

**Faculty (Semi-)Annual Performance Reviews: Relevant Documents<sup>1</sup>**  
**Academic Leadership Program Workshop, 29 November 2018**

**1. [Policy 14: Pregnancy and Parental Leaves \(Including Adoption\)](#)**

Employees' salaries normally will not be affected by the length of pregnancy, adoption or parental leave. Overall on-the-job performance will be the basis for these considerations. Over the 12-month rating period, where there are fewer than eight months on-the-job performance to assess, the salary increase of an employee will normally be based on the average of her/his overall performance ratings in the three previous years (or the number of years available when fewer than three, with a 'satisfactory' rating applied as necessary for new employees).

**2. [Policy 40: The Chair](#)**

The principal duties of a chair shall include the advancement of the academic mission of the unit, the upholding of the highest academic standards, the assignment of equitable responsibilities, the management of the departmental budget, the implementation of the academic program, the oversight of the department's support staff, the allocation of space, the carrying out of annual performance reviews, and recommendations on matters pertaining to promotion and tenure, new appointments and reappointments, and salaries.

**3. [Policy 62: Conflict of Interest in the Employment and Supervision of Personnel](#)**

**1. Faculty and Staff Positions**

Faculty or staff members will not be assigned to positions in which they report to a member of their family, or where there is an indirect relationship such that a family member may influence salary or promotion considerations. Accountability for compliance with this policy will rest with the appropriate line organizations.

**2. Situations Resulting from Administrative Term Appointments**

Should an administrative term appointment create a situation where one family member reports to another, all University of Waterloo procedures affecting tenure, salary increases, promotions and similar matters, will be adjusted so that these procedures take place without the participation of the superordinate family member.

---

<sup>1</sup> Please note that the material included here represents only excerpts from the relevant documents; for full information, please consult the original materials available on the UW website.

#### 4. [Policy 76: Faculty Appointments](#)<sup>2</sup>

##### §2 Faculty Appointment Categories

**A. Regular Faculty Appointments.** Regular full-time faculty in the professorial ranks are normally assigned formal teaching duties in two of the three terms in which the University operates, but are expected to engage in scholarship, supervise students as required, and contribute to University service throughout the year. However, due to the close relationship between clinical practice and scholarly activity for clinical faculty, it is typical and appropriate for the clinical teaching duties for clinical faculty in the professorial ranks to be spread over all three terms. During a term for which formal teaching duties are not assigned, faculty members are expected to increase their scholarly activity. In special circumstances, a faculty member and the department Chair may arrange a different assignment of responsibilities. Any such arrangement must be documented and must have the formal approval of the Faculty Dean.

For full-time Lecturers (including Clinical Lecturers in the School of Optometry), duties are primarily limited to teaching and service, and are normally assigned in all three terms, though Lecturers shall have the option to have at least one term in six be a non-teaching term. Assignment of duties must take into account the distinctive feature of university teaching (i.e., that instruction is provided by scholars who are expected to remain current in their field and maintain their scholarly competence) regardless of whether a separate rating for scholarship is part of the Lecturer's performance review. Prospective Assistant Professors may be appointed as Lecturers for a definite term pending completion of academic requirements (normally the PhD), and in such cases, duties will be as described for Assistant Professors in the preceding paragraph.

**B. Other Faculty Appointments.** Research Appointments: Research faculty members are normally appointed to an academic department or school, and their duties are as specified in their appointment letters. Duties will be primarily research-oriented, but in some cases may include some service, teaching and/or student supervision. Research faculty members should be encouraged to take part in the normal life of the department and Faculty, as permitted by their research duties. The performance of research faculty members should be reviewed annually, in accord with the nature of the appointment as specified in the letter of appointment, by the research director (supervisor, principal investigator) and the department Chair. Where the appointment includes components of service, teaching or student supervision, the department Chair shall review the performance of the research faculty member in these specific areas annually. The results of all such reviews shall be communicated to the research faculty member as soon as possible upon completion.

##### §3 Types of Faculty Appointment

**Probationary-Term Appointments.** Probationary-term Reappointment: For reappointment, the candidate is expected to present a record as a good teacher and evidence of scholarly or creative work as described in sections 2 and 3 of Policy 77. The DTPC shall assess whether the candidate is making satisfactory progress towards tenure, recognizing that at this stage it may be necessary to make judgments in some areas based on potential. The DTPC Chair shall forward the DTPC recommendation to the Dean and shall inform the candidate in writing, including reasons if the recommendation is negative.

