

# Performance Appraisal in Anthropology

## The Annual Performance Appraisal Process

This document is intended to complement but not supersede the "*Faculty of Arts Guidelines for the Annual Performance Review for Faculty*" in order to outline aspects of the performance evaluation procedure specific to the Anthropology Department.

### How the appraisal is conducted

The Anthropology Department will vote every November to decide whether performance evaluations will be conducted by the chair alone or by a committee of department members.

### How the results of the appraisal are calculated and communicated

As outlined in UW policy, each faculty member's appraisal will be in the form of a single score out of 2.0, calculated by combining separate Teaching, Research and Service scores, each also out of 2.0, according to the relative weighting of each of those factors for that faculty member's appointment (typically  $0.4 \times \text{Teaching} + 0.4 \times \text{Research} + 0.2 \times \text{Service}$ ). In any of the categories, the contribution must be truly outstanding to receive a score of 2.0, either in terms of its impact or amount of effort required, or it must mark an extremely high level of accomplishment, or it must demonstrate activity much beyond the departmental norm. The expectation for each faculty member is that they will perform well in each of the three categories.

### Information to be submitted by the faculty member

Faculty members are required to provide documentation that both summarizes and provides evidence for all of the activity/achievement being claimed. The summary is normally done using the Faculty of Arts Activity Report form. It is recommended that all course evaluations, offprints of articles, letters of commendation etc. also be submitted with the Activity Report.

## Teaching

The standard teaching load in the Department of Anthropology is  $2+2=4$  courses per year. Due to the exigencies of fieldwork, many regular faculty members normally teach courses only in the Fall and Winter terms. Some of the courses that we offer in our Masters program are designed to allow the participation of other faculty members, in addition to the person formally responsible for the course, so those other faculty members' teaching activities are also expected to include participation in those courses. In addition to courses, faculty members are expected to make themselves available to supervise honours students' Honours Essays research (ANTH 499A and B) and to supervise masters students.

### Appraisal of Teaching

#### Course Evaluations/Course Perception Surveys

Assessment of teaching will be informed by student input using data from these tools. Other relevant factors that will be considered include:

Last updated October 2020

- • Number of unique courses taught
- • Number of sections taught
- • Number of students taught

### **Course Development or Revision**

The amount of work involved in the development or revision of course materials will be taken into consideration, as will qualitative measures such as the degree of innovation involved in the course materials.

### **Program-related Activities**

Recognition will also be given for leading or being involved with program-related activities which take place outside the classroom.

### **Awards**

Teaching awards will be considered.

### **Supervision of Honours and Masters Students**

Supervision of honours or masters students will be recognized in the teaching rating in the year the activity is completed, as will participation in masters students' supervisory committees within and outside the department, and participation in the supervisory committees of Ph.D students.

## **Research Appraisal of Research**

Both qualitative and quantitative factors will be taken into account when evaluating a department member's research. Qualitative factors will include such things as the review process of the publication/press; the demonstrated impact of the member's work (e.g., reviews); invited or refereed conference presentations; awards. Quantitative information may include such things as number of books, chapters, articles, presentations, book reviews, reference articles, public press articles; number of edited volumes or special journal issues; number of presentations, workshops; research grants.

### **Types of Research Output Publications**

- • Both sole-authored and multi-authored publications are valued. However, in the case of multi-authored publications the faculty member should specify their contribution (i.e., as a percentage, or by indicating which part of the work they produced)
- • Publications in refereed journals will normally be evaluated more positively than publications in edited volumes.

- In general, publications in major international journals will be evaluated more positively than publications in regional journals. However, because many of the journals anthropologists publish in are targeted to specific audiences (e.g., specialists in topical or geographic areas) a publication in a regional or area studies journal, for example, cannot automatically be assumed to be less significant than one in a journal with a larger or more general readership. It may therefore be helpful to the assessment process for

Last updated October 2020

the faculty member to provide a justification of their choice of journal, discussing factors such as readership, impact, etc.

- Published work that straddles the assessment period (e.g., the date of acceptance falls

into one period but the date of publication falls into the next) should be noted and can count towards both assessment periods, but care will be taken not to give credit for a publication more than once.

- A description of work in progress is required for non-tenured members; tenured members may provide information on work in progress if they wish in order to demonstrate the ongoing nature of their activities or to provide context for future achievements.

### **Research Reports**

- Some kinds of anthropological research (e.g., archaeological excavations) carry the legal requirement to produce exhaustive descriptive reports as a condition of being permitted to do the research. These reports, while not refereed, often do undergo a review process and may be considered as legitimate research products when accompanied by appropriate documentation of the review or dissemination process.

### **Conference Presentations**

- Presentations at relevant conferences will be considered.

### **External Grants**

- The receipt of external grants and contracts is a positive indication of quality scholarship, especially with evidence of rigorous peer review.

### **Awards**

- Awards from academic bodies recognizing scholarship will be considered.

### **Impact**

- Credit will be given for work that has an impact but is not published in any of the outlets discussed above. The onus is on the faculty member to provide evidence of its quality, impact and relevance.

## Service

Service is required of all Anthropology faculty members. The following are broad categories of activities that fall under the heading of service:

- • Service on university/faculty/department committees; performing officer duties in the department; other contributions to the life of the department, faculty, or university; outreach work connecting the university to the community at large.
- • Service to the discipline, such as service with associations; journal editorial work; conference organization; participation in organizations that contribute to the functioning of the discipline; other contributions.

### Appraisal of Service

Service will be assessed quantitatively based on the amount of effort, time, and impact of the activity. Service will be assessed qualitatively based on the following questions:

Last updated October 2020

- • Does the service being performed demonstrate leadership or place holding (e.g., sitting on a committee that meets once a year or does little)?
- • Does the service being performed demonstrate a commitment to the work of the department/faculty/university/discipline?

## The Achievement of Tenure in the Anthropology Department

The achievement of tenure at the University of Waterloo is governed by *Policy 77: Tenure and Promotion*. Among other things, Policy 77 notes: “*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.*” The information provided here is designed to summarize considerations that are specific to the discipline of Anthropology and to the University of Waterloo’s Anthropology department.

### Scholarship

By the time they come up for tenure, it is expected that a candidate’s program of research should be demonstrating significant development beyond the specific topical or methodological focus of their doctoral research. Both sole-authored and co-authored

Last updated October 2022

publications are valued within the discipline of Anthropology. In the subdisciplines of Anthropology the publication of a monograph is not an expectation for achieving tenure—publication in peer-reviewed journals or in edited volumes is more common. Conference presentations are valued but there is the expectation that research presented at a conference will eventually be disseminated via a publication. The dissemination of research via innovative means and beyond the academe is encouraged and will be taken into account if well documented.

There are some distinctive characteristics of certain kinds of anthropological research that may have a bearing on the timing, but not the quality, of research output that is expected from tenure-track/tenured faculty:

- Anthropological research frequently involves the collection of data through fieldwork undertaken in relatively remote locations within Canada or elsewhere around the world. Such fieldwork generally requires government authorization and ethics approval. In cross-cultural situations such authorization and ethics approval can be slow or difficult to obtain, and conducting such fieldwork is largely restricted to non-teaching terms or sabbatical leaves.
- Some kinds of anthropological research projects, such as archaeological excavations and ethnographic research, regularly take several years to complete the data collection necessary for synthesis and interpretation in publication.

Last updated October 2020

- Some kinds of anthropological research are by their nature collaborative and involve the participation of a wide array of specialist scholars and technicians. An archeological dig, for example, may require the expertise of a biological anthropologist, a geologist, etc. Publication of research findings is regularly contingent on all members of the team completing their analysis. As outlined in the previous bullet, there may be an impact on the timing of publication(s).

## Teaching

The Anthropology department has a standard teaching load of four courses per year; evidence of effective teaching is required. Candidates for tenure and promotion may choose to document their teaching activities via a teaching dossier. The use of novel teaching methods and techniques, and participation in professional teaching and pedagogical development, will be taken into account.

## Service

Department service is required from all members, including probationary faculty. Nevertheless, the Department's practice is not to have untenured faculty hold major service positions, such as Associate Chair.

## Classical Studies – Discipline Standards for Faculty Performance Reviews 2022

### Overview

This document provides guidelines for the regular evaluation process and the performance expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service for faculty members within the Classical Studies Department at the University of Waterloo. These guidelines are supplemental to, and consistent with the member evaluation procedures outlined in the Memorandum of Agreement Article 13 between UW and FAUW and with Faculty of Arts guidelines for these issues.

These guidelines have been approved by the Department of Classical Studies (27 September 2022) and by the Dean of Arts (\*\*\*)). Any changes to these guidelines will require ratification by the Department and further review by the Dean.

### The Annual Performance Review

Faculty members at the University of Waterloo fulfill their job descriptions by doing some combination of teaching, research, and service. The regular performance review is done so as to evaluate how well one is performing in each of these areas. It also provides an opportunity for ongoing feedback on a faculty member's performance, and provides critical information to probationary faculty preparing for a tenure review, as well as to Tenure and Promotion committees at various stages in each faculty member's career. Note: tenured faculty and continuing lecturers are evaluated biennially, in odd-numbered years, on the basis of the previous two years; probationary faculty and definite-term lecturers are evaluated annually.

Policy 77 states:

*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.*

The Performance Review issues a score out of 2, compounded out of scores out of 2 on each of the three listed job components, typically according to the formula:  $(0.4 \times \text{Teaching}) + (0.4 \times \text{Research}) + (0.2 \times \text{Service})$ . The points on the rating scale and their associated descriptors are:

0.00	Unsatisfactory
0.25	Needs Major Improvement
0.50	Needs Significant Improvement
0.75	Needs Some Improvement
1.00	Satisfactory
1.25	Good
1.50	Very Good
1.75	Excellent
2.00 <sup>1</sup>	Outstanding

The Department will vote every November as to how performance evaluations will be conducted

---

<sup>1</sup> In any of the categories, to receive a score of 2.0 the contribution must be truly outstanding, marking an extremely high level of accomplishment and/or demonstrating ability much beyond the departmental norm.

(either by the Chair alone or with the assistance of a committee of Department members, as specified in the Memorandum of Agreement Article 13).

Faculty (including untenured faculty, tenured faculty and continuing lecturers) should submit a completed Activity Report for the review period in question to the Chair normally by the end of the second week of January. While it was once the practice in this Department to submit student comments from the student perception surveys to the chair, instructors will no longer do so insofar as the APR process is concerned. The APR process will consider the survey's numerical scores and evaluate these in the context of other measures of teaching performance. Faculty should in addition submit course outlines and other course materials, article offprints, conference programs, editors' letters, copies of work in progress, and whatever else may be suggested in the Faculty of Arts APR template. If faculty members wish, they may also submit a memo that fleshes out the information in the Activity Report, or may simply use the Activity Report itself for such purposes. Faculty members are encouraged to take seriously the sections of this form that also solicit any further information they think relevant to their performance over the period. They should feel free to include and explain the widest selection of data they want the Chair to review, and to present fully but concisely their own strongest case.

On the basis of this information the Chair recommends numerical ratings for each faculty member, which are then discussed with the Dean of Arts and possibly revised in order to achieve fairness and consistency across the Faculty. The overall score for each faculty member is then used as a multiplier on the Faculty of Arts basic selective increment, and also serves as a snapshot of one's general performance in the period evaluated.

The expectation for each faculty member is that they will maintain high standards in the categories below.

## **Appraisal Categories**

### **Teaching**

High-quality teaching is an important goal for the Department of Classical Studies. In evaluating any faculty member, junior or senior, the Department follows the guidelines expressed in Policy 77:

*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.*

The following types of information will be taken into account when evaluating a department member's teaching:

- Quantitative information, including number of courses taught, number of students taught, retention rates, new course developments, the development of significant pedagogical materials, and the numerical scores of student perception surveys. As noted above, while the numerical scores of student perception surveys will be taken into account, these alone are an insufficient measure of teaching quality. They will be evaluated in the context of other measures of teaching performance.

- Qualitative information, such as: participation in professional development workshops relevant to pedagogy; degree of innovation or inventive teaching practices; course observations by peers; extra-curricular involvement in student success; awards and nominations for awards.
- Graduate student supervision will be evaluated as part of teaching, taking into account the number of students supervised, evidence of progress towards fulfilling degree requirements and professional development, and their successful degree completion. Extra-curricular faculty efforts to support graduate student success in research and pedagogy will also be taken into account.

## **Research**

It is expected that all faculty members will provide evidence of consistent commitment to research. Publications are particularly important evidence in the determination of scholarly performance. For the purposes of the review process, some kinds of publications are normally considered more significant than others. The intensity (quantity) of the research is also important but does not determine the satisfactory performance of the candidate in this area. Evidence of scholarly activity includes, but is not limited to, the following (in no particular order):

- Books published with publishers having a good academic reputation and with evidence of meaningful peer review
- Edited volumes with good presses or respected contributors; invited chapters in edited collections that feature influential and respected authors or editors, published by reputable presses
- Research papers published in high quality peer-reviewed journals
- Refereed conference proceedings
- Invited major or keynote addresses at prestigious conferences
- Book reviews
- Papers presented at major national and international conferences
- Other modes and/or venues of research dissemination as appropriate

The key measure of research activity is published or presented original research output. But other measures are also relevant, including: evidence of research impact; winning research grants and research awards; and organizing conferences that advance research and promote the research reputation of the individual and the Department.

The following factors will also be taken into account when evaluating a department member's research:

- Published work that straddles the assessment period (e.g. date of acceptance/date of publication) should be noted, and it can count towards both assessment periods, but will not be given equal weight in both.
- Work in progress is required for non-tenured members; tenured members may provide information on work in progress if they wish in order to demonstrate the ongoing nature of their activities or to provide context for future achievements.

## **Service**

Service is an essential part of our role as faculty members and it is highly valued. For tenured faculty, service is evaluated on the basis of work done since the previous evaluation. In keeping with the norms of the Faculty of Arts, the Department recognizes different kinds of service. Service can be performed within the Department, the Faculty, and the University as a whole; it can also include service to the discipline, to the profession, and to the community at large (faculty members are expected to make



service contributions within the University; service outside the University is optional but desirable). For Classical Studies, significant involvement in the Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies and its initiatives may count as service both to the discipline and to the Department/Faculty/University. Since service is expected, lack of service requires an explanation.

Policy 77 states:

*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.*

In determining and evaluating service criteria in Tenure and Promotion decisions, Policy 77 also notes:

*Candidates for tenure or promotion shall provide information on their service activities in sufficient detail to allow the DTPC to assess its quantity and quality. Where necessary, the DTPC should obtain statements from those who have personally observed the candidate's service contributions both internal and external to the University. Some service activities, such as chairing a curriculum committee or editing a professional society journal, may also provide indirect evidence for scholarship and teaching.*

Generally speaking, the assessment of service takes into consideration the following:

- Does the service being performed demonstrate leadership or place holding (e.g. sitting on a committee that meets once a year or does little)?
- Does the service being performed demonstrate a commitment to the work of the department/faculty/university/discipline?

In a memo from the Provost dated Nov. 22, 2010, it was announced that at the Faculty Relations Committee the University and the Faculty Association had issued the following clarification: *"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.*

Further to this, the Department of Classical Studies recognizes the following examples of what constitutes good "Citizenship" in the department (this list is not intended to be exhaustive or exclusive, nor is it in any particular order):

- Being available in the Department. A fair amount of informal business is conducted just through casual conversation around the Department. Questions come up, visitors stop by, and numerous other opportunities (and yes, time-consuming challenges) arise in unpredictable ways. Obviously, we cannot do any planning to cover this kind of activity. But by everyone being available at least some of the time, it does mean that it does not consistently fall on the shoulders of the same person(s) all the time. Availability also demonstrates a commitment to colleagues and to the Department, and a willingness to be engaged in the overall mission of our unit.
- Being available to students. The same points could be made as under the previous bullet.
- Attendance at student events, such as convocation and workshops.

- Regular attendance at and active engagement in committee meetings and other functions that fall within the mandate of our service obligations (for the Chair, e.g., General Group). Our role is not simply to be on the lookout for things concerning Classics – we are also citizens of the Faculty and of the University.
- Being mindful of the distinction between a research term and actual vacation time. Service obligations do not stop during a research term, and if 20% of our work is supposed to be service, that could theoretically equate to faculty members being at the University at least one day a week through the research term.

## Department of Communication Arts - Addendum to Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines

This document provides guidelines for the performance review process, and the expectations for teaching, research, and service for regular faculty members in the Department of Communication Arts at the University of Waterloo. These guidelines are supplemental to, consistent with and cannot override the member evaluation procedures outlined in Article 13 of the [Memorandum of Agreement between UW and FAUW](#); with Policy 77 on [Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members](#); and with [Faculty of Arts Guidelines](#). They are intended to assist regular faculty members in completing the Department of Communication Arts Activity Report Template.

This Addendum is approved biannually in the Fall by the Department of Communication Arts and by the Dean of Arts.

### The Performance Review Process

The performance review is an opportunity for ongoing feedback on a faculty member's performance in all three areas, and provides critical information to probationary faculty preparing for tenure review, as well as to Tenure and Promotion Committees at various stages in each faculty member's career. Ratings also help determine annual salary increases, as explained in Article 13 of the Memorandum of Agreement between UW and FAUW.

The Annual Performance Review issues a score out of 2 on each of the job components. The points on the rating scale and their associated descriptors are defined in Article 13 of the Memorandum of Agreement between UW and FAUW as follows:

- 0.00 Unsatisfactory
- 0.25 Needs Major Improvement
- 0.50 Needs Significant Improvement
- 0.75 Needs Some Improvement
- 1.00 Satisfactory
- 1.25 Good
- 1.50 Very Good
- 1.75 Excellent
- 2.00 Outstanding

Each Fall, the Department of Communication Arts will elect an FPR advisory committee to assist the Chair in determining ratings for faculty members (cf. MOA 13.5.6.c). That committee should consist of at least four faculty members: the Chair, two tenured members of the department, and at least one at-large member (i.e. a probationary term professorial member, a definite term lecturer, or a continuing lecturer). At least two of the members of the committee should not have served the previous year. The committee should include equal gender representation. Each member must complete equity training prior to serving on the committee (e.g. Equity 101: <https://uwaterloo.ca/human-rights-equity-inclusion/>).

Each year, all probationary tenure line faculty and all definite term lecturers will submit an activity report (following the Department of Communication Arts Activity Report Template) as well as an up-to-date cv to the Chair in early January. Every other year (in odd numbered years: 2019, 2021, 2023 . . . )

Approved Oct 2022

all tenured faculty and all continuing lecturers will submit an activity report (following the department template) to the Chair in early January; providing a cv is optional. The FPR advisory committee will review these reports in January to help the Chair determine what ratings should be suggested to the Dean, by using the criteria articulated below. Following consultation with the Dean, the Chair will inform each faculty member of their rating by letter, normally in March.

### **Department of Communication Arts Rubric for Scores in Teaching, Research, and Service**

The Department of Communication Arts has devised the following rubric for use by both individual faculty members in the preparation of Department of Communication Arts Activity Reports and by the FPR advisory committee for the evaluation of reports. The goal of this rubric is to create transparency in the review process while offering clear, qualitative standards for the numerical ratings required by University policy.

Each department member's contractual obligations for teaching, research, and service are explicitly acknowledged on the Department of Communication Arts Activity Report, noting any exceptions where applicable.

*No activity should be included in more than one area of the FPR report, unless there are exceptional circumstances, in which case the faculty member must provide an explanation.*

### **TEACHING**

Faculty members are required to demonstrate their teaching improvements and effectiveness in a qualitative summary, as outlined in the Department of Communication Arts Activity Report Template.

The normal teaching load for regular, tenure-stream faculty in the Department of Communication Arts is two teaching terms of two courses each. The normal load for DTL and CL is seven (in 2022-23 six) courses distributed over three terms, with one non-teaching term every second year. Teaching years follow the annual budget's S/F/W cycle, or starting with the contract term. Exceptions, as approved by the Chair and the Dean, are noted on the Department of Communication Arts Activity Report Template.

Teaching effectiveness can be demonstrated qualitatively through a variety of methods, including but not exclusive to: professional development through Centre for Teaching Excellence or other training, receiving teaching awards, peer review of teaching, research into pedagogy, curriculum development, attendance in teaching and learning seminars or colloquia, participation in teaching initiatives, student achievements, supervisory work and external supervision or examination, workshop development, systematically solicited student feedback, willingness to undertake new teaching at short notice or under exceptional circumstances, and so on.

The Department of Communication Arts recognizes the increasing body of research evidence that student feedback surveys contain considerable bias. Feedback scores vary according to gender and gender performance, dis/ability, race, size of classroom, type of material taught, and other subjective measures. Inclusion of student evaluation scores is considered by the committee as one of many potential components of the overall evaluation of the instructor. Other student feedback should be

Approved Oct 2022

unsolicited, or systematically solicited. New teaching at short notice, or in exceptional circumstances, should also be considered in any evaluation of that teaching.

Where faculty members have no contractual research obligations, research that is in their field of teaching *may* be considered as part of their ongoing professional teaching development, providing the faculty member demonstrates how that research contributes to their teaching.

**2.0 – Outstanding:** Demonstrates exceptional or extraordinary achievement in teaching overall. The demonstration of outstanding teaching may be exhibited by a combination of several of the following: receiving a university or external teaching award, evidence of exceptional success from peer review of teaching, other demonstrations of highly successful attempts at new pedagogical methods or practices, attendance at seminars, colloquia, or publishing on pedagogy, invited participation to lead or participate in university or external initiatives related to improving teaching or developing curricula, developing and successfully delivering a new course at the request of the department or university, outstanding unsolicited or systematically solicited student feedback (which may include but is not exclusive to student evaluations), demonstrations of outstanding student achievements (student assignments, publications, etc.), student supervisory work (graduate student and/or research based), sharing of effective teaching techniques with colleagues in the department or university, or other evidence of teaching excellence (including, but not limited to details on assignments, syllabi, etc.).

**1.75 – Excellent:** Demonstrates an excellent level of achievement in the classroom, and achievements are characterized by sustained superior quality in more than one course. This is achieved by a combination of several of the factors described in the category of “outstanding”.

**1.5 – Very Good:** Demonstrates very good teaching in the classroom, and achievements are characterized by sustained quality in more than one course. This can be achieved by a combination of a few of the factors described in the category of “outstanding”.

**1.25 – Good:** Demonstrates effective teaching in the classroom, as evidenced in peer review of teaching, pedagogical practices, course development, participation in workshops on teaching effectiveness, or other forms of evidence. Evidence that faculty member provides a positive learning environment for students and employs competent and effective pedagogical methods and practices is essential.

**1.0 – Satisfactory:** Meets the minimum level expectations for teaching, but would benefit from improvements. Evidence of teaching success may fall below expected benchmarks and/or little evidence (for example from peer evaluations or supplementary materials) of teaching effectiveness has been submitted by faculty member.

**0.75 – Needs Some Improvement:** Meets the minimum expectations for quantity of teaching, but teaching needs improvement and observation. This level of performance occasionally leads to student complaints judged as significant by peers and department chair, by peer reviews of teaching that raise concerns, or other qualitative evidence of questionable teaching methods.

**0.5 – Needs Significant Improvement:** Significant problems as judged by peers and chair. Some indications of unacceptable teaching from peer and student feedback may include: making no effort to improve teaching, lack of preparation for classroom activities, lack of current knowledge of the subject

Approved Oct 2022

matter, little enthusiasm for the subject matter or classroom interaction, not returning examinations and assignments in a timely manner, not managing the classroom well, not available to students, etc. This level of performance often leads to student complaints judged as significant by peers and department chair.

**0.25 – Needs Major Improvement:** Similar to a rating of .5 only includes a larger number of indicators of significant problems or evidence is of more complex, sustained, or troubling problems with teaching. No other supporting information submitted by faculty member.

**0.0 – Unsatisfactory:** Teaching is not acceptable, and/or no other supporting information was submitted by faculty member.

## RESEARCH

Faculty members are required to demonstrate their research contributions in a qualitative summary, as outlined in the Department of Communication Arts Activity Report Template.

The committee recognizes a variety of research contributions, including (but not limited to) books, articles in refereed journals, creative research, design research, and community-engaged research. Consideration should be given to the particular conditions of community-engaged research and knowledge-mobilization activities. To the extent that it is possible, faculty members should arrange and demonstrate peer and/or professional evaluation of research contributions, including Elders and other knowledge holders, and document those contributions. Faculty should support or expand upon quantitative evidence of research outputs by explaining disciplinary norms or standards, relevant evaluation processes, and the suggested weight given to any output.

