

School of Public Health and Health Systems Guidelines for the Review of Faculty Member Performance

Approved by School November 11, 2016

Introduction

The School of Public Health and Health Systems has developed department-level guidelines concerning the conduct of performance evaluations of faculty. These guidelines are designed to supplement the Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) between the Faculty Association of the University of Waterloo (FAUW) and the University of Waterloo, uW policy 76- Faculty Appointments and uW policy 77- Tenure and Promotion of Faculty, and the Faculty of Applied Health Sciences Performance Review Guidelines by providing department level details on the assessment of teaching, research, and service. These guidelines both reflect, and are to be interpreted in conjunction with the MoA, uW policies 76, 77, and the Faculty of Applied Health Sciences Review Guidelines.

Purpose of these Guidelines

Periodic performance reviews are intended to: (1) recognize faculty member's accomplishments; (2) identify areas which need improvement; (3) enable faculty members to continuously improve their job performance; (4) allow faculty members to benchmark their academic performance relative to their peers; and (5) provide a basis to distribute annual financial allocations from a faculty performance merit pool. Performance reviews also form an important part of a faculty member's application for tenure and/or promotion (and to inform the adjudication of the person's collective record).

The purpose of this document is to provide faculty with a transparent set of guidelines for how performance evaluations are conducted within the School of Public Health and Health Systems and enable individual faculty members to produce and submit effective performance-related documentation. This document will set out general performance expectations for individual faculty members.

Approach to performance assessment

Performance is a function of excellence (i.e., quality of work), innovation, and impact, particularly as it relates to responsibilities for teaching, scholarship and service. It requires the use of a combination of indicators. Performance is based on demonstrable outputs and not effort, time, or other inputs. Productivity in terms of number of courses taught/prepared, quantity of published/presented work, and amount of committee/service work is also important, but will be considered in the wider context of the quality and impact of that work. Where assessment of quality and impact cannot be readily evaluated because of inadequate domain expertise, the Director shall have the discretion to obtain expert opinion, in confidence, from faculty members of the School, or elsewhere in the University, who hold regular appointments in a relevant disciplinary area.

Areas of responsibility and relative weights. To determine an overall numeric performance score, responsibilities for teaching/supervision, scholarship and service are typically weighted at 40%, 40% and 20% respectively for the professorial ranks; and 80% teaching, 20% service for the lectureship ranks. In some cases these responsibilities are reweighted. Re-weighting may be considered when an individual was hired with specific alterations in responsibility (e.g., they may be hired as a research faculty member with no teaching responsibilities, or a lecturer with responsibilities for teaching and service but not research,

etc.), or temporarily adjusted to reflect the conditions associated with a research award or administrative position.

Classification of graduate supervision. For purposes of periodic performance evaluation, the supervision and mentorship of graduate students is normally considered to be an element of teaching. To the extent that it is practicable, thesis supervision of undergraduate Honours students, independent study projects, practicum supervision, and postdoctoral supervision shall be accorded similar recognition. However, publications and research funding (but not studentships or other personnel awards) that are the product of a student and faculty member collaboration, including work related to a student's thesis, are the exception. These outputs may be considered as constituting part of the faculty member's research outputs.

Consistency with University and Faculty Agreements. Performance reviews of faculty members within the School must follow and be consistent with all relevant policies, regulations, guidelines, and memorandums of agreement approved by the University of Waterloo and the Faculty of Applied Health Sciences.

Faculty members are expected to follow the reporting guidelines and format specified in the most recently approved AHS guidelines for the review of faculty performance; this document is appended.

Numeric ratings for new faculty members. As per university and faculty association agreements, newly appointed faculty members 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. If assessment is possible, for example in the case of research/scholarship, a faculty member will be assigned a rating that reflects their performance, regardless of when they began their appointment. Where averaging needs to be done, and in circumstances where there are less than two established faculty members at the same rank, the committee may elect to calculate the mean across the two most comparable ranks (e.g., compare an Assistant Professor with the average scores of all faculty in the School at the rank of Assistant as well as Associate Professor).

Adjustments for exceptional circumstances. The committee should also take exceptional circumstances into account and make appropriate adjustments. These circumstances include instances such as when a faculty member has been on an approved sabbatical leave, maternity or parental leave, bereavement leave, medical leave, or has been granted work-related accommodations due to illness. In these cases, the performance review committee and/or the Director, should either adjust expectations for the volume of work and/or consider using average performance over the previous one or two years as the basis for adjustment.

