

Faculty of Applied Health Sciences
Performance Review Guidelines^a for Faculty (to be adopted by all Dept/School academic units in AHS)
(in conjunction with the Memorandum of Agreement and Policy 77)
MoA changes approved by Board of Governor's, October 25, 2016
Revisions to paragraph made in red text, approved at FC via e-vote: Oct. 19, 2018.
An editorial friendly amendment is highlighted in yellow (approved at FC, Nov. 23, 2018)

Introduction

The University recognizes the Association as representing the University employees (Members) as defined under MoA article 2.1.1. See article 2.1.2 for clarification for those who are not represented by the Association under this Agreement.

The University recognizes the Association as the sole representative of the following groups of University employees (hereinafter referred to as Members) with regard to terms and conditions of employment:

- (a) all regular faculty members (Policy 76, 2.A) who hold definite term, probationary, tenured, or continuing appointments, on either a full-time or fractional-load basis; and
- (b) all part-time faculty members (Policy 76, 2.B) who hold definite term appointments of one year or more with either a FTE of at least 50% (if specified in the letter of appointment) or a base salary of at least 50% of the salary floor for the member's rank. The University will inform the Association when such appointments are made.

The primary purpose of performance reviews for faculty members is to recognize accomplishments, identify areas for improvement and to promote discussion between individual faculty members and the Chair/Director regarding ways of enhancing future contributions. It is the responsibility of the Dean to assess performance, provide a written performance review and be available to discuss the review for the Chairs/Director and the Associate Deans.

As noted in MoA 13.5.1(b), the Faculty Performance Evaluation guidelines are to be approved by Faculty Council and reviewed by the Dean no later than **October 15th of the year before** the evaluation calendar year to which the changes would apply and be published on the Faculty website. These Faculty guidelines shall be reviewed and updated no less than once every five years - MoA 13.5.1(a). Refer to item 13.5.2(c) if there are addendums to the Faculty Performance Evaluation guidelines. These are to be updated biennially.

Article 13 of the Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) states the principles for the determination of salaries and evaluation of faculty members. Section 13.5 – Member Evaluation - of the MoA requires that each Faculty shall have Performance Evaluation Guidelines (this document) setting out the evaluation criteria specific to our Faculty. Faculty guidelines shall be consistent with the MoA and with University policy, procedures and guidelines (including the evaluation criteria set out in Policy 77). Precedence will be given first to the MoA in case of conflict, then to university policy/procedures, then to Faculty performance evaluation guidelines - MoA 13.5.1(c).

As noted in MoA 13.5.2(a), faculty performance reviews will 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. This includes members on full-time, part-time (>50%), reduced load, and joint appointments including those on sabbatical, paid or unpaid leaves, or on "buy-out" arrangement to allow for well-informed decisions to be made regarding selective salary increments (see the web version of the Memorandum of Agreement, article 13).

Member Evaluation

Fractional Load

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.

First Probationary Appointments

Refer to MoA 13.5.2(c) when Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines change during the course of a Member's

^a Performance Review Guidelines are to be approved every 5 years by Faculty Council no later than October 15th in the year before the evaluation calendar year in which the changes would apply. Guidelines are also to be published and available on the Faculty's website.

probationary contract, the Member will continue to be governed by the guidelines in effect at the beginning of their first probationary contract. At the Member's discretion, the Member may elect to be governed by the new set of guidelines. The Member shall advise their Department/School Chair/Director if they elect to be governed by the new set.

Newly appointed Members/ Members on leave (paid or unpaid)

For these individuals, it may not be possible to assess performance in all three categories during the evaluation year. In these cases only, the practices described in 13.5.1, 13.5.2, and 13.5.3 may be amended as follows: (1) a new appointed Member shall receive, in any category where assessment is not possible, a rating equal to the average rating of Members in the **Faculty** who hold the same rank in the current year. (2) A Continuing Member who has been on leave shall receive, in any category where assessment is not possible, because of a leave, a rating equal to the average ratings of the three previous years in which the Member was NOT on leave.

Faculty who are awarded tenure in an even year

Evaluations of tenured faculty take place in odd-numbered years. However, faculty who are hired with tenure or awarded tenure in an even year may require an extra one-year evaluation to transition to the biennial cycle. For example, if someone is awarded tenure July 2016, he/she would have an evaluation based on a single year in 2017, then would have his or her next evaluation in 2019 based on two years.

