Annual Performance Reviews (APR) for Faculty Members

or

“Gee – it’s my favourite time of year. Again.”

Sheila Ager
Director, ALP
Evaluating People – Everyone Hates It

• Purpose(s) of faculty member evaluations –
  • Identification of accomplishments and challenges
  • Communication between faculty member and Chair
  • Basis for salary evaluation
  • Judgements on promotion and tenure (including gauging progress towards tenure)

• One of Chair’s most important tasks – at the core of collegial governance (along with T&P)

• Importance directly proportional to degree of agony suffered by evaluator. And potentially the evaluatee.
Guiding Documents

- **Policy 14** – pregnancy and parental leave
- **Policy 40** – Chair’s responsibilities
- **Policy 62** – conflict of interest in supervision
- **Policy 76** – some performance expectations
- **Policy 77** – measures of assessment for T&P*
- **Memorandum of Agreement, §13** – the nuts and bolts*
- **VPA&P memos** – additional guidelines/ruleds
- Faculty-level APR guidelines (MoA §13.5.1)
- Department/School APR guidelines (MoA §13.5.1)
- Activity Reports submitted by faculty member
Memorandum of Agreement §13.5.1

(a) Each Faculty shall have Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines setting out the evaluation criteria for that Faculty.

(b) Each Department shall have an Addendum to their Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines setting out the performance expectations in the Department for scholarship, teaching, and service.

(d) Current versions of faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines and Departmental Addenda shall be posted on the relevant Faculty website and publically accessible.
Salary Adjustments: MoA §13.2-13.4

• Scale increase: see Memorandum of Settlement –
  • Scale increase 1 May 2015: 1.95%
  • Scale increase 1 May 2016: 1.95%
  • Scale increase 1 May 2017: 1.50%

• Selective increment (merit)*

• Anomalies Fund

• Outstanding Performance Awards*

*This salary increase is tied to APR ratings.
A regular faculty appointment involves three main responsibilities: to communicate effectively the knowledge and nature of one’s discipline via teaching, to advance the state of one’s discipline via research, and to contribute to the administrative functions which support these goals through effective service.

Faculty of Engineering APR Guidelines
(also appears in Math and AHS Guidelines)

Standard weightings: 40% teaching, 40% scholarship, 20% service
Scholarship

• Important to maintain broad perspective on ‘scholarship’ –
  • Academic publications (including textbooks); design innovations; creative work; patents; clinical case studies; etc.
• Disciplinary norms
• Importance of peer review
• Collaborative publication – higher in output quantity
• Research funding – intake or output?
• The place of contract research
• International impact
Teaching

• Multi-faceted activity –
  • Graduate and undergraduate, lectures and seminars, field work, project and thesis supervision, laboratory, distance education...
  • Presentation skills, coaching, grading, advising...

• Criteria for evaluation?
  • Use of student course evaluations?
E-mail from VPA&P, 31 October 2016:

This is a reminder of the university requirement establishing that student written feedback on course evaluations be made available only to the course instructor. Instructors are encouraged to use such feedback towards improving their teaching, and may share it with others if they wish for these purposes. Chairs/directors or other managers/evaluators are not authorized to ask for this information and it is not to be used in any summative assessments, including those done by faculty-performance-evaluation committees or tenure-and-promotion committees.
Undergraduate teaching activity is evaluated, in part, by means of the Faculty of Science Course Evaluation Questionnaire. Responses to ‘Professor’ questions are used for summative evaluations. Responses to other questions are used for formative purposes.

Written comments on the evaluation questionnaire and unsolicited feedback from students received by the Chair/Director provide additional context.
Faculty of Science APR Guidelines (January 2016)

Undergraduate teaching activity is evaluated, in part, by means of the Faculty of Science Course Evaluation Questionnaire. Responses to ‘Professor’ questions are used for summative evaluations. Responses to other questions are used for formative purposes.

Written comments on the evaluation questionnaire and unsolicited feedback from students received by the Chair/Director provide additional context.
Teaching

• Multi-faceted activity –
  • Graduate and undergraduate, lectures and seminars, field work, project and thesis supervision, laboratory, distance education...
  • Presentation skills, coaching, grading, advising...