Documentation. It is important to record on Attachment C (the Acknowledgment of Review) when an individual's performance rating has been indirectly determined in whole or in part by the performance ratings of peers, or by the individual's ratings from previous performance reviews. Attachment C will also specifically note atypical weightings of teaching, research and service (i.e., anything other than 40%, 40%, 20%), and indicate any significant adjustments to faculty workload expectations arising from previously agreed workload reductions or from formally approved types of faculty leave (e.g., sabbatical, medical).

Submission of an annual report. Faculty members are required to submit an annual performance report. Those who fail to do so before the final day of the fall term in the year being reviewed shall be automatically given ratings of 0 in all categories, and overall. In exceptional circumstances, a faculty member may ask the Director for an extension. However, such requests must be received and approved prior to the due date for the report.

Committee selection. As per university and AHS policy and agreements, the School is obliged to annually elect a committee of up to five but not fewer than three people to advise and assist the Director in evaluating individual faculty member performance. To the extent possible and reasonable, the membership constituency should include a balance of genders, disciplinary perspectives, professional practice and scientific program involvement, and faculty ranks. It is also desirable to have at least one person (in addition to the Director) who has previously served on the performance review committee. Finally, it is desirable to include persons with a combination of graduate and undergraduate teaching, as well as a combination of classroom and on-line experience. Continuing lecturers, tenured, and tenure-track faculty with appointments in the School are eligible for election to the committee. Those whose appointments are less than 50% in the School are welcome to serve on the committee depending on their service commitments to their primary Department or School. The committee will be chaired by the School's Director or designate. Nominations and election to the committee shall occur as part of the normal service assignment and election process which generally takes place early in the calendar year (for the following calendar year). Written nominations will be elicited during the service assignment process. Members must be elected by a simple majority of faculty. Elections will be conducted electronically through the School's Community LEARN site. Those who agree to stand for election must be available for several hours of meetings and allocate time to review files during the first three weeks of January.

Use of collective indicators. Performance in a given area of responsibility must be assessed using a combination of complementary indicators. These should include both quantitative and qualitative indicators. The combination of indicators must have face validity to enable individual faculty members, the review committee, the Director and other stakeholders to assess quality/excellence, innovation/creativity, and impact with respect to teaching/supervision, scholarship, and/or service. Performance in a given area of responsibility (i.e., teaching, scholarship, service), should be based on an overall pattern of indicators, benchmarked against the typical performance of comparable faculty across the School.

Recognition of multi-disciplinarity. The School of Public Health and Health Systems is a multi-disciplinary unit that employs and utilizes the expertise of faculty and staff with a wide array of scholarly backgrounds, disciplinary traditions, and administrative experiences. To this end, performance indicators should be interpreted in a manner consistent with these various disciplinary perspectives and traditions. For example, it should be recognized that certain disciplines place greater emphasis on certain types of scholarly outputs (e.g., peer-reviewed journal articles, policy briefs and technical reports, conference proceedings, book and book chapters, artistic works). Moreover, different disciplines use different traditions to signal the relative contributions of collaborating partners. For example, some traditions put the most influential author at the beginning of a multiple author list while others might reserve the last place for the most influential author. That said, it is incumbent upon individual faculty members to put their work into proper disciplinary context for consideration by the performance review committee by clarifying issues such as the interpretation of authorship rankings, the author's fractional or percentage contribution to the published work, the role of the author in the conduct and reporting of the study, and the potential impact and relevance of the study.

Student collaborations. Faculty members are encouraged to help students build a record of publication and funding. This includes providing students with the opportunity to serve as the primary author and/or investigator on a project. In order to reduce potential conflicts of interest, it is the practice of the School (for purposes of performance evaluation) to credit a faculty member with primary authorship in circumstances where all authors of preceding importance are University of Waterloo students (whether or not they are supervised by the faculty member), or students from other universities where the faculty member currently holds or has previously held an academic appointment. Student authors should be designated by placing an asterisk after their name (e.g., Smith, JP*). For example, in a discipline where

importance is determined by the order of appearance in the authorship list, a faculty member named Jones would be credited as the primary or first author for a citation which read, Smith JP*, Chow W*, Jones XZ, Benz M. This procedure shall be used for all type of research outputs including journal publications, book chapter, reviews, technical reports, self-initiated abstracts and presentations, and grants.

This said, it is important for faculty to recognize that the same standard may not be applied by external reviewers of cases for tenure or promotion, who may focus only on senior/corresponding authorship, and view co-authorship with students as demonstrating mentorship (i.e., in the domain of teaching), rather than research or scholarly productivity.

