

Faculty of Engineering

Faculty Evaluation Policy

November 28, 2007

Approved by the regular faculty members in the Faculty of Engineering: December 17, 2007

Approved by the vice-president academic and provost: January 8, 2008

1. Introduction

This evaluation policy articulates the values of the Faculty of Engineering in the context of its academic missions of effective teaching, scholarship and professional activities, and other contributions. The criteria and procedures in this policy seek to promote excellence and encourage creativity in our faculty members' range of university and related endeavors. The policy identifies how a faculty member's contributions will be evaluated for annual salary, reappointment, tenure and promotion recommendations.

Sections 2, 3 and 4 specify the evaluation criteria for teaching effectiveness, scholarship and professional achievements, and other contributions, respectively. Section 5 describes the assessment procedures regarding salary recommendations. Section 6 describes the assessment procedures regarding reappointment, tenure and promotion recommendations.

This evaluation policy is prepared in accordance with the Framework Agreement between the university and the faculty association. Any questions regarding the application of the criteria or procedures described in this document should be discussed with the department chair and/or the dean and are ultimately subject to the avenues of reconsideration and appeal provided for in the Framework Agreement.

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. Faculty members are encouraged to discuss accommodation situations with the department chair and/or the dean when such situations arise. Accommodations are to be appropriately taken into account when assessing the criteria or applying the procedures described in this document. Procedures related to accommodation will be as developed in accordance with Framework Agreement article 68.

In addition, any effect of sick leave, or of maternity or parental leave should be taken into account in the evaluation process.

Modifications to this document may be made by the dean of engineering subject to the approval of the regular faculty members in the Faculty of Engineering and the approval of the vice-president academic and provost.

2. Teaching Effectiveness

Effective teaching is critical to the undergraduate and graduate programs in the faculty. Teaching effectiveness thus relates to all of a faculty member's methods and forms of teaching and student supervision. The evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be primarily conducted on the basis of the faculty member's teaching dossier that, in addition to student teaching evaluations and a record of the member's supervision activities, may include such items as peer reviews, reports on class visits, reviews of syllabi and examinations, evidence of innovative teaching, evidence of curriculum development, evidence of efforts to improve the member's teaching effectiveness, and teaching awards.

The factors to be evaluated when assessing teaching effectiveness include but are not limited to:

- delivery of courses and student evaluation of those courses
- innovative approaches to teaching contributing to an enhanced learning environment
- curriculum and course content development including interdisciplinary initiatives
- graduate student supervision, service on graduate student committees, and service as an external examiner, all of which may be either at UVic or elsewhere
- other supervision including directed studies students, student projects; undergraduate student research assistants, post-doctoral fellows, *etc.*
- scholarship of teaching including textbooks, and journal and conference publications related to curriculum development, teaching and/or pedagogy
- 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

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 activity.

The evaluation of scholarship and professional achievements is to take into account the diverse research methodologies and practices applicable to different research areas.

The factors to be evaluated for scholarship and professional achievements include but are not limited to:

Refereed / Reviewed Work

- books or contributions to books
- patents
- refereed conference publications
- refereed journal publications

Other Publications and Presentations

- invited presentations of research
- other conference, workshop and public presentations of research
- technical / industrial reports
- unrefereed publications

Other measures

- appropriate to rank and experience, the leadership and impact arising from the faculty member's scholarship and professional achievements
- fellowships or awards
- industrial interaction
- public presentations related to university activities
- recognition by learned and professional societies
- research funding
- other professional contributions related to research and professional practice

4. Other Contributions

Beyond the central missions of effective teaching, and scholarship and professional achievements, faculty members make significant other contributions to the university, a profession and the community. These contributions include, but are not limited to:

- attainment of extra-university recognition of a faculty member's university related activities that reflects to the advantage of the university
- contributions in administrative positions or through other service to the university or the faculty association

- contributions through service to or development of the faculty member's department and the faculty
- contributions to student life
- contributions to the profession or community that reflect to advantage on the university, including membership on boards or councils
- mentoring of colleagues in teaching or research
- mentoring of students
- organizational roles for conferences, symposia, workshops, *etc.*
- refereeing academic journal and conference publications, grant applications, *etc.*
- science and engineering popularization,
- service as the (associate) editor of a journal
- service as the chair of a department
- service as the director of a program, centre or institute
- service to other academic institutions in such ways as program reviews or curriculum consultation
- student recruitment and school liaison activities
- technology transfer

5. Annual Salary Review

The chair of department has responsibility for the initial salary recommendation for faculty members in his or her department. A department may elect to form a committee to assist the chair in reaching his or her recommendations. The dean has responsibility for the salary recommendations submitted to the vice-president academic for all faculty members including the department chairs and the associate deans. The dean is evaluated by the vice-president academic.

