References to sections for the component descriptions as well as the required documentation and assessment techniques**

Item \ Criterion	Teaching performance	Scholarship and professional achievement	Other contributions
Description	<a href="#">2.1</a>	<a href="#">3.1</a>	<a href="#">4.1</a>
Documentation	<a href="#">2.2</a> + <a href="#">A</a>	<a href="#">3.2</a> + <a href="#">A</a>	<a href="#">4.2</a> + <a href="#">A</a>
Assessment	<a href="#">2.3</a> + <a href="#">B</a>	<a href="#">3.3</a> + <a href="#">B</a>	<a href="#">4.3</a> + <a href="#">B</a>

Note that some CA articles refer to description, documentation, assessment in the same article and, thus, may be cited more than once.

[Section 5](#) of this document specifies information and deadlines for updating documents.

[Section 6](#) contains a description of the process by which recommendations are made as specified in CA Article 19.5.4:

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

Section 7 describes procedures with regard to appointments, reappointments, promotions and tenure.

Appendix A contains templates for the teaching dossier (A-1), scholarship and professional achievements report (A-2), and other contributions report (A-3).

Appendix B outlines the principal criteria for levels of merit, as required by CA Article 19.2.

Appendix C contains information on how to prepare documents for reappointment, promotion and tenure considerations.

Appendix D contains a peer teaching evaluation checklist.

As a convention in this document, tenure and tenure track faculty members as defined in CA Article 16.1 are referred to as “Research Faculty members” and assistant/associate/full teaching track faculty members as defined in CA Articles 16.3.1, 16.3.2, 16.4 are referred to as “Teaching Faculty members.”

## **1.5 Departmental evaluation policies**

Departmental evaluation policies are to adhere to CA Article 19.3:

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

Any existing Departmental evaluation policies are separate documents and supplement this Faculty Evaluation Policy. The CA and the Faculty Evaluation Policy always take precedence over Departmental policies in all academic matters.

## 1.6 Revisions of this Faculty Evaluation Policy

The CA specifies how and when the Faculty Evaluation Policy is to be revised:

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

## 2 Teaching performance

### 2.1 Description of teaching performance

CA Articles 19.6 and 19.7 specify the components included in teaching performance:

#### Evaluation of Teaching Performance

- 19.6 Teaching performance requires the evaluation of all of a Faculty Member's methods and forms of teaching and student supervision that are described and evaluated in accordance with the evaluation policy of the Faculty and of the Department in which the Faculty Member holds an appointment. Teaching performance includes contributions to the Department's or Faculty's teaching program and to scholarship related to teaching as described in the evaluation policy of each Faculty and in any relevant departmental policies. Scholarship related to teaching includes, but is not limited to, the following:
- 19.6.1 scholarly works relating to teaching, curriculum development or learning in a discipline in which such works would not normally form part of the Member's scholarly and professional achievement;
  - 19.6.2 presentations and addresses related to teaching, curriculum development or learning in a discipline in which such activities would not normally form part of the Member's scholarly and professional achievement; and
  - 19.6.3 contributions related to the unit's teaching program in the form of curriculum development, course design or other contributions that advance the Unit's ability to meet its teaching responsibilities.
- 19.7 The evaluation of teaching performance will be conducted on the basis of a Faculty Member's teaching dossier that, in addition to course experience surveys, may include such items as peer reviews, class visit reports, reviews of syllabi and examinations, evidence of innovative teaching, evidence of contribution to the Department's or Faculty's teaching program, teaching awards, and scholarship related to teaching. There must be no obligation to include anecdotal or subjective student comments. Evaluation of teaching performance must not be based solely on student evaluation scores and must consider all materials in the teaching dossier.

The term "student evaluation scores" in CA Article 19.7 is interpreted to mean course experience survey (CES) reports.

Thus from CA Articles 19.6 and 19.7, teaching performance includes the following components, grouped into four categories:

**2.1.1 Teaching effectiveness**

- contributions to the Department's or Faculty's teaching program,
- peer reviews,
- class visit reports,
- reviews of syllabi and examinations,
- teaching awards, and
- CES

**2.1.2 Innovative teaching**

**2.1.3 Scholarship related to teaching**

- scholarly works related to teaching, curriculum development or learning, and
- presentations and addresses related to teaching, curriculum development or learning

**2.1.4 Leadership related to teaching**

- curriculum development, course design

Further to CA 19.6 and 19.7, contributions to the Department's or Faculty's teaching program include:

- delivery of courses with course outlines and other documents that satisfy the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) review requirements,
- specification of learning outcomes for the courses taught,
- development of course content in a form suitable for sharing with others,
- facilitation of the online CES for the courses taught,
- measurement of learning outcomes,
- short courses and special training programs,
- graduate student supervision,
- service on graduate student committees,
- service as external examiner,
- other supervision including directed studies students, student projects, undergraduate student research assistants, post-doctoral fellows, and research staff,
- research papers authored by students under the faculty member's supervision for which the faculty member provided advice and guidance, but on which the faculty member is not listed as a co-author,
- student teams and competitions,
- development of teaching resources,
- activities to support teaching in your academic unit and/or University
- participation in activities of the Learning and Teaching Centre



Teaching effectiveness also includes:

- student feedback, e.g., as described in [Section 2.2.2](#).

Innovative teaching includes:

- testing, developing, and pioneering of new teaching and assessment methods, and
- implementation of innovative teaching and assessment practices.

Scholarship related to teaching includes:

- publications and presentations at conferences and journals in teaching and learning.

Leadership related to teaching includes:

- curriculum and course content development,
- interdisciplinary initiatives,
- peer mentoring,
- grants related to teaching,
- awards for leadership related to teaching, and
- leadership roles in Department, Faculty, University and beyond.

## **2.2 Documentation of teaching performance**

According to CA Article 19.21, faculty members are to maintain a teaching dossier:

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

### **2.2.1 Essential content**

[Appendix A](#) provides a teaching dossier template that is:

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

The essential content in this template includes:

- course outlines including learning outcomes, and
- contributions to teaching for each relevant component in [Section 2.1](#).

