

### Guidelines for Unit Standards

*This document has been jointly developed by the Faculty Association and the office of Faculty Relations and Academic Administration, and is intended to provide advice and support as Units develop their Unit Standards. Calendar invitations to biweekly drop-in Q&A sessions (up to March 31, 2020) will be sent to Chairs, Directors and Deans for those who wish to consult on specific issues directly with the Faculty Association President and AVP Faculty Relations and Academic Administration. Others working on Unit Standards are welcome to attend.*

### Background

Every academic Unit (Department, School or non-departmentalized Faculty including Division of Medical Sciences and the Library) at UVic must have a written Standard. The Standard serves two primary functions: along with the provisions in the Collective Agreement at sections 12.9 and 12.22 it provides the framework for the assignment of duties to Members by academic leaders (usually, but not always a Chair or Director), and along with the general evaluation criteria and process laid out in the Collective Agreement and Faculty Evaluation Policy it provides a framework for establishing whether a Member has met expectations for salary adjustment evaluation. It also, in conjunction with the Collective Agreement and Faculty Evaluation Policy sets out the Unit's criteria for meeting standards for reappointment, continuing appointment, tenure and promotion.

### Collegial Process and Timelines

The development of Faculty Evaluation Policies and Unit Standards are collegial processes, requiring ratification by Members, and approval of the Dean and Vice-President Academic and Provost. Section 13.2 of the Collective Agreement gives the Members in the Unit the authority to develop procedures for preparing and revising the Standard. The Standard is an important document which deals with sometimes contentious issues and its development may require extensive discussion and problem-solving. It is hoped this will be done in a productive way, resulting in a document that a majority of Members can support, and also that takes into consideration the voices and concerns of various minority constituencies within the Unit. The terms of the Standard must be consistent with the relevant provisions in the Collective Agreement and with the Faculty's Evaluation Policy. It must meet the criteria in s. 13.1 to be approved by the Dean and by the Vice-President Academic. Specifically, s. 13.1 requires the Standard "ensure that the academic objectives and mandate and operating requirements of the Unit are achieved, and to ensure compliance with the renewed Agreement." Discussions to clarify academic objectives, mandate and operating requirements are encouraged. In identifying operating requirements of the Unit, consultation with the Dean is encouraged.

If the Unit is challenged through the process in satisfying the requirements of s. 13.1 in a collegial way, the office of Faculty Relations and Academic Administration and the Faculty Association are prepared to assist.

The Standard must be approved by a majority vote of Members in the Unit holding regular academic appointments. The vote does not need to be by electronic ballot, but it is strongly recommended that ratification votes on the Standard be done by some form of secret ballot which cannot connect any given person to their vote, to ensure votes reflect the wishes of the Members without undue influence.

The Standard must be ratified by March 31<sup>st</sup>, unless the Faculty Association and Administration have agreed to a waiver to permit an extension. Such requests are to be made through the Dean. Faculty Members in Units where the Standard is not ratified and approved by the Dean by March 31 will have a delayed evaluation process, if their Faculty is coming up for evaluation this year. This means salary increases normally beginning in the July 15<sup>th</sup> pay period will be delayed accordingly. In that event, they would be assessed later, but paid retroactive to July 1. .

As noted below, the Collective Agreement defines particular elements that must be included in the Standard. The Faculty Evaluation Policy may further define limits and obligations in the Standard.