In the event of a conflict of interest or apprehension of bias, the dean shall act for a department chair and an associate dean shall act for the dean as dictated by the circumstances. Should there be any dispute as to whether a conflict of interest or reasonable apprehension of bias exists, the final decision shall rest with the vice-president academic.

5.1 Period of Review

The period of review is as specified in Framework Agreement article 74.3.4.

5.2 Documentation Required

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

- a) ensure his or her c.v. in the department office is up to date to the preceding December 31,
- b) submit a teaching dossier using the template given in appendix A,
- c) at his or her discretion, provide a scholarship and professional achievements report and/or any other contributions report using the templates in appendix A.

Publications referred to in the faculty member's c.v. and material referred to in the teaching dossier, scholarship and professional achievements report, and other contributions report need not be submitted but are to be provided for review upon request. The chair or dean may also refer to the faculty member's official performance file as defined in Framework Agreement article 41.1. The faculty member may, by February 1, submit any additional material that he or she feels may help in the assessment process.

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.

5.3 Career Progress Increment (CPI) Recommendations

A CPI recognizes satisfactory career progress where the expected standard of performance is as stated in Framework Agreement article 74.5:

The chair of each department shall make recommendations to the dean regarding CPIs for regular faculty within his or her department excluding themselves, the dean and associate deans. The chair is responsible

for providing documentation supporting the award or withholding a CPI for the situations specified in Framework Agreement article 74.5. The dean will consult with the chair in the event the dean does not agree with the chair's recommendation.

The dean shall make recommendations regarding CPIs for the department chairs and the associate deans. The dean is responsible for providing documentation supporting the award or withholding of a CPI for the situations specified in Framework Agreement article 74.5.

The specific expectations regarding the award of a CPI are as follows:

- a) Teaching Effectiveness: the expected standard of performance is the proper conduct of all teaching duties and in particular as applicable:
 - the preparation of a proper outline for each course
 - the suitable preparation and delivery of lectures
 - ensuring the student course evaluation is properly administered in each of his or her courses
 - 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
 - due care and attention to the supervision of the faculty member's graduate students and service on graduate student committees. (Not being involved in graduate student supervision or on graduate student committees is not reason for withholding of a CPI, but such activity can be used towards justifying the awarding of a CPI.)
- b) Scholarship and Professional Achievement: the expected standard of performance for awarding of a CPI is evidence of ongoing progress and peer acceptance of a faculty member's work demonstrated by publication of research results in refereed journals or refereed conferences. In particular, a faculty member who has not published an average of one peer-reviewed (in full or by abstract) academic work per year (including accepted papers) during the appropriate evaluation period will not be deemed to have met the expected standard of satisfactory performance required for the awarding of a CPI (unless there are mitigating circumstances *e.g.* maternity, parental or sick leave). For this purpose, a patent shall be deemed to be equivalent to a refereed publication.
- c) Other Contributions: A faculty member's other contributions shall be deemed to be substantial with regards to the awarding of a CPI if the member's level of contribution in this area is judged by the chair (or the dean as appropriate) to be well above normal for the faculty member's department, and to have had a significant impact on his or her department, the faculty, the university, the community and/or a profession.

5.4 Merit Increment (MI) Recommendations

MI's serve to recognize levels of meritorious performance beyond the level of performance required for a CPI, and a faculty member can only be awarded MI's if he or she has been assessed to have achieved the standard of performance required for the awarding of a CPI.

The faculty of engineering is committed to excellence in its activities and to awarding those who make meritorious contributions. Consequently, the MI recommendations prepared by the chairs and the dean must properly distinguish and recognize the various levels of performance of faculty members.

