

RPT & Evaluation in the 2025-29 Collective Agreement

Lynne Marks, FA Lead Negotiator and Past President, UVic Faculty Association

Pamela Richards, University Lead Negotiator and Executive Director Faculty Relations and Academic Administration



University of Victoria
Faculty Association



Slide 1 Notes

We acknowledge and respect the Lək ʷəŋən (Songhees and Xʷsepsəm/Esquimalt) Peoples on whose territory the university stands, and the Lək ʷəŋən and WSÁNEĆ Peoples whose historical relationships with the land continue to this day.

Good morning, everyone. Thank you for joining us.

Lynne and I are pleased to provide an overview of some of the key changes to reappointment, tenure, promotion, and evaluation that were negotiated as part of the 2025-2029 Collective Agreement. Many of these changes were developed in response to concerns raised by Members about clarity, workload, fairness, and consistency in existing processes.

Today, we will focus on practical changes that members, chairs, directors, deans, and committee members need to know as they prepare for upcoming RPT and evaluation processes. Our goal is to highlight what has changed.



Unit Standards, Tenure and Promotion and Evaluation

- For any processes relying on the Unit Standard the existing Standard will apply until the revised Standard is fully approved (13.2)
- New language relevant in the new CA and that is helpful to members (e.g., new outputs for Scholarly activity and Research) can also apply
- The Unit Standard will not repeat existing Faculty Evaluation Policy and CA language but will describe the Unit specific standards associated with salary evaluation, career progress and workload within the Units; Unit Standards may reference and link to relevant FEP and CA language where relevant (13.4)
- Unit Standards shall provide guidance for conditions that can be considered to “exceed expectations” in each of Teaching, Research/Scholarly Activity, and Service, separately, and how expectations change by rank (13.9 h)
- Unit Standards shall provide clear and comprehensive criteria for promotion through the ranks (13.9 i)

Slide 2 Notes

Departments have 8 months from CA ratification (June 23rd) to finalize and ratify their unit standards (Feb 23, 2027). Also, cannot repeat existing FEP and CA language although can link to it as relevant in Unit Standard.

In developing Unit Standard need to focus on what evaluation, RPT and workload language is specific to your unit. At the same time, the Unit Standard language cannot contradict any of the language in the FEP or CA – it can only elaborate on it, in terms of what is discipline-specific and otherwise appropriate to your unit.

Language re criteria for promotion must be clear and comprehensive – this is very important to provide appropriate guidance to early and mid career members. At the same time “clear criteria” does not mean one size fits all – should have clear criteria that explain different ways to meet the standard for promotion (eg through journal articles, through impact of community engaged research, policy impact etc)

While current unit standards apply until a revised standard is approved, new language that is relevant and helpful to members can also apply (eg new SEL language, new language re Scholarly Activity and Research outputs) for current RPT files and salary in January.

Unit Standards, Tenure and Promotion and Evaluation: **Peer Reviews**

- Training is no longer required for peer reviewers (*25.14 and 25.15*)
- Timing of peer reviews required for reappointment, tenure and promotion are simplified and clarified (*12.12 a*):
 - For Assistant Profs and Assistant Teaching Profs: two formative peer reviews: one before and one after reappointment
 - Two summative peer reviews: one before submission of the file for Reappointment and one before submission for Promotion
- For Associate Profs and Associate Teaching Profs: Two summative Peer Reviews of Teaching conducted within the last two years before the deadline for the submission of the file for Promotion (*25.12 b*)

Slide 3 Notes

Training for peer reviewers is no longer required under the Collective Agreement. While units may still wish to provide guidance or support to reviewers, formal training is no longer a requirement.

Timing of peer reviews for reappointment, tenure, and promotion has been clarified and simplified.

For Assistant Professors and Assistant Teaching Professors, there are now two formative peer reviews: one conducted before reappointment and one conducted after reappointment. In addition, there are two summative peer reviews: one before the reappointment file is submitted and one before the promotion file is submitted.

For Associate Professors and Associate Teaching Professors seeking promotion, there must be two summative peer reviews conducted within the two years prior to the promotion submission deadline.

The goal of these changes is to create a clearer and more predictable process so that members understand what is required well in advance of their RPT submissions.