The essential content also includes evidence of teaching performance as per CA Article 19.22:

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

[Appendix D](#) details the documentation for peer review of teaching required for promotion and tenure. Peer teaching evaluation is optional for the biennial salary evaluation.

### 2.2.2 Optional content

In addition to the essential content mentioned above, faculty members may attach additional materials in the teaching dossier for some or all of the components in [Section 2.1](#). In particular, according to CA Articles 19.23-19.24:

- 19.23 In addition to the data specified in section [19.22](#), evidence of teaching performance may include complete aggregated statistical results of all teaching evaluation questionnaires administered by the Faculty Member in a course during the period of review; however, the Faculty Member is not obliged to submit or include anecdotal or subjective student comments.
- 19.24 A Faculty Member may choose to include anecdotal or subjective comments by students or former students in her or his teaching dossier. Where such comments are included that have been collected as part of a survey of students in a course, all the comments from that course must be included in the Faculty Member's teaching dossier.

## 2.3 Evaluation of teaching performance

According to CA Article 19.6:

- 19.6 Teaching performance requires the evaluation of all of a Faculty Member's methods and forms of teaching and student supervision that are described and evaluated in accordance with the evaluation policy of the Faculty and of the Department in which the Faculty Member holds an appointment. Teaching performance includes contributions to the Department's or Faculty's

The evaluation of teaching performance is based on the teaching dossier, and may also take into account relevant information in the faculty member's official performance file as described in CA Article 21.3.

Teaching performance is evaluated using the categories from [Section 2.1](#) above:

- Teaching effectiveness,
- Innovative teaching,

- Scholarship related to teaching, and
- Leadership related to teaching.

In applying the teaching performance criteria, evaluators should be mindful of the distinction between achievement (quality of instruction) and activity (number of courses taught).

The evaluators shall take into account the nature of the courses taught by the faculty member, including, but not limited to, class size, lab and course development, level of the course, subject matter, mandatory vs. elective, and historical student response to the course.

Graduate attribute outcome assessment data and possible impact shall not be used for evaluation of faculty members.

The evaluation shall use the principal criteria for levels of merit specified in Tables [B-1](#) and [B-2](#) in [Appendix B](#).

### **3 Scholarship and professional achievements**

Engineering is a research-intensive Faculty that prides itself on the breadth, significance, creativity and impact of the scholarly and professional achievements of its members. Contributions in these areas are assessed by the nature, quality, impact and extent of a faculty member's research, professional and creative activities.

#### **3.1 Description of scholarship and professional achievement**

CA Article 19.8 describes scholarly and professional achievement:

19.8 Scholarly and professional achievement means continuing mastery of one's field of knowledge and the awareness of current scholarship in one's own and closely related fields, and the nature, quality, and extent of one's research, professional, and creative activity as described in the evaluation policy of the Faculty and Department in which the Faculty Member holds an appointment.

Contributions to scholarship and professional achievements may include, but are not limited to the following factors specified CA Article 19.9, as follows:

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

- 19.9.4 membership on boards or councils devoted to research and professional affairs, and in certain fields the extent to which the Faculty Member's professional services are in demand by academic and professional organizations outside the University;
- 19.9.5 recognition by learned and professional societies; and
- 19.9.6 evidence of reputation for scholarship that the Faculty Member establishes among professional colleagues at the University and at other academic and professional institutions.

The items in CA Article 19.9.4 also appear in CA Article 19.11.6 and are referred to in [Section 4.1](#) below.

Scholarship and professional achievements may also include, but are not limited to the following factors that elaborate upon CA Article 19.9, in no particular order:

### **3.1.1 Refereed publications**

- books,
- contributions to books (e.g., chapters),
- patents,
- journal articles, and
- conference papers.

### **3.1.2 Other publications and presentations**

- invited journal, magazine and conference publications,
- invited presentations (e.g., keynotes),
- other conference, workshop and public presentations,
- industrial collaboration reports,
- technical reports, and
- other unrefereed publications.

### **3.1.3 Recognition of research and research stature**

- the leadership and impact arising from the faculty member's scholarship and professional achievements, appropriate to rank and experience,
- metrics of research productivity such as citations, journal impact factors, number of downloads, h-indexes from services such as Web of Science or Google Scholar,
- research funding obtained,
- fellowships or awards granted by the University (see also CA Article 19.9.4), and
- favourable reviews and commendations.

### **3.1.4 Other measures**

- public presentations related to University activities,
- effort to acquire research funding,
- other professional contributions related to research and professional practice,
- industrial interaction, collaboration with industry,
- community based research and its impact,

- research networks and partnerships,
- technology transfer and exchange,
- knowledge mobilization and transition,
- incubating startup companies, and
- evidence of the creation of novel products, processes and services.

### **3.2 Documentation of scholarship and professional achievement**

CA Article 19.19 specifies the materials for documenting scholarship and professional achievement:

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

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

In addition to their curriculum vitae (CV)—a [template](#) is provided by the University—faculty members may include a statement of research achievements of up to two pages. The objective is to allow the faculty member to provide a brief descriptive narrative of their research program that goes beyond the information in their CV and, thus, provide their perspective of the importance and impact of their work in the context of their research areas. Faculty members are encouraged to use this document to explain the nature of and contributions to the collaborative research listed in their CV. Faculty members are also encouraged to explain the reason for choosing to publish in particular venues (i.e., refereed journals, conferences and other venues).

The faculty member must choose whether the items in CA Articles 19.9.4 and 19.11.6 are to be included under scholarship and professional achievement or under other contributions.