---

<sup>2</sup> In the context of describing the parameters of faculty appointments, Policy 76 speaks to a number of performance expectations.

## 5. [Policy 77: Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members](#)<sup>3</sup>

### 1. Introduction

**Professional Conduct:** All faculty members are expected to conduct themselves in relations with colleagues, staff and students across the University in such a way as to promote the academic well-being of all concerned. Faculty members should avoid denigrating the character and professional competence of others, and should pass judgment on the work of colleagues only in the proper academic forums. Further, they should refrain from actions that prevent others from pursuing their legitimate activities and should strive to be helpful, readily contributing their time and expertise for the overall benefit of the academic community.

### 2. Performance Standards

The University expects all faculty members to maintain high standards in all aspects of their university work. To this end, the University exercises judgments on performance in the basic areas of a faculty member's academic responsibilities: teaching, scholarship and service. Such judgments must be made with the greatest possible care and fairness as they are reflected in decisions regarding salary, reappointment, tenure and promotion.

It is the responsibility of department Chairs to assess the performance of each regular faculty member annually, to provide a written performance review and to be available to discuss it upon request. Performance reviews are especially important in helping new faculty members gauge their progress towards meeting the standards for reappointment and tenure. Annual performance reviews form part of the evidence in tenure and promotion considerations, together with reports from external referees and more extensive career reviews carried out by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee (DTPC).

**Teaching:** In all of their teaching activities, faculty members are expected to be fair in the evaluation of student work and constructive in their comments. They are expected to be available to students for interviews and consultations outside the classroom at reasonable times. They must always respect the integrity of their students and carefully avoid any exploitation of them for private advantage. They must maintain strict confidentiality with regard to students' personal lives and political and religious views. They must comment on academic progress and provide judgments on character only to appropriate persons and in appropriate circumstances, and must always be as fair and as objective as possible when making assessments and providing letters of reference.

**Scholarship:** In general, only work that is accessible for peer review or professional adjudication can be considered in assessing scholarship for performance reviews, tenure or promotion. Regardless of the discipline and type of scholarship, the key ingredients are the originality, quality and impact of the scholarly work. Faculty members are expected to meet the ethical standards for scholarship in their particular fields of endeavour; to observe the University's guidelines and policies with respect to ethical conduct in research; and more generally, to act with integrity, truthfulness and honesty in the conduct and communication of their scholarly work.

---

<sup>3</sup> Policy 77 is focused on tenure and promotion, but the measures of assessment are congruent with annual performance reviews (however, the scale employed is different).

**Service:** In addition to their primary duties of teaching and scholarship, regular faculty members have a responsibility to participate in the effective functioning of the University through service on committees, student advising, coordination of activities, and in administrative positions. It is important that all faculty members be willing to assist with administrative duties when their help is needed. Many faculty members also provide valuable service to groups outside the University, such as disciplinary or professional organizations, conferences, journals and granting councils. Community service related to a faculty member's scholarly activities is normally considered as service to the University.

### 3. Performance Assessment

**Teaching:** Classroom performance may be judged in terms of preparation, organization of subject matter, currency of course material, presentation skills, ability to stimulate student interest and scholarship, suitability of assignments and examinations, and willingness to provide individual feedback and help outside the classroom. Student course evaluations are an important source of information, but they should be supplemented with peer evaluation of teaching skills, course content and course materials. University teaching involves much more than classroom performance and, hence, it is important to develop a fair assessment of competence and effectiveness across the candidate's full spectrum of teaching activities. Contributions to project and thesis supervision, clinical supervision and instruction, graduate seminars, oral and thesis examinations, and curriculum development are all relevant in assessing overall teaching activity.