Under normal circumstances, work should be included in the year of publication/exhibition/etc. However, given the vagaries of publication timelines and the sometimes difficult nature of indicating that work is on-going on a major multi-year project.

Collaborative work may be indicated either with a % of the author's contribution, and/or a qualitative measure describing the nature of the involvement in the project.

**2.0 – Outstanding:** Demonstrates superior or extraordinary achievement beyond what is normally expected or required in the development of a sustained high-quality research and/or creative program according to the benchmarks of the discipline. This could include a combination of several significant, high-quality publications or creative projects, along with awards or grants. Outstanding research or creative work usually requires quality indicators that may include significant peer-reviewed, highly respected publications or performance/artistic venues with high rates of readership/viewership along with evidence of peer review or professional adjudication; evidence of complexity of research or creative work; and/or evidence of importance or impact on a field or larger audience. Completion of a major, complex, and sustained research program or creative project with all of the quality indicators above is often evidence of an "outstanding" rating.

**1.75 – Excellent:** Demonstrates excellent research and/or creative achievements according to the benchmarks of the discipline, and achievements are characterized by superior quality and quantity.

Approved Oct 2022

Excellent creative and/or research work also requires the quality indicators in the category of “outstanding” but may demonstrate those indicators to a somewhat lesser degree.

**1.5 – Very Good:** Some combination of a significant range of quality publications, conference presentations, performances, creative projects, grants, or other evidence of an effective and impactful research/creative program. Quality indicators do not rise to the level of outstanding or excellent but are recognized as above normal outputs.

**1.25 – Good:** Solid range of research and/or creative work in respectable venues. At least some evidence of completed publications and/or creative projects (grants, publications, or artistic work), and evidence of work in process.

**1.0 – Satisfactory:** No publications and/or completed creative projects, but work has been submitted for consideration. Research and/or creative work is ongoing but has not yet resulted in outcomes.

**0.75 – Needs Some Improvement:** No publications, no completed creative projects, no conference activity, and no current submissions of work for consideration. Evidence that research and/or creative work is ongoing and approaching submission stages but remains incomplete.

**0.5 – Needs Significant Improvement:** Some evidence of research and/or creative activity, but that evidence is unclear, confusing, or indicates a relatively shallow or insignificant attempt to advance a research and/or creative program.

**0.25 – Needs Major Improvement:** Evidence of very minimal research or creative activity that is far below the normal expectations for the department and faculty.

**0.0 – Unsatisfactory:** No evidence of research or creative activity.

## **SERVICE**

Service contributions are recognized in terms of quantity and quality. Faculty members are required to demonstrate their service contributions in a qualitative summary, as outlined in the Department of Communication Arts Activity Report Template.

Faculty members undertaking major roles such as Chair or Associate Chair have the option to adjust their weightings, in accordance with section 13.5.5 of the Memorandum of Agreement, and with the approval of the Dean. When contractual service obligations specify 20% of one’s duties include service work, that work should add up to approximately 340 hours per year (1 day a week at 7 hours/day \* 48 weeks). All faculty members are expected to engage in some departmental service, except when they are on sabbatical/leave.

Committee membership and/or numbers of hours devoted to service are not in themselves sufficient evidence of the quality of service. The committee recognizes that some types of service work are more difficult than others. The FPR form must include qualitative information about the effort required and quality of service work in addition to quantitative data about the number of hours worked. While

Approved Oct 2022

service to the university or community is valued, some service in the department is normally expected (see below).

The committee recognizes that service obligations *and opportunities* vary with rank. Individual faculty members share responsibility with the Department for ensuring that they are making service contributions appropriate to their rank. Not being asked does not excuse lack of service. As a *medium-sized department*, internal service in the Department of Communication Arts is necessarily weighted towards departmental service. Service as director of a non-departmental program or Centre does not remove the expectation that a faculty member will make a departmental service contribution, including willingness to periodically take on roles involving a major service commitment to the department.

Examples of *university-level service* include but are not limited to faculty-wide or university-wide committees, organization of faculty or university-wide workshops, or administrative roles in university-wide research centres. Examples of *departmental-level service* include but are not limited to departmental committees, or administrative roles in the department. “Departmental citizenship” is an obligation and expected, and it includes, but is not limited to, collegial mentoring of new faculty members, being available in the Department/School, attending departmental and committee meetings and events, being willing to take on hard-to-cover courses, and being available to students. Examples of *professional service* include but are not limited to: editorial appointments; scholarly society administration; manuscript, article, paper, and grant reviews; conference and symposium organization; external refereeing for promotion and tenure cases; departmental discipline assessments; major multi-institutional grant administration, etc. *Community service work* is only considered when that work directly relates to the faculty member’s work at the university, for instance, working with a university student club, running a workshop on one’s research open to the public, and so on. In accordance with Policy 77, community service work *related to a faculty member’s scholarly activities* is normally considered service to the University: This means, for instance, that supervising your child’s basketball club is not service to the University, but if you were supervising a child’s theatre group, this *may be* considered.

Where faculty have no research obligations according to their contract (e.g. DTL, CL), research that is in their field and/or relevant to service commitments *may* be considered as part of their on-going service contributions, providing those faculty demonstrate in their narrative how that research contributes to their service.

**2.0 – Outstanding:** Goes far above and beyond the normal expectations for service to the department, faculty or university by taking on a significant leadership role and effectively managing that role. In the case of probationary faculty and lecturers, goes above and beyond the normal expectations for service related to those ranks – this means evidence of both outstanding quality and quantity of service contributions (not necessarily within a formal leadership role). Demonstrates outstanding citizenship by being available in the department, being willing to take on hard-to-cover courses, and/or being available to students as an advisor, mentor, etc. A 2.0 score is normally offered to someone taking on the role of Chair, Associate Chair, or another major university role, but is not guaranteed to faculty serving in those positions.

**1.75 – Excellent:** Goes above and beyond the normal expectations for service to the department, faculty or university by making meaningful and important contributions to several initiatives or committees, or makes extended, significant, and meaningful contributions to the profession or



community outside the university. Demonstrates good citizenship by being available in the department, being willing to take on hard-to-cover courses, and/or being available to students.

**1.5 – Very Good:** More than one significant or meaningful contribution to department, faculty or university, supplemented with meaningful commitments to the profession and/or community. Demonstrates good citizenship by being available in the department, being willing to take on hard-to-cover courses, and/or being available to students.

**1.25 – Good:** At least one significant or meaningful service contribution to department, faculty, or university, along with demonstrable commitment to professional or community initiatives. At least one of either a meaningful extra-departmental service contribution to the Faculty or University, or a meaningful external service to the academic discipline, profession or community. Demonstrates good departmental citizenship by being available in the department, being willing to take on hard-to-cover courses, and/or being available to students.

**1.0 – Satisfactory:** One example of a service contribution to the department, faculty, or university, along with some indication of a commitment to the profession or community. Refusal by a tenured faculty or continuing lecturer of reasonable requests to take on major service commitments to the department, such as Associate Chair, warrants a score below 1.25. Similarly, while there may be short periods in which an individual faculty member's service is focused on high impact extra-departmental service, if this is a persistent pattern, it warrants a score below 1.25.

**0.75 – Needs Some Improvement:** No meaningful contribution to the department, faculty, or university, minimal indication of service to the profession or community. Does not demonstrate good departmental citizenship.

**0.5 – Needs Significant Improvement:** No contribution to the department, faculty or university, and little to no demonstration of a commitment to the profession or the community.

**0.25 – Needs Major Improvement:** No persuasive evidence of service of any kind to the university or elsewhere.

**0.0 – Unsatisfactory:** No evidence of service of any kind to the university or elsewhere.

## Performance Reviews in the Department of English Language and Literature 2021-22 Evaluation Years

### COVID-19 Special Statement

In unprecedented fashion, the ongoing COVID-19 emergency has affected all areas of performance for all faculty members and may continue to have severe negative effects for some faculty in subsequent years. Faculty members who believe that these effects make an assessment of their performance impossible in any of the three categories of research, teaching, or service during evaluation years 2021 and 2022 may request that their performance evaluations follow one of the two procedures available to faculty members as described in the Memorandum of Agreement's Clause 13.5.4.(b)—that is, they may ask to 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,” or “a rating equal to the [individual faculty member's] average ratings of the three previous years.”

Faculty who wish to be accommodated in this way should make a pro forma confidential request to the Chair, who will forward the request to the Dean. They may also wish to communicate with the University's Occupational Health and Safety Office or with the Faculty Association about the specific reasons that may underlie their request.

### Introductory

Performance Reviews in the Department of English conform in all respects to the requirements set out in the Memorandum of Agreement, Article 13.5, “Member Evaluation.” This document satisfies 13.5.1.b), which states: “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.”

Relative contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service vary over the course of a career. This document is intended to make Departmental practice transparent, in its historical and ongoing character, to outline elements of performance to be taken into account in the Review, and to identify the values informing it. The document is “living” and thus will be subject to biennial review.

### Responsibility of Faculty Members

All members holding regular faculty appointments (Definite-Term Lecturer, Continuing Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor) of at least 50% in the Department of English are assessed by the Department of English Faculty Performance Review Committee (FPR Committee). Cross-appointed faculty are not assessed.

Faculty members are normally required to submit all required material by the Tuesday of the second week of the winter term in the year in which they are being evaluated. Definite term and untenured faculty members are evaluated annually. Continuing and tenured faculty members are evaluated every

two years (performance in 2019 and 2020 will be evaluated in the winter 2021 term; performance in 2021 and 2022 will be evaluated in the winter 2023 term; and so on).

All faculty members are responsible for submitting an up-to-date *c.v.* and a discursive elaboration of their activities in each of their assigned areas, normally teaching, scholarship, and service for those in professorial ranks, and teaching and service for those in lecturer ranks. A format will be specified by the FPR committee.

Evidence is required to support all claims. For example, a letter or email from an editor indicating formal acceptance of a manuscript for publication; an off-print, URL, or copy of a book or journal as proof of publication; course syllabi for new course development, etc.

Faculty members are also encouraged to highlight for the FPR committee what has changed over or developed from the previous year(s) (e.g. an article that was accepted has been published; an online course that was created has been offered; a committee was joined or a service role has ceased, etc.).

The Memorandum of Agreement specifies that “A Member who does not submit the required documentation by the specified deadline normally will receive an overall rating of at most 0.5” (13.5.2a).

### Faculty Performance Review Committee (FPR Committee)

The Department elects three of its members to assist the chair in the assessment of faculty members. Together they constitute the FPR Committee. The committee will strive to take careful note of and to be fair in recognising the contributions of each individual member being assessed.

The chair will assign scores in each relevant area of performance (scholarship, teaching, service). The Faculty Performance Review results in a final score out of 2.0, calculated from the individual scores, also out of 2.0, in each of the two or three assigned areas. For tenured or tenure-track professorial faculty, normal calculations are: Teaching = 40%; Scholarship = 40%; Service = 20%. For definite-term or continuing lecturer faculty, normal calculations are Teaching = 80%; Service = 20%. These values may be adjusted from time to time, normally for at least two years for members whose Service commitments structurally impede their performance in Teaching and/or Scholarship. All adjustments are subject to the approval of the Dean.

Normally, faculty members' scores will fall between 1.25 (“good”) and 1.75 (“excellent”). Scores of 2.0 (“outstanding”) in a given area will be assigned only in those cases where Faculty performance exceeds expectations to an unusual degree in the given year or years (for example: winning a Teaching Award; publishing a monograph; performing a particularly challenging administrative role in a highly creditable manner). Scores under 1.0 are assigned as a clear indication that a faculty member must actively improve his or her performance.

It should be emphasized that scores do not correspond to any precise quantitative or qualitative achievement. Moreover, scores never describe merely a quantity of work accomplished in the given year or years since scholarship, for example, is a process and progress cannot be properly measured in yearly or biennial increments. For these reasons, it is necessary for the Chair and the FPR Committee members to be aware of historical scores and for members to submit an adequately elaborated account of their accomplishments along with the relevant materials.

## Teaching

Assessment of undergraduate teaching performance will take into account: productive innovation in pedagogy; course material indicating preparedness and perspicuity in course design; supervision of Honours theses; participation in teaching workshops; evidence of self-evaluation leading to improvement; peer review of teaching according to the Department's Peer Review Teaching Guidelines; unusual challenges faced; awareness of trends in pedagogy, and other signs of developments in teaching content and method; and perception surveys of teaching by students. In keeping with the MOA, quantitative data from student perception surveys or other instruments should not be the sole basis of assessment, and such data should always be considered in light of their context and in conjunction with other indicators.

It should be emphasized that neither the Department nor the University prescribes specific modes or techniques of teaching. (Due to their exceptional nature, as defined by the University of Waterloo, Professional Development courses will not form part of the performance evaluation of faculty members.) In assessing course perception surveys by students, due consideration will be given to anomalies. Instructors are encouraged to use written student feedback to improve their teaching and may share it with others if they wish for these purposes. However, student comments are not to be used in performance evaluations. Caution will be exercised in interpreting results of EL student perception surveys, since the questions do not clearly distinguish between assessing the course instructor, the course author, and the teaching assistant. Although student perceptions of a course are relevant in providing information about the student experience<sup>1</sup> and for the formative development of an instructor, the FPR Committee will always balance student perceptions of a course against other evidence, as listed above. Further, research has shown that student course perception surveys “have been found to be biased against women and people of color.”<sup>2</sup> For this reason, student perceptions of courses will be used primarily to document patterns in an instructor's feedback over time, not to compare individual faculty members to each other or to a department average.

Graduate teaching has a different character than undergraduate teaching. The graduate seminar is central to the graduate programs. Graduate teaching taken as a whole, however, emphasizes individual work with students to a great degree. Graduate teaching, then, should be seen as encompassing supervision of Major Research Papers and Projects, Master's theses, and PhD dissertations, in addition to teaching seminars. Supervising PhD students through to a successful defence of a dissertation is a particular accomplishment. Sitting on dissertation committees and Area Exam Committees may also be important factors. Other activities that contribute to graduate student development, such as the mentoring and training of TAs and GIs during their teaching assignments, will also be considered. Accordingly,

---

<sup>1</sup> Arbitrator Kaplan. Ryerson University v Ryerson Faculty Association, 2018 <https://www.canlii.org/en/on/onla/doc/2018/2018canlii58446/2018canlii58446.html>

<sup>2</sup> Basow, Susan A., and Julie L. Martin. 2012. “Bias in Student Evaluations.” Pp. 40-49 in *Effective Evaluation of Teaching: A Guide for Faculty and Administrators*, edited by Mary E. Kite. Washington, DC: Society for the Teaching of Psychology. Retrieved from <http://teachpsych.org/ebooks/evals2012/index.php>.  
Spooren, Pieter, Bert Brockx, and Dimitri Mortelmans. 2013. “On the Validity of Student Evaluation of Teaching: The State of the Art.” *Review of Educational Research* 83(4):598–642.

measures of performance in graduate instruction, such as student evaluation of graduate teaching, will be balanced with other metrics, especially the quantity of supervisions and any evidence of the quality of supervision available to the Chair and the FPR Committee.

## Scholarship

Policy 77, on Tenure and Promotion, states that “Although the University looks for evidence of active continuing scholarship, the volume of scholarly output is less important than its quality, originality and impact.” This statement should guide the assessment of performance in scholarship. It will be the job of the FPR Committee to balance the assessment of quality and quantity, with quality always leading. Peer-reviewed scholarly work published in internationally-recognized venues provides the benchmark for assessment of scholarship. The scholarly monograph is the chief achievement followed by articles in highly-regarded journals. Valued work will also include accomplishments such as chapters or essays in edited collections; editing work, including editing collections of essays, editions of primary work, and the ongoing editing of journals; art work, especially juried art work, and other forms of research-creation; presentations, especially invited presentations that reflect status in the scholar’s field, such as plenaries and keynotes; book reviews; and activities that come under the rubric of “knowledge mobilization.” Research inputs, such as tri-council grants, will also be considered, as will evidence of scholarly impact, such as honours, reviews, and citations. Continuous innovation in scholarship and its dissemination may require adjustments in the way research outputs are evaluated. It will always be possible for individual faculty members to make the case for equivalences not captured here.

## Service

All faculty members will participate in service every year, except when they are on sabbatical. Where faculty members find their service contribution to be low, they are expected to seek out opportunities to strengthen their contribution. The chair should ensure all faculty have opportunities to engage in meaningful and appropriate service in the Department.

Faculty members are expected to perform meaningful service at the Departmental level, as well as to contribute to the University, the discipline, the profession, or the community. They are expected to participate in collegial self-governance through regular attendance at Department meetings and through periodic service on Department committees. Faculty members also make important contributions to service in the various coordinator roles that support Departmental life, such as the speakers’ series, awards, and website coordinators. They are expected to respond to student and staff enquiries in a timely fashion, to attend some Department-sponsored events (with greater weight accorded to events related to Convocation, hirings, and graduate orientation, and to Departmental talks), to submit grades by specified deadlines, and to be regularly available in the Department for engagement with students and colleagues. Faculty members should be prepared to take on roles with greater responsibility as their careers proceed. In the Department, the most substantive service role is that of Chair. Acting as Associate Chair, normally for a three-year period, is the next most substantive role. Most faculty members will at some point hold the position of Associate Chair, if not Chair.

Just as service to the Department is always expected, so is service outside the Department. Faculty members will contribute to the University, chiefly through service on one or more of its many committees, and governing bodies such as Senate or FAUW; to the profession or discipline at large through committee membership, conference organizing, reviewing for journals, and so on; or to the community through service related to a faculty member's scholarly activities.

## Performance Reviews and Tenure

Policy 77 of the University states that “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).” For this reason, the Chair’s annual report for untenured faculty members should always include explicit guidance about progress toward tenure.

## Conclusion

All of these varied activities associated with Teaching, Scholarship, and Service will be reviewed by the Chair in the Faculty Performance Review. It is customary for the Chair to write a draft report and show it to the faculty member, with no scores attached, before bringing the final report to the Dean who will, based on the Chair’s recommendation, assign scores to each report. This practice allows the member to ensure, with the Chair’s support, that nothing telling is omitted from the final report and that emphases are appropriate. It will always be possible for members later to appeal to the Dean where there is disagreement between the Chair and the faculty member about scores. It should be emphasized in closing that the Review depends greatly upon considered judgment that weighs all the different factors. The present document is intended to provide a window on the review process for everyone, to describe its central elements and to identify the values that inform it, and thus to stand as a shared impersonal, external reference for future conduct of the Review.

# Annual Performance Review Guidelines

## Department of Fine Arts

Approved October 2022

### 1. Overview, Procedure, and Ratings

#### 1.1 Introduction

These Performance Review guidelines for the faculty complement of the Department of Fine Arts at the University of Waterloo have been composed and approved by all full-time faculty members in the Department and by the Dean of Arts, to become effective 1 January 2023, in accordance with:

- The UW/FAUW Memorandum of Agreement, section 13.5, '[Member Evaluation](#)';
- The [Arts Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines](#) (approved by Arts Faculty Council, January 2017);
- [Policy 77](#): Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members.

Faculty members are responsible for ensuring that the Chair has sufficient information to formulate an accurate assessment in the performance evaluation process. Such information should be provided to the Chair through the use of the [Arts Activity Report](#) and the Fine Arts CV Template (available on the [Fine Arts Sharepoint](#) site), in addition to other relevant materials.

#### 1.2 Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee

To assist the Chair with the annual faculty performance evaluations, three faculty members shall be elected on staggered terms to serve on this Committee. Each term shall last for 2 years and is renewable. Normally, all full-time tenured faculty members are eligible to serve. In addition, one probationary-term faculty member may sit on the Committee as an observer. In the event that three tenured faculty members are not available to serve, the next most senior faculty member, in his/her second probationary period, will be eligible. This committee will review all merit awards to ensure equity within a rank and across the Department of Fine Arts as a whole.

### 1.3 Chair's Responsibility

While the Department of Fine Arts does involve an APR Committee in the performance evaluation exercise, it should be noted that the final responsibility for faculty performance assessment rests with the Chair.

### 1.4 Who is assessed?

Performance reviews are required for all regular faculty (Lecturers to Professors on fulltime or reduced load appointments) with appointments of one year or more. Performance ratings shall pertain to the portion of the evaluation year during which the faculty member was a paid employee of the University, including sabbatical leave, but excluding pregnancy, adoption, or parental leave. Tenured faculty and continuing lecturers are evaluated on a biennial basis, with the review being held in odd-numbered years. Probationary-term faculty and definite-term lecturers are evaluated annually.

### 1.5 Connection to Tenure and Promotion

[Policy 77](#) requires that annual performance reviews be included in Department tenure and promotion considerations. Therefore, it is important that the Chair provide a written assessment of each faculty member's performance. Recommendations for selective merit increases are based on overall performance.

### 1.6 Three Components of Assessment

Performance is assessed in three areas:

**Teaching:** broadly defined to include classroom instruction, student supervision, instructional/curricular material development, etc. Learning experiences conducted outside of the classroom and engaging in different ways of knowing are also represented here.

**Scholarship/Creative Work:** broadly defined as the intellectual/artistic advancement of a discipline.

**Service:** leadership or support to the Department, Faculty, University, the individual faculty member's discipline, broadly defined (art practice, media studies, visual culture, etc.), the wider academic community, and other relevant external communities. Providing mentorship to each other and, specifically to untenured colleagues, is also valued in the Department. Providing mentorship and support to



## 1.7 Recommendations to the Dean

The Chair's recommendation to the Dean must indicate a level of performance in each area and must provide evidence supporting this assessment.

- **Unsatisfactory (0.0):** indicates poor performance. An overall unsatisfactory performance rating carries no selective merit increase. See 1.9 below.
- **Needs Major Improvement (0.25):** signals that significant improvement is necessary in order to attain a score approaching satisfactory. See 1.9 below.
- **Needs Improvement (0.5):** when performance in any one area is questionable, but is not clearly unsatisfactory. See 1.9 below.
- **Needs Some Improvement (0.75):** when performance in any one area is questionable, but is deemed approaching satisfactory. See 1.9 below.
- **Satisfactory (1.0):** when performance in a given area is deemed to have reached the bare minimum acceptable level; 'satisfactory' scores in a performance evaluation do not translate to scores that would be 'satisfactory' for tenure or promotion. See 1.8 below and the Arts Faculty Guidelines.
- **Good (1.25):** indicates a positive performance.
- **Very Good (1.5):** indicates substantial strong positive performance.
- **Excellent (1.75):** recognizes performance that is not quite at the level of outstanding, but is nonetheless remarkable.
- **Outstanding (2.0):** indicates performance at an extraordinary level and it is expected that such a rating will be rare (see the Arts Faculty Guidelines). Strong evidence is required and includes such distinctions as, internally, nomination for the Distinguished Teaching Award, the Faculty of Arts Awards for Teaching, Research, or Service, or, externally, publication of a sole-authored book or major form of artistic or curatorial dissemination, expressions of merit awarded by very prominent institutions or associations in the faculty member's field/discipline, etc. (described in more detail in section 4).

## 1.8 Performance rated 'Satisfactory'

If overall performance is rated as satisfactory, the expectation is that performance is satisfactory in each of the three areas of assessment. This principle is most importantly illustrated in relation to teaching and scholarship. A regular faculty appointment carries two major commitments: the communication of the knowledge and nature of one's discipline via teaching, and the advancement of the state of one's discipline via scholarship. The joint importance of these commitments is underlined in Policy 76 which states:

*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. During a term for which formal teaching duties are not assigned, faculty members are expected to increase their scholarly activity.*

This is further acknowledged by the heavy investment of time and energy most faculty devote to their work as both teachers of their discipline and active contributors to it.

It follows that, unless a faculty member's position has been formally changed to involve a different set of duties, satisfactory performance in *both* teaching and scholarship is expected if the faculty member's overall contribution is to be seen as a satisfactory one. Good performance in one area cannot normally compensate for needing improvement in the other because only part of the job has been performed in a satisfactory manner.

### **1.9 Performance rated 'Needs Improvement'**

If performance in a particular area is seen as needing improvement, some improvement, or major improvement, it is essential that the nature of the problem be communicated to the faculty member. The kind of improvement needed should be discussed, help provided when appropriate and an opportunity given to remedy the problem. This can be one of the most valuable functions of the annual review procedure. If, after a reasonable period of time, a "needs improvement" or "needs some improvement" continues, serious consideration must be given to the appropriateness of continuing the appointment in its present form. This is particularly important if the area needing improvement is that of teaching or scholarship.