Up to 4 MI's may be awarded to a faculty member. The number of MI's awarded shall in general terms indicate:

- 4 exceptional performance
- 3 excellent overall performance
- 2 overall performance at or close to the normal performance expectations for faculty members at the same rank within the faculty member's Department

- 1 overall performance demonstrating a significant level of contribution beyond that required for the awarding of a CPI
- 0 overall performance that does not demonstrate a significant level of contribution beyond that required for the awarding of a CPI or does not justify the awarding of a CPI

A tenured or tenure-track faculty member (other than a teaching professor) will be evaluated for MIs based on her or his

- teaching effectiveness
- scholarship and professional achievements
- other contributions

in the ratio 40:40:20 unless the Member has pre-negotiated an alternative ratio in accordance with Framework Agreement article 74.3.5.1(d).

A senior instructor or teaching professor will be evaluated based on her or his

- teaching effectiveness
- other contributions

in the ratio 80:20 unless the Member has pre-negotiated an alternative ratio in accordance with Framework Agreement article 74.3.5.1(f).

A variance from the 40:40:20 or 80:20 ratios will only be approved when the distribution of a faculty member's duties and responsibilities is substantively different from others in the department and shall normally be approved at or before the time that change takes effect. Situations appropriate for such a variance include, but are not limited to, a higher than normal administrative assignment, or a teaching assignment higher than the norm specified in the department's Statement on the Distribution of Duties and Responsibilities.

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

A **Merit Score (MS)** shall be determined for each faculty member by the chair (or dean as appropriate) by first assigning a level of merit (0,1,2,3,4) for

- teaching effectiveness,
- scholarship and professional achievements, (excluding senior instructors or teaching professors)
- other contributions

using the criteria appropriate to the member's rank, years of experience, reappointment and tenure status as specified in appendix B. These criteria are principal indicators and do not limit the chair or the dean from taking into account other meritorious contributions or deficiencies.

The evaluation of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness shall be based primarily on the faculty member's teaching dossier, but may also take into account relevant information in the faculty member's official performance file. The department chair (or dean as appropriate) shall assign equal importance to the student evaluations and to other evidence of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness assessed in accordance with Section 2. The department chair (or dean as appropriate) shall take into account the nature of the courses taught by the faculty member, e.g. class size, mandatory vs. elective, historic student response to the course, etc.

Assessment of a faculty member's scholarship and professional achievements shall be primarily based on the faculty member's c.v., and Scholarship and Professional Achievements Report if provided, but may also take into account relevant information in the faculty member's official performance file. The assessment shall be in accordance with Section 3.

Assessment of a faculty member's other contributions shall be primarily based on the faculty member's c.v. and Other Contributions Report if provided, but may also take into account relevant information in the faculty member's official performance file. The assessment shall be in accordance with Section 4.

The MS is determined by merging these levels of merit using the ratio applicable to each faculty member.

The chair of each department will prepare a ranked list (most meritorious first) 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 can not be higher than the number recommended for a member higher on the list. This list will normally be in descending order of MS and will show the levels of merit assigned. The chair must attach written reasons if departing from that ordering. The total number of MIs recommended by the department chair will be the least integer greater than or equal to twice the number of members on the chair's ranked list less 20%.

The department chair will also provide prioritized recommendations as to how the dean might allocate any further MIs to be assigned to members of on the list where the number of such MIs is up to the greatest integer less than or equal to 15% of twice the number of faculty on the list.

Based on the department chair's ranked lists and recommendations regarding additional MIs, the dean will create a single ranked list (most meritorious first) of the faculty members in the faculty (including the department chairs) 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. This list shall form the basis for the dean's salary recommendations to the vice-president academic. This list will normally be in descending order of MS and will show the levels of merit. The dean must attach written reasons if departing from that ordering.

The awarding of MIs must at the faculty level adhere to any minima, maxima or distribution requirements as specified in the Salary Policy and the Salary Agreement in place at the time the salary recommendation is made.

5.5 Additional MI Assessment Procedures

A department may institute additional procedures to be followed by the department chair in the assessment of faculty members for MI provided they elaborate on and do not alter or conflict with the procedures described above. Such procedures must be approved by at least a two thirds majority of the faculty members in the department and are also subject to approval by the dean.