### **3.3 Evaluation of scholarship and professional achievement**

CA Articles 19.9 and 19.10 outline how to evaluate scholarship and professional achievement:

19.9 Scholarly and professional achievement will be evaluated in all possible manifestations

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

- In evaluating scholarship, consideration should be given to quality, as well as the amount of scholarship (e.g., number of papers). For example, a seminal or ground-breaking research publication can have more impact and value than a large number of derivative or incremental publications. This should be taken into account in the evaluation.
- It is important to assess the contributions of a faculty member to publications in which colleagues collaborate—either within a discipline or across disciplinary boundaries. The Faculty of Engineering is committed to the principle that there is merit in collaborative and interdisciplinary scholarship. The evaluation of scholarship and professional achievements is to take into account interdisciplinary scholarship and the diverse research methodologies and practices applicable to different research areas.
- The expected number of publications and other metrics, such as citation indices, for a faculty member depends on their discipline(s).
- The evaluation shall use the principal criteria for levels of merit specified in [Table B-3](#) in [Appendix B](#).

## 4 Other contributions

### 4.1 Description of other contributions

Other contributions may include, but are not limited to the factors specified in CA Article 19.11, which distinguishes internal and external contributions. Note that content referred to in CA Article 19.11.6 also appears in CA Article 19.9.4 (cf. [Section 3.1](#)). Thus, other contributions may include, but are not limited to, the following factors:

#### 4.1.1 Internal to the University

- 19.11.1 contributions through service to or development of the Faculty Member's Academic Unit;
- 19.11.2 service as the Chair of a Department, or the Director of a School, centre or institute;
- 19.11.3 contributions through service to the University or the Association;
- 19.11.4 contributions to student life;

- student recruitment, school visits, science fairs and outreach activities,
- mentoring of colleagues and students, and
- assessment of internal grant and fellowship applications.

#### 4.1.2 External to the University

- 19.11.5 attainment of extra-University recognition of a Faculty Member's University related activities; and
- 19.11.6 contributions to the Faculty Member's profession or community, including membership on boards or councils devoted to research and professional affairs, and in certain fields the extent to which the Faculty Member's professional services are in demand by academic, professional and community organizations outside the University.

- organizational roles in conferences, symposia, and workshops,
- refereeing academic books, journal and conference publications, grant applications and other academic materials subject to peer review,
- science and engineering popularization,
- service as the editor, associate editor or member of editorial board (or similar) of a journal,
- service to professional organizations and societies, such as APEGBC, ACM, and IEEE,
- service to other academic institutions in such ways as program reviews or curriculum consultation, and
- community activity, such as contributions related to the faculty member's discipline and expertise.

#### 4.2 Documentation of other contributions

Other contributions may be documented in a free-format other contributions report with page limit of two ([Appendix A-3](#)). The objective is to allow the faculty member to provide a brief descriptive narrative of their other contributions that goes beyond the information in their CV and to provide their perspective of the importance and impact of their work.

The faculty member must choose whether the items in CA Articles 19.9.4 and 19.11.6 are to be included under scholarship and professional achievement or under other contributions.

#### 4.3 Evaluation of other contributions

Other contributions are evaluated based on the other contributions report as described above.

In evaluating other contributions, consideration should be given to the quality and impact of the contributions as well as the quantity.

The evaluators shall use [Table B-4](#) in [Appendix B](#).



## **5 Updating of required documentation**

### **5.1 Biennial updating in odd numbered years**

Each faculty member, including those on paid leave, must by February 1 of each odd year:

- a) ensure that his or her CV in the Department office is up to date to the preceding December 31 (cf. CA Article 19.19, find [here](#) a template of the University's CV),
- b) submit an up to date teaching dossier using the template provided in [Appendix A \(A-1\)](#); cf. CA Articles 19.21 and 19.5.3),
- c) submit some or all of the optional information mentioned in Sections [2.2](#), [3.2](#) and [4.2](#) above (cf. [Appendix A](#)),
- d) if relevant, provide a statement of special circumstances (cf. [Section 6.1.2](#) below).

The period of review is specified in CA Article 19.29.

Faculty members are asked to update the above documents biennially and submit them as PDF files to their Department office by January 31.

Publications referred to in the faculty member's CV and materials referred to in the teaching dossier, scholarship and professional achievements report, or other contributions report need not be submitted but are to be provided for review upon request.

Failure to provide the required documentation will, unless there are extenuating circumstances, render the faculty member ineligible for a CPI and MIs as the Department Chair and Dean will not have the necessary information for an informed assessment.

### **5.2 Annual updating and review of career progress for non-tenured faculty members**

Non-tenured Research Faculty members eligible for tenure are reviewed annually as per CA Articles 20.1-20.12.

Teaching Faculty members who do not have continuing appointments are reviewed annually as per CA Article 20.15.

Thus, the above-mentioned faculty members are expected to update the documents listed in [Section 5.1](#) above on an annual basis.

### **5.3 Official performance files**

CA Articles 21.3–21.5 specify the faculty member's official performance file:



- 21.3 The Official Performance File of a Member must contain only documents and information that pertain to the evaluation of the Member for the purpose of reappointment, tenure, promotion, removal of probationary status (Librarian), or salary. Examples of information that pertains to evaluation for these purposes include:
- 21.3.1 the Member's curriculum vitae;
  - 21.3.2 recommendations with regard to reappointment, tenure or promotion of a Faculty Member made by a departmental committee, the University Academic Appointments Committee, Appointments Committee, Dean or the President of the University including all documents specified in the list of documents provided to the candidate with the departmental recommendation;
  - 21.3.3 recommendations with regard to promotion of a Librarian made by the University Libraries ACRP or by the University Librarian;
  - 21.3.4 recommendations for salary adjustments by a Chair, Director, Dean, University Librarian or the Vice-President Academic and Provost, including decisions by the Vice-President Academic and Provost with regard to a Member's request for a salary review;
  - 21.3.5 an evaluation of a Librarian;
  - 21.3.6 an annual review of a Faculty Member and any response to it;
  - 21.3.7 reports with regard to the Member by a tribunal appointed under the Harassment Policy; the Policy on Scholarly Integrity; or any other University policy.
- 21.4 A Member's Official Performance File will be deemed to include any publications of the Member that are referred to in the Member's curriculum vitae, without the need to physically include a copy in the Official Performance File, and a Faculty Member's teaching dossier.
- 21.5 Each document and other forms of information contained in the Official Performance File will identify the author or creator of the document or information except where a summary is authorized by section 21.11.

