FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING — UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

1 July 2019 – 30 June 2022

University
of Victoria
Engineering

Table of Contents

1   Introduction

Engineering is a research-intensive Faculty that prides itself on the breadth, significance, creativity and impact of the teaching, scholarly, creative and service 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.

In assessing the performance of its members, the Faculty is committed to considering Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) and systemic bias, and the way that these impact opportunities to achieve metrics for success.

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 Section 25.4 of the 2019 Collective Agreement (hereafter referred to as CA) between the University of Victoria Faculty Association and the University of Victoria.

This Faculty Evaluation Policy applies to the Faculty of Engineering at the University of Victoria and supplements the CA. Where the FEP and CA conflict, the CA will govern. Where the FEP and Unit Standard(s) conflict, the FEP will govern.

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

The purpose is stated in CA 25.1.

The criteria and procedures in this Faculty Evaluation Policy aim to promote excellence and encourage creativity in our faculty members' range of Academic Responsibilities.

CA 12.7, 12.8 and 12.9 outlines the Unit process for distribution of assigned Academic responsibilities.

This Faculty Evaluation Policy includes the sections required by CA 25.4a-h

1.3   Criteria for evaluating performance

The criteria are stated in CA 25.5-25.14.

1.4   Overview of this Faculty Evaluation Policy

For each evaluation category (i.e., Teaching, Research, Scholarly Activity, Service), this Policy presents a description of the evaluation criteria, the required documentation and the assessment techniques. The relevant section numbers are summarized in Table 1-1.

Table 1-1: References to FEP sections for the descriptions of evaluation criteria, required documentation and the assessment techniques

Evaluation Category / Item	Teaching	Research, Scholarship & Creative Activity (Research stream)	Scholarly Activity (Teaching stream)	Service
Description	2.1	3.1	3.2	4.1
Documentation	2.3 + B	3.3 + B	3.3 + B	4.2 + B
Assessment	2.4 + B	3.4 + B	3.4 + C	4.3

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

Section 2: Evaluation of Teaching Performance.

Section 3: Evaluation of Research (Research stream) and Scholarly Activity (Teaching stream)

Section 4: Evaluation of Service

Section 5: Procedures and deadlines for updating documents.

Section 6: Procedures for Performance Evaluation of Members and allocation of Performance Pay Increments (PPI) and Outstanding Performance Recommendations (OPR).

Section 7: Procedures for Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure.

Appendix B: Preparation of documents for reappointment, promotion and tenure and continuing appointment considerations.

Appendix D: Checklist for peer review of teaching

1.5   Unit Standards

Each Department must have a Unit Standard to supplement this Faculty Evaluation Policy, as per CA 13.1 - 13.8. The CA and the Faculty Evaluation Policy take precedence over a Unit Standard where a conflict arises.

1.6   Revisions of this Faculty Evaluation Policy

CA 25.3 specifies how and when the Faculty Evaluation Policy is to be revised.

2   Evaluation of Teaching Performance

2.1   Description of Teaching Performance

CA 25.7a-j specifies 10 items of evidence to be considered in evaluating teaching performance. These items are grouped into categories as shown below, along with some additional items relevant to the Faculty of Engineering.

As per CA 12.10, the UVic Division of Learning and Teaching Support and Innovation, 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.

2.1.1 Teaching effectiveness

- CA 25.7c - peer reviews, class visit reports;
- CA 25.7i - course experience surveys
- Student feedback, e.g., as described in FEP 2.3.2 and CA 25.25.

2.1.2 Contributions to the Department or Faculty teaching program

- CA 25.7b - contributions related to the Unit's teaching program in the form of course delivery, as further elaborated in FEP 2.1.2 below.
- CA 25,7e - syllabi, examinations and other course materials;
- CA 25.7j - other contributions to the Department's or Faculty's teaching program;
- delivery of courses with course outlines and other documents that satisfy the accreditation requirements of the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) or the Computer Science Accreditation Council (CIPS/CASC);
- specification of learning outcomes for the courses taught;
- development of course content in a form suitable for sharing with others;
- encouraging students to participate in the online CES for the courses taught;
- measurement of learning outcomes achievement and collection of the resulting data for program accreditation;
- short courses and special training programs;
- development of teaching resources;
- activities to support teaching in your academic unit and/or University;
- participation in activities of the Division of Learning and Teaching Support and Innovation;
- supervision of undergraduate directed studies, capstone projects and honours theses.