**Scholarship:** High quality contributions to the synthesis of knowledge (e.g., books, monographs, review articles) and to non-traditional forms of scholarship (e.g., artistic exhibitions and performances, innovative design) can provide direct evidence of effective scholarship. Consulting reports and planning documents that are accessible for peer review and evidence of having produced improvements in clinical or professional practice may also be submitted as evidence of a candidate's scholarly contributions. Other evidence of activity and standing as a scholar includes supervision of student research, invitations to present "keynote" addresses, election to and awards received from professional and disciplinary societies, service as a referee for journals and granting councils, and membership on government or professional committees. The primary assessment of quality, originality and impact is made by referees and DTCP members on the basis of examining examples of the candidate's work. Other less direct indicators include the rigor of the review processes for journals and conferences in which the candidate has published, the standards of publishing houses for books, and the extent to which other scholars have made reference to the work. In areas such as the fine and performing arts, similar information may be derived from the prestige of exhibitions and performances to which the candidate has contributed, professional reviews and the receipt of awards or prizes.

### 4. Timing and Criteria [for tenure and promotion]

The expectations for the granting of **tenure** are: a record as a good teacher committed to academic and pedagogical excellence; a record of high-quality and peer-assessed scholarly or creative work (normally demonstrated by publication or presentation in suitable academic or artistic forums); and a record of professional, university or community service. See sections II and III. The granting of tenure normally will require a record of strong performance in both scholarship and teaching, with satisfactory performance in service. However, 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.

**Promotion to the rank of Professor** recognizes a high order of achievement in both scholarship and teaching by tenured Associate Professors, together with satisfactory performance in service. Although evidence of strong teaching performance is required, normally the greatest emphasis is placed on scholarship and achievement within an individual’s discipline. However, 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.

6. [UW Memorandum of Agreement, Section 13](#)

**13. FACULTY SALARIES, ANNUAL SELECTIVE INCREASES AND MEMBER EVALUATION PROCEDURES**

13.1	This Article states the principles governing the determination of salaries for faculty members holding regular appointments. These principles include the establishment of a salary structure for these purposes, the procedures used to establish the extent of annual selective increases, and the rules that have been developed to direct the annual evaluation process in each Faculty used to determine individual selective increases.																								
13.2	<b>Faculty Salary Structure</b>																								
13.2.1	<p>The salary structure for regular faculty members shall consist of a salary floor and two thresholds for each of the four ranks and for Clinical Lecturers, together with the Selective Increase Unit (SIU).</p> <p>Effective 1 May 2018, the selective increase unit (SIU) shall be \$3,920, and the salary floors and thresholds shall be as stated below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="282 1108 1424 1373"> <thead> <tr> <th>Rank</th> <th>Floor</th> <th>Threshold T1</th> <th>Threshold T2</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Lecturer</td> <td>\$62,180</td> <td>\$126,997</td> <td>\$147,800</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Clinical Lecturer</td> <td>\$80,143</td> <td>\$156,296</td> <td>\$175,483</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Assistant Professor</td> <td>\$80,143</td> <td>\$175,779</td> <td>\$212,398</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Associate Professor</td> <td>\$100,868</td> <td>\$175,779</td> <td>\$212,398</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Professor</td> <td>\$128,505</td> <td>\$175,779</td> <td>\$212,398</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Rank	Floor	Threshold T1	Threshold T2	Lecturer	\$62,180	\$126,997	\$147,800	Clinical Lecturer	\$80,143	\$156,296	\$175,483	Assistant Professor	\$80,143	\$175,779	\$212,398	Associate Professor	\$100,868	\$175,779	\$212,398	Professor	\$128,505	\$175,779	\$212,398
Rank	Floor	Threshold T1	Threshold T2																						
Lecturer	\$62,180	\$126,997	\$147,800																						
Clinical Lecturer	\$80,143	\$156,296	\$175,483																						
Assistant Professor	\$80,143	\$175,779	\$212,398																						
Associate Professor	\$100,868	\$175,779	\$212,398																						
Professor	\$128,505	\$175,779	\$212,398																						
13.2.2	Effective May 1 of each year, the annual scale change as specified in the <a href="#">Memorandum of Settlement</a> shall be applied to the salary floors, thresholds, and Selective Increase Unit. Otherwise, changes in these amounts shall require the mutual agreement of the Association and the University.																								
13.3	<b>Selective Salary Increases</b>																								
13.3.1	Selective salary increases are intended to move a Member through the salary structure at a rate determined by her/his achievements in the profession and contributions to the University, measured by annual performance ratings undertaken as specified in <a href="#">13.5</a> . In order to ensure orderly career progress consistent with long-range academic goals, the commitment of funds required for this purpose shall have the highest priority in the preparation of the annual budget.																								
13.3.2	Within each Faculty, the Selective Increase Pool for Members shall be determined as follows:																								