Documentation

The primary documentation used to assess an individual's performance are 1) Performance Review (format available on the AHS website), 2) the Work Plan, 3) updated C.V. and 4) any additional supplementary documentation, such as a teaching dossier.

The performance review of regular faculty members will focus on activity in three areas: teaching, scholarship, and service: 1) to communicate the knowledge and nature of one's discipline through teaching; 2) to advance the state of one's discipline through scholarship; and, 3) to contribute to the administrative functions that support these goals through effective service. Performance evaluations should not change dramatically from year to year.

Refer to MOA section 13.5.2(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).

In addition, Members shall provide documentation for the number of previous years specified by their Faculty guidelines (**2 years**).

TEACHING

University teaching encompasses a wide range of activities. It may take different forms (e.g., undergraduate and graduate courses, graduate seminars, on-line courses, project and oral and thesis examinations/supervision, clinical supervision and may include different components (e.g., lectures, tutorials, setting and grading of assignments and examinations, interaction with students outside the classroom, curriculum development, off campus courses/workshops), and may occur in different environments (e.g., large lecture theatres, small seminar rooms, clinics, laboratories, experiential classroom settings, one-on-one supervision, and on-line).

Assessment - It is important to develop a fair assessment of competence and effectiveness across the candidate's full spectrum of teaching activities. The opinions of current and former students can be of value if solicited on a systematic basis. Student course perception surveys (course evaluation surveys) are one important source of information, but these should be supplemented with other key sources, such as peer evaluation of teaching skills, course content and course materials.

Teaching will be evaluated on demonstrated performance based on the year(s) under evaluation.

SCHOLARSHIP

Evidence of **scholarship** normally includes a combination of, but is not limited to, refereed, published, or in press or peer reviewed articles, books, book chapters, refereed published or in press conference proceedings, book reviews, or other short written communications, invited presentations at scientific meetings, self-initiated presentations, grants and contracts, non-refereed publications/presentations, non-refereed proceedings of scholarly/professional

meetings, technical reports, and policy briefs. (Refer to Section B, Scholarly Activity). Peer-reviewed research with respect to pedagogy and innovative teaching also constitute scholarly activity. Evidence of scholarship will also include support from external funding. The originality, quality, impact, and quantity of scholarly work are all considered in reviewing performance.

Scholarship will be evaluated on demonstrated performance based on the previous two years. Refer to MoA section 13.5.2 (b).

SERVICE

Service includes but is not limited to contributions to the Department/School, Faculty and University. This can involve service assignments by the Chairs/Director or service contributions over and above assigned service. 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. Service may also include service to one's discipline through granting council committees, editorial boards, conference organization, and working committees of professional societies, including professional/clinical service, service to the broader academic community and to the broader community. (Refer to Section C, Service).

Service will be evaluated on demonstrated performance based on the year(s) under evaluation.

Submission Timelines (see sample AHS Merit Summary Timeline Schedule)

- Each Faculty member's performance review form (submitted in the correct format, see [Faculty Performance Reviews](#) website) and supporting documentation is due in the office of the Chairs/Director on the last working day in December. A member who does not submit the required documentation by the specified deadline will receive, under normal circumstances, an overall rating of at most 0.5 as specified in MoA article 13.5.3.
- Chair/Director's recommendations should be completed and forwarded to the Dean's Office no later than the first working day in **February**. (Two copies are required, to be submitted to the Administrator, Faculty Relations and Appointments, Dean's Office, for distribution to the Dean and Executive Officer).
- As soon as possible, after the dossiers are received, the Dean will convene a meeting with the Chairs/Director and the Executive Officer (this is an advisory committee to the Dean) in early to mid-February to review assessments for each faculty member. If necessary, the Dean may modify the ratings for an individual, if necessary to maintain consistency of standards across the Faculty.
- The Dean will meet with the VPA&P and provide a merit summary of all faculty merit ratings, and then inform the Chairs/Director, in writing, of the final individual and overall ratings.
- The Chairs/Director will inform each faculty member of her/his final individual and overall ratings (complete Acknowledgement C). The Chair/Director will provide an opportunity for each person to discuss the performance evaluation soon after the Dean has met with the VPA&P and the ratings are approved. Faculty members will sign off on the Acknowledgement Form C and return the form to the Chair/Director.
- The Administrator, Faculty Relations and Appointments and the Executive Officer will enter each faculty merit rating/weighting for each applicable category of teaching, scholarship, and service on-line within the faculty salary increase system adhering to the timelines set by Human Resources. This process starts mid-March in preparation for the May payroll deadline.
- As noted in MoA section 13.5.11, histograms showing the distribution in each Department/School, 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. Rating histograms for small Departments/Schools may be combined with those of other Departments/Schools from similar disciplines in the same Faculty in order to preserve confidentiality.