5.6 Single year awards

The single year award is intended to recognize substantial contributions to the objectives and activities of the university that are above and beyond a faculty member's regular responsibilities. This award has a minimum value of \$1,000. It is not added to the member's base salary. The number of awards in any year is limited to a number not greater than two per cent of the total number of faculty members across the university. Recommendations for such awards can be made by the chair to the dean or by the dean. The awards are determined by the vice-president academic and provost.

5.7 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 the evaluation of that member which shall contain:

1. notice whether the faculty member has achieved the standard of performance required for the awarding of a CPI
2. the level of merit assigned for teaching effectiveness, scholarship and professional achievements, and other contributions of the faculty member, and the number of MI recommended to be awarded to the faculty member
3. a copy of all written justification prepared by the department chair and the dean regarding the evaluation of the faculty member including a recommendation for a single year award
4. each faculty member will receive a report showing the distribution of levels of merit and MS across the faculty in histogram form

6. Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

- 6.1 Evaluation for reappointment, promotion and tenure is based on the faculty member's official performance file as defined in Framework Agreement article 41.1 which in addition to the contents described in 41.1.3 is deemed to include a summary of key accomplishments prepared by the member, and any additional material provided by the member. Requirements for the preparation of material for consideration for reappointment, promotion and tenure cases are given in appendix C.
- 6.2 External letters of reference are sought with regards to tenure and promotion in accordance with Framework Agreement articles 22.0 and 23.0 and the Regulations and Procedures of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Dean which specifies the number of letters required.
- 6.3 For reappointment, tenure and promotion recommendations, teaching effectiveness shall be assessed in ways beyond the faculty member's teaching dossier and in particular must include at least two peer assessments normally conducted within the last two years (see appendix C for procedures).
- 6.4 Reappointment of an Assistant Professor: An assistant professor is evaluated for reappointment in accordance with Framework Agreement Article 15.1 with reference to the appropriate factors identified in sections 2, 3 and 4.
- 6.5 Reappointment of a Senior Instructor: A senior instructor is evaluated for reappointment in accordance with Framework Agreement Article 15.2 with reference to the appropriate factors identified in sections 2 and 4.
- 6.6 Tenure: The standards and procedures for considering a faculty member for tenure are as specified in Framework Agreement article 16 with reference to the appropriate factors identified in sections 2, 3 and 4.
- 6.7 Promotion to Associate Professor: The standards and procedures for promotion to associate professor are as specified in Framework Agreement article 18.1 with reference to the appropriate factors identified in sections 2, 3 and 4.
- 6.8 Promotion to Professor: The standards and procedures for promotion to professor are as specified in Framework Agreement article 18.2 with reference to the appropriate factors identified in sections 2, 3 and 4.
- 6.9 Promotion to Teaching Professor: The standards and procedures for promotion to teaching professor are as specified in Framework Agreement article 18.3 with reference to the appropriate factors identified in sections 2 and 4.

Appendix A: Preparing Material for Annual Salary Evaluation

Faculty member, including those on paid leave, are required to submit the documentation for salary evaluation purposes (see section 5.2) by **February 1** of each year. The teaching dossier is to use the template below. A faculty member also has the option of using the scholarship and professional achievements report and other contributions report given templates below. The templates are available at www.engr.uvic.ca/faculty.php.

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING TEACHING DOSSIER

Each faculty member is required to provide a teaching dossier to be used in assessing the member's teaching effectiveness for annual salary increases and for reappointment, tenure and promotion (RPT) decisions. The dossier should be prepared using the following template.

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

1. Approach to Teaching (for salary, max. 1 page; for RPT, max. 2 pages)

Teaching Goals (include to what extent goals have been met)

Other

2. Efforts to Improve Teaching (for salary, max. 1 page; for RPT, max. 2 pages)

Instructional Development Activities

Consultations on Teaching / Short Courses or Workshops Attended

Other

3. Contributions to Teaching and Accomplishments (for salary, max. 1 page; for RPT, max. 2 pages)

Curriculum and Course Development

Development of Teaching Resources

Implementation of Innovative Teaching and Assessment Practices

Activities to Support Teaching in your Academic Unit and/or University

Peer Mentoring

Research on Teaching and Learning

Presentations and/or Publications on Teaching and Learning

Awards (including nominations) and Grants related to Teaching

Other

4. Assessments of Teaching

Summary of Numerical Scores from Student Ratings of Instruction

Attach the numerical summary sheets for all courses you have taught during the applicable period of evaluation.