	<p>0.25 SIU for each FTE Member, plus  0.25 SIU for each FTE Member with salary below T2, plus  0.5 SIU for each FTE Member with salary below T1.  For these purposes the value of the SIU shall be its value as of May 1 of the salary year in which the selective increases are to take effect, adjusted from year to year as specified in <u>13.2.2</u>.</p>
13.3.3	<p>(a) A Member's selective salary increase depends both on her/his performance rating (actual R) and on the position of the Member's salary relative to the thresholds T1 and T2 for her/his rank. Thus the performance rating (adjusted R) for purposes of calculating a Member's selective increase amount may not be the same as the performance rating (actual R) determined as specified in <u>13.5.5</u>. For Members on a biennial performance review cycle, during non-review years, actual R is equal to the actual R for the previous year. These non-review year actual Rs are subject to adjustment, just as review year actual Rs are. The appropriate values for the adjusted performance rating shall be determined in the following way:  If salary is less than T1 then adjusted R is actual R  If salary is equal to or greater than T1 but less than T2 then adjusted R is actual R less 0.75  If salary is equal to or greater than T2 then adjusted R is actual R less 1.25  The value of adjusted R shall never be less than 0</p>
	<p>(b) The actual dollar value in any one year associated with an adjusted R of 1.0 in each Faculty is calculated by adding all individual adjusted ratings in that Faculty together, and dividing the resulting number into the total value of that Faculty's Selective Increase Pool as determined by <u>13.3.2</u>. All other adjusted R values are assigned a selective increase dollar value by multiplying the adjusted R value by the dollar value of an adjusted R of 1.0.</p>
	<p>(c) Where a selective salary increase as determined in 13.3.3 (a) and (b) would result in a salary which crosses a threshold, that increase shall be "feathered". That is to say, that part of the increase which would bring a Member's salary up to a threshold shall be received by the Member, but the part of the increase which would cause the salary to exceed the threshold shall be adjusted to make it commensurate with the selective increase to which she/he would be entitled with a salary at or above that threshold.</p>
	<p>(d) Effective May 1, 2006, the University will provide annually an Anomalies Fund for each Faculty equal in value to five percent of that Faculty's Selective Increase Pool, to correct individual salary anomalies. These special permanent increases require the approval of the Vice President Academic and Provost (VPA&amp;P) who shall consult with the President of the Association. Any unspent amount in the anomalies fund of a given Faculty will be carried forward to the next salary year.</p>
	<p>(e) Effective May 1, 2004, the University will provide annually an Outstanding Performance Fund for each Faculty equal in value to ten percent of that Faculty's Selective Increase Pool, to provide special permanent salary increases as described below.  Members in each Faculty unit (department or school) whose performance rating for the current year is within the top twenty percent of ratings within the unit may be considered for a special permanent salary increase. For Members on a biennial review cycle, eligibility for consideration for Outstanding Performance Fund salary increases during non-review years are based on the previous year's performance ratings. Members who have received a special increase in either of the previous two years are not eligible to receive a special increase, and are excluded for purposes of determining the top twenty percent and those within it.</p>