*s. 13.5 The Standard will describe Normal Workload and performance expectations for each component of Academic Responsibilities of Faculty Members holding Regular Academic Appointments and Limited-Term Faculty appointments. The Standard will also describe specific expectations for Members designated as Clinical under Article 21, or those whose work is community-engaged, where such work is carried on by Members of the Unit. Academic Units. Academic Units vary in disciplinary norms and in the nature of their contributions to the University. As such, it is understood what constitutes Normal Workload may vary from one Unit to another.*

*13.5.1 The Normal Workload within a Unit shall be consistent with the academic and operating obligations of the Unit, the Faculty and the University.*

*13.6 The Standard must address such matters as:*

- a) the number of course units taught by a Faculty Member with Normal Workload in the Unit;*
- b) supervision of graduate and undergraduate students;*
- c) release provided to tenure-track Faculty Members;*
- d) how instructional and preparation hours beyond the norm associated with distance (on-line) teaching, laboratories, tutorials, field components, large enrollment classes, course coordination of multiple-section courses and other required components are accounted for in Workload calculation;*
- e) the normal Service responsibilities that may be either assigned to a Faculty Member in the Unit or to which a Faculty Member may be elected by members of the Unit.*

### Workload

All Standards must include the Normal Workload for the various appointment types in the Unit (Research and Teaching Stream). For faculty with the same Workload balance, it is expected that Workload expectations be equitable, as averaged over 5 years. Although it is not required to include Workload distribution ratios in a Standard, the Standard must be developed bearing in mind the ratios given in ss. 13.10 and 13.11.

Workload should define the number of course units expected to be taught by a Member with a Normal Workload including how to account for factors outlined in s. 12.9.

*12.9 The Unit process for distribution of assigned Academic Responsibilities among Faculty Members of the Unit shall give consideration to factors such as:*

- a) the academic objectives, mandate and operational obligations of the Academic Unit;*
- b) the Standards of the Unit determined under s. 13.1;*
- c) the Academic Responsibilities assigned to the Faculty Member in previous years;*
- d) the Faculty Member's Workload balance as established by Normal Workload or any Alternative or Reduced Workload arrangement;*
- e) a Faculty Member's administrative and other contributions outside the Faculty Member's Unit;*
- f) a Faculty Member's program of Research and scholarship, where such a program requires supervision of staff and students and significant administrative responsibilities;*
- g) the Faculty Member's career stage, where addressed in the Unit Standard;*
- h) factors relevant to teaching which are beyond the norm and beyond the control of the Faculty Member, such as course preparation, curriculum design work, mode of delivery, level of courses, availability of teaching support, requirement to supervise teaching and laboratory assistants, the size of the class;*
- i) in Units with graduate programs, the number of graduate students supervised and/or advised by the Faculty Member, which are pre-approved by the Chair;*
- j) the number of directed reading courses and Honours supervisions by the Faculty Member, which are pre-approved by the Chair;*
- k) participation by the Faculty Member in Teaching within other Units, including interdisciplinary programs;*
- l) the legal duty to accommodate; and*
- m) the responsibilities of the Academic Unit to contribute to the University community.*

We would encourage Units to include language in the Unit Standard outlining how the Unit will apply the teaching reduction mandated in the CA for Teaching Stream Faculty to ensure clarity and consistency moving forward.

# 2019-2022 Collective Agreement for Faculty and Librarians

## Implementation Update #2

There are various options in the approach to defining Workload. Some examples with respect to Teaching Workload include:

### Example 1

The Normal Teaching Workload for Research Stream Faculty includes teaching 4 courses. In addition, the Faculty Member is expected to undertake a reasonable amount of student supervision and participate in curriculum development as expected of all colleagues.

### Example 2

The Normal Teaching Workload for Research Stream Faculty is 10 units. Each course is worth 1.5 units. Each PhD supervision is worth .5 unit and a Masters' supervision is .25 unit. Faculty are expected to provide between 2-4 units of supervision. Participation in curriculum development or course coordination is 1.0 per 20 hours.

### Example 3

Use either of the two approaches above and further define specific courses that are to be given differential weightings (e.g. large enrollment, field study, online courses, independent study, practicum, lab, etc.).

These examples are intended to provide suggestions of different ways to approach defining Normal Workload. Specific examples may vary depending on the nature and distribution of teaching Workload in different Units.