### **1.10 Weightings**

The weight for each area shall be as specified in the member's letter of appointment. In the absence of specified weights, the normal weights, for tenured or tenure-track positions are 40% for teaching, 40% for scholarship, and 20% for service. For lecturers and continuing lecturers the normal weights are 80% for teaching and 20% for service.

Weightings and duties may be adjusted in a formal agreement between the faculty member and the Chair with the approval of the Dean. Normally, the weights shall be at least 20% in every category, except in the case of lecturer appointments. When a faculty member takes on a significant administrative role they may have a temporary adjustment

of their weightings for purposes of merit evaluation. This adjustment involves a change in expectation for quantity of work in each area but not for quality. Any such re-weighting must be arranged with the Dean ahead of time.

The final overall rating is determined through a formula that applies these weightings to the individual scores in teaching, scholarship, and service.

### **1.11 Newly-Appointed Faculty**

For their first evaluation year, newly-appointed faculty will be assigned a score based on actual performance or, when too little information is available, assigned a score equal to the departmental average for their rank (or the Faculty average when there are too few Departmental members at that rank).

### **1.12 Fractional Load or Leave of Absence**

For faculty on fractional load or a leave of absence the expectations for quality remain the same while expectations for quantity change.

### **1.13 Insufficient Documentation**

It is essential that the faculty member provide sufficient information during the review process to allow an informed judgement in each area. Strong evidence must be demonstrated and provided. **A faculty member who does not submit the required documentation by the specified deadline normally will receive an overall rating of at most 0.5.**

## **2. Performance Measures**

### **2.1 Teaching**

#### **2.1.1 Courses taught**

All relevant factors will be considered including:

- Number of courses/sections taught;
- New course preparations or renovations to existing courses
- Level of each course taught;
- Lecture, seminar or studio courses;
- Number of students taught and enrollment levels in each course;
- Number of terms taught;
- Peer review assessment;  
Student Perception Surveys

#### **2.1.2 Course Development or Revision**

The amount of work involved in the development or revision of course materials will be considered.

#### **2.1.3 Pedagogical Reflections**

Reflections that offer innovative tools on the inclusion, study, and centering of knowledge production and/or creative activity from those that sit outside the Western canon of art, design and media, and/or who are under-represented within existing constructs, including, but not limited to Black, Indigenous and non-Western cultures. Inclusion of decolonial, queer, or anti-racist approaches to pedagogy or subject matter, including, but not limited to the inclusion of readings, artistic examples or course material, engaging in professional development opportunities to build skills in equity, diversity, inclusion and access, etc.

Reflections that offer innovative tools for the study of Indigenous creation and literatures can include a methodological focus on the teaching of Indigenous texts, artwork and projects that go beyond the confines of the classroom, particularly in and with the community.

#### **2.1.4 Plan/Program-related Activities**

Recognition will also be given for leading or being involved with pedagogical/plan/program-related activities that take place outside the classroom, including formal and informal forms of mentorship and experiential learning activities.

#### **2.1.5 Awards**

Teaching awards at UW or elsewhere will be considered.

#### **2.1.6 Professional Development**

Workshops on teaching

Training opportunities (learning new tools, techniques or software)

#### **2.1.7 Conferences**

Participating in conferences related to teaching will be considered.

#### **2.1.8 Supervision of Undergraduate and Graduate Students**

Supervision of undergraduate or graduate students (MA, MFA, MSc, PhD, etc.) will be recognized. The faculty member must be specific about the type, scope, and quantity of supervision. Indicate when engaged in co-supervision.

#### **2.1.9 Additional Considerations**

- Attention should also be given to the ability and willingness of a faculty member to serve the general teaching needs of the department by teaching outside her/his area of expertise, by preparing new courses, and by accepting responsibility for required courses either on campus or through the Centre for Extended Learning.
- Material such as peer reviews and critiques by faculty colleagues and by students, alumni and TAs will be considered. Any information from students or alumni must be shown to have been collected systematically rather than selectively (Policy 77 §3, Assessment of Teaching: "The opinions of current and former students can be of value if solicited on a systematic basis").

### **2.1.10 Materials to be submitted for APR assessment (see the [Activity Report template on Faculty of Arts website](#))**

- New course preparation as evidenced by syllabi;
- Statement of changes/improvements to existing courses;
- Evidence of program/plan/curriculum development (this includes assignment/project descriptions, etc.);
- Evidence of innovative teaching methods<sup>1</sup>;
- Information on independent study courses;
- Peer reviews of teaching (optional);<sup>2</sup>
- Information from other units as appropriate;
- Nomination for DTA or other teaching awards;
- Recognition of teaching by graduating Departmental Award winners;
- Information on the modes of formal/informal mentorship, including number of students, types of opportunities, etc.
- Other materials as appropriate.

### **2.1.11 To be Considered Outstanding (2.0)**

Extremely positive evidence is required for this rating and such evidence is expected to be available for the year under review. An example of such evidence would be nomination for the Distinguished Teacher Award or the Arts Faculty Teaching Award.

## **2.2 Scholarship**

Research within Studio Practice and Visual Culture takes many different forms that correspond to and are consistent with specific disciplines or sub-disciplines, varying paths to knowledge, and engagement within a plurality of communities. Community is understood to refer to places or land-based communities, as well as thematic communities and communities of practice. Community involvement and the co-creation of knowledge can include interpretative approaches that are jointly developed, reviewed, and confirmed.

---

<sup>1</sup> It is understood that teaching does not need to take place in a classroom / studio setting in order to engage in knowledge mobilization. It is also understood that pedagogical content goes beyond that found in written documents and textbooks.

<sup>2</sup> These can be solicited from regular faculty who co-supervise MFA students and / or co-teach undergraduate courses. Observations of a colleagues' teaching can also be solicited via group critique situations and work that is displayed in the department and in the Artery, for example.

Consideration will be given to research based upon public dissemination, community engagement, and knowledge production and mobilization. Evidence of the dissemination and engagement should be provided (dates, venues, brief description if thought to be helpful). The faculty member may also wish to include supporting documentation, such as published reviews and critiques, programs from conferences, gatherings and symposia, correspondence with relevant professional colleagues and/or community members (for example, Indigenous elders), and other material they deem appropriate. Note: formal letters of reference need not be solicited for the APR process.

In judging research, emphasis must be placed on quality as well as quantity. The APR committee's assessment will include consideration of the complexity and/or time needed to produce the project, the innovation within the research area, the relevance and significance of the dissemination opportunity, and the impact of the project within its intended communities.

### **2.2.1 Evidence of scholarship common to all fields/disciplines practiced by faculty members of the Fine Arts Department:**

- Academic Awards (university, college distinctions, etc.).
- Grants
  - Grants applied for (provide description/profile of granting agency if not well-known to APR committee);
  - Indicate if internal (UW) or external;
  - Scope of application (scope of work, budget and role of researcher within the application, ie: PI, Co-PI, Collaborator, etc.);
  - Status;
  - Indicate review process, noting if peer-reviewed.
- Conference Presentations
  - State venue;
  - Indicate if peer-reviewed.
- Keynote Addresses
  - Indicate venue.
- Editorial roles (these may count as either research or service depending on the nature of the role. For example, acting as the guest editor of a special issue of a journal, setting a theme and soliciting authors would count as a contribution to scholarship; being a member of a larger editorial board and carrying out the occasional manuscript review would be more of a service function).

- Organization of conferences, workshops, festivals, community-based activities and outreach, or academic events that advance scholarship and research (faculty members can choose whether to count these activities as scholarship or service or even teaching if relevant).

## **Evidence of scholarship common to all fields/disciplines practiced by faculty members of the Fine Arts Department**

### **Research Creation:**

- Solo and group exhibitions.
- Festivals.
- Screenings.
- Performance art.
- Research carried out using Indigenous knowledge and the practical applications or dissemination of such research generally, or specifically through engagement with Indigenous communities.
- Social practice.
- Community work.
- Material or technological innovation.
- Site-specific work.
- Curatorial practice.
- Bibliography:
  - Catalogue/peer-reviewed essays;
  - Published exhibition reviews;
  - Publications – work represented in;
  - Other media recognition.
- Collections (corporate, public, and notable private).
- Commissioning and/or purchase of art.
- Residencies and artist projects.
  - Indicate if invited, applied for, paid, unpaid.
- Artist talks.
- Other scholarly work (e.g., textbooks).
- Other relevant events.



**Note:** the onus is on the faculty member to provide evidence of the quality, impact, and relevance of this work. If the work has been subject to a review process, the faculty member should provide details of that process.

**Note:** for artworks produced as a result of creative collaboration, the faculty member must indicate the percentage of the overall work that is theirs.

### **Format and Supporting Documentation for the above:**

- List solo and group exhibitions chronologically, most recent first. Include upcoming confirmed exhibitions.
- Community-based projects, and events that take place outside of gallery spaces.
- Provide title, date, gallery/venue, city, curator, whether juried, whether a travelling exhibition.
- Append notices/announcements/invitations.
- Append conference/symposia programs.
- Append documentation for confirmed exhibitions.
- Append documentation for unconfirmed upcoming exhibitions.
- Indicate contribution to group exhibitions.
- Documentation of peer-review process.
- Documentation of work and activity that bridges all forms of knowledge production and dissemination.
- Engagement with elders and other knowledge holders is acknowledged as valued and vital to knowledge transmission within the context of Indigenous Peoples living in place.
- Research includes the results achieved in the form of partnerships and collaborative practices.
- Bibliographic information required for all solo and group exhibitions.
- For “Publications – works represented in” give title of work, date of work, full citation for publication, relevant page number.
- All foreign language titles must be translated.

### **Visual Culture-specific Research**

Publications are especially important evidence in the determination of scholarship performance. The following list includes the range of relevant publications. There is not a definitive list of tiered publications with the visual culture disciplines. However, those that are peer-reviewed will be assessed as more significant.

**Peer-reviewed (documentation of peer review process must be provided):**

- Books with publishers having good academic reputations and meaningful peer review.
- Journal articles in high quality peer-reviewed journals. In general, high quality is evidenced by serious review process and/or evidence of scholarly impact in discipline and/or sub-field.
- Peer-reviewed edited books, edited special issues of a journal.
- Textbooks.
- Chapters in peer reviewed edited volumes.
- Peer-reviewed book reviews in scholarly journals.
- Conference papers (if peer-reviewed).
- Research papers in published conference proceedings (if peer-reviewed).

**Other:**

- Research and dissemination of Indigenous knowledge through community engagement.
- Books with little evidence of, or limited, peer review, or with lesser scholarly reputations.
- Articles in non-peer reviewed journals or books.
- Research notes or commentaries in scholarly journals.
- Non-peer-reviewed book reviews in scholarly journals.
- Conference papers (if non-peer-reviewed).
- Research papers in published conference proceedings (if non-peer-reviewed).
- Re-publications of past published work in scholarly outlets (e.g. in edited collections, translations of past work)
- Other non-refereed publications such as book reviews, magazine articles, newspaper articles, trade publications, briefing papers, research reports, and on-line scholarly commentary.
- Fellowships.
- Keynote addresses.
- Other forms of dissemination of research (significance should be adequately demonstrated).

**Note:** The University states that the onus is on the faculty member to provide evidence of the quality, impact, and relevance of these non-refereed publications. For example, their relevance may be that they disseminate research.

## **For all publications:**

In the case of co-authored/co-edited publications, the faculty member must indicate the percentage of the overall work that is theirs.

### **2.2.2 To be Considered Outstanding (2.0)**

Publication of a sole-authored book by an academic press with a demonstrated peer-review process or a major exhibition in a prominent and distinguished venue are normally rewarded by the Department with an outstanding evaluation (2.0). Such a rating will be rewarded either in the year of the publication or exhibition or in the subsequent year, but not both.

### **2.2.3 Work-in-Progress**

The quantity of work-in-progress, submitted, prepared for exhibition and publication will be considered. Specific goals and timelines should be stated.

### **2.2.4 Impact**

The onus is on faculty members to provide evidence of research impact, including providing contextual information as per the norms of their discipline or research area.

### **2.2.5 Additional Notes**

The APR Committee and Chair will acknowledge that a faculty member's contribution to scholarship may be manifest in a range of forms. Scholarship, Research and Professional Activities refers to all activity that is made accessible to Indigenous people, a faculty member who is a practicing artist may also curate exhibitions, publish in peer reviewed journals, etc.

## **2.3 Service**

### **2.3.1 General Comments**

Service is a very important part of our role as faculty members and it is highly valued. The APR Committee and the Chair attempt to evaluate both the quality and quantity of the service performed. Service is an important component of a faculty member's duties and should be properly encouraged and recognized. It is understood that internal service is an essential duty of faculty members (Policy 77). In a department such as Fine Arts,

which has a relatively small faculty complement and a wealth of extracurricular activities and projects, any faculty member who performs little or no departmental service places a significant additional administrative burden on his or her colleagues. Since service is expected, lack of service requires an explanation.

A “good citizenship” factor recognizes faculty for activities such as mentoring new faculty members, being available in the Department, being willing to take on hard-to-cover courses and being available to students (joint memorandum from Vice-President Academic and Provost and Faculty Association President, 22 November 2010).

### **2.3.2 Service within the Department**

Internal service is an essential duty for faculty. Departmental service includes, but is not limited to the following:

- Administrative appointments, such as Chair or Associate Chair;
- Active service on Departmental Committees;
- Attendance at and participation in Departmental meetings;
- Taking on responsibility for specific Departmental initiatives (e.g., Visiting Artists, Experiential Learning, Brush with Art, etc.);
- Miscellaneous tasks, such as regular studio and equipment maintenance, etc.

#### **Departmental Committees (regular and ad hoc):**

- Undergraduate Curriculum and Scheduling Committee;
- Graduate Operations Committee;
- Master of Fine Arts Selection Committee;
- Space and Equipment Committee (including Airstream);
- Health and Safety Committee;
- Annual Performance Review Committee;
- Department Advisory Committee on Appointments;
- Department Tenure and Promotion Committee.

**Note:** Given the relatively small faculty complement, it is likely that each faculty member will serve on more than one committee within the Department. The Chair will do their best to ensure that Department service duties are distributed in an equitable fashion and in a manner consistent with the faculty member’s rank.

### 2.3.3 Service to the Faculty or the University

Service to the Faculty of Arts or the University of Waterloo will be considered and assessed at a rate consistent with the scope of the service. Activities may include, but are not limited to:

- FAUW Representative/Committee Member/Board of Directors
- FTFC, UTPC
- Membership on Faculty or University-level committees, such as Academic Discipline, Strategic Planning, etc.
- Member of Senate

### 2.3.4 Service to the Discipline/Community

The Department and the University also recognize and encourage service to the wider discipline. Contributions to the wider community and discipline are valuable and reflect the recognition one has earned in the wider discipline.

- For Visual Culture, this can be contributions such as peer reviewing for academic journals, conference abstract and manuscript refereeing, journal editing, board membership in academic societies and community outreach, etc.
- For Studio, this can include board membership in public galleries and arts organizations; donation of artworks for fundraising; participation on juries for exhibitions or funding bodies, awards, grants and public commissions; recipient of award for contribution to arts association and community outreach, roundtable and workshops, etc.

In either case, higher assessment will be placed on the more senior roles in and prominence of the activities.

**Note:** Although such service is encouraged, it must be kept in mind that such service, particularly compensated activities, shall not interfere with the proper discharge of primary University duties. Faculty members should be aware of University policies on Extra-University Activity ([Policy 49](#)), Use of University Resources and Affiliation ([Policy 66](#)), and Conflict of Interest ([Policy 69](#)). Contract scholarship should be discussed with the Office of Research.

### **3. Role of Performance Review for Faculty on Probationary Term Appointments**

Performance reviews of probationary faculty must consider performance in the past year AND the total record to date. Assessment of the total record is important to provide an annual assessment of progress toward tenure. It is important to recall that a grade of “Satisfactory” (1.0) is not considered satisfactory for tenure and promotion purposes. Where appropriate, separate assessments should be given for each component (e.g., “while performance for the past year was satisfactory, the total record is a cause for concern because...”).

Where concern exists, this should be conveyed to the individual in as specific a form as possible and every effort should be made to assist the faculty member to identify and rectify the problem. An indication should be given of the likelihood of the individual being granted tenure if he/she continues to perform at the present level. While not required by policy, it is useful for the Chair to share any such concerns with the Department’s Tenure and Promotion Committee and seek its advice on wording. Policy 77 states that “annual performance reviews form part of the evidence in tenure considerations”. The University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Committee (UTPAC) has stated that: *It is understood that the objective of performance reviews is to be helpful and encouraging, and give an accurate account of the positive and negative aspects of the faculty member’s work. Reservations, if any, must be clearly expressed, and there should be no ambiguity between what is said and what is written. A major purpose is to give the faculty member the means to do a better job. The review should also remind the candidate that the tenure process will include outside assessment in the form of reports from external referees.* (Report to Senate, October 21, 1996).

If the DTPC expressed concern at the time of renewal of the probationary contract, the results of each subsequent annual performance assessment should be reviewed by that Committee. Upon receipt of the DTPC recommendation, the Dean shall decide whether to reappoint, and shall inform the candidate in writing, including reasons if the decision is negative.

### **4. Special Circumstances**

#### **4.1 Long-Term Disability**

A faculty member on long-term disability does not get a performance rating. The salary of a faculty member on long-term disability is paid, and adjusted to include any scale increases, under the LTD plan.

#### **4.2 Paid Leave (including Sabbatical Leave)**

A faculty member on paid leave shall be evaluated on the portion of the evaluation year during which the faculty member was a paid employee of the University. It may not be possible to assess performance in all three categories during the evaluation year. In such cases, a faculty member normally will receive the average of up to the three previous years' ratings in any category where assessment is not possible.

#### **4.3 Pregnancy, Adoption or Parental Leave**

For faculty members on approved pregnancy, adoption or parental leave, assessment is in a similar manner to paid leave.

#### **4.4 Sick Leave**

A faculty member on sick leave does receive a performance rating. If information to evaluate the faculty member's performance is not available owing to the illness, the assessment is in a manner similar to paid leave.

#### **4.5 Unpaid Leave**

For faculty members on unpaid leave, the full scale increase shall apply, but the merit increase will be pro-rated by the fraction of the year served at the University.

#### **4.6 Administrative Duty**

In the case where a faculty member serves as Chair of a Department for part of a year, the Dean will provide a service rating to the Department for that fraction of the year.

## **French Department Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines for 2023 and 2024**

Discussed at the September 9, 2022 department meeting.

Approved via e-ballot September 23, 2022

### **Introduction**

This document provides guidelines for the evaluation process and the performance review expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service for faculty with the Department of French Studies at the University of Waterloo. These guidelines are supplemental to, and consistent with University of Waterloo Policies, the member evaluation procedures outlined in Article 13 of the Memorandum of Agreement between the University and FAUW, and the Faculty of Arts guidelines for these issues.

Faculty members at the University of Waterloo fulfill their job descriptions by doing some combination of teaching, research, and service. The performance appraisal is done so as to evaluate how well one is performing in each of these areas. It also provides an opportunity for ongoing feedback on a faculty member's performance, and provides critical information to Tenure and Promotion committees at various stages in each faculty member's career.

It is the normal practice in the Department of French Studies that newly appointed Faculty members be offered an internal mentor to help them understand the APR process and expectations, and to receive individualized guidance while they prepare for probationary contract renewal, application for tenure and promotion, or application to Continuing Lecturer status.

### **PROCEDURES**

The Department will vote every year in the fall as to how performance evaluations will be conducted – either by chair alone or by a committee of no more than 5 tenured or continuing department members who will advise the Chair.

Every two years, usually in the fall, the department will review and approve this document.

Documentation is to be provided that gives evidence of the activity/achievement being claimed. The Department of French Studies usually requires all course evaluations, offprints of articles, letters of commendation etc. to be submitted with the Activity Report.

### **THE FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATING SCALE**

0	Unsatisfactory
0.25	Less than satisfactory; needs major improvement
0.5	Less than satisfactory; needs significant improvement
0.75	Less than satisfactory; needs some improvement
1.0	Satisfactory
1.25	Good
1.5	Very Good
1.75	Excellent
2.0	Outstanding



**Typical formula for professors:**

Research: 40%

Teaching: 40%

Service: 20%

Other weightings are sometimes negotiated for faculty members having special research, teaching, or administrative appointments, usually on a temporary basis.

**Formula for lecturers:**

Teaching: 80%

Service: 20%

**PRE-TENURE CONSIDERATIONS/EVALUATION/EXPECTATIONS**

At the departmental level, the view is that there is nothing inherently problematic in a probationary-term faculty member's having scores that initially fall at the lower end of the departmental or faculty distribution. Such scores may simply represent a nascent research program, lack of experience as an instructor, or initial adaptation to the service aspects of a professorial career. In these cases, what matters is that scores are not so low as to be objectively problematic (Unsatisfactory; Needs Improvement) and that they generally improve over the period of one's probationary term.

Overall scores that plateau in the Satisfactory-Good range over several years may be seen as marginal progress toward tenure; the interpretation of such scores will come down to specifics in the sub-scores and to the details of the faculty member's vita over that time period.

**EXPECTATIONS (FOR ALL FACULTY MEMBERS)**

In any of the categories, to receive a score of 2.0 the contribution must be truly outstanding in terms of its impact or amount of effort required, or it must mark an extremely high level of accomplishment, or it must demonstrate ability much beyond the departmental norm.

Recent output and impending output can rightly influence an appraisal.

The expectation for each faculty member is that they will perform well in the categories below.

**1. APPRAISAL OF TEACHING**

For tenure-line faculty, the standard teaching load in the Department is currently four courses per academic year. For Lecturers, the standard teaching load is currently 12 courses over two academic years. Teaching is an important aspect of the role of faculty members and is highly valued. Assessing teaching should not be based solely on course evaluations. The appraisal of teaching will consider both the quantity and quality of all teaching activities. The Chair or Performance Review Committee may consider all plausible evidence of effective teaching or supervision submitted by the faculty member.

The following factors will be taken into account when evaluating a department member's teaching:

- Quantitative information, such as: number of undergraduate courses and graduate seminars taught; number of students taught; scores on course evaluations; number of M.A. mémoires,

M.A. theses and Ph.D. dissertations supervised or co-supervised; number of graduate supervisory committees served on (as examiner, reader, internal/external).

- Qualitative information, such as: new or repeat course; degree of innovation or inventive teaching practices; course observations by others; training of graduate students; involvement in student success; awards; curriculum development or revision; teaching development (conferences or workshops pertaining to teaching); course coordination; mentoring and training TAs, RAs, Online Learning Assistants (OLA) or Course Technical Support Assistants (CTSA).

## 2. APPRAISAL OF RESEARCH

The assessment of research quality and intensity is particularly open to case-specific considerations. The key measure of research activity is published or presented original research output. But other measures are also relevant, including: evidence of research impact; winning research grants and research awards, especially Tri-Council and other external awards (foundations, government agencies, etc.); and organizing conferences and academic institutes that advance research and promote the research reputation of the Department. Equal consideration will be given to digital resources (web sites, databases, programs, etc.) when the dossier provides evidence that such work represents original and substantial scholarship. Contributions to research may take novel forms such as translation, creative writing, design, fine and performing arts, and the discovery, development, and transfer of technology for societal benefit. Peer-reviewed research with respect to pedagogy and peer-reviewed research with respect to innovative teaching also constitute scholarly activity. Types of assessment may include formal peer review, citation metrics, and public impact. 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, e-journals, and granting councils, and membership on government or professional committees. (Policy 77)

The following factors will be taken into account when evaluating a department member's research:

- Quantitative information, such as paper or on-line publications; number of books, chapters, articles, presentations, book reviews, reference articles, public press articles; number of edited volumes or special journal issues; number of presentations, workshops; research grants.
- Qualitative information, such as: review process of the publication/press; demonstrated impact of the member's work (e.g. reviews, proven usage of a website, database or other digital materials); invited or refereed conference presentations; awards.

Please note: Single or co-authorship is assessed according to the practices of discipline involved; published work that straddles the assessment period (e.g. date of acceptance -> date of publication) should be noted, and it can count towards both assessment periods, but in only one assessment period should it ever be considered outstanding; Work in progress is required for non-tenured members; tenured members may provide information on work in progress if they wish in order to demonstrate the ongoing nature of their activities or to provide context for future achievements.