2.1.3 Teaching improvement and innovation

- CA 25.7a - participation in panels, presentations and addresses related to teaching, curriculum development or learning
- CA 25.7d - evidence of professional development supporting growth as a teacher, supervisor or scholar of teaching and learning;
- CA 25.7f - 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;

2.1.4 Leadership related to teaching

- CA 25.7b - contributions related to the Unit's teaching program in the form of curriculum development, course co-ordination, program assessment or development, and course design**;**
- CA 25.7g - teaching awards and grants
- CA 25.7h - evidence 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;
- Creation of teaching materials that are adopted at other universities
- CA 25.5 - Community engaged teaching (see also FEP 3.1.5).
- Scholarship related to teaching is considered to be "Scholarly Activity", see FEP 3.2.

2.1.5 Supervision

- CA 25.5 - student supervision
- graduate student supervision
- service on graduate student committees
- student clubs, organizations, teams and competitions (see also FEP 4.1.1)
- service as external examiner,
- other supervision including 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.

2.1.6 Professional Licensure for Accreditation

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. To support accreditation of all CEAB accredited programs, faculty members are encouraged to become either licensed professional engineers or limited licensees. Unless licensure is a specified as a condition of appointment in one's appointment letter, a faculty member's performance will not be evaluated based on their licensure status.

2.2 Additional Description of Teaching Performance (Research versus Teaching streams)

For the Teaching Stream, items in FEP 2.1.5 are not expected but, if present, will be evaluated.

2.3 Documentation of Teaching Performance

CA 25.19 specifies that Faculty members shall maintain a curriculum vitae (CV) that documents their achievements in their Academic Responsibilities, including Teaching.

A curriculum vitae (CV) template is provided by the University.

CA 25.21 specifies that Faculty Members will maintain a teaching dossier in a format prescribed

in FEP 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 for the purpose of career progress (FEP 6) and provide this to the Department Chair on the date specified in FEP 5.

These materials are used for both salary review (FEP 6) and also for reappointment, promotion and tenure (FEP 7).

2.3.1 Essential content in teaching dossier

As per CA 25.4e, the essential content is:
- Course outlines including learning outcomes
- Summary of contributions to teaching for the types of evidence listed in FEP 2.1,
  - limited to 2 pages for research stream,
  - limited to 4 for teaching stream
- Required CES data, as per CA 25.6 and CA 25.22, 25.23, 25.24 and 25.25

FEP Appendix D details the documentation for peer review of teaching required for promotion and tenure. Peer teaching evaluation is optional (i.e. at the discretion of the member) for the biennial salary evaluation.

2.3.2 Optional content in teaching dossier

In addition to the essential content mentioned above, Members may include:

- Optional CES data, as per CA 25.6 and CA 25.22, 25.23, 25.24 and 25.25

- A statement of teaching philosophy and/or response to student comments (2 pages maximum)

2.4 Assessment Techniques

The assessment of teaching performance is based on the items in CA 25.5 as documented in the teaching dossier as per CA 25.6, and may also take into account relevant information in the faculty member's official performance file as described in CA 18.3, 18.4 and 18.6 and disciplinary processes as per CA 46.7, 46.8 and 46.9.

As per CA 25.17, members should be assessed taking into account their stage of career.

Assessment of a Member who has had an Alternative Workload or Reduced Workload in the period under evaluation will be undertaken in accordance with CA 25.18.

Teaching performance assessed based on evidence in the categories from FEP 2.1 and FEP 2.2.

In assessing the teaching performance criteria, evaluators will be mindful of the distinction between achievement (effectiveness) (quality of instruction) and activity (contribution) (number of courses taught).

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

Evaluators will take into account CA 25.22 through 25.25 in their consideration of CES scores.

Collected CEAB or CASC accreditation data and Graduate attribute outcome assessment data and possible impact (success against metrics) will not be used for evaluation of faculty members.

3 Evaluation of Research, Scholarship and Creative activity (Research stream) and Scholarly Activity (Teaching stream)

3.1 Description of Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity (Research Stream)

CA 25.8 describes Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity.

Contributions to Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity may include, but are not limited to, the factors specified CA 25.9.

Research, scholarship and creative activity may also include, but are not limited to, the following items that elaborate upon CA 25.9, in no particular order:

3.1.1 Peer-reviewed publications

- CA 25.9a
- books,
- contributions to books (e.g., chapters),
- patents,
- journal articles, and
- conference papers.