Unit Standards, Tenure and Promotion and Evaluation: Student Experience of Learning Surveys

Given biases and low response rates, SEL frequencies will no longer be used directly in salary evaluation. They will be replaced by a statement from members about how they used SEL results (frequencies or frequencies and comments) to develop and improve their courses and/or teaching methods.

For tenure and promotion, SEL frequencies will not be required if SEL response rates are 50% or below. When response rates are below 50%, members will be required to review SEL results (frequencies or frequencies and comments) and prepare a statement outlining how they were used to develop and improve the Member's courses and teaching methods. (25.10 and 25.11)

For the fall 2026 round of RPT submissions, Members can use frequencies, as in the previous CA, or follow the new CA language on SEL (as above).

Slide 4 Notes

This is a significant change in the agreement.

Historically, SEL frequencies were used directly in salary evaluations. Concerns have been raised for many years regarding both low response rates and recognized biases in student evaluations.

Under the new language, SEL frequencies will no longer be used directly for salary evaluation. Instead, members will provide a reflective statement describing how they reviewed and used SEL results to improve their courses, teaching approaches, or instructional practices.

There are also important changes for tenure and promotion files. When SEL response rates are 50 percent or lower, members will no longer be required to include SEL frequencies. Instead, they must review their SEL results and provide a statement outlining how those results informed changes or improvements in their teaching.

For the Fall 2026 RPT cycle, there is a transitional provision. Members may either follow the previous Collective Agreement approach and submit frequencies, or they may use the new provisions and provide the reflective statement described in the current agreement. This flexibility is intended to ensure a smooth transition to the new process.

For examples of such reflective statements, see FA broadcast email sent out in August, and or ask the FA or Faculty Relations for examples.



Tenure and Promotion and Evaluation: **Scholarly Activity**

Definitions of Scholarly Activity for Teaching Stream faculty have been broadened and clarified. Can include research as well as a range of teaching related scholarly activity. (25.21, 25.21.1, 25.22)

- 25.21 Scholarly Activity means activities which enhance teaching ability or effectiveness including: continuing mastery of one's field of knowledge and 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.
- 25.21.1 Scholarly Activity includes, but is not limited to:
 - a) Research, as described in 25.19
 - b) The use of scholarly methods in development of courses, programs or curricula, and the scholarship of teaching and learning
 - c) The development of Educational Resources (e.g., textbooks, open-access textbooks, digital learning resources)
 - d) Educational technology scholarship (e.g., development of digital tools, simulations and labs, development of online courses informed by SoTL)
 - e) Leadership in Scholarship of Teaching and Learning activities (e.g., leading workshops, training sessions, Universal Design for Learning, scholarly communities of practice)
 - f) Any activity that meets the description in 25.21

Slide 5 Notes

There has been significant concern raised by both teaching stream faculty and Chairs about how to clearly define Scholarly Activity, and to differentiate it from teaching outputs.

This language further clarifies the language in the 2022 CA, making it very clear that Scholarly Activity can be research (as defined in 25.19), but it equally does not have to be research, but can be any number of ways of using scholarly activity methods in developing courses, programs, educational resources, digital tools, leadership in the scholarship of teaching and learning (everything listed in 25.21.1 and all outputs listed in 25.22)



Tenure and Promotion and Evaluation: **Scholarly Activity (continued)**

Examples that count for Scholarly Activity include 25.22 a-h and:

25.22 i The creation, application, and dissemination of knowledge through traditional and emerging forms. Activities such as curriculum innovation, educational resource development, public scholarship, student research mentorship, educational technology innovation, and community-engaged scholarship are recognized as valid forms of Scholarly Activity, when undertaken using scholarly methods and in accordance with Unit Standards.

Given concerns about possible overlap between teaching and scholarly activity, *an activity can only be claimed in one category for teaching stream promotion, although Members may also identify relevant overlap. (29.12 d and 29.14 c)*

A Member may be assessed as “meeting” or “exceeding” expectations in Scholarly Activity, and can meet Scholarly Activity requirements for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, through any combination of the types of Scholarly Activity described in 25.21 and 25.21.1. *(13.9 j)*

Slide 6 Notes

To address concerns about possible overlap between activities claimed under teaching or scholarly activity, such activities can only be claimed in one category for teaching stream promotion, although it is reasonable for Members to identify relevant overlap.