Probationary faculty should ensure the maintenance of quantifiable research output over the short term, even if longer-term and larger-scale research projects are also under way.

### 3. APPRAISAL OF SERVICE

It should be taken as a faculty member's duty to find ways of contributing service-wise to the Department. Departmental affairs moreover require the existence of a range of committees. Some of these are standing committees, some are periodically and predictably reconstituted, and some are ad hoc committees intended to deal with specific issues.

Service in these committees too can be a substantial contribution, depending on the number of issues that fall to the committee in a given year.

This can be considered Open-Door service: the contribution that faculty members make to the Department by being present during regular office hours; by being readily available for consultation with students and other faculty members. Absenteeism, a reduced departmental presence, or chronic tardiness or disorganization in the completion of administrative tasks all lead to some burdens falling disproportionately upon those faculty who are in their offices, available, and responsive. They also create additional work for departmental administrators and support staff. Problematic performance in these aspects of Service is likely to be reflected in one's annual appraisal.

The Department and the University recognize and encourage service at the Faculty level, at University level and to the wider discipline, board membership in academic societies; community outreach; and academic mentorship not amounting to teaching. Some service activities, such as chairing a curriculum committee or editing a professional society journal, may also provide indirect evidence for scholarship and teaching.

"Citizenship" has not been expressly stated as a category, but it is understood that department members are expected to contribute positively to the life of the department, the faculty, the university, and the discipline.

These guidelines have been prepared in accordance with the following documents:

- Memorandum of Agreement between FAUW and UW.
- Policy 77: Tenure and Promotion.
- Review of the Faculty Performance Evaluation Process and its recommendations as revised by the Faculty Relations Committee. The Review will be available at: <https://uwaterloo.ca/provost/memos-reports>.
- Faculty of Arts Guidelines for the Faculty Performance Evaluation: <https://uwaterloo.ca/arts/information-faculty-and-staff/faculty-arts-internal-documents>.

## Department Performance Review Guidelines

Approved by department vote 2022.09.16.



UNIVERSITY OF  
**WATERLOO**

FACULTY OF ARTS  
Department of Germanic  
and Slavic Studies

### General Information

- The Department will vote every evaluation cycle in November as to how performance evaluations will be conducted - either by chair alone or by a committee of department members.
- Documentation is to be provided that gives evidence of the activity/achievement being claimed. GSS usually requires all course evaluations, offprints of articles, letters of commendation etc. to be submitted with the Activity Report.
- In any of the categories, to receive a score of 2.0 the contribution must be truly outstanding in terms of its impact or amount of effort required, or it must mark an extremely high level of accomplishment, or it must demonstrate ability much beyond the departmental norm.
- The expectation for each faculty member is that they will perform well in the categories below.

### Appraisal of Teaching

The following factors will be taken into account when evaluating a department member's teaching:

- Quantitative information, such as: number of courses taught; number of students taught; scores on course evaluations; number of theses/dissertations supervised; number of grad defence committees served on.
- Qualitative information, such as: new or repeat course; degree of innovation or inventive teaching practices; written feedback from students; course observations by others; training of graduate students; involvement in student success; awards.

Please note:

- Research on teaching is evaluated under research.
- Supervision of graduate students is evaluated under teaching.

### Appraisal of Research

The following factors will be taken into account when evaluating a department member's research:

- Quantitative information, such as: number of books, chapters, articles, presentations, book reviews, reference articles, public press articles; number of edited volumes or special journal issues; number of presentations, workshops; research grants.
- Qualitative information, such as: review process of the publication/press; demonstrated impact of the member's work (e.g. reviews); invited or refereed conference presentations; awards.

Please note:

- Single or co-authorship is assessed according to the practices of discipline involved.
- Published work that straddles the assessment period (e.g. date of acceptance -> date of publication) should be noted, and it can count towards both assessment periods, but in only one assessment period should it ever be considered outstanding.
- Work in progress is required for non-tenured members; tenured members may provide information on work in progress if they wish in order to demonstrate the ongoing nature of their activities or to provide context for future achievements.

### Appraisal of Service

What counts as service?

- University service, such as: service on university/faculty/department committees; performing officer duties in the department; other contributions to the life of the department, faculty, or university; outreach work connecting the university to the community at large.

- Discipline service, such as: service with associations; journal editorial work; conference organization; other contributions.

How is service evaluated?

- Does the service being performed demonstrate leadership or place holding (e.g. sitting on a committee that meets once a year or does little)?
- Does the service being performed demonstrate a commitment to the work of the department/faculty/university/discipline?

Please note:

- "Citizenship" has not been expressly stated as a category, but it is understood that department members are expected to contribute positively to the life of the department/faculty/university/discipline.

UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO HISTORY DEPARTMENT ADDENDUM TO  
FACULTY OF ARTS PERFORMANCE REVIEW GUIDELINES,

Preamble:

In accordance with Policy 77 and the Memorandum of Agreement, the History Department has prepared a 'living document', which represents guidelines for the Performance Review Committee and regularly employed faculty members to use for the bi-annual evaluation. The expectation is that this document will be subject to regular review. Performance is normally assessed in three areas: teaching, scholarship and service and the evaluation score is based on the scale found in the Memorandum of Agreement at <http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/OfficialDocuments/MoA.htm>.

As each of the following sections demonstrates, the Chair (in consultation with a duly elected Advisory Performance Review Committee when agreed upon by the department) undertakes the bi-annual performance evaluation for all regular faculty holding appointments of one year or more. The evaluation includes the portion of the year that the faculty member was a paid employee of the University, including sabbatical leave, but excluding pregnancy, adoption or parental leave.

Policy 77 requires that bi-annual performance reviews be included in tenure and promotion considerations. Therefore, it is important that the Chair provides a written assessment of each faculty member's performance which will normally reflect values of 40% for teaching, 40% for scholarship and 20% for service. Recommendations for selective merit increases are based on overall performance.

## TEACHING

Preamble:

In accordance with Policy 77, all regular faculty members are expected to contribute to undergraduate teaching and, where possible, to contribute to graduate teaching and project/thesis supervision. Faculty members are expected: to be fair and constructive in the evaluation of student work; to be available for consultation outside the classroom at reasonable times; to respect their students' integrity and maintain strict confidentiality with regard to students' personal lives and political and religious views; and to be as fair and objective as possible when making assessments and providing letters of recommendation.

Types of Teaching:

Faculty members are normally expected to teach a 2-2 course load per year, as well as engage in other teaching activities like graduate supervision, PhD fields, and directed studies as needed. Teaching in the Department falls into two broad categories: undergraduate and graduate. In both categories the Department normally expects strong teaching from all faculty members. Undergraduate teaching may include lecture courses, tutorials, seminars, experiential learning, courses taught through Online Learning, and individual student supervision. It also includes setting and grading of assignments and examinations, interactions with students outside the classroom, and curriculum development. Graduate teaching may include formal course offerings (at both the MA and Ph.D. level), experiential learning, as well as graduate supervision. Graduate supervision includes: reviewing potential MA and Ph.D. students; participation on Tri-University MA and

Ph.D. committees, either as supervisor or regular member; pedagogical mentoring for teaching assistants and doctoral candidates; and mentoring for grantsmanship and post-graduate employment.

Principles for Evaluation:

In accordance with Policy 77, teaching quality should be assessed broadly using evidence gathered from as many sources as practicable. Responsibility for providing documentary evidence on teaching rests with the candidate and, to a lesser degree, the Department Chair.

In evaluating one's quality of teaching, the Performance Review Committee may take into account such factors as class size, undergraduate versus graduate, service versus core, seminar versus lecture, for example. University teaching involves much more than classroom performance. Hence, a fair assessment of one's teaching activities includes taking into account contributions to project and thesis supervision, graduate seminars, oral and thesis examinations, preparation of new courses and significant course revision, and curriculum development.

Measures of the quality of undergraduate and graduate classroom teaching may usefully include:

- student evaluation forms (when available); peer evaluation; copies of course syllabi;
- evidence that courses are kept up-to-date with current scholarship and/or presentation methods; significant external recognition of teaching excellence;
- and any other evidence one might wish to introduce as a measure of teaching quality.
- Measures of the quality of graduate supervision may include:
  - availability to one's students; reasonable turn-around on written work; willingness to participate on other committees; successful guidance of students through the program and preparation for post-graduate success.

## SCHOLARSHIP

Preamble:

In accordance with Policy 77, scholarship generally is considered to include the discovery of new knowledge, including the generation of new concepts, ideas, principles and theories, as well as the innovative coordination, synthesis or integration of knowledge. As well, significant new applications of knowledge to the problems of society represent important scholarly contributions. Peer-reviewed research with respect to pedagogy and peer-reviewed research with respect to innovative teaching also constitute scholarly activity.

In addition, scholarship in the discipline of history may take, and is increasingly taking, a variety of forms. This is especially true for two reasons. First, there is a drive within the profession to reach broader audiences than the traditional one of fellow scholars, which can necessarily affect the focus and nature of the work without compromising its intellectual and scholarly integrity. Second, the possible forms of publication are in a considerable state of flux with the advent of electronic publishing of all forms and, more generally, the increasing sophistication of the internet as a venue for communication. With the profession's mission to reach beyond its traditional audience, the Department of History recognizes that it must be receptive to both new and innovative ways of publishing scholarly work and to new kinds of scholarly work, while remaining respectful of those works that advance an individual's field of research in the more traditional manner.

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.

#### Types of Scholarship:

Scholarship may take any number of equally valid forms within the broad provisions of Policy 77, such as:

- a scholarly journal article (peer-reviewed);
- a book-length academic monograph (published with a university or other academic press and subject to peer review);
- editing a collection of essays;
- an essay in a collection of essays; encyclopedia or dictionary entries;
- e-publications, either the equivalent of book-length or article-length or shorter;
- textbooks;
- engagement in the development of public policy, as a consultant or an author of a commissioned report, for example;
  - film, media or artistic productions that contribute to the advancement of the discipline;
  - historical consultant on film, media or artistic productions that contribute to the advancement of the discipline;
- books and/or articles published with trade presses (and therefore not necessarily peer-reviewed) that contribute to the advancement of the discipline;
- presentation of papers at academic conferences;
- invited addresses to scholarly bodies;
- contributions to broader public debate in the role of "public intellectual."

Note: This list is not considered to be either comprehensive or prioritized.

#### Principles for evaluation:

The basic principles for evaluation of scholarship must begin with a recognition of the target audience for any particular work - whether it be the traditional audience of scholars or a non-academic audience - and the differing requirements for effective communication with those target audiences. In each case, the objective is an assessment of the originality, the significance, and the impact of the work in terms of the target audience. In the discipline of history, the evaluative norm is the peer review process and it is recognized as such for the purposes of these guidelines.

For more traditional forms of academic scholarship, an assessment of the value of the work's contribution may be based on such evidence as grants received to support the project; the peer-review process of the publisher; the work's final, confirmed acceptance for publication; and acceptance rates of the publisher.

Subsequent to publication, further assessments of its quality worth noting and considering as a part of a candidate's evaluation, without being exclusive, are reviews of the work and any awards it may have won, recognizing that these may occur some time after the work's initial release.

For other forms of scholarly activity, the Department will necessarily entertain alternative measures of originality, significance and impact. These measures may include (without implying that this list is comprehensive):



- peer review of a work, if it is available;
- the size of the audience reached (for example, the number of hits on a website; the number of times a film or documentary is shown and the venues in which it has played);
- any grants acquired in support of the project;
- press or other media reviews of the project;
- any institutional support provided for the project (either from the University of Waterloo or other institutions).

Given the nature of historical research in which it can take some time to see a research project through to its fruition, bi-annual evaluation of scholarly activity cannot be based solely on the production of a final product. Instead, bi-annual reviews should seek evidence of steady progress towards the completion of any particular project, within the norms of the profession.

## SERVICE

Preamble:

In accordance with Policy 77, all 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 when asked. As well, many faculty members also provide valuable service to groups outside the University, such as disciplinary or professional organizations, conferences, journals and granting councils and agencies. Community service related to a faculty member's scholarly activities is normally considered as service to the University.

### TYPES OF SERVICE

#### Service to the Department

Service to the department includes such "good citizenship" activities as serving on ad hoc and standing committees, undertaking departmental officerships, mentoring new faculty, being available to students, engaging in promotional activities, serving as a guest scholar or moderator in colleague's courses, for example.

#### Service to the Faculty of Arts

Service to the Faculty of Arts includes but is not limited to service on standing and ad hoc committees, serving as an administrative officer, for example.

#### Service to the University

Service to the University includes but is not limited to service on standing and ad hoc committees, participation in university-led initiatives, service on the Faculty Association and its committees, serving as an external appraiser during program reviews, for example.

#### Service to the Discipline

Service to the discipline includes officerships in societies/associations, serving on editorial boards, organizing conferences, providing manuscript reviews, serving as an external examiner on graduate theses,

providing expert assessments for external promotion and tenure candidates, serving on review committees or providing external assessments for granting agencies, for example.

#### Service to the Community

Sharing the results of our research with the community is an important component of academic life and may take the form of public addresses, media interviews, community outreach, op-ed pieces, film screenings, digital websites, blogs, for example.

#### Principles for Evaluation:

Service is highly valued by the History Department and as such is to be encouraged and appropriately recognized during deliberations on tenure, promotion and merit.

According to Policy 77, candidates for tenure or promotion shall provide information on their service activities in sufficient detail to allow the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee to assess its quantity and quality. The DTPC may also request statements from those who have observed the candidate's service contributions both inside and outside the University.

For the purpose of tenure, promotion and merit evaluation, evidence must be provided for all forms of service. For example, the time required to prepare for and attend meetings should be provided. Likewise, the time spent reviewing manuscripts, grant applications, external master's and doctoral theses, and tenure and promotion dossiers for external scholars should be calculated and included in the performance review material. Similar information should be provided for association/society officerships, conference organizing, and other duties performed for external groups.

For community service, evidence such as flyers and posters should be included as well as an indication of the number of hours required to create the talk, op-ed piece, article, web site, for example. Additional information such as the URL for digital contributions, letters, emails or other indications of impact may be provided.

September 13, 2011

Updated Sept. 2015, and approved at Department Meeting. Sept. 18, 2015 Reviewed,

edited, and approved October 30, 2018 via an email vote.

Reviewed and Approved at Department Meeting, September 24, 2020 (meeting held on MS Teams).

Reviewed and Approved at Department Meeting, September 16, 2022.

## ***Performance appraisals and progress toward tenure and promotion***

*Advice for understanding the current (October 2021) faculty performance appraisal process and its relation to tenure and promotion in the Department of Philosophy*

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Faculty members at the University of Waterloo fulfill their job descriptions by doing some combination of teaching, research, and service. Faculty performance appraisals rate how well one is performing each of these elements of one's job. This process determines faculty members' selective salary increment each year through the process described in Article 13 of the Memorandum of Agreement. It also constitutes one component of ongoing feedback on their performance, and provides important information to Tenure and Promotion committees at various stages in each faculty member's career.

The following are default standards and desiderata for the appraisal process. This is a living document, to be updated as circumstances change and as good arguments for revisions come to light. Its role is to describe the procedures and heuristics by which performance is appraised and to sketch the reasons underlying those heuristics. With this information, all faculty may better understand the needs and expectations of the Department and the University as these bear on their job performance and its evaluation; and faculty may better understand the relation between performance appraisals and the tenure and promotion process. There is a standing invitation to bring proposed revisions to this document to the Chair, or to departmental meetings.

Across the University the provisions of Article 13 in the M.O.A. are implemented in somewhat different ways, reflecting different sizes, disciplines, and orientations of faculties and departments. The Department of Philosophy, like many smaller departments, until 2014 left the appraisal process to the Chair. Beginning in January 2015, since the Department now has more than 15 regular faculty members, the reviews will be conducted by a Departmental Performance Review Committee headed by the Chair, as is required by university policy.

To say that the standards described in the document are default is to flag their defeasibility when a reasonable case can be made for departing from them; this is not a one-size-fits-all model. But to say that these are default guidelines is also to indicate the need for such a reasonable case in order to motivate a departure from them. Many of the standards can be met in a variety of ways, and so sometimes that reasonable case will involve showing that the standard has indeed been met, though in a non-standard way. Faculty members are not, however, required or expected to disclose to the Departmental Performance Review Committee any medical accommodations that would justify a departure from these standards. Those accommodations are arranged through the Dean of Arts, who is also ultimately responsible for assigning performance appraisal scores.

## 2. THE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

The Performance Appraisal issues in a score out of 2, compounded out of the scores out of 2 on each of the three listed job components, typically according to the formula:  $(.4 \times \text{Teaching}) + (.4 \times \text{Research}) + (.2 \times \text{Service})$ . The points on the rating scale and their associated descriptors are:

- 0 – Unsatisfactory
- 0.25 – Needs major improvement
- 0.5 – Needs significant improvement 0.75 – Needs some improvement
- 1.0 – Satisfactory
- 1.25 – Good
- 1.5 – Very Good
- 1.75 – Excellent
- 2.0 – Outstanding

Weightings other than 40% each for Teaching and Research and 20% for Service are sometimes negotiated for faculty having special research, teaching, or administrative appointments, usually on a temporary basis. Lighter duties or changed weightings are understood to influence expectations of the quantity of one's contributions in that area, but not their quality.

Every year (over December and January, traditionally), probationary and fixed-term contract regular faculty members are invited to submit information detailing their accomplishments in each of the three evaluation areas during the previous year. Tenured and continuing faculty members complete the process every second year. A standard form is available in the Faculty of Arts for the presentation of common categories of information. But faculty members are encouraged to take seriously the sections of this form that also solicit any further information they think relevant to their performance since their previous performance review. Faculty members should feel free to include and explain the widest selection of data they want the Chair and Committee to review, and to generally present their own strongest case.

Once the work of the Departmental Performance Review Committee is completed, the Chair recommends numerical ratings for each faculty member, which are then discussed with the Dean of Arts and possibly revised in order to achieve fairness and consistency across the Faculty.

The overall score for each faculty member is then used to determine that faculty member's multiplier ("adjusted R") on the Faculty of Arts basic selective increment, and also serves as a snapshot of one's general performance in the years evaluated. [The elaborate process for calculating annual salary increases is described in section 13.3.3 of the Memorandum of Agreement.] There is no very precise set of year- by-year scores necessary for tenure; moreover, any remarks in these guidelines must be understood only as advisory to faculty members without being binding on Faculty or University-level committees or adjudicators. But at the departmental level, at least, the view is that there is nothing inherently problematic in a probationary-term faculty member's having scores that initially fall at the lower end of the departmental or faculty distribution. Such scores may simply represent a nascent research program, lack of experience as an instructor, or initial adaptation to the service aspects of a professorial career. In these cases, what matters is that scores are not so low as to be objectively problematic (below 1.0) and that those that do start at the low end of the distribution generally improve over the period of one's

probationary term. Fluctuating overall or specific scores are not an absolute barrier to tenure; indeed, if the fluctuations occur higher up the scale – between Excellent (1.75) and Very Good (1.5), for example – they are likely to be of little moment. But scores that dip down below Satisfactory on any measure, and especially on Teaching or Research, are likely to be of some concern to Tenure and Promotion Committees, who will want to see a trend of quick recovery from any scores of that nature. Overall scores that plateau in the Satisfactory-Good range over several years may be seen as marginal progress toward tenure; the interpretation of such scores will come down to specifics in the sub-scores and to the details of the faculty member’s vita over that time period.

Over the longer course of a career, appraisals should reflect the fact that performance in each of the three measures, and most particularly on research, neither materializes nor disappears within a single year. Recent output and impending output can rightly influence an appraisal. The process should negotiate a middle path between anachronistic ratings, on which a long-quiescent professor receives unwarrantedly high evaluations for “lifetime achievement”, and a mercenary approach, on which one’s contributions are instantly and completely forgotten from one year to the next.

### **3. DEPARTMENT PERFORMANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE (DPRC)**

The DPRC assists and advises the Chair in the assignment of performance evaluation scores, though the final responsibility for rankings rests with the Chair, who submits a recommendation to the Dean (in accordance with M of A section 13.5.6).

*Eligibility:* All regular faculty members with a continuing appointment in the department (i.e., tenured professors or continuing lecturers) are eligible to serve. Regular faculty with probationary appointments are eligible to serve as non-voting members of the DPRC as described below. Committee members will recuse themselves for the discussion of their own or their spouses’ files, and declare other possible causes of conflict of interest.

*Scope:* The DPRC will normally assess the performance of all members of the Department other than those who, by policy, are not evaluated in the Department (e.g., the Chair, members holding administrative appointments at the rank of Associate Dean or higher). The committee will recommend scores in each of the categories (Teaching, Scholarship and Service) for each department member evaluated in every category for which her/his appointment requires an evaluation.

*Information provided and confidentiality:* Members of the DPRC will have access to the activity reports submitted by all department members to be evaluated, and to other information relevant to performance evaluation. This includes the weightings of scholarship, teaching and service of each faculty member, information about reduced loads, the performance ratings from the previous year, and other things that may arise on an individual basis. Since university policy and practice dictates that “smoothing” of scores over a number of years is often appropriate, the Chair will share information with the DPRC about whether “smoothing” happened in recent

years for any particular faculty member. Much of this information is sensitive; the deliberations of the DPRC will therefore be confidential, and members will treat the confidential portions of the assessment material appropriately.

*Membership:* The DPRC will include the department Chair, who shall chair the committee, and two other eligible department members. Normally, members will be elected for a two-year term, with the terms staggered to provide continuity; after the completion of a term on the committee, a department member will not be eligible for membership on the committee for two years (except in the case where s/he becomes Chair). Each year the Chair may appoint one probationary faculty member as a non-voting member of the committee. In the first year after a new Chair is appointed, the Chair may choose to appoint the previous Chair as a non-voting adviser to the committee.

*Selection of Committee:* During the Fall term, ballots will be circulated to all regular faculty members in the department; the ballot will list all members of the department eligible for election to the DPRC, and will include available information about who will be on sabbatical or other leave at the time the committee's work will be carried out. Each department member will vote for up to three department members. When the results are tallied, the Chair will approach members about their willingness to serve in order by decreasing number of votes.

#### **4. TEACHING**

Teaching in the Department falls into two broad categories: undergraduate and graduate. Each of these has various forms, moreover. In both categories the Department expects engaged, quality teaching of all faculty members. Among other things this means teaching accurate information, engaging students, grading fairly, organizing courses well, following Departmental policies for teaching, and generally treating students with respect. Most of the appraisal of one's teaching contributions will be based on evidence regarding the intensity and quality of one's performance in these two categories. However, the boundaries between them can be blurred in some situations, and there are also forms of mentorship that are partly educational and partly research or service oriented – such as supervising a Research Assistantship or professionally mentoring the Teaching Assistants for one's courses. Heavy work obligations or significant successes in one of these less central or less sharply defined domains are also worth taking into account, especially if the former were imposed or requested by the Department. It should be noted, however, that the Faculty of Arts has adopted the view that “overload” teaching for which a stipend is paid and that was not assigned by the department will not count as an increase in teaching workload, and that such work, even when assigned by the Department, must be evaluated in light of the fact that the faculty member has already received some extra financial compensation for it. Such additional considerations should be clearly articulated in one's activity report to the Chair.

Faculty should also feel free to seek out extra information about their teaching – e.g., by requesting extra classroom visits by faculty members – with the aim of improving their

instruction, without fear that such additional information, if negative in some respect, would be used in their summative evaluations.

The standard teaching load in the Department is currently four courses per academic year for professors and seven courses per year for lecturers (or an equivalent assignment of responsibilities). For professors, often the four courses will be organized as two in the Fall term and two in the Winter term, but there are sometimes also options to teach in the Spring. Given the Department's historical faculty and student numbers, it is rare for faculty to teach more than one graduate seminar per academic year, and not uncommon to teach no graduate seminar in an academic year. So the bulk of one's course-based teaching in any given year, and possibly all of it, will be undergraduate teaching.

Faculty should include information about curriculum development work and whether a course was a new prep in the material they submit as part of the annual performance review process.

Undergraduate teaching is the largest single undertaking of the University and the Department. It encompasses lecture instruction, pedagogy through feedback on coursework, and the evaluation of student work. The clearest analogue of undergraduate teaching at the graduate level is the graduate seminar. Through some combination of lecturing and student participation, professors bring their students to the cutting edge of research in some sub-field, introducing students to the scholarship and methods that will enable them to contribute to academic philosophy as researchers. In large measure the Department's standards and expectations for the structure and orientation of such seminars can be gleaned by examining the range of seminars recently offered by other faculty members. However, some explicit guidelines for graduate teaching do exist. These include grade-level rubrics for graduate work, periodically circulated by the Departmental Graduate Chair and available from the Graduate Coordinator.