3.1.2 Other publications and presentations

- CA 25.9b
- 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

- CA 25.9c, e, f, g.
- the leadership and impact arising from the faculty member's Research, scholarship and creative activity, 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 25.9c), and
- favourable reviews and commendations.

3.1.4 Additional measures

- public presentations related to University activities,
- effort to acquire research funding, even if unsuccessful, such as:
  - networking with entities to seek out research funding opportunities,
  - formal applications that were not funded
  - formal application rank relative to the funding cutoff.
- other professional contributions related to research and professional practice,
- industrial interaction, collaboration with industry,
- research networks and partnerships,
- technology transfer and exchange,
- knowledge mobilization and transition,
- incubating startup companies, and
- evidence of the creation of successful novel products, processes and services.
- Consideration of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion as per NSERC guidelines
  https://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/_doc/EDI/Guide_for_Applicants_EN.pdf

3.1.5 Community-Engaged Research and Scholarly Activity (CERSA)

As per CA 13.5, 25.4c, 25.5, and 25.9d the Faculty of Engineering values CERSA and recognizes that this research can be pursued in a variety of forms. These forms may be more broad than those that arise in the context of a single research project, research grants, or inter-related sequences of projects and/or grants.

A faculty member seeking to include CERSA as part of their performance evaluation and/or promotion or tenure assessment will:

- Delineate the nature and characteristics of their CERSA, inclusive of denoting the involved community or communities.
- Clearly delineate how their CERSA differ and are distinct from activities assessed elsewhere in the Faculty Evaluation Policy.
- Provide evidence of the nature of outcomes and/or impacts that have accrued from their CERSA, including the impacts and/or benefits arising to (of for) the engaged community or communities.
- Provide evidence of on-going community engagement throughout the duration of the CERSA, from inception forward, inclusive of efforts and active work in developing and nurturing the collaborative relationship(s) with the identified community(ies).

It is expected CERSA will encompass activities beyond those traditionally undertaken within the pursuit of academic research and scholarly activities. Moreover, CERSA is expected to involve multiple stakeholders from outside of the University community. Such stakeholders are normally expected to be actively engaged throughout the CERSA, including but not limited to: formation of research questions and/or projects, development of research funding proposals, dissemination of results.

Guidance on structuring ethical community engagements with First Nations, Inuit and Métis Peoples of Canada is provided by the Canadian Panel on Research Ethics TCPS 2 (2018) available

on-line: http://pre.ethics.gc.ca/eng/tcps2-eptc2_2018_chapter9-chapitre9.html

3.2 Description of Scholarly Activity (Teaching Stream)

CA 25.11 and 25.12 describe Scholarly Activity

As required by CA 25.4(g), Teaching Stream faculty will keep abreast of current developments in their respective fields, and are expected to make contributions to Scholarly Activity as defined in this Article on an ongoing basis.

Contributions to Scholarly Activity may include, but are not limited to the factors specified CA 25.12.

Contributions to Scholarly Activity may also include:

- Items in FEP 3.1.1-3.1.5 that are consistent with CA 25.11.
- Other scholarly contributions that enhance teaching in the Department. These are to be negotiated with and approved by the Chair, prior to undertaking the contribution.
- The Unit Standard may set out more specific expectations in relation to Scholarly Activity.

3.3 Documentation of Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity (Research Stream) and Scholarly Activity (Teaching Stream)

CA 25.19 specifies that Faculty members shall maintain a curriculum vitae (CV) that documents their achievements in their Academic Responsibilities, including Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity (Research Stream) or Scholarly Activity (Teaching Stream).

A curriculum vitae (CV) template is provided by the University.

In addition to the CV, 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).

A Common CV https://ccv-cvc.ca may be a useful source of data for the CV.

These materials are used for both salary review (FEP 6) and also for reappointment, promotion and tenure (FEP 7).

3.4 Assessment Techniques

As per CA 25.10, the evaluation is based on the CV and optional 2-page statement of research achievements, and may also take into account relevant information in the Faculty Member's official performance file as described in CA 18.3, 18.4 and 18.6 and disciplinary processes as per CA 46.7, 46.8 and 46.9.

Evaluations of a Member who has had an Alternative Workload or Reduced Workload in the period under evaluation will be undertaken in accordance with CA 25.18.

As per CA 25.17, members should be assessed taking into account their stage of career.