## **6 Biennial salary adjustment evaluation and awarding of career progress increments (CPI) and merit increments (MI)**

### **6.1 General procedures with regard to evaluation**

Members are evaluated according to the criteria summarized in [Table 1-1](#) in [Section 1.3](#) above.

The Department Chair is responsible for the salary recommendations to the Dean for the faculty members in his or her department. A department may form a committee to assist the Chair in reaching his or her recommendations. The Dean is responsible for the salary recommendations to the Vice-President Academic for all faculty members in the Faculty of Engineering.

### 6.1.1 Evaluation ratio

- 19.25 Every Faculty and Libraries Evaluation Policy must contain provisions for evaluation for salary adjustment and, in particular, must provide:
- 19.25.1 that Faculty Members, other than Assistant Teaching Professors and Teaching Professors, be evaluated on the criteria listed in sections 19.5.1.1, 19.5.1.2, and 19.5.1.3 in the ratio of 40:40:20 respectively;
  - 19.25.2 that Assistant Teaching Professors, Associate Teaching Professors and Teaching Professors be evaluated on the basis of the criteria listed in sections 19.6 and 19.11 in the ratio of 80:20 respectively;
  - 19.25.3 that Librarians be evaluated on the criteria listed in section 19.12.1 in a ratio of 80:10:10 respectively; and
  - 19.25.4 that Academic Administrators be evaluated on the criteria listed in section 19.14 in the ratio to be fixed between Members and Chair and approved by the Dean or, where the

As per CA Article 19.25.1, a Research Faculty member is evaluated based on the following criteria listed in Sections 2, 3, and 4 above in the ratio 40:40:20:

- teaching performance,
- scholarship and professional achievements, and
- other contributions.

As per CA Article 19.25.2, a Teaching Faculty member is evaluated based on the following criteria listed in Sections 3 and 4 above in the ratio 80:20:

- teaching performance,
- other contributions

According to the CA Article 19.5.5 there is:

- 19.5.5 provision that while Assistant Teaching Professors and Associate Teaching Professors are not evaluated on the basis of their research and scholarship, there is an expectation that they will keep abreast of current developments in their respective fields, and they may be evaluated on the basis of contributions to scholarship related to teaching, which is included in the definition of teaching performance in this section. Teaching Professors will be expected to make contributions to scholarship related to teaching on an ongoing basis;

Other ratio options are discussed in CA Article 19.26:

- 19.26 In regards to the evaluation ratio specified in section 19.25, an alternative ratio may be agreed between the Member and the Chair or supervising Librarian in advance for a fixed period, and approved by the Dean or University Librarian. For a Faculty Member, each figure in this alternative ratio must be at least 20. With regard to Chairs, such an agreement is made between the Dean and the Chair and should be made at the time of appointment as Chair to cover the full term of the appointment.

In evaluating performance for the purpose of merit awards, the evaluation is based on the faculty member's distribution of responsibilities as per CA articles 19.25 and 19.26.

The distribution of responsibilities reflected in a faculty member's job description must be clearly spelled out by the Department Chair. For example, if a faculty member's job description contains a 60% teaching weight, a greater contribution to the teaching program is expected than the average for the unit. As in all cases, assessments must be based on the documentation (i.e., CV, teaching dossier, and other relevant materials) provided by the faculty member.

### **6.1.2 Circumstances to be taken into account**

According to CA Articles 19.17–19.18 and 19.5.7, the following circumstances are to be taken into account:

19.17 Faculty Members should be assessed taking into account their years of experience.

19.18 The evaluation policy must specify that expectations for a Member's performance must be consistent with the Member's FTE.

19.5.7 provision for taking into account the effect on performance of maternity, parental and adoption leave, special leave, sick leave, compassionate care leave, compassionate leave without salary, and long term disability.

As required by [University Policy HR6115](#), accommodations are from time to time required for circumstances that may affect a faculty member's ability to perform his or her duties, or that may affect his or her performance or achievement. Accommodations are to be appropriately taken into account when assessing the criteria or applying the procedures described in this document. Procedures related to accommodation are to be developed in accordance with [University Policy HR6115](#).

## **6.2 Career progress increment (CPI) recommendations**

63.12 A CPI recognizes career progress of a Member whose performance is judged to have satisfied the expected standard of career progress in the period of review.

### **6.2.1 General procedures**

The Chair of each Department shall make recommendations to the Dean regarding CPIs for regular faculty members within their Department, excluding themselves, the Dean and Associate Deans. The Dean shall make recommendations regarding CPIs for the Department Chairs and the Associate Deans.

The Dean will consult with the Chair in the event that the Dean does not agree with the Chair's recommendations. In the event that the Chair recommends withholding a CPI, the Chair is required to provide written justification. Moreover, CA Article 63.14 applies in this case.

63.14 Before a Dean or the University Librarian forwards to the Vice-President Academic and Provost biennial salary recommendations that would result in a CPI not being awarded to the Member, the Member will be given a written statement of the reasons for not awarding the CPI and be given an opportunity to discuss that statement with the Dean (in the case of a Faculty Member) or the University Librarian (in the case of a Librarian).

### **6.2.2 Expected standard of career progress**

In order to be awarded a CPI, the expectations in each of the relevant evaluation criteria below must be met.

In the event that Scholarship and Professional Achievement contributions do not meet these expectations, a faculty member may qualify for a CPI—provided the faculty member and Chair both agree in advance—by doing additional teaching or making external contributions above the normal workload expectation within the following evaluation window.