Policy 77 says that university teaching includes both classroom teaching and other activities, and that "teaching quality should be assessed broadly using evidence gathered from as many sources as practicable."

In accordance with Policy 77, classroom teaching "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." Some factors relevant to this evaluation include information about classes taught, such as class size, undergraduate versus graduate, service versus core, and seminar versus lecture.

With respect to other activities, evaluation of teaching will also take into account factors related to graduate supervision, such as contributions to project and thesis supervision, participation in MA and PhD thesis committees, serving as an internal or external examiner, willingness to serve as *pro tem* advisors and teaching mentors, and other qualitative factors such as mentoring students through the process of applying for grants, fellowships, graduate programs, post-docs and positions, preparation of new courses, and significant course revision and curriculum development. See further details below.

The primary intended purposes of the Waterloo Student Course Perceptions (WSCP) surveys are 1) to collect formative and summative data to help improve the design and delivery of courses and the student learning experience; and 2) to provide students with an avenue to voice their learning experiences. The Chair and the DPRC should always be sensitive to evidence of bias in student evaluations, and also balance student perceptions of a course against other evidence, such as peer reviews of teaching.

With respect to graduate teaching, much of it is the form of individual work with Philosophy graduate students: PhD Research Area supervision, M.A. research papers, and thesis supervision at both the Master's and Doctoral levels. Supervision in each of these domains is a matter of teaching, guiding the revision of work, monitoring students' progress, and providing timely feedback, each in a manner appropriate to the particular student. Faculty have a part in seeing that students complete their work to an appropriate standard and on a reasonable schedule. Faculty members' obligations therefore include avoiding a range of potential problematic behaviors: frequently slow feedback on draft work, disorganization, poor communication, shifting or inconsistent advice, or inaccessibility for meetings. Supervisory conduct that unreasonably slows the completion of students' programs amounts to unsatisfactory teaching.

High quality graduate supervision is thus properly understood as encompassing teaching, among other things. It is not merely gate-keeping into the academy. Some students may thrive on nearly independent work, but supervision includes more focused guidance for those students who require more intense and more regular interaction with faculty. It is difficult to measure fine degrees of excellence in supervision, but quality supervision is indicated by such outcomes as student work that gets published or given at refereed conferences, and by graduate placement in desirable jobs, while problematic supervision may be manifest as a student dissertation, area study, or coursework that requires departmental intervention or otherwise falls on some other faculty member to remedy. However, these outcomes can also partly reflect the abilities and efforts of the students themselves. Regular Departmental discussions regarding graduate students, as well as direct feedback from supervisors in their annual reports, assist the Chair in recognizing when weaker or struggling students are getting good supervision in spite of not necessarily producing the best or most highly appreciated work. For some such students, merely completing the degree may be a sign of outstanding supervision. Thus the aim of these remarks is not to dissuade faculty from supervising any but the most talented graduate students, but rather to emphasize the need for good supervision of any student, and the goal of using all plausible metrics to measure the quality of supervision.

It takes a department to raise a graduate student. Delivering the components of a graduate degree to all the students the Department admits is a shared responsibility in Philosophy. Every faculty member, over the long run, should discharge this obligation by substantial contribution to as many facets of graduate instruction as possible, supplementing fewer contributions in one respect (e.g., thesis supervision) with greater contributions in another (e.g., thesis committee work). Graduate teaching that overlaps with service and is essential to the smooth functioning of the Department includes serving as a reader or thesis committee member for graduate theses; arranging and conducting oral defenses of theses; professionally and academically advising students, including in one's role as *pro tem* advisor; and conducting mock interviews for students with impending academic job interviews.



## 5. RESEARCH

The assessment of research quality and intensity is particularly open to case-specific considerations. Policy 77 reflects the breadth of endeavours apt to count as research contributions:

"Scholarship may take several equally valuable forms. One is the discovery of new knowledge, which may differ from discipline to discipline, and includes the generation of new concepts, ideas, principles and theories. A second form involves the innovative coordination, synthesis or integration of knowledge. This type of scholarship seeks and promotes understanding in a broader context by organizing knowledge in a new and useful way, by illustrating new relationships between the parts and the whole, by relating the past in a new way to the present and future, or by demonstrating new and significant patterns of meaning. Scholarship may also be observed in new and useful applications. Indeed, significant new applications of knowledge to the problems of society represent important scholarly contributions."

Nevertheless, disciplinary and sub-disciplinary standards and practices can rightly influence how research contributions of these various sorts are evaluated. Sound and fair evaluation will reflect the standards of the relevant field or sub-field, without penalizing breadth or innovation that is appropriately linked to the relevant field.

Normally the key measure of research activity is published or presented original research output. But other measures are also relevant, including: evidence of research impact; winning research grants and research awards, especially Tri-Council awards; and organizing conferences and academic institutes that advance research and promote the research reputation of the Department. Hence it is important to reemphasize both the default nature of these Departmental guidelines and the invitation for faculty members to bring forward and explain any evidence they consider relevant to their evaluation.

The research of some faculty engages primarily with public audiences and public policy, rather than with professional scholarly communities. The Department acknowledges that the optimal outlet for such research may not be conventional academic publications. In evaluating such outputs, the Department will place emphasis on peer review and on the demonstrated impact of the research.

### *5a. Research quality*

The following schema for the evaluation of research performance serves as a *prima facie* categorization of research venues. The relative rankings can be overridden on the basis of the properties of specific pieces of work. Faculty members can make a case for regarding some piece of research as coeval with other (*prima facie* more significant) kinds of research, or for regarding forms of work not listed here as having a research component that merits consideration.

The categories have both fuzzy borders and a great deal of internal variety; one should expect overlapping categories and room for negotiation about, e.g., rankings among journals, among presses, and among conferences. Distinct sub-disciplines have different premier journals, and place varying emphases on the relative merits of books and articles in prestigious journals, so the

assessment of research contributions should be relative to sub-disciplinary context. In general, however, evidence of high quality will comprise evidence of serious (preferably anonymous) review processes, low acceptance rates (roughly, below 15%, and lower if possible), and evidence of research impact in the discipline. Non-traditional publication venues and formats such as policy papers, public outreach outputs, online journals, or works published under “creative common license,” may well demonstrate these features.

From most significant to least significant, the default categories of research significance are listed below. It is to be emphasized that these are default rankings, and that very significant and high impact research may appear in categories lower down the list. In such cases, and in cases where research is disseminated in non-traditional or public-facing formats, faculty members are encouraged to provide evidence of the impact and significance of the work.

1. Books published with presses having strong academic reputations, and with evidence of meaningful peer review.
2. High quality peer-reviewed journal articles, as these terms are understood above.
3. Edited volumes with good presses or respected contributors; invited chapters in edited collections that feature influential and respected authors or editors, published by reputable presses; and textbooks, especially those with reputable presses, with evidence of novel contributions to the discipline.
4. Books with less prestigious presses, but with evidence of some non-trivial refereeing process.
5. Refereed, but non-competitive publications in well-known venues (e.g., Stanford Encyclopedia).
6. Research papers in lesser-known journals having relatively high acceptance rates.
7. Invited major or keynote addresses to prestigious conferences.
8. Research papers presented in longer sessions at major international conferences with evidence of substantial peer review and prearranged commentary.
9. Books with presses that facilitate self-publishing.
10. Book reviews in top journals.
11. Poster presentations at major international conferences with evidence of substantial peer review.
12. Research papers in minor, unrefereed journals or proceedings.
13. Book reviews in minor, unrefereed, or simply book-reviewing journals.
14. Non-academic or purely introductory presentations, popular talks; newspaper or (non-academic) magazine articles.

#### *5b. Research intensity*

In sketchiest general terms, one to three items annually in Categories 2 or 3, or a proportional rate of Category 1 book publication, or, of course, combinations of these with compensating adjustments in frequency, should be considered very strong research output for Philosophy faculty, especially when supplemented with other output in further categories. However, a dearth of research output for a few years after hiring is not a good start, even if this results in a book eventually. Probationary faculty should ensure the maintenance of quantifiable research output over the short term, even if longer-term and larger-scale research projects are also under way.

As has been noted elsewhere in this document, department members are free to include and explain any information they feel is relevant to the evaluation of their performance in their activity reports. Additionally, though, in cases where there is concern—due to variation in subdisciplinary norms or for other legitimate reasons—that there is a persistent risk that one’s rate of publication could be misjudged by the DPRC and DTPC, faculty members are invited to work with the Department Chair to develop useful information that can be shared with the DPRC and the DTPC about what rate of publication is appropriately expected.

It is worth reemphasizing that appraisals should reflect the fact that performance as a researcher neither materializes nor disappears within a single year. Throughout one’s career, research output can be “streaky,” so in general a pattern of productivity is more important than one’s output over any particular year. At the same time, in any given year (factoring out special circumstances) it is important to show signs of research activity at some levels on the above scale, preferably as part of a trend for work to move upwards on the above scale from year to year. For example, a conference paper has added significance when it occurs as part of a research career in which conference papers have frequently turned into journal articles.

The above remarks apply to most of the research activity normally reported by members of the Department. Some scholarly activity undertaken by faculty members, perhaps for instance a “significant new application of knowledge to the problems of society,” might not be reflected in publication in traditional venues. The Department recognizes the value of such work, provided it relates in appropriate ways to philosophy as a discipline. However, it is up to the faculty member to provide evidence of the significance of this work, bearing in mind this passage from Policy 77:

"Although any of these scholarly activities may be carried out on a confidential basis, the expectation of the University is for communicated 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."

Note also that Indigenous scholars and scholars involved in Indigenous research may choose to be evaluated in a manner consistent [with SSHRC’s Guidelines for the Merit Review of Indigenous Research](#).

Finally, lower categories on the above list have a fairly rapidly diminishing marginal utility; a few book reviews or newspaper articles are part of a healthy research profile, but a multitude of book reviews or newspaper articles on their own do not “make up for” a lack of peer-reviewed books and articles. Rather, this would be a sign of mistaken use of professional time and energy.

## **6. SERVICE**

The University recognizes work of various kinds, at various administrative levels, as apt for the partial satisfaction of the Service element of a continuing lecturer, tenured or tenure-track appointment. Faculties and departments may emphasize more specific kinds of service, however,

and indeed both the Faculty of Arts and the Department do so. In a smaller department, such as Philosophy, the fixed administrative load of a department (especially one with a PhD program) is less widely distributed on faculty members than in a large department. Since there is a substantial minimum amount of administration that must be done in order for the Department to sustain its various programs, and to interact effectively with the University, any faculty member who performs little or no departmental service thereby places a significant additional administrative burden on his or her colleagues to do it. In Philosophy, therefore, while the appraisal of each faculty member's Service component recognizes wider institutional and disciplinary service, it emphasizes Departmental work in the first instance. Service of these broader institutional and disciplinary sorts, to be recognized and valued, should proceed in addition to or parallel with Departmental service over at least the medium term, and should not be viewed as a longer-term alternative to Departmental service.

In the absence of competition among faculty members to hold committee and Associate Chair positions, these are typically distributed by nomination from the Chair or by active voluntarism from faculty members, followed by discussion and consensus among the Department, rather than by a wider nomination and voting process. It is a faculty member's duty to find ways of contributing service-wise to the Department both within and outside the department – perhaps simply by indicating to the Chair a willingness to serve in appropriate roles.

The positions of Department Chair, Associate Chair of Undergraduate Studies, and Associate Chair of Graduate Studies are the most substantial forms of departmental service. They are positions in which faculty members are effectively “on call” to deal with specific administrative issues at any time, and which require not only a major investment of time but also an element of leadership and assistance for other faculty members. Each of these positions carries with it a stipend and a reduction in teaching duties, which must be taken into account when performance is evaluated. However, the roles, diligently undertaken, typically involve a much larger investment of time and energy than is compensated for in this way. Responsible and highly effective performance in one of these positions is the most certain determinant of a high Service rating.

Other formalized positions in the Department of Philosophy at the time of writing include: Gender and Social Justice Advisor; Cognitive Science Advisor; Applied Philosophy Advisor; Social Media Coordinator; Library Officer; Undergraduate Philosophy Student Society (“Philsoc”) Liaison Officer; GSJ Society Liaison Officer; Computing/IT Officer; Colloquium and event organizer; Alumni Relations Officer; Careers Advisor; St. Jerome's Philosophy Department Liaison Officer; and Departmental FAUW Representative. The Library, Undergrad, Computing, Colloquium and FAUW Representative positions may be particularly well-suited for junior faculty members, since they are both less time-intensive and presuppose somewhat less familiarity with the intricacies of the University. Yet it is to be expected that each of these positions involves periodic meetings, maintaining contact with designated extra-departmental staff or students, some organizational commitments, and a responsibility to keep the Department informed of relevant developments, normally via written reports but in other means if circumstances warrant. From year to year their commitments can vary significantly; their contributions to one's Service rating vary accordingly.

Departmental affairs moreover require the existence of a range of committees. Some of these are standing committees, some are periodically and predictably reconstituted, and some are ad hoc committees intended to deal with specific issues. For example:

Standing committees:

Graduate Committee

Undergraduate Committee

Gender and Social Justice Committee

Performance Review Committee

Recurring committees constituted as necessary:

DACA (Hiring Committee)

DTPC (Tenure and Promotion)

Service in these committees too can be a substantial contribution, depending on the number of issues that fall to the committee in a given year.

There is also a more diffuse sense in which the Department of Philosophy depends on faculty service, both for the effective administration of the Department and for the maintenance of an academic community for the Department's students, and particularly its graduate students. This service can include such things as: being readily available for consultation with students, staff, and other faculty members; attending Departmental events such as meetings, colloquia, and student focused social events; a tendency to answer email and telephone messages promptly, and to complete administrative necessities (grades, letters of recommendation, etc.) quickly and without reminders; and a tendency to serve on committees and to take on other administrative roles when asked. Service of this broad sort helps to evenly distribute the inevitable daily burdens of running a department. Being consistently unavailable to students, staff, and faculty colleagues can lead to some burdens falling disproportionately upon those faculty who are available and responsive. This can also create additional work for departmental administrators and support staff.

The Department strives to maintain an accessible professional culture and workspace for students, faculty, and staff. In general, faculty members are expected to be involved in the collegial academic and professional life of the Department and to share committee and other responsibilities. When thinking about philosophy faculty collectively, it is important to have a certain level of physical presence in the department and at events to sustain a sense of academic community, which is of benefit to all members of the department, especially graduate students. But active involvement and engagement can take many forms, both remote and in-person, and it is possible for a faculty member for whom in-person contributions are infrequent to perform valuable service of this kind in virtue of their other relevant contributions. Faculty members,

especially junior ones, are encouraged to consult the Chair if they are unsure about the full range of possibilities for departmental service, and to include brief descriptions of their activities related to departmental service in their Activity Reports.

There are many opportunities to meet the expectations for University-level service such as: various Faculty of Arts committees (Arts Faculty Council Executive, Admissions; appeal committees of various sorts); University committees; Senate; with the Faculty Association; or in conjunction with student organizations; in roles such as chairing PhD examinations in other departments; and so on. These will have widely diverging levels of commitment, however, and the degree of these commitments is a factor in weighing the significance of the service. Membership on several quiescent University committees may not be evaluated as highly as membership on the Department's DACA during a hiring year.

Finally, the Department and the University also recognize and encourage service to the wider discipline, in the form of work such as journal, conference, and manuscript refereeing; journal editing; administrative and leadership roles in extra- Departmental programs; board membership in academic societies; community outreach; and academic mentorship not amounting to teaching. This is valuable work indicating a well-rounded contribution to the academy, and reflecting the respect and recognition one has earned in the wider discipline. It should be so recognized in performance appraisals. (These may also be contributions that weigh especially heavily in later-career decisions about promotion to Full Professor rank.) Nevertheless, every faculty member's career as a successful contributor to the wider discipline asymmetrically depends upon having a functionally administered department, and service evaluations within the Department ought to reflect this.

## Department of Political Science

# GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS AND PROGRESS TOWARD TENURE & PROMOTION

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This document provides guidelines for the evaluation process and the performance expectations for scholarship, teaching, and service for faculty with the Political Science department at University of Waterloo. These guidelines supplement and are consistent with [University of Waterloo Policies](#), the member evaluation procedures outlined in Article 13 of the [Memorandum of Agreement between UW and FAUW](#), and the [Faculty of Arts guidelines](#) for these issues.

This document will be reviewed, updated, and approved by the members of the Department at the start of each academic year.

### 1.1 General comments about performance reviews

#### 1.1.1 Who is assessed?

Performance reviews are required for all regular faculty with appointments of more than one year (Lecturers to Professors on full-time or reduced load appointments including Definite Term Lecturers). Reviews will be conducted annually for faculty on probation and biennially for other faculty. Performance ratings will pertain to the portion of the evaluation year during which the faculty member was a paid employee of the University, including sabbatical leave, but excluding pregnancy, adoption or parental leave. Policy 77 requires that annual performance reviews be included in tenure and promotion considerations.

*Faculty on Long Term Disability:* A faculty member on long term disability is not subject to a performance review. The salary of a faculty member on long term disability is paid, and adjusted to include any scale increases, under the LTD plan.

*Newly-Appointed Faculty:* For new faculty in their first year, a score will be assigned in each category based on actual performance, or, when too little information is available, a score equal to the departmental average for their rank.

*On Paid Leave (including Sabbatical Leave):* A faculty member on paid leave will be evaluated on the portion of the evaluation year during which the faculty member was a paid employee of the University. It may not be possible to assess performance in all three categories during the evaluation year. In such cases, a faculty member normally

will receive the average of up to the three previous years' ratings in any category where assessment is not possible.

*On Pregnancy, Adoption or Parental Leave:* For faculty members on approved pregnancy, adoption or parental leave, the full scale and selective increases shall apply.

*On Sick Leave:* A faculty member on sick leave is subject to performance review. If information to evaluate the faculty member's performance is not available owing to the illness, the average of up to three years could be used.

*On Unpaid Leave:* For faculty members on unpaid leave, the full scale increase shall apply, but the merit increase will be prorated by the fraction of the year served at the University.

*Administrative Duty:* In the case where a faculty member served as Chair of a Department for part of a year, the Dean will provide a service rating to the Department for that fraction of the year.

### **1.1.2 Ratings, weightings and process**

#### *Ratings and Weightings:*

Performance is assessed out of a score of 2.0 in three areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. The scoring categories are as follows: Unsatisfactory (0.0), Needs Improvement (0.25, 0.5, 0.75), Satisfactory (1.0), Good (1.25), Very Good (1.5), Excellent (1.75), Outstanding (2.0).

For the overall performance rating, scores across the three areas are averaged according to a weighting system. The weight for each area shall be as specified in the member's letter of appointment (or subsequent revisions). In the absence of specified weights, the normal weights shall be deemed to be 40 percent for scholarship, 40 percent for teaching, and 20 percent for service. Faculty members can request that the Dean approve a temporary adjustment of their weightings when they take on a significant administrative role. The adjustment involves a change in expectations for quantity of work in each area but not for quality.

*Process:* Within the Department, responsibility for performance evaluations rests with the Chair. The Chair is advised by a performance review committee which includes: the Chair, three members elected each year from all full-time faculty within the Department, and (where possible) one probationary faculty appointed by the Chair as a non-voting member. All members of the performance review committee must be provided with each faculty member's respective weightings of scholarship, teaching and service for the year.



The Chair's recommendation to the Dean must indicate whether performance in each area is satisfactory or not and must provide evidence supporting this assessment. Because performance reviews are included in tenure and promotion deliberations, it is important that Chairs provide a thorough written assessment of each faculty member's performance.

It is essential that the faculty member provide sufficient information during the performance review process to allow an informed judgement in each area. It is the responsibility of faculty members to ensure that all information, e.g., page numbers for articles, is complete. A faculty member who does not submit the required documentation by the specified deadline normally will receive an overall rating of at most 0.5.

### **1.1.3 Probationary faculty**

*Probationary Faculty:* Performance reviews of probationary faculty are important in providing an annual assessment of progress toward tenure. Where appropriate, separate assessments should be given for each component (e.g., while performance on research for the past year was satisfactory, the total record is a cause for concern because, etc.). All concerns should be conveyed to the individual in as specific a form as possible and every effort should be made to assist the faculty member to identify and rectify the problem. An indication should be given of the likelihood of the individual being granted tenure if he/she continues to perform at the present level. While not required by policy, it is useful for the Chair to share any such concerns with the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee (DTPC) and seek its advice on appropriate feedback to faculty.

Policy 77 states that “annual performance reviews form part of the evidence in tenure considerations”. The University Tenure Appeals Committee (UTAC) has stated that: *“It is understood that the objective of performance reviews is to be helpful and encouraging, and give an accurate account of the positive and negative aspects of the faculty member’s work. Reservations, if any, must be clearly expressed, and there should be no ambiguity between what is said and what is written. A major purpose is to give the faculty member means to do a better job. The review should also remind the candidate that the tenure process will include outside assessment in the form of reports from external referees.”* (Report to Senate, October 21, 1996)

Faculty members at risk of not receiving reappointment to a second probationary position should have this spelled out clearly in the annual review letter(s).

If the DTPC has expressed concern at the time of renewal of the probationary contract, the results of each subsequent annual performance assessment should be reviewed by that Committee. Upon receipt of the DTPC recommendation, the Dean shall decide whether to reappoint, and shall inform the candidate in writing, including reasons if the decision is negative.

### 1.1.4 Tenured Associate Professors

In accordance with Policy 77, the objective of performance reviews is to provide helpful feedback on the work of faculty. The Chair and the DTTC are available to provide mentorship to faculty regarding their progress towards promotion to full Professor.

## 2. Scholarship

Policy 77 notes: *“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.”* Further, as the university-wide review of the Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation Process notes (recommendation 3.2), *“scholarly work outside of the usual peer reviewed venues is valued, but the onus is on the faculty member to provide evidence of its quality, impact and relevance.”*

### 2.1 Quality of Scholarship

Distinct sub-fields in political science have different premier journals, and place varying emphases on the relative merits of books and articles in prestigious journals; accordingly, the assessment of research contributions will be relative to sub-field context. In general, however, evidence of serious peer review, low acceptance rates and citation impact will be considered *prima facie* evidence of high quality.

The three major categories of peer-reviewed research are books, journal articles, and edited books/chapters in edited books. In evaluating each of these, emphasis will be placed on quality.

#### 1. Books with publishers having good academic reputations and meaningful peer review.

Books with leading university presses will usually be more favourably regarded than peer-reviewed books with other presses, but standards vary across sub-fields of the disciplines and it is recognized that some non-university presses can have stronger academic reputations than some university presses.

#### 2. Journal articles in peer-reviewed journals.

Many political scientists publish in multi-disciplinary journals devoted to country or area studies, or to specific fields such as feminist thought, race and class, international political economy, global governance, or security studies. In most of these areas, as

with subfields of the discipline, there is substantial agreement in the relevant epistemic community on the relative quality of journals: this ranking is usually closely correlated with the rigour of peer review and the demonstrated impact of articles published in the journals.

Faculty should aim to publish in journals that are included in InCites Journal Citation Reports (Web of Science/Social Sciences Citation Index): (<https://jcr-clarivate-com.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/JCRLandingPageAction.action?Init=Yes>) and/or Scopus (<https://www.scopus.com/sources>). These citation reports provide comprehensive coverage in many fields but the Department recognizes that there may be some journals significant for some subfields that are not included in these reports.<sup>1</sup> For these journals, the onus will be on faculty to provide evidence of serious peer review and of the impact of their publication.

3. Edited books/chapters in peer-reviewed edited books. Emphasis will be placed on the reputation of the publisher and the rigour of peer review. The Department acknowledges that edited collections are often the product of workshops that are valuable for reasons such as establishing a research profile and facilitating networking. Generally, however, chapters in edited collections do not have the impact of articles published in high quality journals.

Candidates with a published book are encouraged to submit evidence of the good reputation and rigour of the review processes of the book's publisher. Candidates with published journal articles are encouraged to submit evidence of the "high quality" of the journals in which they have published. Candidates are also encouraged to include evidence of the extent to which other scholars have made reference to their work.