The Faculty of Engineering values collaborative and interdisciplinary scholarship. Contributions in which colleagues collaborate, either within a discipline or across disciplinary boundaries, will be assessed. Evaluations will take into account interdisciplinary scholarship and the diverse research methodologies and practices applicable to different research areas.

The Faculty of Engineering values Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI). Evaluations will take into account any consideration of EDI factors when present in the documentation (FEP 3.3).

3.4.1 Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity (Research Stream)

The assessment will be based on the evidence described in CA 25.9 and 25.10 as elaborated in FEP 3.1.1-3.1.5.

Consideration will be given to quality, as well as the amount of scholarship. For example, a seminal or ground-breaking contribution can have more impact and value than a large number of derivative or incremental contributions.

The Unit Standards will identify expectations for publication and other metrics for the Unit, as appropriate to the discipline.

3.4.2 Scholarly Activity (Teaching Stream)

This assessment will be based on the evidence described in CA 25.12 and 25.13 and 25.4g, as elaborated in FEP 3.1.1-3.1.5 and consistent with CA 25.11.

Consideration will be given to quality, as well as the amount of the activities.

The Unit Standards will identify expectations for the Unit, as appropriate to the discipline.

4 Evaluation of Service

4.1 Description of Service

CA 25.14 describes Service.

Service may include, but is not limited to the factors specified in CA Section 25.14, which distinguishes internal and external contributions.

4.1.1 Service Internal to the University
- items in CA 25.14abcd
- student recruitment, school visits, science fairs and outreach activities,
- mentoring of colleagues and students, and
- assessment of internal grant and fellowship application

4.1.2 Service External to the University
- items in CA 25.14ef
- organizational roles in conferences, symposia, and workshops,
- refereeing academic books, journal and conference publications, grant applications and other academic materials subject to peer review,
- promotion of computer science and engineering to external audiences, including public

presentations, (live or video recorded), articles in public media and magazines or similar,

- service as the editor, associate editor or member of editorial board (or similar) of a journal,
- service to professional organizations and societies, such as EGBC, 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.
- activities that advance the profile and reputation of the Faculty and the University.

4.2   Documentation of Service

CA 25.19 specifies that Faculty members shall maintain a curriculum vitae (CV) that records their achievements in their Academic Responsibilities, including Service.

In addition to the CV, Service may be documented in a free-format Service report with page limit of two. The objective is to allow the faculty member to provide a brief descriptive narrative of their Service that goes beyond the information in their CV and to provide their perspective of the importance and impact of their work.

These materials are used for both salary review (FEP 6) and also for reappointment, promotion and tenure (FEP 7).

4.3   Assessment Techniques

Service is evaluated based on the CV and optional Service report and how it makes a positive contribution, and may also take into account relevant information in the Faculty Member's official performance file as described in CA 18.3, 18.4 and 18.6 and disciplinary processes as per CA 46.7, 46.8 and 46.9.

Evaluations of a Member who has had an Alternative Workload or Reduced Workload in the period under evaluation will be undertaken in accordance with CA 25.18.

As per CA 25.17, members should be assessed taking into account their stage of career.

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

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) submit a 2-page summary of accomplishments during the review period.
b) ensure that their CV in the Department office is up to date to the preceding December 31 (CA 25.19).
c) submit an up to date teaching dossier CA 25.6, CA 25.21.
d) submit optional information permissible under FEP 2.3, 3.3 and 4.2, if the faculty member so chooses,
e) if relevant, provide a statement of special circumstances (FEP 6.1.2),

f) Conflict of interest declaration (annual).

The period of review is specified in CA 50.27.1, 50.27.3 and 50.27.4.

Faculty members will update the above documents biennially and submit them as PDF files to their Chair by January 31.

Publications referred to in the faculty member's CV and materials referred to in the Teaching Dossier, Research, Scholarship and Creative activity report, Scholarly Activity report, or Service 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 (as specified in CA 50.29), render the faculty member ineligible for a CPI and a PPI 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 Stream Members eligible for tenure are reviewed annually as per CA 26.

Teaching stream Members who do not have continuing appointments are reviewed annually as per CA 26.

The above-mentioned faculty members will update the documents listed in FEP 5.1 above on an annual basis.

5.3 Official performance files

CA 18.3–18.5 specify the contents of a Member's official performance file.

6 Biennial salary adjustment evaluation and awarding of Career Progress Increments (CPI), Performance Pay Increments (PPI) and Outstanding Performance Recognition (OPR)

6.1 General procedures

CA 50.24 and 50.27 and 50.28 and 50.30 outline the procedures.