Student Comments

You may choose to attach anecdotal or subjective comments by students or former students. Where such comments are from the formal course evaluation, all the comments from that course must be included.

Peer Assessments

At least two assessments conducted within the last two years are required for RPT considerations. You may choose to attach any peer assessments of your teaching whether formally conducted by the department or of a less formal nature.

Other Comments

5. Additional Teaching / Supervisory Activities

Describe any teaching / supervisory duties or activities not included in your curriculum vitae.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING

SCHOLARSHIP AND PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS REPORT

A faculty member *may at his or her discretion* using the template below submit a Scholarship and Professional Achievements Report to supplement his or her c.v. for the purpose of annual salary and RPT evaluations.

Evidence of Impact of Scholarship and Professional Achievements (for salary, max. 1 page; for RPT, max. 4 pages)

Member's Statement on the Impact of His or Her Scholarly and Professional Activities

Citations in Scholarly Publications

Awards

Scholarly Appointments

Other Recognition of Impact

Signature: _____

Date: _____

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS REPORT

A faculty member may *at his or her discretion* using the template below submit an Other Contributions Report to supplement his or her c.v. for the purpose of annual salary and RPT evaluations.

Impact of Other Contributions (for salary, max. 1 page; for RPT, max. 4 pages)

Highlight major contribution in the appropriate categories below for which the impact of your contributions may not be evident from the entry on your curriculum vitae.

Administrative Positions and Committees

Professional Activities (professional groups, conference organization, editorships, etc.)

Technology Transfer

Outreach Activity (school visits, student recruitment, science fairs, etc.)

Community Activity (contributions related to your discipline expertise)

Other

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix B: Principal Criteria for Levels of Merit

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 UVic and elsewhere.

Teaching Effectiveness (see section 2 for principal factors to be evaluated)

Level	0	1	2	3	4
Senior Instructor	<i>well below normal teaching evaluations or well below normal overall teaching effectiveness</i>	<i>below normal teaching evaluations or below normal overall teaching effectiveness</i>	<i>normal teaching evaluations and normal overall teaching effectiveness</i>	<i>same as (2) with above normal teaching evaluations or above normal overall teaching effectiveness</i>	<i>same as (2) with exceptional teaching evaluations or exceptional overall teaching effectiveness</i>
Teaching Professor			<i>same as above plus continued activity in teaching scholarship</i>		<i>same as above or exceptional teaching scholarship</i>

Level	0	1	2	3	4
Assistant Professor pre-reappointment or untenured Associate Professor	<i>well below normal teaching evaluations or well below normal overall teaching effectiveness</i>	<i>below normal teaching evaluations or below normal overall teaching effectiveness</i>	<i>normal teaching evaluations and normal overall teaching effectiveness</i>	<i>same as (2) with</i> <i>above normal teaching evaluations or above normal overall teaching effectiveness</i>	<i>same as (2) with</i> <i>above normal teaching evaluations and above normal overall teaching effectiveness</i>
Assistant Professor post-reappointment, pre-tenure or Associate Professor or Tenured Assistant Professor, (first five years)					<i>same as (2) with</i> <i>exceptional teaching evaluations or exceptional overall teaching effectiveness</i>
Professor, or five or more years experience as an Associate Professor or Tenured Assistant Professor				<i>same as (2) with</i> <i>above normal teaching evaluations and above normal overall teaching effectiveness</i>	<i>same as (2) with</i> <i>exceptional teaching evaluations and exceptional overall teaching effectiveness</i>

Scholarship and Professional Achievements (see section 3 for principal factors to be evaluated)