### **6.2.3 Expected standards for each criterion**

#### **Teaching performance**

The expected standard of performance for a CPI is the fulfillment of all teaching duties and in particular:

- the preparation of an outline for each course following Departmental guidelines;
- the suitable preparation and delivery of lectures;
- the suitable provision for student consultation through scheduled office hours and/or electronic communication, and reasonable availability prior to the final examination;
- due care and attention to the preparation of course materials such as assignments, tests and examinations;
- due care and attention to the administration of tests and examinations;
- due care and attention to grading and grade submission;
- members teaching engineering science or engineering design in the accredited engineering programs are normally expected to be licensed as a professional engineer or as a limited licensee; instructors of engineering program courses are required to be licensed in order to maintain our accreditation;
- to support accreditation of the SENG program, which requires both CSC and SENG courses, faculty members with an appointment in the Computer Science Department are strongly encouraged to become either licensed professional engineers or limited licensees; in any case, faculty members are expected to keep the Chair apprised of their licensing status;
- due care and attention to the outcome-based learning practice and the collection of learning outcome measures; and
- due care and attention to the supervision of the faculty member's graduate students and service on graduate student committees; while graduate student supervision or service on

graduate student committees is not required to obtain a CPI, such activity can be used to justify a CPI award.

### **Scholarship and professional achievement**

The expected standard of performance for awarding of a CPI is evidence of reasonable research output and peer acceptance of a faculty member's work as per the items in [Section 3.1](#). The Department Chair (advised by the Departmental merit review committee if one exists) is responsible for determining whether the expected standard is met.

### **Other contributions**

The expected standard of performance for awarding of a CPI is reasonable internal contributions as per the items in [Section 4.1.1](#). Consideration may also be given to external contributions as per the items in [Section 4.1.2](#). The Department Chair (advised possibly by the Departmental merit review committee) is to determine whether the expected standard is met.

### **6.2.4 Documentation**

Faculty members who do not submit updated and complete documentation including all essential content as per [Section 5.1](#) (and [Section 5.2](#) if applicable) are not eligible for a CPI award.

## **6.3 Merit increment (MI) recommendations**

CA Article 19.5.4 specifies the process for MI recommendations:

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

The process for MI recommendations consists of three steps as described in Sections [6.3.1–6.3.3](#) below. Due to the nature of the comparative MI distribution, a faculty member who is given a specific number of MIs in a given year may not necessarily receive the same number of MIs in the next evaluation period, even though his or her performance is similar.

### **6.3.1 Level of merit**

The level of merit is determined for each criterion using the assessment techniques in Sections [2.3](#), [3.3](#) and [4.3](#) above as well as CA Article 19.28:

19.28 To achieve equity in the evaluation process both within a unit and between units, it is important that the evaluation categories be assessed in a comparable manner. For that purpose, the scores for each of the evaluation categories specified in this section will be assigned on a 0 – 100 scale. Before a Faculty Member's scores are combined using the 40:40:20 or 80:20 rule, or using another agreed-upon ratio, the score in each category will be adjusted by subtracting a value equal to the average of the scores assigned across the unit for that category less 50.

The principal indicators of level of merit are specified in [Appendix B](#).



### 6.3.2 Merit score

As per CA Article 19.28, the merit score (MS) for a faculty member is computed as illustrated in the [Table 6-1](#) below.

**Table 6-1: Example for determining merit based on performance scores**

Criterion \ Merit	Teaching performance	Scholarship and professional achievement	Other contributions	Total
Ratio	40	40	20	100
Level of merit 0-4 scale	3	2	2	
Level of merit 0-100 scale	75	50	50	
Average of scores across unit	70	40	55	
Average of scores across unit less 50	20	-10	5	
Adjusted level of merit	$75 - 20 = 55$	$50 - (-10) = 60$	$50 - 5 = 45$	
Weighted merit	$55 \times 0.4 = 22$	$60 \times 0.4 = 24$	$45 \times 0.2 = 9$	55

### 6.3.3 Merit increments

The merit score is converted to merit increments (MIs) by the process specified in this section and CA Articles 63.13 and 63.15.

63.12 A CPI recognizes career progress of a Member whose performance is judged to have satisfied the expected standard of career progress in the period of review. MIs serve to recognize increasing levels of meritorious performance. The maximum number of MIs that may be awarded to a Member in one year is four.

63.15 MIs are available only to Members who receive a CPI. All Members receiving a CPI will receive 0.0, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5, 3.0, 3.5, or 4.0 MIs. Any score of 0.0 or 0.5 requires the Chair to write to the Member, explaining the reasons behind the decision.

The MS assigned as per [Section 6.3.2](#) above is converted to an allocation of 0-4 MIs for each individual faculty member using the following process.

The Chair of each Department prepares a ranked list based on the Merit Score of the faculty members in the Department (excluding the Chair, Dean and Associate Deans) with a recommendation of from 0 to 4 MIs for each member where the number of MIs recommended for each member cannot be higher than the number recommended for a member higher on the list. The awarding of MIs by the Chairs respects the distribution requirement in CA Article 63.17 unless the Dean provides special permission. This list is normally in descending order of MS and shows the levels of merit assigned.

The total number of MIs recommended by the Department Chair is specified by the Dean, and is typically the least integer greater than or equal to twice the number of members on the Chair's ranked list less than 20%.

The Chair presents the ranked list, including recommendations to the Dean for approval, as well as recommendations for other MIs to be met from the Dean's pool of MIs. When the Chair presents his or her list for the distribution of MIs to the Dean, he or she also provides a description of the process that was used to create the list including a description of the factors that led to the particular placement of individuals on the list. The Chair also provides prioritized recommendations as to how the Dean might allocate any further MIs to be assigned to members on this list.

Based on the Chairs' ranked lists and recommendations regarding additional MIs, the Dean makes salary recommendations to the Vice-President Academic, for the faculty members in the Faculty of Engineering (including the Department Chairs and Associate Deans) with a recommendation of from 0 to 4 MIs for each member. The number of MIs recommended for each member normally cannot be higher than the number recommended for a member in his or her department with a higher merit score. The Dean must attach written reasons if departing from the ordering of the Department Chair.