Member performance is evaluated using the criteria and assessment techniques summarized in Table 1-1, FEP 1.4 .

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

Further to CA 50.30, the process of the Chair's review of the Member's performance is described in FEP 6.1, 6.2, 6.3.1 and 6.3.2.

6.1.1 Evaluation ratio

CA 25.26, 25.27, 13.10, 13.11 and 25.27.1 specify the evaluation ratio.

CA 13.10 is interpreted by the Faculty of Engineering to mean a ratio of 40% Teaching, 40% Research and 20% Service, for Research Stream, and 70% Teaching, 10% Scholarly Activity and 20% Service, for Teaching Stream.

Alternative evaluation ratios options are discussed in CA 25.27.2.

6.1.2 Circumstances to be taken into account

CA 25.17, 25.18 and 25.4h specify the circumstances to be taken into account.

As required by University Policy HR6115, accommodations are from time to time required for circumstances that may affect a Member's ability to perform their duties, or that may affect their performance or achievement. Approved accommodations are to be 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 CA 39 and University Policy HR6115.

6.2 Career progress increment (CPI) recommendations

CA 50.12 describes CPI.

6.2.1 General procedures

The Chair of each Department will make recommendations to the Dean regarding CPIs for Faculty Members within their Department, excluding themselves, the Dean and Associate Deans. The Dean will make recommendations regarding CPIs for the Department Chairs and the Associate Deans.

6.2.2 Expected standard of career progress

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

6.2.3 Expected standards for each evaluation category (i.e., Teaching, Research, Scholarly Activity, Service)

In this section, minimum expected standards for each evaluation category are described. The Unit Standards provide additional requirements.

Teaching

The expected standard of performance for a CPI is the fulfillment of all teaching duties, subject to the provisions in FEP 6.1.2 above. Teaching duties include due care and attention to:

- preparation of an outline for each course following Departmental guidelines;
- preparation and delivery of lectures and other in-class activities.
- provision for student consultation through scheduled office hours and/or electronic communication, and reasonable availability prior to the final examination;
- preparation of course materials such as assignments, tests and examinations;
- administration of tests and examinations;
- grading and timely grade submission;
- learning outcome-based learning practice;
- measurement of learning outcomes achievement and collection of the resulting data for

program accreditation;

- supervision of the Member's graduate students and service on graduate student committees in accordance with the Graduate Supervision policy; 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.

Research, scholarship and creative activity (Research Stream)

The expected standard of performance for awarding of a CPI is evidence of Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity output as per the items in Section 3.1, in accordance with the Unit Standard. The Department Chair (advised by the Departmental review committee if one exists) is responsible for determining whether the expected standard is met.

Scholarly Activity (Teaching Stream)

The expected standard of performance for awarding of a CPI is evidence of output from Scholarly Activity items in Section 3.2, in accordance with the Unit Standard.

As required by CA 25.4(g), Teaching Stream faculty will keep abreast of current developments in their respective fields, and are expected to make contributions to Scholarly Activity as defined in this Article on an ongoing basis.

The Department Chair (advised by the Departmental review committee if one exists) is responsible for determining whether the expected standard is met.

Service

The expected standard of performance for awarding of a CPI is evidence of internal Service as per the items in Section 4.1.1 and external Service as per the items in Section 4.1.2 in accordance with the Unit Standard. The Department Chair (possibly advised by the Departmental review committee, if one exists) is responsible for determining 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 FEP 5.1 (and FEP 5.2, if applicable) are not eligible for a CPI award, subject to the provisions in CA 50.29 and FEP 6.1.2 above.

6.2.5   Assessment for award of CPI

CA 50.31.2 and 50.33 describe the procedures when a CPI is not awarded.

The Dean will consult with the Chair in the event that the Dean does not agree with the Chair's recommendations.

CPI will be awarded only to Members whose internal Service contributions per FEP 4.1.1 meet or exceed a minimum level of service, to be defined the Unit Standards.

6.3   Recommendations for Performance Pay Increment (PPI) and Outstanding Performance Recognition (OPR)

CA 50.7-50.22 describes the processes and requirements for PPI and OPR recommendations.

The process for PPI and OPR recommendations in the Faculty of Engineering consists of four steps, as described in FEP 6.3.1–6.3.4

6.3.1 Levels of performance

The level of performance for each evaluation category is assessed using the techniques described in FEP 2.4, 3.4 and 4.3 .

