(Semi-)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)
Evaluating People – Everyone Hates It

- Purpose(s) of faculty member evaluations
- 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
Salary Adjustments: MoA §13.2-13.4

• Scale increase: see Memorandum of Settlement –
  • Scale increase 1 May 2018: 2.00%
  • Scale increase 1 May 2019: 2.15%
  • Scale increase 1 May 2020: 2.15%
  • MoS expires 30 April 2021
• Selective increment (merit)*
• Anomalies Fund
• Outstanding Performance Awards*

*This salary increase is tied to APR ratings.
(a) Each Faculty shall have Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines setting out the evaluation criteria for that Faculty. Update every five years.

(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. Update every two years.
Changes to the MoA, 2016

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 [next assessment of tenured faculty, January 2019].

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.
Memo from VPAP and FAUW President

27 September 2017

In order that 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.
Probationary Faculty

- Probationary and definite-term faculty – annual, not biennial
- Honesty and clarity paramount
- Guidance and mentoring important throughout the year
- Advice for improvement (as applicable)
- Active support for improvement (outside the APR process)
- Keep Policy 77 in mind
- Conduct peer reviews for teaching
- Clear indications in APR letters and probationary renewal of progress towards tenure (and letters are part of T&P brief)
Standard Weightings:
40% scholarship, 40% teaching, 20% service
Scholarship

• Important to maintain broad perspective on ‘scholarship’ –
  • Academic publications (including textbooks); design innovations; creative work; patents; clinical case studies; scholarly, creative, digital contributions to pedagogy; etc.

• Disciplinary norms
• Importance of peer review
• Collaborative publication – higher in output quantity
• Research funding – intake or output?
• The place of contract research and consulting
• International impact
Teaching

• Multi-faceted activity –
  • Graduate and undergraduate, lectures and seminars, field work, project and thesis supervision, laboratory, studio, online education...
  • Course design, presentation skills, coaching, grading, advising...

• Instruments for evaluation?
  • Use of student course evaluations?
E-mail from VPAP, 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.
Teaching

• Multi-faceted activity –
  • Graduate and undergraduate, lectures and seminars, field work, project and thesis supervision, laboratory, studio, online education...
  • Course design, presentation skills, coaching, grading, advising...

• Instruments for evaluation?
  • Use of student course evaluations?
    Current exploration of use of evaluations/alternative methods
  • Peer reviews of teaching – someone other than the Chair?
  • Peer assessment of course materials, course design, etc.
  • Student success (within reason)
  • Teaching dossiers (full or focused)
  • CTE sessions
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

The expectation is that every faculty member in the unit contributes to the success of the unit through their activities of teaching, collegiality and citizenship.

**AHS APR Guidelines**, 2018

The successful operation of the university depends on the willingness of individuals to contribute. Good citizenship and a willingness to volunteer is a significant aspect of service.

**ENG APR Guidelines**, 2016
Citizenship

• Role of the Chair and others in modelling citizenship
• Specified in the VPAP 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.
Citizenship

• Role of the Chair and others in modelling citizenship
• Specified in the VPA&P memo(s) and most Faculty Guidelines (not in the MoA)
• How do we quantify it?
  • 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. Also carries the danger of turning into a popularity contest.
• 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
The Actual Ratings
Numbers are the Universal language offered by the deity to humans as confirmation of the truth.

St. Augustine
Quantitative and Qualitative

• Extremely important that the numbers align with the qualitative assessments
  • E.g., 1.5 = “Very Good”

• Both types of assessment re-affirm and validate the other
  • The descriptive assessment lends context to the number
  • The number lends an air of objectivity to a subjective process, and allows for comparison
Use all the ratings, including the unsatisfactory ones (but be aware of the consequences)

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 (but be aware of the consequences)

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
A rating of 1.0 represents the minimum level of acceptable performance in a given year. A rating below this level in a given year, or a consistent pattern of 1.0 ratings in one or more categories over time, indicates the need for active consultation and problem-solving strategies between the Chair and faculty member.
Termiology: 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

• The advantages of a committee: transparency and the elimination of actual bias/the apprehension of bias
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
The Letter

• Clarity and honesty
• Link it explicitly to the Departmental APR and T&P guidelines
• Highlight achievements (i.e., don’t reproduce the entire Activity Report)
• Contextualize achievements for future FTPCs, UTPCs (e.g., disciplinary norms)
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 VPAP
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

• Waiting for evaluation time to address serious issues
• 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)
Do you have a nightmare case/situation?

Henry Fuseli
The Nightmare, 1781