Reporting integrity. Faculty members are expected to make every reasonable effort to ensure the accuracy of their performance reports. To this end, it is important not to “double count” outputs under a given category across reporting periods. For example, reports should NOT include peer-reviewed papers, books, or proceedings published in the current year that were listed in a previous report as “in press”. It is, however, acceptable to list a grant as “in submission” in one year’s report and then list it as funded in the following year’s report. Potential publications that have been submitted and are under review should NOT be listed in a performance report. Outputs that were published during the proceeding year, but inadvertently not included or counted in the Performance Review of that year, may be brought forward in the following year outputs for recognition in the Performance Review of the latter year.

Importance of Feedback

As noted previously, an important aspect of the performance review process is to enable faculty members to continuously improve their performance through honest, constructive feedback. While overall numeric ratings as well as individual scores for teaching, research and service are useful, written feedback is also important. Feedback is normally provided on attachment C, the Acknowledgment of Review. Written feedback should be honest, concise, and constructive. It may be useful to include specific examples of excellence or areas of challenge. It may also be useful to include statements that help a faculty member to benchmark their performance against their peers in the School. The Director should not normally wait until the completion of a performance review cycle to provide feedback regarding a serious concern or deficiency in a faculty member’s performance. In these instances it is important to provide feedback in a timely way, with special emphasis on the development of a remediation plan. Similarly, faculty members with serious concerns about factors that may impair their performance should not wait until the end of the performance review process to express these concerns. Mutual education may be necessary between faculty and Director as to how express an assessment clearly when the annual performance work report contains unconventional research or service outputs in specialized areas or rapidly evolving areas of the School.

General expectations for faculty member performance

Benchmarking. Benchmarking can be an important means of placing one’s performance into context. To that end, each numeric score is linked to a descriptive label (see the AHS policy document, appended). For example, a score of 2.00 is considered ‘outstanding’. It is reserved for rare instances where an individual’s performance is demonstrably better than the vast majority of their peers due to exceptional achievement as recognized by external awards or internal consensus. Standards of performance within the School are generally high. Therefore, the majority of performance scores are normally expected to be awarded in the range of ‘good’ (1.25) to excellent (1.75). Scores of less than 1.25 in a given category, or overall, are well below the typical performance standards within the School, and individuals with such scores are encouraged to work with their Director to develop a specific, time-anchored plan for improvement.

For sake of transparency and accountability, the School will make available to faculty, subsequent to any readjustment by the Dean of AHS, aggregate statistics regarding overall, teaching, research and service scores.

Teaching

Those with 40% teaching responsibilities are typically expected to teach the equivalent of 3.5 courses per year; those with 80% teaching responsibilities are typically expected to teach the equivalent of 6 courses/year. Those with alternative workloads will have different teaching expectation, though the minimum teaching responsibility per year in the School is 1.5 courses/course equivalents. General principles and metrics for assigning and assessing teaching workloads are spelled out in the School Teaching Workload Equity Policy (posted to the LEARN site). In addition to in-class or online instructional activities, teaching activities include course development and preparation, course renewal, undergraduate thesis supervision, and graduate student supervision and professional program student advisement. Faculty are responsible for keeping a documentary archive of all of their teaching activities, including materials related to course development, preparation or revision, reading lists, audiovisual materials, case study or problem-based instructional materials, homework and project assignments, marking rubrics, and so on. Faculty members should be prepared to provide some or all of these materials upon the request of the Director or an Associate Director, for the purposes of quality assurance in the teaching mission of the School, and for the purposes of annual faculty performance reviews and tenure and promotion decisions. All faculty members, particularly tenure-track faculty members, are encouraged to create and maintain an up-to-date teaching dossier that documents all of their significant activities regarding preparation and delivery of teaching materials.

Important indicators of teaching performance include, but should not be limited to, student evaluations (especially where response rates are high). Student evaluations should be interpreted with caution and consider factors such as whether the instructor had sufficient notice to adequately prepare the course, the instructor's familiarity with courses being covered for other absent/unavailable faculty, the size of the course, whether it is a required or elective course, and the response rate. Teaching performance should also include periodic peer-evaluation of course teaching methods; this usually is conducted in conjunction with tenure or promotional reviews. . However, it is recommended for all faculty members regardless of rank.

Faculty members are expected to be engaged teachers who dedicate sufficient time and thought to the craft of teaching and mentorship. They are expected to periodically explore and try innovative teaching methods, and then share results with their peers. Courses where the overall student grade average is significantly higher or lower than expected in comparison to comparable courses in the School, or in same course in previous years, may be examined further to identify any recurring problematic aspects of course teaching that might constitute a major factor affecting the instructor and/or course ratings.