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 this purpose, the level of performance for each evaluation category in Table 1.1 will be assigned a score on a 0 – 100 scale.

This level of performance is adjusted by subtracting the average of the scores assigned across the unit, for that evaluation category, less 50.

6.3.2 Performance Score and Assessment Rating

To calculate the Performance Score, the adjusted level of performance for each evaluation category are combined, based on the workload ratio for that Member (i.e., 40:40:20, 70:10:20, or Alterative Workload ratio as per CA Section 13). An example of the calculation of Performance Score for a Member is illustrated FEP Table 6-1.

Regarding the assessment ratings in CA 50.30, the assessment rating of "meets expectations" is awarded to all Faculty Members who are awarded a CPI, as described in 6.2.3.

The assessment rating of "exceeds expectations" will be based on the Performance Score (FEP 6.3.2). The method by which Performance Scores are converted to assessment ratings will be specified in the Unit Standard of each Department. Following the discussion with each Member (CA 50.28), the Chair may adjust assessment rating for that member. Reason for such adjustments will be documented in the Members Official Performance File.

Table 6-1: Example Performance Score calculation for a Research stream Member. Calculation for a Teaching stream Member is similar, except category weights are 70/10/20.

Criteria / Performance	Teaching performance	Research, scholarship and creative activity	Service	Totals
Ratio	40	40	20	100
Level of performance 0-4 scale	3	2	2	
Level of performance 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 performance	75-20 = 55	50-(-10) = 60	50-5 = 45	
Weighted performance	55 x 0.4 = 22	60 x 0.4 = 24	45 x 0.2 = 9	55

6.3.3 Chair's Recommendations to the Dean (CA 50.31)

By March 1 of the year of evaluation, each Chair will provide to the Dean:

a) The assessment rating (meets/does not meet/exceeds) as per CA 50.30 for each Member including the Directors of the Biomedical Engineering and Software Engineering programs but excluding the Chair and members who hold an appointment as a Dean or Associate Dean.

b) A description of the method used to determine the assessment ratings. The method by which Performance Scores are converted to assessment ratings will be specified in the Unit Standard of each Department.

c) For any Member assessed as "does not meet expectations", a memo outlining the performance concerns which support the assessment and any supporting documentation (CA 50.31.2).

d) Recommendations for PPI awards comprising separate ranked lists for Research and Teaching Stream Members who "exceed expectations" as per CA 50.17. In developing these recommendations, the Chair will take into account the following:

    i. Pro-rata distribution of among Ranks and between Streams,

    ii. Only Members assessed as "exceeds expectations" are eligible for one PPI,

    iii. Normally a maximum of 30% of Members in a Unit will receive one PPI even if more than this percentage receive an assessment of "exceeds expectations",

    iv. Members whose years since initial appointment, per s. 50.13., exceeds the eligibility window for CPI are eligible for PPI,

e) Recommendations for OPR awards. In the Faculty of Engineering, OPR awards recognize a singular achievement in any of evaluation categories (Teaching, Research/Scholarly Activities, Service), as opposed to a cumulative record, within the review period as per CA 50.21. Examples of such achievements could include, but are not limited to:

    i. a major external award or recognition;

    ii. a significant publication or research achievement;

    iii. a significant curricular development or achievement (e.g. a new program, an innovative development in curriculum or teaching reform);

    iv. election to a significant professional, national or international leadership role

    v. a significant national or international recognition,

    vi. an output of high societal impact

f) A memo supporting each recommendation as per CA 50.31.1. In developing these recommendations, the Chair will take into account:

    i. Pro-rata distribution of among Ranks and between Streams,

    ii. Only Members who are awarded PPI are eligible for OPR (CA 50.21.1),

    iii. Up to 10% of the Members of the Faculty will receive OPR awards.

6.3.4 Dean's evaluation and recommendation (CA 50.32)

The Dean will evaluate the Faculty Administrators (Chairs, Associate Deans).

In the performing this evaluation, the Research/Scholarly Activity and Teaching categories of each Administrator's Academic Responsibilities are evaluated by the Dean, relative to the Administrator's peers in the Department. The Service component is evaluated relative to the other Administrators in the Faculty.

This evaluation will be converted to a Performance Score according to FEP 6.3.2. Where a Chair is assessed as "exceeds expectations", the Dean will place the Chair within the appropriate ranked list created by the Chair, as per 6.3.3(d). The Dean will make recommendations for PPI awards based on these revised ranked lists. The number of faculty recommended for PPI will be no more than 30% of the number of Members in the Faculty. PPI recommendations will take into account pro-rata distribution among ranks and between streams as per CA 50.19.