The awarding of MIs at the faculty level must adhere to CA Article 63.17:

63.17 Subject to section [63.19](#), MIs must be distributed among the Members in a unit, other than Chairs and those Members who receive an automatic 2 MI in accordance with section [19.39](#), such that at least 15% of Members in the unit, rounded down to the nearest whole number, fall within each of the following categories:

63.17.1 0.0, 0.5, or 1.0 MIs;

63.17.2 1.5, 2.0, or 2.5 MIs; or

63.17.3 3.0, 3.5, or 4.0 MIs.

#### **6.3.4 Distribution of merit increments to Departments**

MIs are allocated to the Departments according to CA Articles 63.18–63.19:

63.18 There are two pools of MIs available for award: the primary pool where the number of MIs will be twice the number of Members to be evaluated including Chairs; and a supplementary pool where the number of MIs shall be equal to the number of Chairs.

63.19 MIs are allocated by the Vice-President Academic and Provost to the Deans and the Libraries in proportion to the number of Members to be evaluated in the respective unit, such that each unit is able to distribute 2 MIs per Member evaluated. The Vice-President Academic and Provost will also allocate to each Dean of a Faculty sub-divided into Departments a number of supplementary MIs equal to the number of Departments in the Faculty.

### **6.3.5 Feedback to faculty members**

At the time the Dean submits his or her recommendations to the Vice-President Academic, the Dean shall provide each faculty member with a summary of his or her evaluation, which shall contain:

- a) a notice whether the faculty member has achieved the expected standard of career progress required for the awarding of a CPI;
- b) the level of merit (0-100) assigned for teaching performance scholarship and professional achievements, and other contributions of the faculty member, the MS, and the number of MI recommended to be awarded to the faculty member;
- c) a copy of any written statement of reasons prepared by the Department Chair or the Dean as per CA Article 63.14 if no CPI awarded and as per CA 63.15 if MI of 0.0 or 0.5 is awarded;
- d) a written statement of reasons will be provided on request if an MI of 1-4 is awarded; and
- e) a report showing the distribution of MS and MIs across the Faculty of Engineering.

## **7 Reappointment, promotion and tenure**

This section is intended to provide guidance to a faculty member regarding the issues of promotion and tenure.

### **7.1 Procedures from the CA**

Review of Career Progress is addressed in CA Article 20, including the mandatory annual review of pre-tenure faculty members.

Although Chair and peer mentors are expected to provide guidance, the faculty member responsible for his or her successful performance.

Reappointments are addressed in CA Article 22.

Tenure is addressed in CA Article 23.



Promotion for faculty members is addressed in CA Article 25.

Procedures for Candidates and ARPT Committees are addressed in Part 3, Sections 31-42 of the CA.

Continuing appointments are addressed in CA Article 41.

Schedule and deadline are addressed in Appendix G of the CA.

## **7.2 Additional procedures and considerations**

### **7.2.1 Guidelines for promotion of Assistant Teaching Professors and Associate Teaching Professors**

Teaching Faculty members who apply for promotion, when evaluated on teaching performance, are to provide evidence of significant contributions in scholarship in curriculum and program development and leadership in curriculum and program development, in addition to teaching effectiveness, as described in [Section 2.1](#).

### **7.2.2 Evaluation of prior service**

In some cases, the evidence for the level of teaching performance and other contributions may stem in part from prior service at another institution.

### **7.2.3 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 senior NSERC Industrial Research Chairs, or Canada Research Chairs who have held academic appointments elsewhere, or for other senior regular appointments.

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

- a candidate considered for tenure will submit as much relevant information as possible from previous positions held, including records and evaluations of teaching and other service;
- two or more arms-length letters of reference to be solicited from referees selected by the ARPT, in addition to letters from referees suggested by the candidate;
- the ARPT committee is to evaluate the available documentation in terms of the standards and expectations that apply at UVic;
- when an appointment with tenure involves the recruitment of a professor with tenure from a recognized academic institution to a similar position at UVic, this would constitute support for offering a UVic appointment with tenure;
- the recommendation to offer a tenured appointment is to be supported by a separate vote by the ARPT, distinct from the decision to offer an untenured appointment; and
- in making the decision to offer a tenured appointment the Dean is to be advised by the Chairs in the Faculty of Engineering.

### **7.2.4 Referees**

Further to CA Article 33, with the exception of promotion to Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor, at least four external letters of reference are required and to be solicited by the departmental ARPT Committee.

For promotion to Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor, at least two external letters and two internal letters are required and to be solicited by the departmental the ARPT Committee. The external letters are required to assess the scholarship and leadership as described in [Section 2.1](#).

To ensure that four letters are available in a timely fashion, at least six letters should normally be solicited.

For cases in which tenure may be granted along with promotion, the letter sent to referees should clearly state that tenure will be granted along with promotion, and an opinion should be requested on the appropriateness of both tenure and promotion. An excerpt of the standards as outlined in the articles in the CA is to be appended to the letter.

Reference letters are deemed to be current if they are less than one year old. Where medical conditions, or maternity or parental leave necessitated delay of a tenure or promotion case for which letters had already been obtained, the candidate may request that: previously obtained letters be used in the current submission to the Departmental ARPT even if they are more than 12 months old; or updated letters based on updated documents as per Sections [2.2](#), [3.2](#) and [4.2](#).

## Appendix A: Salary evaluation materials

Faculty members, including those on paid leave, are required to submit the documentation for salary evaluation purposes (cf. [Section 5.2](#)) by February 1 of each year where evaluation is scheduled to take place. The template below is to be used to prepare the teaching dossier. A faculty member also has the option of using the scholarship and professional achievements report and other contributions report templates given below. The templates are available [here](#).

In addition, a faculty member may provide the optional material referred to in Sections [2.2](#), [3.2](#) and [4.2](#), adhering to the specified page limits. Alternately, a faculty member may submit a summary of activities providing highlights of all three categories over the review period.

Note that the materials should be clearly identified such as below.

Name:
Department:
Purpose of review:
Period of review:

### A-1 Teaching dossier

Each faculty member is required to provide a teaching dossier to be used in assessing the member's teaching effectiveness for salary evaluation as well as reappointment, tenure and promotion (RPT) decisions.