	<p>All Members identified by the process above will form a single Faculty-wide pool. The Dean of the Faculty, in consultation with the Vice-President, Academic &amp; Provost, will review the performance of all Members in this pool, and make special salary increase awards equal in value to one Selective Increase Unit (SIU) to a subset of them. For at least eighty percent of the awards, the sole criterion will be outstanding performance in teaching and scholarship. Remaining awards may be given on the basis of outstanding service to the University. Consideration also should be given to dispersing the awards across Faculty units, ranks, and to both women and men. Awards given on the basis of outstanding service will not be limited to Members holding administrative positions. The number of awards made will be such that, in the aggregate, they will differ from ten percent of each Faculty's Selective Increase Pool by less than one SIU, and any unspent amount in the Fund of a given Faculty will be carried forward to the next salary year. The Vice-President, Academic &amp; Provost will publicly announce the award recipients.</p>
13.4	<b>Miscellaneous</b>
13.4.1	In every case, scale and selective increases shall be applied to the Member's nominal full-time salary.
13.4.2	For Members on approved pregnancy, adoption or parental leave: the full scale and selective increases shall apply.
13.4.3	For Members newly appointed within the evaluation year, or who are on full or partial unpaid leave for part of the evaluation year: the full scale increase shall apply, but the Merit Increase will be prorated by the fraction of the year served at the University.
13.5	<b>Member Evaluation</b>
13.5.1	(a) Each Faculty shall have Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines setting out the evaluation criteria for that Faculty. The Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines shall be reviewed and updated no less than once every five (5) years, and changes shall be approved by a majority vote of the Faculty Council no later than 15 October in the year before evaluation calendar year to which the changes would apply.
	(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. The Addendum shall be reviewed and updated biennially, and changes shall be approved by: (i) a majority vote of members of the Department, and (ii) the Faculty Dean who shall review for consistency with the documents listed in 13.5.1(c) no later than 15 October in the year before the evaluation calendar year(s) to which the changes would apply.
	(c) Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines and Departmental Addenda shall be consistent with this Agreement, and with University policies, procedures and guidelines (including the evaluation criteria set out in Policy 77). Departmental Addenda shall also be consistent with Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines. In case of a conflict, precedence shall be given first to this Agreement; then to University policies, procedures and guidelines; and then to the Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines.
	(d) Current versions of faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines and Departmental Addenda shall be posted on the relevant Faculty website and publically accessible.
13.5.2	(a) Each Member shall receive performance evaluation based upon documentation provided by the Member, submitted in the format and by the deadline specified in the Faculty Performance

	<p>Evaluation Guidelines. Performance evaluations shall occur on an annual basis for Members holding probationary or definite-term appointments, and on a biennial basis on odd numbered years for Members holding tenured or continuing appointments. A Member who does not submit the required documentation by the specified deadline normally will receive an overall rating of at most 0.5 as specified in <a href="#">13.5.3</a>.</p>
	<p>(b) Members shall provide documentation for the calendar year(s) under evaluation (one year for Members holding probationary or definite-term appointments, and two years for Members holding tenured or continuing appointments). Members shall in addition provide documentation for the number of previous years specified by their Faculty Guidelines. Scholarship shall be assessed on the total evidence from a window of two years. Teaching and service shall be assessed on the evidence from the year(s) under evaluation. The remaining documented years shall provide context to the assessed evidence.</p>
	<p>(c) When Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines or Departmental Addenda change during the course of a Member's probationary contracts, the Member will continue to be governed by the guidelines and addenda in effect at the beginning of their first probationary contract, unless the Member elects to be governed by the new set of guidelines or addenda, at the Member's discretion. The Member shall advise their Department Chair if they elect to be governed by the new set.</p>
13.5.3	<p>Each Member shall receive one of the following nine numerical performance ratings in each of teaching, scholarship and service:</p> <p>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</p>
13.5.4	<p>(a) Performance ratings shall pertain to the portion of the evaluation year during which the Member was a paid employee of the University, including sabbatical leave, but excluding pregnancy, adoption, parental, or sick leave.</p>
	<p>(b) For newly appointed Members, and for Members on paid or unpaid leave, it may not be possible to assess performance in all three categories during the evaluation year. In these cases only, the practices described in <a href="#">13.5.1</a>, <a href="#">13.5.2</a>, and <a href="#">13.5.3</a> may be amended as follows: (1) A newly appointed Member shall receive, in any category where assessment is not possible, a rating equal to the average rating of Members in the Department who hold the same rank; and (2) A continuing Member who has been on leave shall receive in any category where assessment is not possible as a result of the leave, a rating equal to the average ratings of the three previous years in which the Member was not on leave.</p>
	<p>(c) In situations where a Member has held a fractional load appointment, or has taken a leave of absence, in the period for which evaluation data is being considered, expectations for quality shall remain the same but expectations for quantity shall be adjusted.</p>
13.5.5	<p>(a) The overall rating (R) for each Member shall be computed as the weighted average of the individual ratings in teaching, scholarship and service for the year(s) being reviewed. For Members on a biennial performance review cycle, the rating for non-review years shall be</p>