In the event that the number of members assessed as "exceeds expectations" in a Department is less than 30% of the number of members in that Department, the Dean may allocate unallocated PPI to members in other Departments, who are assessed as "exceeds expectations".

The Dean will evaluate and make recommendations on the recipients of the OPR awards for the Faculty, based on CA 50.22 and FEP 6.3.3(e)(f).

The Dean will notify the Vice-President Academic and Provost of their recommendations of the assessments and PPI and OPR awards no later than May 1 in the year of evaluation.

6.3.5 Feedback to faculty member

At the time the Dean recommends a reduced CPI for a Member and before submitting that recommendation to the VPAC, the Dean will follow the provisions of CA 50.33.

Further to CA 50.34,

At the time the Dean receives approval by the VPAC of their recommendations, the Dean will provide each faculty member with a summary of their evaluation, which will 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 performance (0-100) assigned for Teaching, Research, scholarship and creative activity, and Service of the faculty member, the Performance Score, and any PPI or OPR to be awarded to the faculty member;

c) a written statement of reasons will be provided on request, if a PPI is not awarded; and

d) a report showing the distribution of Performance Scores and PPIs 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 26, including the mandatory annual review of pre-tenure faculty members.

Although the Chair and peer mentors are expected to provide guidance, the faculty member is responsible for understanding the criteria required to meet the relevant standard.

Reappointments are addressed in CA 27.

Tenure is addressed in CA 28.

Promotion for faculty members is addressed in CA 29.

The consideration processes for reappointments, continuing appointment, promotion and tenure and procedures for Candidates and ARPT Committees are addressed in CA 32 and 33, 33.1, 33.19, 33.23 and 25.18.

Schedule and deadline are addressed in the Resource section, which follows the Appendices in the CA.

RPT Committees may refer to reliable sources of external information, 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 FEP or Unit Standard.

7.2 Expectations for Promotion and Tenure

7.2.1 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (Research Stream)

The expectations for achieving tenure with promotion to Associate Professor are in CA 28.15, 28.16 and CA 29.1. Furthermore, in the Faculty of Engineering, the minimum expectations are:

1. A record of teaching performance (as defined in FEP 2.1) demonstrating quality course instruction, normally at both the undergraduate and graduate levels;
2. An established record of research-intensive graduate student supervision and graduation at the Master's level;
3. Success in securing external resources needed to support a program of Research, Scholarship and Creative activity;
4. High quality output from Research, Scholarship and Creative activity (as defined in FEP 3.1);
5. Service contributions (as defined in FEP 4.1) that support the operations, culture, visibility and/or reputation of the Department, Faculty, and/or University;

Unit Standards may elaborate on these criteria or define additional criteria.

7.2.2 Promotion to Professor

The expectations for achieving promotion to Professor are in CA 28.17 and CA 29.2. Furthermore, in the Faculty of Engineering, the minimum expectations are:

1. A substantial record of teaching performance (as defined in FEP 2.1), normally spanning at least ten years, demonstrating high quality course instruction, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels;
2. A substantial record of research-intensive graduate student supervision, including graduation of Doctoral students;
3. Sustained success in securing external resources to support a program of Research, Scholarship and Creative activity;
4. Sustained and high quality output from Research, Scholarship and Creative activity (as defined in FEP 3.1) which is nationally or internationally recognized;
5. Substantial service contributions (as defined in FEP 4.1) that support the operations, culture, visibility and/or reputation of the Department, Faculty, and/or University.

Unit Standards may elaborate on these criteria or define additional criteria.

7.2.3 Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor

The expectations for achieving promotion to Associate Teaching Professor are in CA 29.5.

Unit Standards may elaborate on these criteria or define additional criteria.

7.2.4 Promotion to Teaching Professor

The expectations for achieving promotion to Teaching Professor are in CA 28.18 and CA 29.7.

Unit Standards may elaborate on these criteria or define additional criteria.

7.2.5 Evaluation of prior service

Evidence for the level of teaching performance and service from prior employment at another institution may be taken into account, provided that the applicant provides this evidence and includes a memo that explains the nature and context of this evidence.

7.2.6 Guidelines for the appointment of a new faculty member with tenure

For some cases, 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 recommend a tenured appointment to the Provost, the Dean is to be advised by the Chairs in the Faculty of Engineering.