The research of some faculty engages with public policy. The Department acknowledges that the optimal outlet for such research may not be conventional academic publications but, for instance, policy papers. In evaluating such outputs, the Department will place emphasis on peer review and on the demonstrated impact of the research. It borrows the definition of "impact" used in the UK's 2020 Research Excellence Framework: "an effect on, change or benefit to the economy, society, culture, public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life, beyond academia".<sup>2</sup> The Department, however, recognizes the challenges involved in measuring impact.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> In July 2020, Scopus listed 636 journals in international relations and political science; InCites included 180 political science journals, 77 categorized as Area Studies, and 95 as international relations.

<sup>2</sup> Research Excellence Framework REF2021 (2019), 'Guidance on submissions (2019/01)' paragraph 297, (<[https://www.ref.ac.uk/media/1092/ref-2019\\_01-guidance-on-submissions.pdf](https://www.ref.ac.uk/media/1092/ref-2019_01-guidance-on-submissions.pdf)>).

<sup>3</sup> As documented, for example, in Boswell, Christina and Smith, Katherine (2017), "Rethinking policy 'impact': four models of research-policy relations", *Palgrave Communications*, 3 (1), 44.

In the case of co-authored/co-edited publications, the Chair and performance review committee will assume that the division of work among the authors/editors was shared equally unless faculty members provide evidence otherwise. Co-authored/co-edited publications generally will carry less weight than single-authored publications.

Non-peer-reviewed outputs are often a valuable part of regular scholarly activity. They may play a role in establishing or maintaining faculty profiles in the profession or in service to national or international professional bodies. Conference presentations are valued but the expectation is that research presented at a conference will eventually be disseminated via a publication. Authoring, editing or contributing to textbooks sometimes afford opportunities for creative syntheses of work published in the subfield: faculty can either ask for them to be considered as scholarship or as part of their contribution to teaching. Book reviews can be a means for junior faculty to establish a profile: unless, however, they take the form of an extended review essay, they seldom reflect original research.

Other non-refereed publications such as magazine articles, newspaper articles, trade publications, briefing papers, research reports, and scholarly commentary in the media can be considered under the category of scholarship. The University has noted, however, that the onus is on the faculty member to provide evidence of the quality, impact and relevance of these non-refereed publications if they are to be considered as part of scholarship. Faculty members alternatively may choose to have these non-refereed publications considered under the category of service.

Substantial output of non-refereed publications will not be regarded as offsetting a weak record in refereed publications.

## *2.2 Other Evidence of Excellence in Scholarship*

Evidence of excellence in scholarship can be provided by:

- Success in winning competitive external grants
- Receipt of prizes from local, national or international professional bodies for scholarly work
- Election to learned societies
- Invitations to present “keynote” addresses
- Service as a journal editor, member of an editorial board, or as a referee for journals, scholarly prize competitions or granting councils
- Membership on government or professional committees
- Invitations to present submissions to government enquiries, parliamentary committees or other policy-making processes
- Supervision of student research. Faculty members should specify whether supervision is to be counted as scholarship or teaching.
- Invitations to participate in collaborative projects from established leaders in a field

This list is not exhaustive. Other activities may be included but faculty must make a case for their relevance in light of Policy 77.

### **3. TEACHING**

#### **3.1 General comments**

Teaching is broadly defined to include lecture, seminar and laboratory instruction, office consultation, undergraduate reading and independent study courses, graduate and undergraduate supervision and course and program development or revision. Ratings of teaching performance will be based on evidence relevant to any or all these areas. Faculty members in political science engage in both graduate and undergraduate teaching and supervision, and all forms of these teaching activities are taken into account in performance review, tenure and promotion decisions. Faculty are expected to display professionalism in all aspects of their teaching.

#### **3.2 Evaluation**

*Policy 77 notes: "Teaching quality should be assessed broadly using evidence gathered from as many sources as practicable. Responsibility for providing documentary evidence on teaching rests with the candidate and, to a lesser degree, with the Department Chair. A teaching dossier developed by the candidate may be the most effective way of assembling this information. 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."*

Faculty are encouraged to submit evidence of teaching excellence. This may include evidence of supervision and mentoring of graduate students, course outlines, student course perceptions, evidence of professional development such as participation in or organization of teaching or pedagogical workshops, evidence of other teaching-related activities outside the classroom such as training or mentoring teaching assistants, mentoring junior faculty, and supervision of students in independent studies courses.

Faculty can also count publication of textbooks towards their teaching activities. If a textbook contributes to the synthesis of knowledge, it may be counted under "scholarship" instead. Faculty members must indicate under which category they would like textbooks to be considered; these publications cannot be double-counted under both categories.

### **3.2.2 Supervision**

Most supervision in the political science department is graduate supervision, but in some cases faculty members supervise undergraduate students in reading or research courses. Supervision in the political science department counts as teaching, rather than research, unless a faculty member makes a strong case to the contrary. Supervision in programs to which political science contributes teaching resources (such as the Global Governance, Master of Public Service, and Master of Peace & Conflict Studies programs), or in programs to which the faculty member has a formal, contractual relationship, is considered part of a faculty member's supervisory load within the Department.

Supervision outside of the Department is valued, but all faculty members are expected to share the burden of supervision within the Department. Delivering the components of a graduate degree to all the students the Department admits is a shared responsibility in Political Science. There is no simple relationship between the supply of supervision and the demand for supervision. Some Department members may have lower supervision loads but have accepted every student who has asked to work with them. Every faculty member, over the long run, should discharge their supervisory obligations by substantial contribution to as many facets of graduate instruction as possible, supplementing fewer contributions on one dimension (e.g., thesis supervision) with greater contributions on another (e.g., thesis committee work). Graduate teaching that overlaps with service and is essential to the smooth functioning of the Department includes: serving as a reader or thesis committee member for graduate theses; arranging and conducting oral defenses of theses; professionally and academically advising students; and conducting mock interviews for students with impending academic job interviews. Faculty can choose whether they count these activities as teaching or as service.

## **4. SERVICE**

### **4.1 General comments**

*Policy 77 notes: "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."*

Service is a very important and essential part of our role as faculty members and it is highly valued. For tenured faculty, service is evaluated on the basis of work done since the previous evaluation. In keeping with the norms of the Faculty of Arts, the Department recognizes different kinds of service. Service can be performed within the Department, the Faculty, and the University as a whole. It can also include service to the discipline or to the profession and to the community at large. Service is an important component of a faculty member's duties and should be properly encouraged and recognized. Since service is expected, lack of service requires an explanation.

Generally, the three categories of service noted above are reported in performance reviews; and there is an expectation that all faculty members will contribute to service in the Department. Extra-university activity (such as consulting, research or external teaching for which payment is received) should be reported to the Chair on a yearly basis but is not usually considered as part of the performance review process. Care should be taken that such activity does not interfere with the proper discharge of primary University duties. Faculty members should be aware of University policies on [Extra-University Activity \(Policy #49\)](#) and [Conflict of Interest \(Policy #69\)](#). Contract research should be discussed with the Office of Research.

To receive a score of 1.25 for service in any year, a faculty member normally must present evidence of all the following during that year:

1. Membership on and a meaningful contribution to some important departmental committee (or an equivalent meaningful service contribution to the Department).
2. Good departmental citizenship (explained below).
3. At least one of the following:
  - a. A meaningful extra-departmental service contribution to the Faculty or University.
  - b. Meaningful external service to the academic discipline, profession or community.

All Department members are expected to be good Department citizens (including attending Department meetings) and, normally, should expect to do some minimum level of Department service that cannot normally be replaced by service to other academic programs with which the Department has a formal relationship (e.g., Global Governance graduate programs at BSIA, the MPS program) except by agreement in advance with the Chair. Beyond that requirement, Department members will have the flexibility to treat their additional service contributions to these other academic programs as either additional departmental service or university service.



## 4.2 Departmental service

Internal service to the Department and departmental citizenship are an essential duty. Faculty members are expected to be involved in the collegial academic and professional life of the Department and to share committee and other responsibilities. All Department members are encouraged to participate in Department meetings, ceremonies, and other professional activities when possible. Probationary candidates are not expected to fill major administrative roles. Where service to other units is required by the nature of the position (e.g., joint appointment, directorship), this will be considered as service to the Department. Some examples of activities that can be counted as evidence of departmental service include (this list is not meant to be exhaustive):

- Student advising
- Committee work
- Administrative roles
- Coordinator of speakers' series
- Organization of workshops and conferences
- "Good citizenship" such as mentoring new faculty, being available in the Department, being willing to take on hard-to-cover courses, sponsoring or mentoring student groups, and generally being available to students.

## 4.3 University service

Some examples of activities that can be counted as evidence of university service include (this list is not meant to be exhaustive):

- Service to other units that is not contractually obligated. Such service is valued by the Department (eg., BSIA, MPS).
- Committee work
- Leadership roles
- Coordinator of speakers series
- University service awards
- Organization of workshops and conferences
- Serving on adjudication committees for grant applications

Policy 77 notes: "*Community service related to a faculty member's scholarly activities is normally considered as service to the University.*" Included in this category are the following kinds of activities (this list is not meant to be exhaustive): media and community outreach, engagement with policymakers, engagement with community and civil society groups, involvement with think tanks, and testimony before government bodies. Some of these kinds of activities may be counted under research dissemination. Faculty members must clearly specify how they would prefer these activities be counted; double-counting across categories is not permitted. Note that paid work or consultancy (including work done for CIGI as part of a faculty member's

normally paid CIGI duties) does not normally count as service, but consultancy (e.g. for the government) does count as service where only expenses are reimbursed.

#### **4.4 Service to the profession**

Some examples of activities that can be counted as service to the profession include (this list is not meant to be exhaustive):

- Editorial roles (more value is placed on the more senior roles and on higher-tier publications)
  - Editorial board and advisory board roles
  - Service in professional committees or organizations
- Scholarly manuscript reviewing activities for journals and book publishers (with higher value placed on reviews for higher-tier publications)
- Providing formal or informal mentorship to colleagues within or outside the university
- Reviewing activities for granting agencies, tenure and promotion at other universities, program reviews at other institutions, awards/prizes etc.
- Adjudication of Service awards from academic or professional bodies
- Articles, editorials, commentary, interviews in media (faculty can choose whether to count this as service or dissemination of research under scholarship)
- Serving on adjudication committees of external agencies granting scholarships and research funding

## **5. Applications for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

### **5.1 General comments**

Policy 77 notes: *“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.”* The Policy continues: *“By the time candidates are considered for tenure they will have had ample opportunity to develop their teaching skills and to make original contributions to their fields of endeavour. These original contributions must be of sufficient magnitude to give witness to a candidate’s depth of understanding and scholarly and professional competence.”*

Standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are not reducible to a quantitative formula. Qualitative judgements will have an important bearing on tenure decisions. In reaching these judgements, the views of external referees on the quality of the contributions of faculty members will be particularly important.

### **5.2 Scholarship**

The Department encourages publication of dissertation research but expects the candidate to show evidence by the time of submitting an application for tenure of establishing a research agenda that goes beyond the dissertation. Policy 77 notes: *“Particular attention will be paid to assessing the likelihood that candidates will continue their scholarly activities once tenure has been awarded.”*

Policy 77 continues: *“Although the University looks for evidence of active continuing scholarship, the volume of scholarly output is less important than its quality, originality and impact.”*

In evaluating the quality of faculty members’ scholarship, the DTTC will rely on the criteria for scholarly excellence outlined in section 2.1 of this document.

Although the primary emphasis is on quality of scholarly output, candidates for tenure are expected to publish at a rate commensurate with the standards for faculty at a similar stage of their careers at research-intensive universities. Minimum expectations (noting the statement in section two regarding how preferred outputs may vary across sub-fields), would typically be either:

a single-authored book with a publisher with a good academic reputation and meaningful peer review, and two single-authored articles in high quality, peer-reviewed journals

**or**

six peer-reviewed outputs, the majority of which would be single-authored articles in high quality peer-reviewed journals.

It is important to emphasize that this advice is provided only as a rough guideline. It is a minimum standard: meeting it is no guarantee that tenure will be awarded. Quality considerations will be paramount in the Department's recommendation on tenure. High quality is usually closely correlated with the rigour of peer review and the demonstrated impact of published work.

Candidates with a published book are encouraged to submit evidence of the good reputation and rigour of the review processes of the book's publisher. Candidates with published journal articles are encouraged to submit evidence of the "high quality" of the journals in which they have published. Candidates are also encouraged to include evidence of the extent to which other scholars have made reference to their work.

Research unconditionally accepted for publication at the time of the tenure application will be counted as equal to work already published.

In the case of co-authored or co-edited publications, candidates must include some indication of the division of work between the authors or editors. If not indicated, the Department will assume that all authors contributed equally to a publication.

Other kinds of evidence beyond publications will be considered in evaluations of scholarship performance for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. These are listed in section 2.2. By the time of their promotion application, the expectation is that junior faculty will be establishing a profile within the profession nationally and/or internationally. Evidence of this might include serving as a referee for journals or as a member of editorial boards, invitations to give keynote addresses, invitations to make a submission to a government inquiry, parliamentary committees or other policy-making processes, or contribute in other ways to knowledge mobilization in the profession.

Probationary faculty are encouraged to apply for research grants, and the winning of research grants is a positive indication of recognition of quality scholarship. The Department does not, however, consider successful research grant applications to be necessary for tenure and promotion. The Department recognizes that research funding in the social sciences is difficult to secure and that certain fields within political science do not require large research grants.

### **5.3 Teaching**

Candidates for tenure and promotion are evaluated on their entire teaching record. They should assemble a teaching dossier that includes student course perceptions, peer review(s) of their teaching, course syllabi, supervisory achievements (graduate and

undergraduate), and involvement in oral and thesis examinations. Candidates can also include evidence of novel teaching methods and techniques, evidence of participation in professional teaching and pedagogical development, curriculum development, teaching citations or awards, course content, and course materials, and other indications of teaching excellence as discussed in section 3.2.

To be assessed with a record of “strong” performance in teaching, a candidate must have at least earned teaching scores in the annual performance review that were close to the departmental average over the last two probationary years. To be assessed with a record of “very strong” performance in teaching, a candidate must have at least earned teaching scores that were significantly higher than the departmental average over the last four probationary years, and present a wider body of extremely positive supporting evidence drawn from items in Section 3.2, demonstrating major instructional innovation, nomination and/or winning of a teaching award, or other kinds of unusually positive recognition by peers or students.

These standards are minimum standards; that is, they are expected but not necessarily sufficient conditions to meet the standards of “satisfactory”, “strong” or “very strong” teaching records. Information from other aspects of a candidate’s teaching dossier will also enter into the evaluation.

#### **5.4 Service**

In determining and evaluating service criteria in Tenure and Promotion decisions, Policy 77 notes: *“Candidates for tenure or promotion shall provide information on their service activities in sufficient detail to allow the DTTC to assess its quantity and quality. Where necessary, the DTTC should obtain statements from those who have personally observed the candidate's service contributions both internal and external to the University. Some service activities, such as chairing a curriculum committee or editing a professional society journal, may also provide indirect evidence for scholarship and teaching.”*

Probationary candidates are not expected to fill major administrative roles. Policy 77 notes that *“service expectations are lower for probationary faculty than for tenured faculty, and service is not weighted as heavily as scholarship or teaching in tenure considerations”*. Like all other faculty, however, probationary candidates are expected to be good departmental citizens and to participate in Department meetings, ceremonies, and other professional activities. They are expected to be active members of the departmental committees to which they have been appointed and to undertake other activities listed in Section 4.2. By the time of their promotion application, faculty will be expected to have begun to undertake service activities in the profession outside the University.

## 6. Promotion to Professor

### *General Remarks*

Policy 77 notes that *“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...Promotion to Professor is not an assured step in the career of a faculty member, and some will not attain this rank.”*

Policy 77 continues: *“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.”*

### **6.1 Scholarship**

Candidates for promotion to Professor will be evaluated on their career scholarship. The Department notes that the full impact of research published before candidates were promoted to Associate Professor may not have been obvious at that time. However, consistent with the emphasis in Policy 77 on continuing excellence in scholarship, scholarly outputs since the granting of tenure will be of particular importance in the promotion decision for most candidates. Policy 77 states that *“A continuous program of scholarship with positive peer review by nationally and internationally recognized scholars is essential for promotion to Professor.”* The normal expectation is that faculty will have significant publications in at least one major project that goes beyond work completed when tenure was granted. Policy 77 states that it is unusual for promotion to Full Professor to occur prior to five years of full-time service as Associate Professor, indicating that scholarly output in this period is expected to at least match in quantity and quality that required by the Department for tenure.

The Department's criteria for excellence in scholarship are listed in section 2.1 above.

The Department expects that the professional achievements of candidates for Professor normally will have been recognized through several of the following:

- Success in winning major external research funding
- Receipt of prizes for outstanding scholarship
- Invitations to give keynote addresses to major conferences or workshops
- Playing a role in editing a leading journal within their field
- Membership of editorial boards of leading national and international journals
- Membership of committees determining the award of prizes in their fields
- Invitation to make submissions to government inquiries, parliamentary committees or other policy-making processes
- Office-holding in a major professional association
- Election to one or more learned societies

## **6.2 Teaching**

Candidates for promotion to Professor are evaluated on their entire teaching record. They should assemble a teaching dossier that includes student course perceptions, peer review(s) of their teaching, course syllabi, supervisory achievements (graduate and undergraduate), and involvement in oral and thesis examinations. Candidates can also include evidence of novel teaching methods and techniques, evidence of participation in professional teaching and pedagogical development, curriculum development, teaching citations or awards, course content, and course materials, and other indications of teaching excellence as discussed in section 3.2.

Candidates for promotion to Professor will normally be expected to have played a significant role in graduate education, including the supervision of research theses where opportunities were available.

## **6.3 Service**

As noted in paragraph 4.1, the Department recognizes various forms of service including those to the Department, the Faculty, the University as a whole, to the profession and to the community as a whole.

By the time that they apply for promotion to Professor, the expectation is that faculty members at some point normally will have held one of the major administrative positions in the Department, e.g., Associate Chair, or Director of one of the programs with which the Department is affiliated, e.g., MPS, Global Governance, or a role of equivalent administrative seniority in the University. They will also demonstrate satisfactory performance in the activities identified in paragraphs 4.2 through 4.4 including a consistent record of good departmental citizenship.

**Department of Psychology Guidelines Regarding Faculty Performance Expectations and  
the Evaluation Process  
(Addendum to the Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines for Arts)**

**October 2022**

**Preamble**

In 2010, the Faculty Relations Committee (composed of members from the university administration and the Faculty Association) made a series of recommendations for improving the evaluation process. Among these was the requirement that each department produce a “document outlining the evaluation process and the performance expectations in their department for scholarship, teaching, and service.” This document is to be approved by a majority vote of the members of the department and then to be updated, reviewed, and approved biennially. Faculty members are to be provided with the updated document biennially to assist with the preparation of their Activity Reports. Faculty members are also to receive the current “Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines” (updated every five years; [see here](#)).

In 2016, the Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) was revised such that evaluation of tenured faculty and continuing lecturers now occurs biennially at the beginning of odd-numbered years (e.g., in early 2021 for the calendar years 2019 and 2020). Evaluation of all others continues to occur annually.

**Process**

Every year (for untenured faculty and definite-term lecturers), or every second year (for tenured faculty and continuing lecturers), activities and accomplishments must be reported in three domains: teaching, research, and service. Ordinarily, these three domains are considered to represent 40%, 40%, and 20% of a tenure-stream faculty member’s activity. The weightings for lecturers ordinarily are 80%, 0%, and 20% (i.e., there is no expectation of research). Evaluation in each of the domains is accomplished by generating a rating on a 9-point scale in 0.25 steps from 0.00 to 2.00. In Psychology, together with the Chair, an elected committee of 5 faculty members—the Annual Performance Review Committee (APRC)—examines these Activity Reports. By policy, this committee makes recommendations to the Chair concerning the evaluation of all faculty members. In practice, it is the aggregated ratings of this committee plus the Chair (i.e., the average of all six) that the Chair then uses for determining the final evaluations. In the event of notable discrepancy within the committee concerning the evaluation of any faculty member, the committee provides guidance to the Chair to assist in resolving the discrepancy.

Under the modified MoA of 2016 (see MoA Section 13.5.2b), scholarship (research) is to be assessed on the total evidence from a window of two years whereas teaching and service are to be assessed on the evidence from the year(s) under evaluation. Additional documented years can provide context to the assessed evidence. In Psychology, we use the following intervals. For evaluation of the 2021 and 2022 calendar years (in early 2023), tenured and continuing faculty will submit a *biennial* Activity Report in December 2022 covering two years of activity in



Research, Teaching, and Service (from January 1, 2021 to December 31, 2022\*). The full two years of evidence in each of the three areas will inform ratings for the 2023 merit increases, ratings which will carry forward for the 2024 merit increases as well. Definite-term and probationary faculty will submit an *annual* Activity Report each December. This annual report will detail two years of activity in Teaching and Service with the current year activity (e.g., 2022 activity detailed in the 2022 report) serving as the evidence for the evaluation and the prior year activity (e.g., 2021 activity detailed in the 2022 report) providing context for the evidence. For probationary faculty, the annual report will detail *all research activity so far in career* with the activity from the two-year window (e.g., 2021 and 2022 in the 2022 report) serving as the evidence for the evaluation and the prior years' activity providing context for the evidence.

**\*Note:** Given the administrative demands of compiling and distributing APR documents to the committee in a timely manner, the Department requests all documents be submitted by mid-December. If there is a change in activity (e.g., a paper is accepted for publication) after materials are submitted but before the end of the calendar year, please notify the Chair by the first week of January to ensure the most up to date materials are reviewed.

## Expectations

All faculty members in Psychology are expected to use the most recent version of the Department of Psychology Activity Report (the latest version of the template will accompany this document). The categories and their sequence must be the same as in the template to facilitate the work of the APRC. In what follows, the three components of the Activity Report are described in the order that they appear in the Activity Report. Note that each section of the Activity Report begins with a summary and that the Report ends with a section for awards.

**Research.** The section on scholarship begins with a list of publications, including books, book chapters, and journal articles, either published or in press/accepted. This section also requests reporting of work under review: In Psychology, all faculty members may use this section, indicating the journal and the date of submission. Note, however, that the section on work in progress is to be used only by probationary (untentured) faculty, indicating the current status of the project. As context, untentured faculty also are expected to cover their entire research career to date, not just the two-year window that applies to tentured faculty. This is followed by conference presentations and invited colloquia and presentations, and then by grants held and applied for. Note that, except in the case of untentured faculty, these lists are to be restricted to the two calendar years of the report. It is important to indicate which work has been independently assessed, peer reviewed, etc. In Psychology, it is expected that faculty members will publish with graduate students (and possibly undergraduate students), so student co-authors should be identified in all publications. Where there are explicit quality indicators, such as journal impact factors or an exceptional evaluation from an editor, this information may be provided to assist in the evaluation of quality. For publications and presentations, the list should include only those on which the faculty member is an author. The final qualitative section should be used to highlight accomplishments—to assist in making the case for the quality of the faculty member's scholarship. A partial list of influential factors might include citation counts and other indices of impact (e.g., *h-index*, *i10*, or similar measures), visibility in textbooks, reprinted articles, book reviews, grant ranking, etc.

The question may arise as to where to assign certain kinds of activities: In particular, are they research or service? Illustrations might include consulting or knowledge mobilization work, for example. In no case should an activity be reported in more than one section of the Activity Report. As a guideline, where such work is done on a contractual basis and is paid, it is ordinarily best to list the work as service. But where the work is done primarily for scholarly purposes, as when it leads to publications, assists with the development of graduate student skills, or the like, it may fit best into scholarship. Consultation with the Chair can help to resolve ambiguities.

**Teaching.** In the Department of Psychology, we hold a broad conceptualization of teaching effectiveness that includes an instructor's ability to communicate and achieve stated learning objectives and have a broad impact on student learning (e.g., motivate and engage with students to support their educational and professional development). As such, and in accordance with Policy 77, teaching effectiveness will be assessed broadly using multiple sources of evidence.

There are two major parts to the section on teaching activities: one on undergraduate and one on graduate teaching and supervision. For the undergraduate part, all courses that have been taught in the two-year window must be listed, indicating any that were not part of the faculty member's regular load. Policy 77 states that "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." The university requires that Student Course Perception Surveys (SCPS) be part of the APR process, which typically entails reporting the mean rating for questions 1-6 on the standard Student Course Perception survey for each undergraduate course taught. The Department recognizes SCPSs as relevant in providing information about student experience and for the formative development of an instructor. However, the Department also recognizes concerns with the validity of these measures as indicators of instructors' effectiveness per se, and further recognizes that there are many other indicators of effectiveness in teaching. As such, faculty members are strongly encouraged to provide the APRC with evidence for teaching effectiveness in the open-ended, "Qualitative" section of the teaching report (see below).