The dossier should be prepared using the following template. Page limit: for salary: 4 pages, excluding CES scores and comments, and also excluding course outlines and learning outcomes.

For salary evaluation the teaching dossier should cover the applicable period of review. For RPT decisions, the teaching dossier should cover the candidate's entire teaching career.

Contributions to teaching and accomplishments (see [Section 2.2.1](#))

#### a) Teaching effectiveness

- contributions to the Department's or Faculty's teaching program,
- peer reviews,
- class visit reports,
- reviews of syllabi and examinations,
- teaching awards, and
- CES

#### b) Innovative teaching

#### c) Scholarship related to teaching

- scholarly works related to teaching, curriculum development or learning, and

- presentations and addresses related to teaching, curriculum development or learning
- d) Leadership related to teaching
- curriculum development, course design
- e) Other items, e.g. as listed in [Section 2.1](#) and [Section 2.2.2](#).
- f) Optional for Teaching Faculty: teaching statement (additionally, up to 2 pages)
- g) Course outlines and learning outcomes

### **A-2 Scholarship and professional achievements report**

A faculty member may, at his or her discretion, may submit a scholarship and professional achievements report of up to two pages to supplement his or her CV for the purpose of salary and/or RPT evaluations.

### **A-3 Other contributions report**

A faculty member may, at his or her discretion, may submit an other contributions report of up to two pages to supplement his or her CV for the purpose of salary and RPT evaluations.

## **Appendix B: Principal criteria for merit assessment**

In assessing levels of merit, the rank, reappointment, and tenure status of the faculty member shall be taken into account regarding normal expectations.

Note: Years of experience include appointments at University of Victoria and elsewhere.

### **B-1 Teaching performance**

Please refer to [Section 2.1](#) for principal factors to be evaluated.

Note that in the tables below, the term “normal” means the expected level of effectiveness and is understood according to rank and experience.

In the following tables, TP stands for Teaching Professor.

**Table B-1: Teaching performance levels for Teaching Faculty members**

Level Prof type	0 well below normal	1 below normal	2 normal	3 above normal	4 well above normal
Assistant TP First 3 years	well below normal teaching performance	below normal teaching performance	normal teaching performance	above normal teaching performance	exceptional teaching performance
Assistant TP Years 4-6 Continuing Assistant TP	well below normal teaching performance	below normal teaching performance	normal teaching performance	above normal teaching performance	exceptional teaching performance
Associate TP First 5 years	well below normal teaching performance	below normal teaching performance	normal teaching performance	above normal teaching performance	exceptional teaching performance
Associate TP past first 5 years TP	well below normal teaching performance	below normal teaching performance	normal teaching performance	above normal teaching performance	exceptional teaching performance

**Table B-2: Teaching performance levels for Research Faculty members**

Level Prof type	0 well below normal	1 below normal	2 normal	3 above normal	4 well above normal
Assistant Professor pre-reappointment	well below normal teaching performance	below normal teaching performance	normal teaching performance	above normal teaching performance	exceptional teaching performance
Assistant Professor post-reappointment, pre-tenure	well below normal teaching performance	below normal teaching performance	normal teaching performance	above normal teaching performance	exceptional teaching performance
Associate Professor or Tenured Assistant Professor first 5 years	well below normal teaching performance	below normal teaching performance	normal teaching performance	above normal teaching performance	exceptional teaching performance
Professor, Associate Professor $\geq 5$ years, or Tenured Assistant Professor	well below normal teaching performance	below normal teaching performance	normal teaching performance	above normal teaching performance	exceptional teaching performance

## B-2 Scholarship and professional achievements

Please refer to [Section 3.1](#) for principal factors to be evaluated. Note that the term “normal” means the expected level of effectiveness and is understood according to rank and experience.

**Table B-3: Scholarship and professional achievements levels for research professors**

Level Prof type	0 well below normal	1 below normal	2 normal	3 above normal	4 well above normal
Assistant Professor pre-reappointment	well below normal scholarship and professional achievement	below normal scholarship and below normal professional achievements	normal scholarship and normal professional achievements	above normal scholarship and above normal professional achievements	exceptional scholarship and professional achievements
Assistant Professor post-reappointment, pre-tenure	well below normal scholarship and professional achievement	below normal scholarship and below normal professional achievements	normal scholarship and normal professional achievements	above normal scholarship and above normal professional achievements	exceptional scholarship and exceptional professional achievement, with some demonstrated impact
Associate Professor or Tenured Assistant Professor first 5 years	well below normal scholarship and professional achievement	below normal scholarship and below normal professional achievements	normal scholarship and normal professional achievements	above normal scholarship and above normal professional achievements	exceptional scholarship and exceptional professional achievement, with demonstrated impact
Professor, Associate Professor $\geq 5$ years, or Tenured Assistant Professor	well below normal scholarship and professional achievement	below normal scholarship and professional achievements	normal scholarship and professional achievements	above normal scholarship and above normal professional achievements	exceptional scholarship and professional achievement, with strong demonstrated impact



### B-3 Other contributions

Please refer to [Section 4.1](#) for principal factors to be evaluated.

Note that the term “normal” in the table below means the expected level of effectiveness and is understood according to rank and experience. It is up to the evaluators’ discretion to consider supplementing some Department, Faculty or University service with other professional service, provided that the level for other contributions for Department, Faculty or University is at least normal. This can be done only to the benefit of the faculty member.

**Table B-4: Performance levels for other contributions**

Level Prof type	0 well below normal	1 below normal	2 normal	3 above normal	4 well above normal
Assistant Professor pre-tenure, Assistant TP pre-continuing, Associate Professor pre-tenure, Associate TP pre-continuing	well below internal other contributions	below normal internal other contributions	normal internal other contributions	above normal internal other contributions	as in (3) plus: exceptional internal other contributions, or significant external other contributions
Tenured Associate Professor, Tenured Assistant Professor, Continuing Assistant TP, or Continuing Associate TP first 5 years	well below internal normal other contributions	below normal internal other contributions	normal internal other contributions and normal external other contributions	as in (2) plus: above normal internal other contributions, or above internal normal contributions	exceptional internal other contributions and significant external other contributions
Professor or TP, $\geq 5$ years for Associate Professor, Associate TP, or Tenured Assistant Professor	well below normal internal other contributions	below normal internal other contributions	normal internal other contributions and normal external other contributions	above normal internal other contributions, and above normal external other contributions	exceptional internal other contributions and significant external other contributions

## **Appendix C: Reappointment, tenure & promotion materials**

In assessing levels of merit, the rank, reappointment and tenure status of the faculty member shall be taken into account regarding normal expectations.