• Instruments for evaluation?
  • Use of student course evaluations?
  • Peer reviews of teaching skills
  • Peer assessment of course materials, course design, etc.
  • Student success (within reason)
  • Other?
  • A CTE session?
Service

• Internal service, external service
• Tension between service and self-service (can be mitigated by obligation for internal service within the institution)
• Quality of service important
• Some things are just part of the job (e.g., writing reference letters)
• Paid external activities normally don’t count
• The vexed question of ‘citizenship’...
Citizenship

• Specified in the VPA&P memo(s) and most Faculty Guidelines (not in the MoA)
'Departmental citizenship’ includes, but is not limited to, mentoring new faculty members, being available in the Department/School, being willing to take on hard-to-cover courses, and being available to students. In keeping with Recommendation 4.1 of the Report of the Working Group on Faculty Evaluation, it is understood that internal service to the university (and in smaller units, to the department) is an essential duty of faculty members.*

*VPAP/FAUW memo, 22 November 2010; Policy 77 also mandates this.
‘Departmental citizenship’ includes, but is not limited to, mentoring new faculty members, being available in the Department/School, being willing to take on hard-to-cover courses, and being available to students. In keeping with Recommendation 4.1 of the Report of the Working Group on Faculty Evaluation, it is understood that internal service to the university (and in smaller units, to the department) is an essential duty of faculty members.*

*VPAP/FAUW memo, 22 November 2010; Policy 77 also mandates this.
Citizenship

• Specified in the VPA&P memo(s) and most Faculty Guidelines (not in the MoA)

• How do we quantify it?
  • Does one give extra grades for something that’s just part of the job?
  • Or is it a matter of demerit points for those exhibiting poor citizenship? That can be very difficult to quantify/prove.

• Classical Studies citizenship guidelines...
Classical Studies Examples of Citizenship

• Being available in the Department
• Being available to students (and leaving the door open)
• Attendance at student events
• Attendance at and engagement in committee meetings, etc., that fall within mandate of service functions
• Distinguishing between a research term and vacation time
Probationary Faculty

• Probationary and definite-term faculty – annual, not biennial
• Advice for improvement (as applicable)
• Active support for improvement
• Keep Policy 77 in mind
• Conduct peer reviews for teaching
• Clear indications in APR letters and probationary renewal of progress towards tenure
• Note that APR letters become part of tenure/promotion brief
Use all the ratings, including the unsatisfactory ones.

2.0  Outstanding
1.75  Excellent
1.5  Very Good
1.25  Good
1.0  Satisfactory
0.75  Needs Some Improvement
0.5  Needs Significant Improvement
0.25  Needs Major Improvement
0.0  Unsatisfactory
Use all the ratings, including the unsatisfactory ones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.0</strong></td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Needs Some Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Needs Significant Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Needs Major Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Terminology: the MoA and Policy 77**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Performance Review</th>
<th>Tenure Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0: Outstanding</td>
<td>‘Strong performance in both scholarship and teaching’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75: Excellent</td>
<td>‘Satisfactory performance in service’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5: Very good</td>
<td>Alternate standard*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25: Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0: Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A candidate may also qualify for appointment as a tenured Associate Professor by virtue of very strong performance in scholarship or teaching with at least satisfactory performance in the other two areas.
**Terminology: the MoA and Policy 77**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Performance Review</th>
<th>Promotion to Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0: Outstanding</td>
<td>‘High order of achievement in both scholarship and teaching’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75: Excellent</td>
<td>‘Satisfactory performance in service’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5: Very good</td>
<td>‘Greatest emphasis is placed on scholarship’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25: Good</td>
<td>Alternate standard*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0: Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*in exceptional cases, a tenured Associate Professor may be promoted on the basis of an outstanding teaching record accompanied by a continuing and long-standing record of satisfactory or better scholarship and service.
Chairs and Committees?  
MoA §13.5.6

• Units of >15 members must strike a performance evaluation advisory committee

• Units of ≤15 members may choose (by majority vote) to have the Chair or a committee carry out the task
Dean’s Responsibilities
MoA §13.5.7

The Dean shall review the ratings proposed by the Chair, and may establish an advisory committee to assist with this review. The Dean may modify the ratings for a Member or Members of a Department, if necessary, to maintain consistency of standards across the Faculty. The Dean shall inform the Chair in writing of the final individual and overall ratings, together with reasons for any changes.
Final (?) Disposition
MoA §13.5.8

• Chair informs faculty member in writing
• Chair provides opportunity for faculty member to discuss the ratings
Where Does the Buck Stop?

• APRs not normally grievable (MoA §9.2.5):
  • Annual performance evaluations and selective increments, and denial of sabbatical leaves are not normally grievable except under 9.2.2 or 9.2.3.

• Faculty member to raise concerns with Chair first, then Dean

• Chairs to raise concerns about their own evaluations with Dean first, then VPA&P
Miscellaneous Considerations

• Does rank of faculty member matter?
• Does your unit/Faculty strive towards a particular average?
• How to assist under-performing or otherwise struggling faculty members?
• Tenure is not a sinecure. ‘Persistent and serious neglect of the normal duties of a faculty member’ can lead to dismissal for cause (MoA §8.5).
Things to Beware Of

- Using evaluation to bring up problems never raised before
- Using the assessment letter as a discipline letter
- Judging individuals for things other than their performance
- Using different standards for different individuals
- Dropping a rating drastically from one year to the next (sudden performance issues may be an indicator of other problems)