All faculty members are expected to supervise and mentor graduate students enrolled in one or more of the graduate programs within the School, though the numbers of students will vary over time, and may depend on the stage of the faculty member's career, access to funding, restrictions on available laboratory or research space, and student demand. Supervision and advisement of students in both research and professional programs is required, and will be considered by the performance review committee.

Teaching and mentorship includes an expectation that tenured and tenure-track faculty members will sit on the committees of students (thesis committees, comprehensive exams) that they don't directly supervise. It is expected that faculty should be available to serve on the committee or comprehensive exam of at least

one student per year (other than those they supervise or co-supervise). In cases where such graduate student thesis committee or comprehensive committee work is infrequent, other forms of activity may be recognized as equivalent, such as graduate practicum supervision.

Graduate student supervisors are expected to fund their students when and where they have external grant funding, and otherwise involve their students in research projects including publishing in refereed journals and presenting at academic and professional conferences. They are expected to help students apply for and obtain studentships and awards. They are expected to enable a high proportion of their students to graduate and complete degree requirements within standard term limits specified for the degree program. They are expected to meet with students on a regular basis and be available to offer relevant advice, instruction, and feedback. In the case of professional program students, faculty are expected to provide advisement as well as approve practicum placements and practicum learning contracts. These metrics of mentorship will be considered in the performance review.

Research and Scholarship

All tenure and tenure-track faculty are expected to develop and maintain a high quality program of research that aims to have positive impact on the state of knowledge, research practice, professional practice, policy and/or other relevant outcomes. The School values curiosity-driven, basic research equally with applied research and knowledge translation/knowledge-to-action activities.

It is important to document research outputs, including but not limited to journal papers, proceedings, presentations, books and book chapters, monographs, reviews, technical reports, and policy briefs. Not all outputs provide the same level of confidence when assessing research performance. Therefore, it is incumbent on the faculty member to ensure that each major published or presented work has undergone some form of peer review, editorial board review, or review by a relevant committee of a recognized research body or governmental organization. Papers published in peer-reviewed journals, and authored books and book chapters, edited books and technical reports accepted by reputable publishers with academically sound editorial policies are considered as particularly important, and are normally accorded a greater weight than other types of research communications where editorial review is seen as absent or weak. For some disciplines (e.g., engineering and computer science), peer-reviewed conference proceedings are also regarded as important.

The School does not explicitly use indicators such as citation counts or journal impact factors because these do not always indicate whether research has been shared through the most appropriate channel relative to the work's purpose and primary audience, nor does it reflect on the wider policy or social impact of a research product. However, in order to demonstrate quality and innovation, over the course of one's career faculty members are strongly encouraged to publish at least some of their work in "high profile, high impact peer-reviewed journals or books". In any event, it is incumbent on a faculty member to identify and articulate the impact of a particular piece of work, especially if it is less "traditional"; e.g., a policy brief that results in a change to policy or law, or development of a critical community collaboration that facilitates ongoing applied research activities.

Tenure and tenure-track faculty are expected to disseminate their work with appropriate audiences (other researchers, practitioners, policy makers, etc.) through recognized and novel mediums (journal articles, books and book chapters, presentations to professional and/or research audiences, etc.). Faculty members are expected to secure funding at a level and from a source that is appropriate for their work, rank, position and aims. They are expected to secure funding to support graduate student stipends, travel, and research projects.

Obtaining peer-reviewed funding is usually taken as an indication that one's research is of high quality, innovative and will add value to the field. Funding from one or more of the tri-council agencies (NSERC, CIHR, and SSHRC) is held in particularly high esteem, although a combination of funders and funding types, including both grants and contracts is acceptable and typical in a multidisciplinary and applied program of research. Grants and contracts from major sources of public health funding in Canada, including international agencies (e.g., WHO, FAO), federal agencies (e.g., Health Canada, PHAC), provincial agencies (e.g., MOHLTC, MOE, WSIB), and local public health agencies are all considered desirable and important.

Funding support from organizations in the voluntary health sector (e.g., Heart and Stroke Canada, Cancer Care Ontario), and health-related NGO's and research institutes is also considered as valuable, especially where faculty can demonstrate continuing or repeated linkages to influencing policy and practice in public health and health services in Ontario, in Canada, or globally. Research work undertaken by faculty members that involves collaboration, consulting, expert testimony, or contracting with private sector business organizations and governmental organizations may be counted toward academic research activity for the purposes of merit and tenure if it is demonstrably related to current or recent areas of research typically conducted by the faculty member within the university.