Departmental Procedures for Member Evaluation (refer to MOA 13.5)

All Departments/School Chair/Director will ensure their members are aware of the Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines, which sets out the performance expectations and weights (and any weight adjustments) for scholarship, teaching and service.

The Chair/Director, together with the Review Committee, has the responsibility for performance evaluations of all faculty members in the Department/School, to provide a written performance review and to be available to discuss it upon request. Interviews provide faculty members an opportunity to comment on their roles within the Department/School, and to suggest how they might redirect or enhance their contributions in the future. If a faculty member is experiencing difficulty in an area, the Chair/Director and the faculty member should develop a written plan to address the individual's overall contributions to the Department/School.

Performance reviews are especially important in helping new faculty members gauge their progress towards meeting the standards for reappointment and tenure. 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/School Tenure and Promotion Committee (D/STPC).

Communication of Ratings/Weightings

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.

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/Director shall collect and provide this weight information, which must be consistent with the normal weights or the lecturer position weights and any adjustments made (refer to MoA section 13.5.5(a) (b) (c)). The normal weights shall be 40 percent for teaching, 40 percent for scholarship, and 20 percent for service unless written agreement to the contrary exists.

Weightings and duties may be adjusted in a formal written agreement between the faculty member and the Chair/Director with the approval of the Dean. The weights shall be at least 20 percent in every category, except in the case of lecturer appointments, which allows for 0% weight on the scholarship component.

For lecturer positions, the default weights shall be 80 percent for teaching and 20 percent for service (refer to MoA 13.5.5).

MoA 13.5.5(b) states any formal agreement shall be agreed upon by mutual consent, except in the case of a definite-term appointment, for a period of up to 5 years but no less than 2 years. Such an agreement may be renewed by mutual consent.

The weight for each area shall be specified in the Member's letter of appointment (refer to MOA 13.5.5(a)).

The Chair/Director shall inform the Dean of the proposed ratings in the three categories and overall. The Chair/Director may recommend the appointment of one or more associate Chair/Director to assist in these tasks.

For Departments/School with 15 or fewer full-time equivalent regular faculty positions, the members of the Department/School shall decide by majority vote whether to elect an advisory committee of no more than five members to assist the Chair/Director in carrying out the responsibility in 13.5.6 (a). A common committee spanning two or more small Departments/School may be considered.

For Departments/School 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/Director in carrying out the responsibility in 13.5.6 (a).

The Chairs/Director shall inform the Member in writing, of her/his individual and overall ratings, once the Faculty merit meeting has taken place, and after the final individual and overall ratings are agreed upon with the Dean. The

Chairs/Director shall provide an opportunity for the Member to discuss her/his performance evaluation.

The Dean shall review the ratings proposed by the Chairs/Director, 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/School, if necessary, to maintain consistency of standards across the Faculty.

The Dean shall inform the Chairs/Director, in writing, of the final individual and overall ratings, together with reasons for any changes.

The Dean shall evaluate the performance of Department/School Chairs/Director 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 Chairs/Director or Associate Dean in writing with reasons of any changes in the recommended ratings. Performance evaluations and selective salary increases are not normally grievable except under Article 9.2.2 or 9.2.3 of the MoA Agreement.

Performance Review Assessment

A faculty member, who does not submit the required documentation according to the departmental/school deadline, will receive (except in cases of extenuating circumstances i.e. sick leave) an overall rating of 0.5 at most. In particular, Chairs/Director must pay attention to the provisions of Section 13.5.4 (c) of the MoA regarding evaluations for members on leave.