Given the broad array of ways that Members can count scholarly activity, we wish to remind you of 13.19 j (this is not new language but it has been moved from article 25 to article 13.) It notes that there are a number of ways that Members can meet Scholarly Activity requirements for RPT and meet or exceed requirements in Scholarly Activity for salary purposes. This means that Unit Standards must recognize the broad array of different ways members can meet Scholarly Activity requirements. Unit Standards can add disciplinary specific requirements here, but they cannot limit Scholarly Activity to one of either research or teaching related activities.



Tenure and Promotion and Evaluation: **New Research Language**

25.19 Research will be evaluated, using a range of quantitative and qualitative measures, in alignment with DORA and principles of responsible research assessment, in accordance with the FEP and Unit Standard, in all possible manifestations and may include, but is not limited to:

- d) funding attracted for research and creative works
- e) evidence of active research pursuit, which may include applications to external funding bodies where such applications demonstrate the development or extension of a sustained research or creative agenda
- f) public scholarship (e.g., writing research-informed texts, articles or media pieces for non-academic audiences, and delivering public lectures)
- g) open scholarship, including data sets, code, articles, chapters, methods, and pre-registration of experimental protocols
- m) evidence of impact on policy and practice developments, including qualitative indicators of these impacts.

Only new language included above, for full list see 25.19 a-m

Slide 7 Notes

DORA urges organizations to stop using journal-based metrics—like the Journal Impact Factor—to judge individual scientific articles, hiring, promotions, or funding.

DORA promotes more Holistic Evaluation: It promotes qualitative assessment and values diverse research outputs, such as datasets, software, policy changes, community impact including developing long term relationships with communities, and societal impact (such as those listed in CA 25.19 f)-h) and m)), rather than just published papers.

This does not mean that Unit Standards can no longer include peer-reviewed journal articles (or can no longer rank journals by impact factors) but it does say that Unit Standards must identify a much broader array of criteria/outputs that can be relevant for determining whether a Member has met the bar for RPT and for exceeding expectations in salary, and that these criteria need to include a much broader range of research outputs, recognizing the importance of public scholarship, open scholarship, community impact and broader societal impact.

We have been asked whether the social/policy impacts of Member research work can be included in their RPT or salary evaluation if Members were originally paid to do this work (eg policy work for gov't or an Indigenous community). We would argue that it is irrelevant if they were originally paid, as what is being evaluated here is the broader/longer term societal and policy impact of their work. So this work can definitely be part of their file for evaluation.



Changes to Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Language: **Reappointment**

27.2 An Assistant Professor is evaluated for Reappointment on the basis of:

- a) Teaching effectiveness since being appointed to the University
- b) Research and scholarly achievements during their career
- c) Research and scholarly activity since being appointed to the University
- d) Service since being appointed to the University

For Assistant Teaching Professors, parallel language includes scholarly activity since being appointed to the University (27.6 c)

Slide 8 Notes

The language regarding reappointment has also been refined.

For Assistant Professors, reappointment continues to be based on teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly achievements, research and scholarly activity, and service. However, the agreement now clearly distinguishes between a member's overall career achievements in research and scholarly activity and the work undertaken in these areas since their appointment at UVic.

The new language expects that research and scholarly activity will have occurred since a Member's appointment. This "activity" is differentiated from the achievements expected over the whole career (27.2 b). Activity may include completed activities (such as conference papers), but it can also include activities in progress, such as drafts of article or partial book manuscripts, which would demonstrate research activity for a candidate for reappointment, while not yet being a research achievement.

This clarification helps committees identify and assess the member's research and or scholarly activities and development during their period since appointment at the university while still considering the broader context of their scholarly career.

Comparable language has also been added for Assistant Teaching Professors, including scholarly activity undertaken since appointment to the university.

These changes are intended primarily to improve clarity and consistency in how reappointment files are assessed.