Following the section on courses taught, there is a section in which to report all undergraduate supervision, including honours theses, directed or independent studies, co-op work terms, research assistant work, summer internships (e.g., NSERC USRA), and any other related activities. Where new courses have been constructed, or significant revisions have been made to existing courses, these should be described in the section on "New Course Development," with syllabi attached. Where significant revisions have been made to existing courses, please include the old and new syllabi. Other information related to the quality of undergraduate teaching and supervision should be presented in the "Qualitative" section at the end of the undergraduate part. Appropriate indicators will vary depending on features of the teaching activity (e.g., large survey classes, senior seminars, honours thesis supervisions), but could include demonstrations of *effective classroom behaviours* (e.g., clear communication of learning outcomes to students, incorporation of active learning techniques, improvements in curricular design, development of effective course material that is used by other instructors) and *effective research supervision* (e.g., regular evaluation of student progress towards learning outcomes, regular meetings with

students, awards won by students, student presentations at conferences, student success in admission to postgraduate programs and job placements). Please honour the two-year window here as well.

The second part closely parallels the first and is used to report activities with respect to graduate teaching and supervision. All courses that have been taught in the two-year window should be listed. Afterward, any new course development should be described; ideally, syllabi would accompany this description. The major task follows—to list all graduate supervisory activity. The first few sections list completed and ongoing M.A. and Ph.D. supervision, both as major advisor (or co-advisor) and as committee member. Faculty may include an additional section listing postdoctoral fellows, as appropriate. In the Clinical Area, a section on clinical supervision and preparation for the licensing exam may also be added here. There is also a place to indicate other activities related to graduate training, such as serving as an external examiner or the like. Other information related to the quality of graduate teaching and supervision may be presented in the “Qualitative” section at the end of the graduate part. Faculty members are encouraged to use this section to report on *effective teaching behaviours* and *effective research supervision* as noted in the Undergraduate section above. In addition, graduate teaching effectiveness might include information about graduate student research awards, graduate student grant council awards, postdoctoral fellowships, academic positions, and jobs in industry. Citations of publications and conference presentations involving students will be listed under Research, as set out above, so only graduate student involvement should be described here. For example, it might be informative to present a count of publications and presentations involving graduate students, and to indicate regular lab meetings in which graduate students (as well as undergraduates) take part. Ordinarily, the information in this section will also be limited to the two-year window; however, exceptions may exist and should be reported here (e.g., a former graduate student winning a major research award).

**Service.** The service component of the Activity Report is divided into several sections. The first three sections relate to departmental, faculty, and university service. In the first section, departmental committees (e.g., Executive, DTPC, APRC) should be listed, as well as any other administrative roles in the department (e.g., Associate Chair, Area Head). Corresponding entries should be made for Faculty of Arts and university committees (e.g., FTPC, Office of Research Ethics, Chair of Ph.D. thesis orals) in the second and third sections.

Next is professional service internationally and nationally. Internationally, items might include: Editorial appointments (e.g., Associate Editor of a journal), professional offices (e.g., Secretary of a society), professional selection committees (e.g., Fellows Selection Committee), paper and grant reviews, conference and symposium organization, external refereeing for promotion and tenure cases. At the national level, items might include grant council membership, graduate fellowship/scholarship adjudication committees, and so on.

The final section covers community service, where the list might include such contributions as media coverage of research, media interviews, judging a science fair, supervising a high school co-op student, giving a talk at a local library, service on a community committee or board, providing a report to a national or local agency, and the like.

As with the other parts of the Activity Report, this part ends with a qualitative section. Although the benchmarks for quality are less clear with regard to service, it nevertheless is the case that faculty members can and should present evidence for quality. This is also one situation where quantity is relevant and could be discussed, as when a particular role entails an extensive time commitment.

## **Postscript**

Where faculty members are uncertain about how to report any component of the Annual Report, or where they have suggestions for improving this document, they are encouraged to contact the Chair.

These guidelines have been prepared in accordance with the Faculty of Arts Guidelines, which in turn were prepared in accordance with the following documents:

- Memorandum of Agreement between FAUW and UW: <https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat-general-counsel/documents-potential-interest/memorandum-agreement-uw-fauw>
- Policy 77: Tenure and Promotion: <https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat-general-counsel/policies-procedures-guidelines/policy-77>
- Review of the Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation Process and its recommendations as revised by the Faculty Relations Committee (August 13, 2010). The Review is available at: <https://uwaterloo.ca/provost/sites/ca.provost/files/uploads/files/Revised-Performance-Evaluation-Recommendations.pdf>

## **UW Department of Religious Studies Performance appraisals and progress toward tenure**

Advice from the Chair for understanding the current (September 2020) annual appraisal process and its relation to tenure and promotion in the Department of Religious Studies

The Department of Religious Studies consists of faculty members appointed by and accountable to one of the following five agencies: University of Waterloo Faculty of Arts, St. Jerome's University, Renison University College, St. Paul's University College, and Conrad Grebel University College. This document applies to those appointed by the University of Waterloo Faculty of Arts. Other agencies may elect to make use of this advice.

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Faculty members at the University of Waterloo fulfill their job descriptions by doing some combination of teaching, research, and service. The bi-annual performance appraisal rates how well one is performing each of these elements of one's job. This process determines faculty members' selective salary increment each year through the process described in Article 13 of the Memorandum of Agreement. It also constitutes one component of ongoing feedback on their performance, and provides important information to the Tenure and Appointments Committee at various stages in each faculty member's career.

The following are default standards and desiderata for the annual appraisal process. This is a living document, to be updated as circumstances change and as good arguments for revisions come to light. Its role is to describe the procedures and heuristics by which performance is appraised and to sketch the reasons underlying those heuristics. With this information, all faculty members may better understand the needs and expectations of the Department and the University as these bear on their job performance and its evaluation; and untenured faculty members may better understand the relation between performance appraisals and the tenure process. There is a standing invitation to bring proposed revisions to this document to the Chair, or to departmental meetings.

To say that the standards described in the document are default is to flag their defeasibility when a reasonable case can be made for departing from them; this is not a one-size-fits-all model. However, to say that these are default guidelines is also to indicate the need for such a reasonable case in order to motivate a departure from them.

### **2. THE BI-ANNUAL PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL**

The Annual Performance Appraisal issues in a score out of 2, compounded out of the scores out of 2 on each of the three listed job components, typically according to the formula:  $(.4 \times \text{Teaching}) + (.4 \times \text{Research}) + (.2 \times \text{Service})$ . The points on the rating scale and their associated descriptors are:

- 0 – Unsatisfactory
- 0.25 – New rating point effective 2012
- 0.5 – Needs Improvement
- 0.75 – New rating point effective 2012
- 1.0 – Satisfactory
- 1.25 – Good
- 1.5 – Very Good
- 1.75 – Excellent
- 2.0 – Outstanding

Weightings other than 40% each for Teaching and Research and 20% for Service are sometimes negotiated for faculty members having special research, teaching, or administrative appointments, usually on a temporary basis. Lighter duties or changed weightings are understood to influence expectations of the quantity of one's contributions in that area, but not their quality.

Every second year (over December and January, traditionally), faculty members are invited to submit information detailing their accomplishments in each of the three evaluation areas during the previous year. A standard form is available in the Faculty of Arts for the presentation of common categories of information. But faculty members are encouraged to take seriously the sections of this form that also solicit any further information they think relevant to their performance over the past year. Faculty members should feel free to include and explain the widest selection of data they want the Chair (or Committee) to review, and to generally present their own strongest case.

On the basis of this information the Chair (or committee) recommends numerical ratings for each faculty member, which are then discussed with the Dean of Arts and possibly revised in order to achieve fairness and consistency across the Faculty.

The overall score for each faculty member is then used as a multiplier on the Faculty of Arts basic selective increment, and also serves as a snapshot of one's general performance in the years evaluated. There is no very precise set of scores necessary for tenure; moreover, any remarks in these guidelines must be understood only as advisory to faculty members without being binding on Faculty or University-level committees or adjudicators.

Over the longer course of a career, appraisals should reflect the fact that performance in each of the three measures, and most particularly on research, neither materializes nor disappears within a single year. Recent output and impending output can rightly influence an appraisal. The process should negotiate a middle path between anachronistic ratings, on which a long-unpublished professor receives unwarrantedly high evaluations for "lifetime achievement", and a mercenary approach, on which one's contributions are instantly and completely forgotten from one year to the next.

### 3. TEACHING

Teaching in the Department falls into two broad categories: undergraduate and graduate. While all faculty members teach undergraduate courses, some will be quite

involved in graduate teaching and others may have little formal involvement with the graduate program beyond the general oversight exercise by the Department. The Department expects strong teaching of all faculty members. Among other things this means teaching accurate information, engaging students, grading fairly, organizing courses well, following Departmental policies for teaching, and generally treating students with respect. Most of the appraisal of one's teaching contributions will be based on evidence regarding the intensity and quality of one's performance

Faculty should also feel free to seek out extra information about their teaching – e.g., by requesting extra informal classroom visits by faculty members – with the aim of improving their instruction, without fear that such additional information, if negative in some respect, would be used in their summative evaluations. This informal practice of advice-seeking initiated by the faculty member is not the same as a more formal process, usually in the case of probationary faculty, initiated by the Chair or Department.

The standard teaching load for those faculty members accountable to the Faculty of Arts is currently four courses per academic year; typically these will be organized as two courses in the Fall term and two in the Winter term.

### 3a. *Undergraduate teaching*

Undergraduate teaching is the largest single undertaking of the University and the Department. Assessment of teaching will include course experience evaluations provided by students. In particular, questions 4 (instructor attitude), 8 (overall evaluation of the instructor) and 9 (overall evaluation of the course) will serve as a marker of satisfactory performance or concern. Context relevant to the interpretation of this evidence includes the course size, level, degree of technicality, status as required or optional, proportion of Religious Studies majors/honours among the students, and one's teaching load in that term. Large courses at the first or second year level that are required courses for students from other faculties may have a lower natural evaluation level, while small courses taught primarily to Religious Studies majors/honours students are expected to have higher course evaluations. Such differences will normally be factored into the evaluation of the scores. Other relevant evidence can include such factors as independent student complaints, and nominations for teaching excellence awards.

Contributions to teaching will also be based on:

1. Course Development or Revision
2. Innovations in course design and delivery
3. Course Content, Evaluation, and Delivery
4. Program-related Activities (such as offering workshops to all RS students)
5. Textbook production.
6. Teaching awards
7. Participation in teaching-related conferences
8. Supervision of undergraduate and Masters students (independent studies, etc.)

Teaching include lectures, seminars, and office consultation, undergraduate reading and independent study courses, and graduate and undergraduate supervision. Attention

should also be given to the ability and willingness of a faculty member to serve the general teaching needs of the Department by teaching outside their area of specialization, by preparing new courses, and by accepting responsibility for required courses, or by preparing courses through the Centre for Extended Learning.

### 3b. *Graduate teaching*

The clearest analogue of undergraduate teaching at the graduate level is the graduate seminar. Through some combination of lecturing and student participation, professors bring their students to the cutting edge of research in some sub-field, introducing students to the scholarship and methods that will enable them to contribute to academic Religious Studies as researchers. In large measure the Department's standards and expectations for the structure and orientation of such seminars can be gleaned by examining the range of seminars recently offered by other faculty members.

Course evaluations are normally conducted for graduate seminars. These evaluations normally will be substantially higher than average undergraduate evaluation scores, but they do provide an opportunity for information about problematic teaching, should it exist, to come to the fore. Hence they are worth administering at regular intervals for all faculty members (say, at least every second seminar), and every time for probationary faculty.

Much graduate teaching is in the form of individual work with Religious Studies graduate students: supervision of comprehensive exams and/or doctoral dissertations. Supervision in each of these domains is a matter of teaching, guiding the revision of work, monitoring students' progress, and providing timely feedback, each in a manner appropriate to the particular student. Faculty members have a part in seeing that students complete their work to an appropriate standard and on a reasonable schedule. The office of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs has outlined the [roles and responsibilities](#) of supervisors.

Strong graduate supervision requires sensitivity to students' needs. Some students may thrive on nearly independent work, but supervision includes more focused guidance for those students who require more intense and more regular interaction with faculty. Strong supervision is indicated by such outcomes as student work that gets published or given at refereed conferences, and by graduate placement in desirable jobs, while problematic supervision may be manifested as a student dissertation, area study, or coursework that requires departmental intervention or otherwise falls on some other faculty member to remedy. However, these outcomes can also reflect the abilities and efforts of the students themselves. Hence, regular Departmental discussions regarding graduate students, as well as direct feedback from supervisors in their annual reports, assist the Chair in recognizing when weaker students are getting strong supervision in spite of not necessarily producing the strongest work. Thus the aim of these remarks is not to dissuade faculty members from supervising any but the most talented graduate students, but rather to emphasize the need for good supervision of any student, and the goal of using all plausible metrics to measure the quality of supervision.

Delivering the components of a graduate degree to all the students, the Department admits, is a shared responsibility in Religious Studies. This shared responsibility exists even though some faculty members will have little directly



involvement with students as seminar instructor, member of thesis committee, or supervisor. Graduate teaching that overlaps with service and is essential to the smooth functioning of the Department includes serving as a reader or thesis committee member for graduate theses; arranging and conducting oral defenses of theses; professionally and academically advising students, including in one's role as *pro tem* supervisor; and preparing students for academic or professional job interviews.

#### 4. RESEARCH

The assessment of research quality and intensity is particularly open to case-specific considerations. Hence it is important to reemphasize both the default nature of these guidelines and the invitation for faculty members to bring forward and explain any evidence they consider relevant to their evaluation.

The standard measure of research activity is published or presented original research output in peer-reviewed outlets. But other measures are also relevant, including: evidence of research impact; research grants and research awards, especially Tri-Council awards; and leadership in conferences and academic institutes that advance research and promote the research reputation of the Department and the University.

##### 4a. *Research quality*

The following schema for the evaluation of research performance serves as a *prima facie* categorization of research venues. The relative rankings can be overridden on the basis of the properties of specific pieces of work. Faculty members can make a case for including non-traditional forms of research and research dissemination (documentary films, web sites, reports, etc.) as equivalent to publication in scholarly for a.

The categories have both fuzzy borders and a great deal of internal variety; one should expect overlapping categories and room for negotiation about things, such as, rankings among journals, presses, and conferences. Distinct sub-disciplines have different premier journals, and place varying emphases on the relative merits of books and articles in prestigious journals, so the assessment of research contributions should be relative to sub-disciplinary context. In general, however, evidence of serious review and low acceptance rates will be considered evidence of high quality. From most significant to least significant, the default categories of research significance are:

1. Books published in Religious Studies, with publishers having good academic reputations, and with evidence of meaningful peer review.
2. Research papers published in high quality peer-reviewed Religious Studies journals having low acceptance rates.
3. Edited volumes with good presses or respected contributors; invited chapters in edited collections that feature influential and respected authors or editors, published by reputable presses in Religious Studies; and textbooks, especially those with reputable presses, with evidence of novel contributions to the discipline.
4. Books with undistinguished presses, but with evidence of some non-trivial refereeing process.
5. Research papers in lesser-known journals having relatively high acceptance rates.
6. Invited major or keynote addresses to prestigious conferences.

7. Research papers presented in longer sessions at major international conferences with evidence of substantial peer review and prearranged commentary.
- 8.
8. Book reviews in top journals.
9. Poster presentations at major international conferences with evidence of substantial peer review.
10. Research papers in minor, unrefereed journals or proceedings.
11. Books on Religious Studies topics with presses that essentially facilitate self-publishing.
13. Book reviews in minor, unrefereed, or simply book-reviewing journals.

4b. *Research intensity*

In sketchiest general terms, a Category 1 book every five years, or one to three items annually in Categories 2 or 3, should be considered strong research output for Religious Studies faculty members, especially when supplemented with other output in further categories. However, a dearth of research output for a few years after hiring is not a good start, even if this results in a book eventually. Probationary faculty members should ensure the maintenance of quantifiable research output over the short term, even if longer-term and larger-scale research projects are also under way.

It is worth reemphasizing that appraisals should reflect the fact that performance as a researcher neither materializes nor disappears within a single evaluation period. Throughout one's career, research output can be "streaky," so in general a pattern of productivity is more important than one's output over any particular year. At the same time, in any given year (factoring out special circumstances) it is important to show signs of research activity at some levels on the above scale, preferably as part of a trend for work to move upwards on the above scale from year to year. For example, a conference paper has added significance when it occurs as part of a research career in which conference papers have frequently turned into journal articles.

Finally, lower categories on the above list have a fairly rapidly diminishing marginal utility; a few book reviews are part of a healthy research profile, but a multitude of book reviews on their own do not "make up for" a lack of peer-reviewed books and articles. Rather, this would be a sign of mistaken use of professional time and energy.

5. SERVICE

The University recognizes work of various kinds, at various administrative levels, to satisfy the Service element of a tenured or tenure-track appointment. Faculties and departments may emphasize more specific kinds of service, however. In a smaller department, such as Religious Studies, the fixed administrative load of a department (especially one with a PhD program) is less widely distributed on faculty members than in a large department. Since there is a substantial minimum amount of administration that must be done in order for the Department to sustain its various programs and to interact effectively with the University, any faculty member who performs little or no

departmental service thereby places a significant additional administrative burden on their colleagues to do it. In Religious Studies, therefore, while the appraisal of each faculty member's Service component recognizes wider institutional and disciplinary service, it emphasizes Departmental work in the first instance.

In the absence of competition among faculty members to hold committee and officer positions, these are typically distributed by nomination from the Chair or by active voluntarism from faculty members, followed by discussion and consensus among the Department, rather than by a wider nomination and voting process. It should be taken as a faculty member's duty to find ways of contributing service-wise to the Department – perhaps simply by indicating to the Chair a willingness to serve in particular roles. The Chair is responsible for assisting probationary faculty in finding appropriate service roles.

The positions of Department Chair, Associate Chair Graduate and Associate Chair Undergraduate, are the most substantial forms of departmental service. They are positions in which faculty members are effectively “on call” to deal with specific administrative issues at any time, and which require not only a major investment of time but also an element of leadership and assistance for other faculty members. The responsible performance of one of these positions is the most certain determinant of a high Service rating.

Other formalized positions in the Department of Religious Studies at the time of writing include: Events coordinator, Distance Education and Co-op Representative, Peace and Conflict Studies Representative, Library Representative, Scheduling Coordinators, OGS Selection Committee Representative, Faculty Association Representative(s), Student Society Liaison. Some of these positions may be particularly well-suited for junior faculty members, since they are both less time-intensive and presuppose somewhat less familiarity with the intricacies of the University. Yet it is to be expected that each of these positions involves periodic meetings, maintaining contact with designated extra-departmental staff or students, some organizational commitments, and a responsibility to keep the Department informed of relevant developments via written reports. From year to year their commitments can vary significantly; their contributions to one's Service rating vary accordingly.

Departmental affairs moreover require the existence of a range of committees. Some of these are standing committees, some are periodically and predictably reconstituted, and some are ad hoc committees intended to deal with specific issues. For example:

Standing committees of the Department include:

- Graduate Committee
- Curriculum Committee
- Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee
- RS Awards
- Publicity and Visibility

- Policy Committee

Recurring committees constituted as necessary:

Hiring Committee

Moreover, the Department requires the following offices to be filled:

- CEL and Co-op Representative
- RS Representative to Peace and Conflict Studies
- RS Representative to Faculty of Arts Computer Advisory Committee
- RS Representative to Arts Library Committee
- RS Representative to FAUW
- Student Society Liaison

Service in these committees too can be a substantial contribution, depending on the number of issues that fall to the committee in a given year.

Given that the Chair may be called upon to review department members employed by one of the Affiliated and Federated Institutions at Waterloo (AFIW), service to that particular institution shall be, for the purposes of that review, considered equal in value and weight as those contributions listed above.

There is also a more diffuse yet significant sense in which the Department of Religious Studies depends on faculty service. This can be considered Open-Door service: the contribution that faculty members make to the Department by being present during regular office hours; by being readily available for consultation with students and other faculty members; by their inclination to answer email and telephone messages promptly, and to complete administrative necessities (grades, letters of recommendation, etc.) in a timely fashion; and thereby to help evenly distribute the inevitable daily burdens of running a department. Absenteeism, a reduced departmental presence, or chronic tardiness or disorganization in the completion of administrative tasks, all lead to some burdens falling disproportionately upon those faculty who are in their offices, available, and responsive. They also create additional work for departmental administrators and support staff. Problematic performance in these aspects of Service is likely to be reflected in one's annual appraisal.

There are many opportunities for University-level service in various Faculty of Arts or University committees, on Senate, with the Faculty Association, or in conjunction with student organizations. These will have widely diverging levels of commitment, however, and the degree of these commitments is a factor in weighing the significance of the service. Membership on several quiescent University committees may not be evaluated as highly as membership on the Department's Hiring Committee during a hiring year.

Finally, the Department and the University also recognize and encourage service to the wider discipline, in the form of work such as journal, conference, and

manuscript refereeing; journal editing; board membership in academic societies; community outreach; and academic mentorship not amounting to teaching. This is valuable work indicating a well-rounded contribution to the academy, and reflecting the respect and recognition one has earned in the wider discipline. It should be so recognized in annual appraisals. (These may also be contributions that weigh especially heavily in later-career decisions about promotion to Full Professor rank.) Nevertheless, there is significance in the way that a faculty member's career as a successful contributor to the wider discipline asymmetrically depends upon having a functionally administered department. Service of these broader sorts should proceed in addition to or parallel with departmental service, over the longer run, and not as an alternative to it.

Reviewed in September 2020

**Accepted by Departmental vote: September 23, 2022**

## MEMORANDUM

To: Faculty – School of Accounting and Finance  
From: Blake Phillips – Director, School of Accounting and Finance  
Date: September 2022  
Subject: **Faculty Performance Review Process and Standards for 2022 and 2023**

---

### Table of Contents

#### ***GENERAL***

Performance Evaluation Review Committee  
Director's Responsibility  
Who is assessed?  
Three components of assessment.  
Recommendations to the Dean.  
Performance is Satisfactory  
Performance Needs Improvement  
Weightings  
Newly-Appointed Faculty  
Fraction Load or Leave of Absence  
Years Considered in the Evaluation  
Insufficient Documentation

#### ***RATING OF TEACHING***

Awards  
Conferences  
Contributions to the Teaching and Learning  
Community  
Course Design, Assessment and Delivery  
Course Development or Revision  
Course Surveys  
Supervision of Undergraduate and Masters  
Students  
Supervision of PhD Students  
Textbooks  
Additional Considerations

#### ***RATING OF SCHOLARSHIP***

Scholarship Directed at Academic Audiences  
Academic Publications  
Work in Progress  
Conference Presentations  
External Grants  
Awards and Other Indicators of Reputation  
Scholarship Primarily Directed at Business/  
Professional Audiences  
Additional Considerations  
Graduate (PhD) Supervision

#### ***RATING OF SERVICE***

Service within the School  
Service to the Faculty or the University  
Service to the Professions (CPA, CFA, etc.)  
Service to the Academic Community  
Editorial Boards  
Ad hoc Review and Conference Program  
Committees  
Awards  
Citizenship

#### ***SAF PERFORMANCE REVIEW WORKSHEET PERFORMANCE REVIEW FOR FACULTY ON PROBATIONARY TERM APPOINTMENTS FACULTY MEMBERS ON:***

Long Term Disability  
Paid Leave (including Sabbatical Leave)  
Pregnancy, Adoption or Parental Leave  
Sick Leave  
Unpaid Leave  
Administrative Duty

## Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee

To assist the Director with the annual faculty performance evaluations, two faculty members are elected on staggered terms to serve on this Committee. At least one member shall be a Member holding a probationary term or tenured appointment. All full-time faculty members (full, associate and assistant professors, continuing lecturers and lecturers) are eligible to serve. This committee will review all merit awards to ensure equity within a rank and within the School as a whole.

## Director's Responsibility

While the School does involve a committee in the performance evaluation exercise, it should be noted that the final responsibility for faculty performance assessment rests with the Director (see *Memorandum of Agreement* 13.5.6.).