		equal to the rating for the previous review year. The weight for each area shall be as specified in the member's letter of appointment. In the absence of specified weights for professorial positions, the normal weights shall be 40 percent for teaching, 40 percent for scholarship, and 20 percent for service; for lecturer positions, the normal weights shall be 80 percent for teaching and 20 percent for service. These default weights do not apply to lecturer appointments made prior to May 1, 2008. Member weights remain in effect for the duration of the appointment unless otherwise changed under sub articles (b) and (c). There is no intended linear relationship between the percent for teaching and the number of courses taught.
	(b)	Weightings and duties may be adjusted in a formal agreement between the Member and the Chair with the approval of the Dean. The weights shall be at least 20 percent in every category, except in the case of lecturer appointments. Weight redistribution does not modify the performance quality expected in any of the three areas, though expectations for quantity will change.
	(c)	Any such formal agreement under 13.5.5 (b) shall be by mutual consent and, except in the case of definite-term appointments, shall be for a period of up to 5 years but no less than 2 years. Such an agreement may be renewed by mutual consent.
	(d)	The performance evaluation of a Member shall be done with all evaluators being informed of the weights in each area, and any adjustments made to the weights in each area, over the entire period for which evaluation data is being considered. Each Member shall be informed of the weight information used in their evaluation. The Chair shall collect and provide this weight information, which must be consistent with sub article (a) and any adjustments made under sub articles (b) and (c).
13.5.6	(a)	The Chair has the responsibility for annual performance evaluations of all Members in the Department. The Chair shall inform the Dean of the proposed ratings in the three categories and overall.
	(b)	For Departments with 15 or fewer full-time equivalent regular faculty positions, the Members of the Department shall decide by majority vote whether to elect an advisory committee of no more than five Members to assist the Chair in carrying out the responsibility in 13.5.6 (a). A common committee spanning two or more small Departments may be considered.
	(c)	For Departments with more than 15 full-time equivalent regular faculty positions, the Members of the Department shall elect an advisory committee of no more than five Members to assist the Chair in carrying the responsibility in 13.5.6 (a).
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.
13.5.8		The Chair shall inform the Member in writing of her/his final individual and overall ratings, and shall provide an opportunity for the Member to discuss her/his performance evaluation.
13.5.9		The Dean shall evaluate the performance of Department Chairs and Associate Deans, and shall forward proposed performance ratings in the three categories and overall to the VPA&P for approval. The VPA&P shall inform the Dean and the Chair or Associate Dean in writing with reasons of any changes in the recommended ratings.

13.5.10	(a)	A Member who disagrees with her/his performance evaluation should proceed first to the Department Chair, and then, if not resolved, to the Dean of the Faculty for disposition.
	(b)	A Department Chair or Associate Dean who disagrees with her/his performance evaluation should proceed first to the Dean, and then, if not resolved, to the VPA&P for disposition.
	(c)	Performance evaluations and selective salary increases are not normally grievable except under Article <u>9.2.2</u> or <u>9.2.3</u> of this Agreement.
13.5.11		Histograms showing the distribution in each Department, and by rank in the Faculty, of: (a) final overall ratings and (b) unweighted ratings in the categories of teaching, scholarship, and service, shall be provided to each Member with their performance evaluation. Ratings histograms for small Departments may be combined with those of other Departments from similar disciplines in the same Faculty in order to preserve confidentiality.

## 7. [Vice-President Academic and Provost's Memos and Other Communications](#)

### [Memo from VPAP and FAUW President, 22 November 2010](#)

To: Department Chairs / Directors of Schools  
Faculty Relations Committee  
Marie Armstrong, Associate University Secretary

From: Geoff McBoyle, Vice-President, Academic and Provost  
George Freeman, President, Faculty Association

Re: Annual Performance Review Process

Date: November 22, 2010

The information sessions for Chairs and Directors during September 22nd and 24th on changes to the annual performance review process provided the Faculty Relations Committee with a good deal of constructive feedback about implementing the recommendations. Below is a summary of key aspects for Chairs and Directors to address, based on the ideas that emerged during these sessions:

- We confirm the University's commitment to ensuring that Chairs and Directors will have a forum that facilitates their further input on the process as these changes proceed.
- We would also remind Chairs and Directors that the original report of the Provost's Committee included not only recommendations, but discussions of the reasons supporting each of the recommendations; these discussions, we suspect, will often be useful guides for how to understand the recommendations as you set about implementing them.
- Faculties that do not yet have a written statement outlining Faculty-wide expectations related to scholarship, teaching, and service must have developed one by Spring 2011. Those academic units in Faculties that lack a department or school statement must prepare a document specific to their own department or school in parallel with the preparation of the Faculty statement, with the goal of having the document completed by September 2011. This document must be approved by all faculty in the unit, using whichever criteria (majority? Consensus? etc.) unit faculty deem appropriate.
- Recommendation 2.5 prohibits the inappropriate double counting of graduate supervision as both teaching and scholarship. The tasks involved in graduate supervision may be broken down into component parts that, individually, may count under research, teaching, or service. In this

context, departments need to explain which aspects of graduate supervision are counted as research, teaching, or service, and that they can only be counted under one category.

- Recommendation 1.2 requires that units with 15 or more FTE faculty strike a committee to advise the Chair on annual performance evaluations. It is up to each unit to decide the size of the committee, the mix of membership, the length of term members will serve, and the procedure for selecting the committee.
- While Recommendation 3.1 has not yet been officially adopted at Faculty Relations, Chairs should be aware that it is likely to be adopted soon. It is worth emphasizing again the motivation for this change: Two-year evaluations for all tenured faculty and continuing lecturers will provide committees and chairs with sufficient time to write detailed, constructive feedback to pre-tenure faculty, without undue increase in the workload for Chairs.

With regard to other topics raised at the sessions, we would also note the following:

- Faculty members will be required to describe the nature and scope of their service contributions including an estimate of time spent on each item so that they can be properly evaluated.
- The Faculty Relations Committee has produced a guideline for departments as they achieve consensus on what departmental citizenship means in their particular units:
  - “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.
- Discussions concerning the implementation of Recommendation 3.1 (“Evaluate scholarship on the basis of a two to four year period, and evaluate teaching and service on the basis of work done since the previous evaluation”) are continuing at FRC.

We will work with the Deans to ensure that they provide Chairs with information about expectations related to average overall performance scores, and the range around such averages, for their Faculties. In this manner, we believe greater transparency and accountability in the merit review process will be achieved.

**E-Mail from Vice-President Academic and Provost (31 October 2016)**

Deans and Chairs,

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.

Sincerely, Ian

Ian Orchard  
Vice-President Academic and Provost

**Memo from VPAP and FAUW President, 27 September 2017**

To: Faculty Deans  
School Directors and Department Chairs

From: D. George Dixon, Vice-President Academic & Provost  
Bryan Tolson, President, FAUW

Re: Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines

Date: September 27, 2017

We are writing to remind you that in accordance with 2016 revisions to Section 13 of the University of Waterloo's Memorandum of Agreement with the Faculty Association of the University of Waterloo (FAUW), neither faculty-level Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines nor departmental Addenda to Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines should be updated in odd-numbered years.

Performance reviews for tenured and continuing faculty members now occur biennially on odd-numbered years. In order that those faculty members are held to consistent standards for the entire two-year cycle, and that pre-tenure and definite-term faculty members are assessed using the same standards that apply to tenured and continuing faculty members, no changes to faculty and departmental review guidelines are permitted on odd-numbered years. Put simply, the next deadline to revise faculty review documents is October 15, 2018.

**See also:**

- [Review of the Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation Process \(28 April 2009\)](#)
- [VPAP Response to Review of Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation Process \(21 May 2009\)](#)
- [Faculty Annual Performance Appraisal Process Recommendations \(1 June 2010\)](#)
- [Review of the Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation Process \(reissued August 13, 2010 – 2.2 corrected\)](#)

**8. Faculty/Department/School APR Guidelines**

Each Faculty has (or should have) publicly accessible guidelines for annual performance reviews (MoA 13.5.1). Each Department/School should have an addendum to these guidelines that speaks to the unit's culture and expectations.

**9. Activity Reports**

Most Faculties have devised templates for faculty members to complete as part of their submission of documentation for the APR. These templates provide some guidance in structuring the review process.