Other Changes to Tenure and Promotion and Salary Language

- Unit Standards must now include criteria related to the assessment of Indigenous Members, regardless of whether the Unit currently has Indigenous Members, to ensure that all Units are ready to welcome and include Indigenous Members (13.9 g)
- Faculty Members must wait for three years to go up for promotion to Associate or Full Prof or Associate Teaching Prof or Teaching Prof positions, unless the Dean allows an exception (28 and 29)
- Does not apply to those going up this fall.
- Members who were successfully reappointed, but whose committee had some concerns, will be offered mentorship. The Chair will help identify a possible mentor; mentorship does not have to be accepted (27.3.1)
- Members who do “not meet expectations” in salary evaluation will be offered mentorship, and if mentorship is refused, will be expected to develop a written plan to improve their work (50.47)
- Members of equity-deserving groups can request a support person from an equity deserving group to attend RPT, UAAC or disciplinary meetings with them, in addition to FA rep; this has already been available to Indigenous Members; support people can only provide support and may not speak at the meetings

Slide 9 Notes

All Unit Standards must now include criteria related to the assessment of Indigenous Members, whether or not a unit currently employs Indigenous Members. This change recognizes the university's commitment to Indigenous inclusion and helps ensure that all units are prepared to evaluate Indigenous contributions appropriately and fairly.

Members seeking promotion to Associate Professor, Full Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, or Teaching Professor must normally wait three years before applying for a subsequent promotion unless an exception is approved by the Dean. It is important to note that this provision does not apply to individuals who have submitted files for this fall's RPT cycle or where their letter of offer provides them with this approved option.

Another change relates to mentorship. Members who are successfully reappointed but whose committee identifies concerns during the review process will be offered mentorship support. The Chair will assist in identifying a potential mentor, although participation remains voluntary.

Similarly, members who receive a "does not meet expectations" assessment in salary evaluation will be offered mentorship. If mentorship is declined, the member will be expected to develop a written plan to address identified concerns and improve performance.

Finally, members of equity-deserving groups may request a support person from an equity-deserving group to attend RPT, UAAC, or disciplinary meetings. This support person may attend in addition to a Faculty Association representative. Their role is to provide support and assistance; they do not participate directly in the discussion or deliberations.

"Equity-Deserving Groups" is defined in the Collective Agreement includes, but is not limited to, those who self-identify from the following groups: people with a disability, Indigenous people, racialized/visible minorities, women, ethno-religious groups, Black people and 2SLGBTQIA+ people.

Overall, these changes are intended to provide additional support, clarity, and inclusiveness within university processes.



Changes to Committee Structures and UAAC

Changes to Article 32 (ARPT):

- Removed requirement that ARPT Committees can have a maximum of 9 members; now the requirement is a minimum of 3 members (32.2)
- 32.2 and 32.3 still have common requirements for ARPT committees, but most of article has separated requirements for Appointment Committees and RPT Committees

Changes to Article 33 (UAAC):

- Librarian files can now be referred to UAAC
- Process for creation of UAAC is changed. President of FA and President of UVic each identify a pool of 10 faculty and 3 librarians; combined pool can be drawn on for 4 members for each UAAC case; chair jointly chosen by FA President and President of UVic
- Only Full Professors and Teaching Professors can serve on UAAC

Slide 10 Notes

The final area involves changes to committee structures and the University Academic Appointments Committee, or UAAC.

Within Article 32, the previous maximum size of nine members for ARPT Committees has been removed. The Collective Agreement now establishes a minimum of three members rather than a maximum size. This gives units greater flexibility when constructing committees that meet their local needs. A unit may keep the maximum of nine members if that is preferred or they can agree upon an alternative (smaller or larger) number including a Committee comprised of the whole unit.

The article has also been reorganized so that appointment committee requirements and RPT committee requirements are more clearly distinguished.

Several changes have also been made to UAAC.

Librarian files may now be referred to UAAC. In addition, the process for establishing a UAAC panel has changed. The President of the Faculty Association and the President of the University will each identify a pool of faculty and librarian members. From that combined pool, four members will be selected for individual cases, and the chair will be jointly chosen by the Faculty Association President and the University President.

Another important change is that only Full Professors and Teaching Professors are eligible to serve on UAAC.

Taken together, these changes are intended to improve flexibility, consistency, and confidence in committee processes.



Questions?

Faculty Association
lsmarks@uvic.ca or

uvicfa@uvic.ca

Faculty Relations and Academic Administration
facultyrelations@uvic.ca
uvic.ca/vpacademic



University of Victoria
Faculty Association



Slide 11

We encourage you to review the Collective Agreement language carefully and to seek advice early if you have questions about how these provisions apply in your circumstances.

We will be sharing a copy of these slides with attendees no later than Wednesday. Along with the slides, we will circulate a few additional reminders and practical tips for those preparing files in this year's cycle, including deadlines, documentation requirements, and some of the transitional provisions that apply to the Fall 2026 process.