Years of experience include appointments at University of Victoria and elsewhere. The following guidelines are intended to assist faculty members in preparing materials in support of reappointment, promotion and tenure (RPT) considerations. Faculty members should consult their peers and Department Chair for more specific guidance.

### **Summary of accomplishments**

The candidate should prepare a summary of accomplishments in the form of a letter addressed to the appropriate department committee, highlighting contributions in teaching, scholarship and other contributions as well as their impact. For tenure and promotion cases, this letter is included in the package sent to external referees.

### **Publications**

The candidate should prepare a list of 4—6 selected publications, together with PDF copies of these publications. This list and the selected publications are included in the package sent to external reviewers.

### **Curriculum vitae (CV)**

The candidate is responsible for ensuring his or her official University of Victoria CV is up to date. In addition, the candidate has the option to prepare a separate CV in a format of his or her own choosing, which is sent to external reviewers and be made available to the departmental ARPT committee. Otherwise the reviewers are provided with a copy of the UVic CV.

### **Evaluation of teaching**

The candidate shall prepare a teaching dossier using the template provided in [Appendix A](#) of this document. For Teaching Faculty only, the teaching dossier is sent to the external. The teaching dossier should cover the candidate's entire teaching career.

At least two peer teaching evaluations over the previous 24 months are required. The department is responsible for conducting that the peer assessments are conducted. The peer evaluators shall be chosen by the department in consultation with the candidate.

A peer teaching evaluation consists of two parts:

- a) evaluation of the course dossier provided by faculty member containing
  - a half-page introduction stating the objectives for each course;
  - course outlines and learning outcomes;
  - all assignments, tests and exams given during the member's most recent offering of the courses;
  - notes given to the students (e.g., web pages)
- b) two in-class visit evaluations

A guide is provided in [Appendix D](#) to help the peer reviewer prepare the written evaluation. Additional information for the instructor may also be provided.

The peer reviewer should contact the instructor in advance to attending the instructor's classes.

**Additional materials**

The faculty member is invited to submit additional materials in support of their case.

## Appendix D: Peer teaching evaluation guide

A peer evaluation report should address the following questions:

- Is the course content up to date?
- Are assignments and exams sufficiently challenging?
- Do students appear to be engaged with the course materials?
- Is the instructor interacting effectively with the students?
- Please comment on innovation, scholarship and leadership (cf. [Section 2](#)) as detailed in the candidate's teaching dossier.

The guide below provides suggestions for additional topics to consider in the written report.

**Table D-1: What is the quality of the materials used in teaching?**

Materials	Comments
Course outline	
Reading list	
Text used	
Study guide	
Non-print materials	
Hand-outs	
Online materials	
Problem sets	
Assignments	
Exams	

**Table D-2: Checklist**

The session/lecture incorporated the following elements	Comments
Expository lecture	
Seminar	
Q & A session	
Problem solving	
Interactive lecture	
Blackboard	
Overheads	
Computer presentation	
Hardware demonstration	
In-class activities	
Case Study	
Other ....	

**Table D-3: Teaching skills checklist**

<b>Content of the session Organization and clarity</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Stated the purpose of the class session	
Presented a brief overview of the content and/or lesson plan for the day	
Made explicit the relationship between current session and other sessions of the course	
Summarized the main ideas	
Related the day's material to upcoming sessions	

<b>Lecture</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Defined terms, concepts and principles appropriately	
Arranged and discussed the content in a systematic and organized fashion	
Asked questions periodically	
Presented clear and simple examples to clarify abstract concepts and ideas	
Used alternate explanations	
Explicitly stated the relationships among various ideas or concepts	
The examples used were based on well motivated or real life applications	

<b>In case of blackboard use</b>	<b>Comments</b>
The blackboard picture was well organized	
The writing was legible	

<b>In case of overhead use</b>	<b>Comments</b>
The slides were organized.	
The text was readable	

<b>In case of computer presentation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
The equipment was handled competently	
The slides were presented in an appropriate speed	
The slides were organized	

The slides were readable with respect to color choice and font size	
---	--

<b>In case of demonstration</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Demonstration was effective	

<b>Dealing with questions</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Paused after questions to allow the students to answer	
Repeated answers when necessary so the entire class could hear	
Received students' comments and questions in an appropriate way	
Encouraged student questions	
Answered student's questions	
Adapted lecture content based on student questions /comments	
When appropriate, requested that time-consuming questions or questions of limited interest be discussed after class or during office hours	

<b>In case of problem solving</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Problems were solved in sufficient detail	
Amount of solution detail was adapted to student questions	

<b>In case of seminar</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Topic suitable – multiple possible solutions	
Good opening question	
Involves many students	
Discussion well controlled	
Discussion well structured	
Corrected student errors	

<b>Communication and interaction skills</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Established and maintained eye contact with the class	
Facial and body movements did not contradict speech or expressed intentions	

Noted and responded to signs of puzzlement, boredom, curiosity	
Voice could be heard easily	
Voice was raised or lowered for variety and emphasis	
Speech fillers were not distracting	
Varied the pace of the lecture	
Exercised appropriate classroom control	
Mediated disruptive behaviour	

<b>In case of in-class activities</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Activities used appeared to be appropriate for this class	
Activities were stated clearly	
Sufficient time was given to complete the activities	
Activities involved group work	

<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Class session was inspiring	
Students appeared to be paying attention	
Students appeared to be motivated	