7.2.7 Referees

Further to CA 33.7, 33.12, 33.13, 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 ARPT Committee. The external letters are required to assess the scholarship and leadership as described in FEP 2.1. One of the external letters of reference may be substituted with two teaching peer reviews as per CA 33.7.1.

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 FEP 2.3, 3.2 and 4.2.

Appendix A: Salary evaluation materials

Faculty members are required to submit the documentation for salary evaluation purposes (cf. FEP 5.2) by February 1 of each year where evaluation is scheduled to take place, subject to CA 50.29. The required documentation is specified in Appendix B.

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

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

Appendix B: Teaching Dossier and Summary Reports

Teaching Dossier

As per FEP 2.3, each 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. For salary evaluation, the teaching dossier covers the applicable period of review. For RPT decisions, the teaching dossier covers the candidate's entire teaching career.

The teaching dossier content is specified in FEP 2.3.1 and 2.3.2.

Summary reports

Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity Report (Research Stream)

As per FEP 3.3, a faculty member may, at their discretion, submit a Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity Report of up to two pages to supplement their CV for the purpose of salary and/or RPT evaluations.

Scholarly Activity Report (Teaching Stream)

As per FEP 3.3 a faculty member may, at their discretion, submit a Scholarly Activity report of up to two pages to supplement their CV for the purpose of salary and/or RPT evaluations.

Service Report

As per FEP 4.2, a faculty member may, at their discretion, submit a Service Report of up to two pages to supplement their CV for the purpose of salary and RPT evaluations.

Appendix C: Reappointment, tenure & promotion materials

The following guidance is intended to assist faculty members in both Research and Teaching Streams 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.

CA-33.19 describes the required documentation that a candidate must submit as part of an RPT consideration process.

C-1   Summary of accomplishments (2-page maximum)

As per CA-33.19d, the candidate is encouraged to prepare a brief summary of accomplishments highlighting the significant contributions to teaching, scholarship and other contributions and their associated impacts. This summary would normally be one to two pages. For tenure and promotion cases, this summary of accomplishments, if provided, will be included in the package sent to external referees.

C-2   Publications

A list of up to six selected publications, as per CA-33.19c, together with PDF copies of these publications, as well as a short summary of each work's importance and impact. The provided materials will be included in the package sent to external referees.

Publications submitted for a previous successful promotion application to Associate (Teaching) Professor may not be used again for an application for promotion to (Teaching) Professor, unless the candidate justifies its inclusion in a maximum one-page memo on the basis of impact that was not felt at the time of the previous promotion application.

C-3   Curriculum vitae (CV) (40-page maximum)

As per CA-33.19a, the candidate is responsible for submitting an up to date curriculum vitae (CV). The CV may be in the official University of Victoria CV format or an alternate format with the same or greater content. The candidate's submitted CV is sent to external referees.

C-4   Assessment of Teaching

As per CA-33.19b, the candidate will prepare a teaching dossier covering the candidate's entire teaching career as per FEP 2.3. Note that this document is not subject to the page limits prescribed in FEP 2.3. For Research Stream Faculty this teaching dossier is not sent to the external referees. For Teaching Steam Faculty, the materials referred to in CA 33.19bc will be set to the external referee(s).

As per CA 33.7.1, at least two peer reviews of teaching over the previous 18 months are also required. The peer reviewers must be approved by the Dean. The candidate's department is responsible for ensuring that the peer assessments are conducted and that the timing of the peer reviews does not delay the RPT process. The department will inform the Dean's office of the dates of the assessments and names of the peer evaluators who will be chosen by the department in consultation with the candidate.

A peer review of teaching is conducted according to the process and using the forms in Appendix D for a summative evaluation for assessment.

C-5   Additional materials

As per CA-33-19e, a candidate may also provide a brief statement (2-page maximum) to provide context for their achievements for the external referees and up to 8 pages of other documents.

Appendix D: Peer review of teaching guide

Further to CA 27.15, peer review, when used as part of an evaluative process, is to be fair and transparent, rigorous and undertaken in a way that is consistent and supported by current learning and teaching research. To ensure these criteria are met, the Faculty adopts the *Guidelines for Peer-review Process for Teaching Enhancement* (objectives, process, and forms) developed by the Division of Learning and Teaching Support and Innovation, which are found at: https://www.uvic.ca/learningandteaching/faculty/resources/peerreview/index.php.

The Unit Standard may specify alternative or additional procedures and forms.