Level	0	1	2	3	4
Assistant Professor pre-reappointment	<i>no scholarship and no other professional achievements</i>	<i>below normal scholarship and some other professional achievements</i>	<i>normal scholarship and some other professional achievements</i>	<i>normal scholarship and normal other professional achievements</i>	<i>same as (3) with above normal scholarship and above normal other professional achievements</i>
Assistant Professor post-reappointment, pre-tenure	<i>well below normal scholarship and minimal other professional achievement</i>	<i>below normal scholarship or below normal other professional achievements</i>	<i>normal scholarship and normal other professional achievements</i>	<i>same as (2) with above normal scholarship or above normal other professional achievements</i>	<i>same as (2) with well above normal scholarship or well above normal other professional achievements</i>
Associate Professor or Tenured Assistant Professor, (first five years)				<i>above normal scholarship with demonstrated impact and normal other professional achievements</i>	<i>well above normal scholarship with demonstrated impact and normal other professional achievements</i>
Professor, or five or more years experience as an Associate Professor or Tenured Assistant Professor					<i>exceptional scholarship with demonstrated impact and above normal other professional achievements</i>

Other contributions (see section 4 for principal factors to be evaluated)

note: On its own, attendance at Department and/or Faculty Meeting constitutes minimal contribution.

Level	0	1	2	3	4
Senior Instructor	<i>minimal other contributions</i>	<i>below normal other contributions</i>	<i>normal other contributions</i>	<i>same as (2) with</i> <i>above normal other contributions at UVic</i> or <i>above normal external professional service</i>	<i>same as (2) with</i> <i>well above normal other contributions at UVic</i> or <i>well above external professional service</i>
Teaching Professor					<i>same as (2) with</i> <i>exceptional other contributions at UVic</i> or <i>exceptional external professional service</i>

Level	0	1	2	3	4
Assistant Professor or Associate Professor pre-tenure		<i>some participation in Dept., Faculty and/or University activities</i>	<i>normal participation in Dept., Faculty and/or University activities</i>	<i>above normal participation in Dept., Faculty and/or University activities</i>	<i>above normal participation in Dept., Faculty and/or University activities</i> or <i>above normal professional service</i>
Associate Professor or Tenured Assistant Professor, (first five years)		<i>participation in Dept., Faculty and/or University activities</i>	<i>normal participation in Dept., Faculty and/or University activities</i>	<i>above normal participation in Dept., Faculty and/or University activities</i> or <i>normal professional service</i>	<i>above normal participation in Dept., Faculty and/or University activities</i> and <i>above normal professional service</i>
Professor, or five or more years experience as an Associate Professor or Tenured Assistant Professor	<i>no or below normal participation in Dept., Faculty and/or University activities</i>	<i>normal participation in Dept., Faculty and/or University activities</i>	<i>above normal participation in Dept., Faculty and/or University activities</i>	<i>above normal participation in Dept., Faculty and/or University activities</i> and <i>normal professional service</i>	<i>same as (3) with\</i> <i>exceptional participation in Dept., Faculty and/or University activities</i> or <i>exceptional professional service</i>

Appendix C: Preparing Material for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Consideration

The following guidelines are intended to assist faculty members in preparing material in support of reappointment, promotion and tenure (RPT) considerations. Faculty members should consult their department chair for more specific guidance as required.

Summary of Accomplishments

The candidate should prepare a summary of accomplishments for the period under consideration. This should take the form of a letter addressed to the appropriate department committee. The letter should highlight the faculty member's principal contributions in teaching, scholarship and other contributions and particularly the impact of those contributions. For tenure and promotion cases, this letter will be included in the material sent to the external referees.

Publications

The candidate should prepare a list of his or her publications for the appropriate period of evaluation together with copies of up to six publications that best illustrate the nature and impact of the candidate's research contributions for the period of evaluation. Submitted work should be listed separately of published work. Submission, acceptance and publication dates should be provided for each item on the list and the acceptance rate for a conference should be provided if known.

This list and the selected publications will be included in the material sent to the external reviewers.

Curriculum Vitae

The candidate is responsible for ensuring his or her c.v. is fully up to date. It is very important that the candidate carefully check the c.v. for accuracy, consistency and completeness. The c.v. is not sent to external reviewers but the letter to the reviewer should make it clear that a copy of the c.v. will be provided at the request of the reviewer.

Teaching Dossier

The candidate should prepare a teaching dossier using the template provided in appendix A. The teaching dossier is not sent to the external reviewers for tenure and promotion cases.

The teaching dossier must contain at least two peer teaching evaluations conducted by the department normally during the previous 24 months.