Remunerated external work is allowable for annual performance consideration if the faculty member derives no private income from the activity, where the activity has been registered and approved by the University Office of Research or an equivalent body at another university, and major findings of the research are published or disseminated by the author(s) in the public domain, without editorial interference or undue delay by any external organization or sponsor. In accordance with Policy 49, where a faculty member engages in external work that is directly remunerated for the purposes of deriving non-University income, in some circumstances this work may also be eligible for consideration in annual performance appraisals. However, in order to be eligible, it is strongly recommended that any such income-generating work should be approved in advance by the Director, especially if the income activity occurs on a frequent or recurring basis.

Invitation to present at major professional or scientific conferences and meetings can be an important indicator that a faculty member's research is innovative, and/or is having an impact on influential stakeholders and decision makers.

Technical reports, monographs, policy briefs and other written outputs can be important indicators of research productivity, quality, innovation and impact. However, in order to assist the performance review committee, faculty members are encouraged to provide annotation describing the origin (e.g., who initiated the work), scope, and impact (i.e., who the primary audience is) of these types of works. It is especially important to be able to objectively demonstrate whether a published or presented work has undergone formal peer review by a scholarly review committee, or in the case of policy reports and technical reports whether the report has undergone the equivalent of peer review in the form of institutional acceptance and publication of the report on the institutional website or in formally printed materials under the control of the institution. Reports that are unpublished, not available in the public domain, substantively modified by the sponsoring organization without the control of the original authors, or classified as proprietary or confidential will not normally be accorded status as a peer-reviewed publication.

In general, self-initiated and/or non-peer reviewed outputs are considered the least reliable indicators of quality, innovation and impact.

Finally, research performance cannot be adequately captured only through quantitative indicators of outputs. While it is important to document productivity, it is more important to provide evidence of quality, creativity, and impact. Scholarship in public health and health systems practice is valued by the School. Scholarly outputs may vary by area of practice. To this end, faculty members are expected to help the performance review committee understand the context of research that will aid in the interpretation of its quality, impact, and innovation. For example, it can be helpful to annotate one's role in the production of a publication. Sometimes, it can be useful to identify policies and plans, standards, regulations, products, court or regulatory tribunal decisions, and other outcomes that were directly based on or highly influenced by a faculty member's research. Where a publication, report, or project (or series of projects) from a previous time period has become demonstrably impactful to current public health theory, policy, or practice, faculty members who were PI's or primary authors are encouraged to note this impact in their Annual Report, as further evidence for innovation and impact in the long-term time horizon of their research.

Service

Recognized service may be classified into three types: (1) service within the School, Faculty, and University; (2) service to one's profession; and (3) public service to the community.

Collegial leadership is a defining characteristic of successful academic institutions. To that end, all faculty members are expected to provide leadership through service to the University of Waterloo. This typically includes being assigned to one major standing committee within the School, or agreeing to participate in one or more ad hoc or administrative committees (e.g., SACAs).

Faculty members will be given an opportunity to express their interest in serving on one or more committees; the School Executive Committee will take this into consideration in making assignments. Not all faculty will be able in any given year to serve on a standing committee; and their service expectation may be met by serving on ad hoc committees in the School or on committees at the level of the Faculty or University. This includes assignments to the university pool of chairs for doctoral defences, serving on Senate, and assisting with graduate program admissions.

All faculty members are expected to be involved in the recruitment of high-quality students at the undergraduate and graduate level. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member, supported by the School recruitment activities, to help enrol students into all programs offered by the School. Such activities may include attending recruitment events, seeking out and attracting strong students to our program areas, and responding to individual student enquiries.

All faculty members are expected to help build a positive, collegial environment by attending information, career, orientation, and/or social events for students, faculty and staff.

All faculty members are expected to contribute to their profession by serving as a reviewer of manuscripts and grants, serving on professional societies, organizing conferences, etc.

Depending upon the nature of their work, faculty members are encouraged to provide some type of public service connected to their expertise and position. This might include services such as providing policy or program advice to governments or professional societies, giving public lectures, responding to media inquiries and interviews, serving as an expert witness in a court proceeding, etc. Faculty members are expected to act in a manner that enhances the reputation and positive impact of the university and is

within their area of professional competence. Community service that is unrelated to one's role as a professor and expert is normally not considered part of one's service contributions.