Each faculty member shall receive one of the following nine numerical performance ratings ranging from zero to two, in each of teaching, scholarship, and service using the standard scale below. The overall rating shall be computed as the weighted average of the individual ratings in teaching, scholarship and service for the year(s) being reviewed. Chairs/Director, and performance evaluation committees, should be prepared to use a similarly wide range of scores for all three areas, and to adhere to the .25 increments.

Refer to MoA section 13.5.5(a) - for faculty Members on a biennial performance review cycle, the rating for non-review years shall be equal to the rating for the previous review year, as specified in the letter of appointment, or in written agreement between the Member and the Chair/Director approved by the Dean (sub-articles (b) and (c)).

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.

- 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

Dispute Resolution (applies to both annual and biennial cycles)

A faculty member who disagrees with her/his performance evaluation should proceed first to the Chair/Director, and then, if not resolved, to the Dean of the Faculty for final disposition.

A Chair/Director 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.

Performance evaluations and selective salary increases are not normally grievable except under circumstances as outlined in the Memorandum of Agreement (article 9.2.2 or 9.2.3).

Salary Increases (Refer to MoA 13.3)

A pool of funds for selective salary increases is provided to the Faculty in accordance with the MoA article 13.3.2. A faculty member's selective salary increase depends both on her/his performance rating and on the position of her/his salary relative to the threshold T1 and T2 for her/his rank. The selective increases are described in detail in MoA Section 13.3. Refer to the MoA (article 13.3.3 (a-e) for more information on Salary increases, anomaly adjustments and Outstanding Performance Awards (OPAs).

In every case, scale and selective increases shall be applied to the Member's nominal full-time salary.

All salary increases are reviewed by, and require the approval of, the Vice-President, Academic and Provost.

For members on approved pregnancy, adoption or parental leave, the full scale and selective increases shall apply.

For Members newly appointed within the evaluation year, or who are on full or partial unpaid leave for part of the evaluation year: full-scale increase shall apply, but the Merit Increase will be prorated by the fraction of the year served at the University.

Anomaly Adjustments

As described in the MoA (article 13.3.3(d), the University will provide an annual Anomalies Fund for each Faculty, which is equal in value to five percent of the Faculty's Selective Increase Pool, to correct individual salary anomalies. These special permanent increases are determined by the Dean based upon recommendations of the Chair/Directors, and require the approval of the Vice-President Academic and Provost who consults with the President of the Faculty Association. Any unspent amount in the anomalies fund of a given Faculty will be carried forward to the next year's anomaly pool.

Outstanding Performance Awards (OPA) *(OPA's will continue to be calculated and awarded on an annual basis using each individual's most recent score)*

As described in MoA Section 13.3.3(e) regarding the Outstanding Performance Awards (OPAs), the University will provide 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.

Members in each Faculty unit (department or school) whose performance rating for the current year is within the top twenty per cent 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 per cent and those within it. A report of previous recipients is available from the Dean's office.

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 & 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 based on outstanding **service** to the University.

Consideration should also be given to dispersing the **awards across Faculty units, ranks**, and to **both women and men**. Awards given based on 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 & Provost will publicly announce the award recipients.

AHS Practice for Outstanding Performance Evaluations

Merit scores are used essentially to determine salary increases and eligibility for the outstanding performance awards. Due to differences in department/school practice and values in setting merit scores as well as the inherent difficulties in making comparisons across disciplines, merit scores cannot and should not be used to rank all eligible candidates once the entire AHS pool is generated.

As stipulated in the MOA, the OPA's should be allocated based on a principle of equity with consideration of gender, rank, and department/school. While this procedure necessitates some judgment on the part of the Dean, particularly when there are more eligible candidates in AHS than awards provide, the application of the principle ensures fairness. Concomitantly, it is understood that any imbalances within one year will be addressed in a subsequent year.

Implementation of When MoA Changes Take Affect

The next few years will transition to a 2-year cycle (calendar year) as follows:

- 2017 – evaluation of all faculty members covering performance in 2016
- 2018 – evaluation of tenure-track and definite term only, covering 2017

The first biennial review will take place in 2019

- 2019 – evaluation of tenured faculty and continuing appointments covering 2017 and 2018
evaluation of tenure-track and definite-term faculty covering 2018.

For SPHHS faculty members only: please refer to the School's addendum in conjunction with AHS Faculty Performance Review Guidelines and the Memorandum of Agreement.