### *Alternative Workload*

Unit Standards may set out situations which will consistently warrant a defined Alternative Workload (AWL) (subject to approvals by Dean and Provost). For example, the award of a CRC or major grant may attract an AWL that is more heavily weighted in Research, or significant longer term administrative responsibilities may attract an AWL that is more heavily weighted in Service. Similarly, responsibility for a program or community-engagement initiative could warrant an AWL. The CA provisions related to Alternative Workload start at s. 13.25.

### **Evaluation Criteria**

Unit level evaluation criteria for salary evaluation, Reappointment, Continuing Appointment, Tenure and Promotion must be included in the Standard. While some Units currently may only have written criteria for Tenure, the CA now mandates that all Units must include in their Standard written criteria for Reappointment, Continuing Appointment, Tenure and Promotion. In addition to the criteria of the FEPs, we encourage the development of clear, disciplinary specific Unit level criteria, as these are very valuable for faculty members preparing for Continuing appointment and Promotion. It is also important to have clear criteria to be sent to external reviewers. The general standard is set out in the CA for each rank. The Faculty may further define such standards in the FEP, and the Unit Standard may further define the criteria and the evidence required to meet the criteria, provided they are not in conflict with each other. For example, CA s. 21.18 says Appointment at (promotion to) the rank of Teaching Professor normally requires: a) a Master's degree or higher qualification, or appropriate professional

February 12, 2020

# 2019-2022 Collective Agreement for Faculty and Librarians

## Implementation Update #2

achievement in the candidate's discipline; b) a record of outstanding achievement in teaching; and c) scholarship related to teaching that has attained national or international recognition. The FEP or Unit Standard may define that in the discipline, a PhD is expected at such a rank, or might indicate that international recognition would be expected in the circumstances.

After 2021, tenure will not be granted without promotion to Associate Professor (except in the case of faculty hired at the rank of Teaching Professor without tenure). In developing or reassessing Unit level criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor it is important to employ fairness in the transition, particularly for colleagues currently at Assistant Professor rank for whom this is a new expectation, while maintaining academic standards in the discipline.

In terms of salary evaluation the Standard will expand on the criteria set out in the Collective Agreement and Faculty Evaluation Policy necessary for Members to meet or exceed expectations. This is an opportunity to identify criteria that reflect expectations and practices of the discipline. Subject to the provisions of the Faculty Evaluation Policy, the Unit can determine whether to "exceed expectations" one needs to exceed expectations in one, two or three areas of Academic Responsibility.

The criteria for "meets expectations" should be formulated to enable the bulk of Members to meet the test. These criteria should be seen as an absolute standard that everyone can at least in theory meet. It is not a relative standard, in which one is judged in relation to one's colleagues, as was the case with the earlier MI system. A "does not meet" evaluation should be reserved for faculty who are performing at an unacceptable level warranting performance management. It is not necessary to define criteria for "does not meet" given it can be defined as the failure to "meet" expectations.

Unlike RPT evaluations which are focused on the established academic record as identified by publications and other completed productivity, in salary evaluation Units are encouraged to consider work in progress for which there is evidence, recognizing that research outcomes ebb and flow over a period of years.

Unit standards must be clear that the criteria for "meeting expectations" for salary evaluation is completely separate from the evaluation standards and criteria for Continuing Appointment or Promotion. It is certainly possible that junior members could "meet expectations" for salary evaluation, but not meet the standard required for Promotion and Tenure. It may be useful to articulate this distinction in the Unit Standard and in annual reviews of career progress to ensure junior colleagues do not make mistaken assumptions.

Units are expected to define criteria separately for Research Stream and Teaching Stream faculty, given the fundamental differences in their Academic Responsibilities. Research Stream Faculty have a Normal Workload of approximately 40T-40R-20S, while that of Teaching Stream Faculty is 70T-10SA-20S. The definitions of Research (s. 25.8) and Scholarly Activity (s. 25.11, noted below) while sharing some components are distinctly different. Given this, criteria should reflect the differences in definition and emphasis. For example, while graduate supervision might be included as part of "meeting expectations" for Research Stream Faculty, it may not be a consideration in evaluation of Teaching Stream Faculty or could be included under "exceeding expectations".