The peer evaluators shall be chosen by the department chair and the candidate in consultation.

A peer evaluation consists of two parts:

- a) evaluation of the course dossier that is provided by faculty member (on paper or CD) which should contain
 - a ½ page introduction stating the objectives for the course
 - the course outline
 - all assignments, tests and exams given during the member's most recent offering of the course
 - notes given to the students, web pages, *etc.*
- b) evaluation of two in-class visits

A checklist questionnaire is provided in appendix D to help the peer reviewer prepare the written evaluation. The reviewer should use it to help formulate comments for the summary. Additional information for the instructor may also be provided.

The peer reviewer should meet the instructor before attending the instructor's classes to identify additional goals.

In addition to the items to be included in the teaching dossier as identified in appendix A, the faculty member should include a self-assessment, up to 1 page, of his or her contributions to teaching and overall teaching effectiveness for the period under review.

Additional Material

A faculty member is entitled to submit any additional material he or she wishes in support of his or her RPT case. In particular, a faculty member may, at his or her discretion, submit a Scholarship and Professional Achievements Report and / or an Other Contributions Report using the templates in appendix A. The candidate and the Chair of the Department shall in consultation determine which additional material is to be sent to the external referees. In the event of a disagreement, the candidate determines which additional material shall be sent.

Faculty Advisory Committee

Tenure and promotion cases are considered by the Faculty Advisory Committee as are appointments at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. The guidelines and procedures for the Faculty Advisory Committee as approved by the Faculty of Engineering are available at <http://www.engr.uvic.ca/faculty.php>.



Peer Teaching Evaluation Checklist (Appendix D)

(Checklist Updated: April 7, 2009)

Instructor:		Class:	
Observer:		Date:	
Estimated number of students in the room:			

This checklist may be used as a guide for preparing your written report. The written report should specify the date of the evaluation, the evaluator, and the person evaluated. It should then address:

- the strong points of the classroom performance and areas for improvement; and
- the strong points of the other teaching materials and areas for improvement.

1. Checklist Questionnaire: Preamble

Suggestion: Respond to each of the following statements by checking the blank that corresponds to your observation.

Yes = Observed

Sometimes = More emphasis needed

No = Not observed, would have been appropriate

N/A = not applicable

2. Checklist Questionnaire: Evaluation of course dossier

The evaluation of the course material can be performed better when the reviewer is familiar with the presented material, however, this will often not be the case.

What is the quality of the materials used in teaching?

	High	Sufficient	Low	N/A	Comments
Course outline					
Reading list					
Text used					
Study guide					
Non-print materials					
Hand-outs					
Online materials					
Problem sets					
Assignments					
Exams					

Is the presented material current?

Does the material represent the best in the field?

Is the material adequate and appropriate to course goals?

Does the material represent superficial or thorough coverage of course content?

3. Checklist Questionnaire: Evaluation of in-class visit(s)

The first question simply aims at identifying the style used for the session

The session/lecture incorporated the following elements	Yes	Sometimes	No	NA	Comments
Expository lecture					
Seminar					
Question and Answer Session					
Problem Solving					
Interactive lecture					
Blackboard					
Overheads					
Computer presentation					
Hardware demonstration					
In-class activities					
Case Study					
Other					

Checklist of Teaching Skills

Content of the session: Organization and clarity	Yes	Sometimes	No	NA	Comments
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 today's and other aspects of the course.					
Summarized the main ideas.					
Related the day's material to upcoming sessions.					

Lecture:					
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.					

In case of blackboard use:

The blackboard picture was well organized.					
The writing was legible					

In case of overhead use:					
The slides were organized.					
The text was readable					

In case of computer-presentation:					
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.					

In case of hardware demonstration:					
Demonstration was effective					

Dealing with questions:					
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.					

In case of problem solving:					
Problems were solved in sufficient detail					
Amount of solution detail was adapted to student questions					

In case of Seminar:					
Topic suitable – multiple possible solutions					

Good opening question					
Involves many students					
Discussion well controlled					
Discussion well structured					
Corrected student errors					

Communication:					
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 etc.					
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					

In case of in-class activities:					
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.					

Overall assessment:					
Class session was inspiring					
Students appeared to be paying attention					
Students appeared to be motivated					