February 12, 2020

*25.11 Scholarly Activity means activities which enhance teaching ability or effectiveness including continuing mastery of one's field of knowledge and the awareness of current Scholarship in one's own and closely related fields and the nature, quality, and extent of one's own work; independent research on the scholarship of teaching and learning; and activities enhancing one's ability to engage in research-enriched teaching, as described in the FEP and Unit Standard applicable to the Faculty Member.*

Some of these expectations existed in the former Collective Agreement, although were considerations under the Teaching component of Academic Responsibilities. The possible considerations have been expanded to reflect the Parties' interest in considering independent research done by Teaching Stream faculty as it relates to scholarship of teaching and learning and as it supports their ability to engage in research-enriched teaching within their discipline. Some, but not all, Teaching Stream Faculty will have the background and desire to engage in independent research and Unit Standards should reflect the myriad of ways in which expectations could be met, including both tangible and intangible outputs. Independent research should not be an expectation, but it should be recognized where offered as evidence of Scholarly Activity, as defined. The Parties intended that Units recognize an array of activities that support strong teaching – including, but not limited to, work in relation to scholarship of teaching and learning, literature reviews, disciplinary inquiry, and research in the discipline, provided that it supports teaching effectiveness, including research-enriched teaching. Units are encouraged to consider including the kinds of work already done by Teaching Stream faculty which fall within the definition of “Scholarly Activity”.

### **Evaluation Process**

All Members must submit the documents identified in the Faculty Evaluation Policy in order to be evaluated for CPI and PPI. A failure to provide the documents required may mean the Member becomes ineligible for CPI and/or PPI, with the exception of those excused under s. 50.29. If the FEP allows for different forms to be used by Units within a Faculty, each Unit's form must be in compliance with the evaluation principles outlined in the FEP.

The CA does not require a scoring system for evaluation; if Units wish to include scoring as part of their evaluation systems, that is permitted (if the FEP allows it) but it is not required. If used, scoring systems must be applied to all who are eligible for CPIs and PPIs within the applicable Unit. In all systems, those who exceed expectations must be ranked. The ranking is important to enable identification of the top 30% across the Faculty to receive PPI. Because of the rules under s. 50.19 and 50.22 which require a pro-rata distribution of PPI and OPR among streams and ranks, insofar as possible, it may be useful for Units to develop separate ranked lists “by stream” and including “rank”, although this is not required under the CA. If direction in this regard is not given in the Faculty Evaluation Policy, it is recommended that the Unit have a discussion with the Dean to determine the best process for supporting the Dean's final recommendation. Units can send more than 30% of members to the Dean for consideration, as long as all have been assessed as “exceeding expectations.”

Whatever evaluation system is used, at the Unit level Members are encouraged to ensure criteria are based on robust collegial discussion of relative equivalencies or “weight” of an outcome in an assessment, particularly concerning forms of research output. For example,



how would articles or community-engaged research outputs be valued, or documentary films or monographs. The value of engaging in such collegial discussions is both to create more transparency regarding assessments and to reduce the risk of more subjective assessments. Any adoption of scoring systems, or systems ascribing particular values to research outputs, would need to be included in the Unit Standard.

Chairs will provide a list of Members of their Units indicating whether each Member meets, exceeds, or does not meet expectations, based upon agreed criteria developed by the Faculty and the Unit. There is no forced distribution on these ratings. The rating should reflect the actual performance of the Member as against the criteria. This list must also include rank and stream for each faculty member, and will be submitted to the Dean. Those who exceed expectations must be ranked. As noted in s. 50.19 and 50.22, there must be a representative proportion of Teaching and Research stream faculty among those recommended by the Dean to VPAC for a PPI, as well as a representative proportion of each rank.

### Teaching Evaluation, including CES

The CA, at s. 25.7, identifies the types of evidence which must be considered (where it exists), in relation to the evaluation of Teaching. The Faculty Evaluation policies may identify other types of evidence which must be considered, provided it does not conflict with the Collective Agreement.

Additions to the list include:

- class visit reports;
- other peer reviews;
- documentation of such activities as: work related to teaching (course coordination, program assessment, design and development);
- using research-enriched, community-engaged, Indigenized or other innovative teaching techniques; and
- mentoring other faculty in their teaching.

As is consistent with requirements of the Collective Agreement and Faculty Evaluation Policy, Unit are encouraged to include in their Standards additional provisions for the use of evidence that is discipline-relevant: e.g. Development and delivery of teaching for professional licensure; curriculum de-colonization.

CES is a required element of evaluation for salary and reappointment, continuing appointment, tenure and promotion in the CA. It is recognized in the CA that Course Experience Surveys are “evidence of a student’s experience of a Member’s teaching,” and are not an evaluation of teaching effectiveness. While student’s experience of a Member’s teaching are important considerations in performance evaluation, the distinction is a consideration in ascribing the weight of CES in the overall evaluation system. The CA mandates that only frequency distributions of CES scores be used for evaluation purposes. Reference to criteria related to means or medians is no longer possible. The CA also requires that those evaluating teaching take into consideration the response rate for the CES, and known biases in CES responses (for

example, in relation to gender, race, age, first language, etc) as applicable to the discipline. These issues need to be identified in the Unit Standard and ideally methods of addressing these shortcomings noted. Units may decide that a certain level of response rate might be required for a particular CES report to be included for evaluation. While CES must be included in evaluation, the Unit Standard can limit relative weight assigned to it in overall evaluation of teaching as long as such weighting does not contradict the CA or FEP.

Units are considered to use the full range of tools available for teaching evaluation including, but not limited to, peer reviews of teaching, teaching philosophy statements and indicators of efforts to improve teaching. The Faculty Evaluation Policies will provide guidance on the use of peer review, or will devolve responsibility to the Unit to identify means to support academic rigour and fairness in peer review of teaching in the Unit Standard.

### **Research or Scholarly Activity Evaluation**

The 2019-2022 Collective Agreement has new language that distinguishes between Research, which is expected of Members in the Research Stream, and Scholarly Activity, which is expected of Members in the Teaching Stream. There is a list of possible types of evidence of a Member's Research at s. 25.9, and a list of possible types of evidence of Scholarly Activity at s. 25.12. New evidence of Research or Scholarly Activity included in the CA now includes the development of ongoing relationships with communities for those who are doing community-engaged research.

Special care should be taken to ensure that the language related to "meeting" or "exceeding" expectations for Scholarly Activity in the Unit Standard recognizes that, as noted above, evidence of Scholarly Activity does not have to include only the scholarship of teaching and learning, and does not have to involve a tangible product or concrete outcome.

The Unit Standard should make it clear that Teaching Stream Members are expected both to keep their knowledge of the field current, and to make other contributions that constitute Scholarly Activity. We encourage Units to include Teaching Stream faculty in the collegial decisions about what constitutes Scholarly Activity, and how it is to be rated in meeting or exceeding expectations.

### **Evaluation of Service**

The evaluation of Service can include all Service work listed in the CA in s. 25.14. As noted, this list is not exhaustive, and Members can make the case that other Service work that they have done both within and outside the university should count for salary evaluation and RPT. Units may wish to specify in their Standards particular disciplinary-specific Service work that is not included in the CA. Units should note that "contributions to student life in relation to their academic success," is now included under Service, and will assist in taking into account the work done by faculty members in informally mentoring students. Unit standards can specify how such mentoring is to be accounted for in salary evaluation and RPT purposes.