## Who is assessed?

Performance reviews are required for all regular faculty (Lecturers to Professors on full-time or reduced load appointments) with appointments of one year or more. Performance ratings shall pertain to the portion of the evaluation year during which the faculty member was a paid employee of the University, including sabbatical leave, but excluding pregnancy, adoption or parental leave.

Policy 77 requires that annual performance reviews be included in School tenure and promotion considerations. Therefore, it is important that the Director provide a written assessment of each faculty member's performance. Recommendations for selective merit increases are based on overall performance.

## How often?

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 (see *Memorandum of Agreement* 13.5.2.).

## Three components of assessment

Performance is assessed in three areas using the general descriptions established in Policy 77:

- Teaching* – broadly defined including classroom instruction, individual program-related work with students, student supervision, instructional material development, etc.,
- Scholarship* – including intellectual advancement of a discipline, and
- Service* – leadership or support to the School, Faculty, University, profession, academic community, and other relevant communities.

## Recommendations to the Dean

The Director's recommendation to the Dean must indicate a level of performance in each area and must provide evidence supporting this assessment.

Unsatisfactory	0.0	
Needs Major Improvement	0.25	
Needs Significant Improvement	0.5	
Needs Some Improvement	0.75	
Satisfactory	1.0	The minimum level of acceptable performance. A consistent pattern of satisfactory rankings for any member would be cause for concern, particularly in light of requirements for

reappointment, tenure, and promotion as outlined in Policy 76- Faculty Appointments and Policy 77- Tenure and Promotion

Good	1.25	To be considered Good (1.25), positive evidence must be presented in the areas of activity.
Very Good	1.5	To be considered Very Good (1.5), strong positive evidence must be presented, in the areas of activity.
Excellent	1.75	To be considered Excellent (1.75), very strong positive evidence must be presented, in the areas of activity.
Outstanding	2.0	To be considered Outstanding (2.00), compelling evidence of exceptionally strong performance must be presented in the areas of activity.

### **Performance is Satisfactory**

If overall performance is rated as satisfactory, the expectation is that performance is satisfactory in each of the three areas of assessment.

This principle is most importantly illustrated in relation to teaching and scholarship. A regular faculty appointment carries two major commitments: the communication of the knowledge and nature of one's discipline via teaching, and the advancement of the state of one's discipline via scholarship. The joint importance of these commitments is underlined in Policy 76 which states:

“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. During a term for which formal teaching duties are not assigned, faculty members are expected to increase their scholarly activity.”

This is further acknowledged by the heavy investment of time and energy most faculty devote to their work as both teachers of their discipline and active contributors to it.

It follows that, unless a faculty member's position has been formally changed to involve a different set of duties, satisfactory performance in both teaching and scholarship is expected if the faculty member's overall contribution is to be seen as a satisfactory one. Good performance in one area cannot, normally, compensate for needing improvement in the other because only part of the job has been performed in a satisfactory manner.

### **Performance Needs (Major, Significant or Some) Improvement**

If performance in a particular area is seen as needing improvement, it is essential that the nature of the problem be communicated to the faculty member. The kind of improvement needed should be discussed, help provided when appropriate and an opportunity given to remedy the problem. This can be one of the most valuable functions of the annual review procedure. If, after a reasonable period of time, a “needs improvement” continues, serious consideration must be given to the appropriateness of continuing the appointment in its present form. This is particularly important if the area needing improvement is that of teaching or scholarship.



## **Weightings**

The weight for each area shall be as specified in the member's letter of appointment. In the absence of specified weights, the normal weights, for tenured or tenure-track positions are 40 percent for teaching, 40 percent for scholarship, and 20 percent for service. For lecturers and continuing lecturers the normal weights are 60 percent for teaching and 40 percent for service.

Weightings and duties may be adjusted in a formal agreement between the faculty member and the Director with the approval of the Dean. Normally, the weights shall be at least 20 percent in teaching and scholarship for tenured faculty.

When a faculty member takes on a significant administrative role they can have a temporary adjustment of their weightings for purposes of merit evaluation. This adjustment involves a change in expectation for quantity of work in each area but not for quality.

## **Newly-Appointed Faculty**

For their first evaluation year, newly-appointed faculty will be assigned a score based on actual performance or, when too little information is available, assigned a score equal to the departmental average for their rank.

## **Fraction Load or Leave of Absence**

For faculty on fraction load or a leave of absence the expectations for quality remain the same while expectations for quantity change.

## **Years Considered in the Evaluation**

Scholarship will be evaluated on the basis of work done in the two most recent years. Teaching and service will be evaluated on the basis of work done in the one year or two years for which the evaluation is being provided. For probationary term appointments, cumulative work will also be considered.

## **Insufficient Documentation**

It is essential that the faculty member provide sufficient information during the review process to allow an informed judgement in each area. A faculty member who does not submit the required documentation by the specified deadline normally will receive an overall rating of at most 0.5.

## ***RATING OF TEACHING***

The Director uses outcomes from the breadth of categories outlined below to evaluate teaching and learning.

### **Awards**

Teaching awards at UW or elsewhere will be considered.

### **Conferences**

Participating in conferences related to teaching will be considered.

### **Contributions to the Teaching and Learning Community**

Faculty may choose to contribute to the teaching community. Contributions may occur through a wide variety of initiatives beyond course design and delivery that are considered in this assessment. Examples include, but are not limited to, contributing to the development of problem-based learning within SAF, designing international learning opportunities, assuming community leadership roles such as course coordinator, facilitating competitions or clubs that have a significant learning element, and developing and/or delivering non-class learning opportunities that are outside the standard curriculum.

### **Course Design, Assessment, and Delivery**

An analysis of course outlines, reading lists, assessment methods, the nature and extent of student participation and engagement, and the connections shown between course and program outcomes can be helpful in the assessment of the quality of course teaching and student learning.

### **Course Development or Revision**

The amount of work involved in the development or revision of course materials will be considered. Innovations in course design and delivery will be considered.

### **Course Surveys**

Student surveys may be a valuable source of information relative to the students' experience in each course taught, but on their own are not necessarily predictive of student learning or the faculty member's teaching effectiveness. An April 2017 University task force report acknowledged there is evidence that student surveys can introduce elements of bias that may be unfair to the instructor.

All questions will be considered. When interpreting the results of the surveys, it is important to consider issues that may influence student responses. Examples of factors that may be considered are:

Number of courses taught

Number of sections taught

Number of students taught

Number of terms taught

Student response rate on course evaluations

### **Supervision of Undergraduate and Masters Students**

Supervision of undergraduate or master's program students will be recognized in the teaching rating in the year the activity is completed.

## **Supervision of PhD Students**

Supervision of a PhD student prior to the dissertation stage and involvement on their dissertation committee will be recognized in the teaching rating in the year the activity occurs with the student.

## **Textbooks**

Being the author or co-author of a textbook used at the university level will be considered. The author should provide evidence that the textbook has been adopted for use at other universities. Normally, revised editions will receive less credit than first editions, solo-authored textbooks will be viewed more positively than multi-authored textbooks and Canadianization of foreign texts will not be given as much weight as new texts. However, we will look for evidence of contribution to the text and its success.

## **Additional Considerations**

Teaching is broadly defined to include interacting with students through lectures, seminars and other types of scheduled time to support student learning (i.e., office hours), as well as undergraduate reading and independent study courses.

Attention should also be given to the ability and willingness of a faculty member to serve the general teaching needs of the School by teaching outside her/his preferred area of interest, by preparing new courses, and by accepting responsibility for required courses either on campus or through Distance Education.

The general needs are also served by a willingness to incorporate in a course, where applicable, elements of the School's learning model, content elements necessary to the program, and to work with colleagues to integrate the course into the overall program.

Material such as peer reviews and critiques by faculty colleagues and by students, alumni and TAs will be considered.

Activities, such as training students for case competitions, will be considered

## **Note:**

The assessment also considers extenuating circumstances in the evaluation of teaching. Examples of extenuating circumstances could include:

1. Taking an unpopular stand on an academic integrity issue.
2. Attempted something new that was significant in terms of value to the course, but was not well received by students.

## ***RATING OF SCHOLARSHIP***

### **Scholarship Primarily Directed at Academic Audiences**

#### ***Academic Publications***

Papers will be recognized in the year they are accepted for publication.

The merit associated with a publication is based on its contribution to its field and the associated contribution to the faculty member's reputation within the academic community. To aid the faculty member and the Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee in assessing quality, the faculty member is encouraged to provide evidence of the publication's contribution. To aid in this process, faculty members can identify the following features.

#### ***Journal Quality***

It is common in business disciplines to use the quality of a journal as a proxy for the quality of papers published in it. The University Policy 77, Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members, states the following, "Although the University looks for evidence of active continuing scholarship, the volume of scholarly output is less important than its quality, originality and impact." In line with this policy, quality of publications is weighted more heavily than quantity.

Faculty can make reference to the most appropriate journal quality assessments (for the paper's topic and method) to support the expected impact of the research. Examples of well-established lists include the *Financial Times* 50 ([www.ft.com](http://www.ft.com)) and Canadian Consortium List of Top Management Journals. Beyond these lists, numerous published papers assess the quality of journals within specific fields or more broadly. Reference to these sources will aid the assessment of a particular publication.

#### ***Additional considerations***

Solo-authored papers will be viewed more positively than multi-authored papers.

Citation counts are a common method of assessing the impact of particular papers. As evidence of overall scholarly reputation, recent citation counts from, for example, Google Scholar or Scopus, can be considered.

Care will be taken not to give credit for a publication more than once.

#### ***Work in Progress***

The quantity of work submitted to journals and other work still in progress will be considered.

#### ***Conference Presentations***

Presentations at relevant conferences will be considered.

#### ***External Grants***

The receipt of external grants is a positive indication of quality scholarship.

#### **Awards and Other Indicators of Reputation and Impact**

Awards from academic bodies recognizing scholarship will be considered.

Other broader measures of the faculty members' scholarly reputation and impact will also be considered. For example, journal editorial responsibilities, invitation to give academic presentations, SSRN download activity signal the degree to which the faculty member has achieved scholarly reputation and the member's research is having an impact.

## **Scholarship Primarily Directed at Business/Professional Audiences**

For faculty members who are tenured, or who have definite-term lecturer or continuing lecturer appointments, scholarship directed at business and professional audiences will also be considered.

The assessment of such scholarship will be assessed based on its demonstrated impact or reputation within the business community. Examples include publication of scholarly work within media outlets and publications with strong circulation in the intended audience, presentation at conferences and events, downloads of web-based materials, or other measures of impact.

## **Additional Considerations**

If the faculty member agrees to a reweighting from scholarship to teaching and/or service then this will result in increased teaching and/or service responsibilities. Expectations of scholarly output will be reduced concurrently with the change in weighting.

If a faculty member's scholarship weighting is 20%, then publishing advances in teaching materials (textbooks) or pedagogy may be considered for scholarship as long as it is not also considered under teaching.

To be equitable, faculty members with teaching load reductions due to scholarship outcomes/reputation will be expected to have a higher level of scholarship activity than others of the same rank in order to receive an equivalent evaluation. However, consideration will be given to the number of teaching preparations and the number of terms taught in the year.

***Scholarship is broadly defined*** to include papers in refereed journals, published monographs, books, articles in professional publications, papers in conference proceedings, and intellectual works published in other forms. For further guidance please refer to Policy 77.

## **Graduate (PhD) Supervision (Either teaching or scholarship)**

Since it can be argued that supervision of a PhD student could be evaluated in either teaching or scholarship, faculty will be given the option of choosing the category under which they want to have it evaluated. This choice between teaching and scholarship will be made the first time they want to receive credit for supervising a PhD student. This choice will remain in effect until the faculty member requests a change; the requested change is subject to the approval of the Director. This choice is meant to be a long-term decision.

Supervision, at the dissertation stage of a PhD student, will be recognized in the rating in the year the student successfully defends his/her dissertation and the following year. If two faculty members jointly supervise a student then they would each get recognition in the year the thesis is successfully defended but not in the following year. The quality of supervision can often be assessed by reports of external thesis examiners, feedback from the graduated candidate, and by the impact of the thesis itself (i.e., did it receive an external award, etc.). Participation as a member of the student's dissertation committee is considered in teaching, as stated above.

## ***RATING OF SERVICE***

Service is a very important part of our role as a faculty member and it is highly valued. The Director attempts to evaluate both the quality and quantity of the service performed.

Service is an important component of a faculty member's duties and should be properly encouraged and recognized. Since service is expected, lack of service requires an explanation.

A "good citizenship" factor recognizes faculty for activities such as mentoring new faculty and being available in the School to colleagues and to students.

Extra-University activity should be reported to the Director on a yearly basis. Care should be taken that such activity, particularly compensated activities, does not interfere with the proper discharge of primary University duties. Faculty members should be made aware of University policies on Extra-University Activity (Policy #49) and Conflict of Interest (Policy #69). Contract scholarship should be discussed with the Office of Research.

### **Service within the School**

Internal service is an essential duty for faculty.

### **Service to the Faculty or the University**

Service to the Faculty of Arts or the University of Waterloo will be considered.

### **Service to the Professions (CPA, CFA, etc.)**

Service on professional bodies or committees will be considered.

### **Service to the Academic Community**

Service on academic bodies or committees will be considered.

### **Editorial Boards**

Being on an editorial board will be considered as service with more value placed on the more senior roles and higher-tier publications.

### **Ad-hoc Review and Conference Program Committees**

Being an ad-hoc reviewer will be considered as service with more value placed on reviews for higher-tier publications. The number of articles reviewed will be considered. Participation in academic or practitioner conference program committees will be considered as service.

### **Awards**

Service awards from academic or professional bodies will be considered.

### **Citizenship**

"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. It is understood that internal service to the university, the Faculty and to the department is an essential duty of faculty members.

## SAF PERFORMANCE REVIEW WORKSHEET – 2017/2018

Name:

<b>Teaching</b>	#	#	#	(Weighting %)	Unsatisfactory	0.00
Course(s)				(Load )	Needs major imp	0.25
# of students:					Needs significant imp	0.50
# of sections:					Needs some imp	0.75
Awards and conferences					Satisfactory	1.00
Teaching community					Good	1.25
Design and delivery					Very Good	1.50
Student surveys					Excellent	1.75
Supervision and other					Outstanding	2.00
					2020	
					2019 (if applicable)	
					2018	
<b>Scholarship</b>				(Weighting %)	Unsatisfactory	0.00
Academic Publications					Needs major imp	0.25
WIP and presentations					Needs significant imp	0.50
Grants and awards					Needs some imp	0.75
Measures of impact – citation counts					Satisfactory	1.00
– other					Good	1.25
Business/professional-facing scholarship					Very Good	1.50
PhD Thesis supervision (elected Teaching or Research)					Excellent	1.75
					Outstanding	2.00
					2020	
					2019 (if applicable)	
					2018	
<b>Service</b>				(Weighting %)	Unsatisfactory	0.00
SAF					Needs major imp	0.25
Arts/UW					Needs significant imp	0.50
Professional					Needs some imp	0.75
Academic					Satisfactory	1.00
Citizenship					Good	1.25
					Very Good	1.50
					Excellent	1.75
					Outstanding	2.00
					2020	
					2019 (if applicable)	
					2018	

## **PERFORMANCE REVIEW FOR FACULTY ON PROBATIONARY TERM APPOINTMENTS**

Performance reviews of probationary faculty must consider performance in the past year AND the total record to date. Assessment of the total record is important to provide an annual assessment of progress toward tenure. Where appropriate, separate assessments should be given for each component (e.g., while performance for the past year was satisfactory, the total record is a cause for concern because...). Where concern exists, this should be conveyed to the individual in as specific a form as possible and every effort should be made to assist the faculty member to identify and rectify the problem. An indication should be given of the likelihood of the individual being granted tenure if he/she continues to perform at the present level. While not required by policy, it is useful for the Director to share any such concerns with the School's Tenure and Promotion Committee (SAFTPC) and seek its advice on wording.

Policy 77 states that "annual performance reviews form part of the evidence in tenure considerations". The University Tenure Appeals Committee (UTAC) has stated that:

*It is understood that the objective of performance reviews is to be helpful and encouraging, and give an accurate account of the positive and negative aspects of the faculty member's work. Reservations, if any, must be clearly expressed, and there should be no ambiguity between what is said and what is written. A major purpose is to give the faculty member means to do a better job. The review should also remind the candidate that the tenure process will include outside assessment in the form of reports from external referees. (Report to Senate, October 21, 1996)*

If the SAFTPC expressed concern at the time of renewal of the probationary contract, the results of each subsequent annual performance assessment should be reviewed by that Committee.

### **FACULTY MEMBERS ON:**

#### **Long Term Disability**

A faculty member on long term disability does not get a performance rating. The salary of a faculty member on long term disability is paid, and adjusted to include any scale increases, under the LTD plan.

#### **Paid Leave (including Sabbatical Leave)**

A faculty member on paid leave shall be evaluated on the portion of the evaluation year during which the faculty member was a paid employee of the University. It may not be possible to assess performance in all three categories during the evaluation period. In such cases, a faculty member normally will receive the average of the previous ratings, up to four years, in any category where assessment is not possible.

#### **Pregnancy, Adoption or Parental Leave**

For faculty members on approved pregnancy, adoption or parental leave, assessment is in a similar manner to paid leave.

#### **Sick Leave**

A faculty member on sick leave receives a performance rating. If information to evaluate the faculty member's performance is not available owing to the illness, the assessment follows that for paid leave.

#### **Unpaid Leave**

For faculty members on unpaid leave, the full scale increase shall apply, but the merit increase will be prorated by the fraction of the year served at the University.

#### **Administrative Duty**

In the case where a faculty member serves as Director of a department for part of a year, the Dean will provide a service rating to the School for that fraction of the year.



# Performance Appraisal in Anthropology

## The Annual Performance Appraisal Process

This document is intended to complement but not supersede the “*Faculty of Arts Guidelines for the Annual Performance Review for Faculty*” in order to outline aspects of the performance evaluation procedure specific to the Anthropology Department.

### How the appraisal is conducted

The Anthropology Department will vote every November to decide whether performance evaluations will be conducted by the chair alone or by a committee of department members.

### How the results of the appraisal are calculated and communicated

As outlined in UW policy, each faculty member’s appraisal will be in the form of a single score out of 2.0, calculated by combining separate Teaching, Research and Service scores, each also out of 2.0, according to the relative weighting of each of those factors for that faculty member’s appointment (typically  $0.4 \times \text{Teaching} + 0.4 \times \text{Research} + 0.2 \times \text{Service}$ ). In any of the categories, the contribution must be truly outstanding to receive a score of 2.0, either in terms of its impact or amount of effort required, or it must mark an extremely high level of accomplishment, or it must demonstrate activity much beyond the departmental norm. The expectation for each faculty member is that they will perform well in each of the three categories.

### Information to be submitted by the faculty member

Faculty members are required to provide documentation that both summarizes and provides evidence for all of the activity/achievement being claimed. The summary is normally done using the Faculty of Arts Activity Report form. It is recommended that all course evaluations, offprints of articles, letters of commendation etc. also be submitted with the Activity Report.

## Teaching

The standard teaching load in the Department of Anthropology is  $2+2=4$  courses per year. Due to the exigencies of fieldwork, many regular faculty members normally teach courses only in the Fall and Winter terms. Some of the courses that we offer in our Masters program are designed to allow the participation of other faculty members, in addition to the person formally responsible for the course, so those other faculty members’ teaching activities are also expected to include participation in those courses. In addition to courses, faculty members are expected to make themselves available to supervise honours students’ Honours Essays research (ANTH 499A and B) and to supervise masters students.

## Appraisal of Teaching

### Course Evaluations/Course Perception Surveys

Assessment of teaching will be informed by student input using data from these tools. Other relevant factors that will be considered include:

- Number of unique courses taught
- Number of sections taught
- Number of students taught

### **Course Development or Revision**

The amount of work involved in the development or revision of course materials will be taken into consideration, as will qualitative measures such as the degree of innovation involved in the course materials.

### **Program-related Activities**

Recognition will also be given for leading or being involved with program-related activities which take place outside the classroom.

### **Awards**

Teaching awards will be considered.

### **Supervision of Honours and Masters Students**

Supervision of honours or masters students will be recognized in the teaching rating in the year the activity is completed, as will participation in masters students' supervisory committees within and outside the department, and participation in the supervisory committees of Ph.D students.

## **Research**

### **Appraisal of Research**

Both qualitative and quantitative factors will be taken into account when evaluating a department member's research. Qualitative factors will include such things as the review process of the publication/press; the demonstrated impact of the member's work (e.g., reviews); invited or refereed conference presentations; awards. Quantitative information may include such things as number of books, chapters, articles, presentations, book reviews, reference articles, public press articles; number of edited volumes or special journal issues; number of presentations, workshops; research grants.

### **Types of Research Output**

#### **Publications**

- Both sole-authored and multi-authored publications are valued. However, in the case of multi-authored publications the faculty member should specify their contribution (i.e., as a percentage, or by indicating which part of the work they produced)
- Publications in refereed journals will normally be evaluated more positively than publications in edited volumes.
- In general, publications in major international journals will be evaluated more positively than publications in regional journals. However, because many of the journals anthropologists publish in are targeted to specific audiences (e.g., specialists in topical or geographic areas) a publication in a regional or area studies journal, for example, cannot automatically be assumed to be less significant than one in a journal with a larger or more general readership. It may therefore be helpful to the assessment process for

the faculty member to provide a justification of their choice of journal, discussing factors such as readership, impact, etc.

- Published work that straddles the assessment period (e.g., the date of acceptance falls into one period but the date of publication falls into the next) should be noted and can count towards both assessment periods, but care will be taken not to give credit for a publication more than once.
- A description of work in progress is required for non-tenured members; tenured members may provide information on work in progress if they wish in order to demonstrate the ongoing nature of their activities or to provide context for future achievements.

### **Research Reports**

- Some kinds of anthropological research (e.g., archaeological excavations) carry the legal requirement to produce exhaustive descriptive reports as a condition of being permitted to do the research. These reports, while not refereed, often do undergo a review process and may be considered as legitimate research products when accompanied by appropriate documentation of the review or dissemination process.

### **Conference Presentations**

- Presentations at relevant conferences will be considered.

### **External Grants**

- The receipt of external grants and contracts is a positive indication of quality scholarship, especially with evidence of rigorous peer review.

### **Awards**

- Awards from academic bodies recognizing scholarship will be considered.

### **Impact**

- Credit will be given for work that has an impact but is not published in any of the outlets discussed above. The onus is on the faculty member to provide evidence of its quality, impact and relevance.

## **Service**

Service is required of all Anthropology faculty members. The following are broad categories of activities that fall under the heading of service:

- Service on university/faculty/department committees; performing officer duties in the department; other contributions to the life of the department, faculty, or university; outreach work connecting the university to the community at large.
- Service to the discipline, such as service with associations; journal editorial work; conference organization; participation in organizations that contribute to the functioning of the discipline; other contributions.

### **Appraisal of Service**

Service will be assessed quantitatively based on the amount of effort, time, and impact of the activity. Service will be assessed qualitatively based on the following questions:

- Does the service being performed demonstrate leadership or place holding (e.g., sitting on a committee that meets once a year or does little)?
- Does the service being performed demonstrate a commitment to the work of the department/faculty/university/discipline?

# The Achievement of Tenure in the Anthropology Department

The achievement of tenure at the University of Waterloo is governed by *Policy 77: Tenure and Promotion*. Among other things, Policy 77 notes: “*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.*” The information provided here is designed to summarize considerations that are specific to the discipline of Anthropology and to the University of Waterloo’s Anthropology department.

## Scholarship

By the time they come up for tenure, it is expected that a candidate’s program of research should be demonstrating significant development beyond the specific topical or methodological focus of their doctoral research. Both sole-authored and co-authored publications are valued within the discipline of Anthropology. In the subdisciplines of Anthropology the publication of a monograph is not an expectation for achieving tenure—publication in peer-reviewed journals or in edited volumes is more common. Conference presentations are valued but there is the expectation that research presented at a conference will eventually be disseminated via a publication. The dissemination of research via innovative means and beyond the academe is encouraged and will be taken into account if well documented.

There are some distinctive characteristics of certain kinds of anthropological research that may have a bearing on the timing, but not the quality, of research output that is expected from tenure-track/tenured faculty:

- Anthropological research frequently involves the collection of data through fieldwork undertaken in relatively remote locations within Canada or elsewhere around the world. Such fieldwork generally requires government authorization and ethics approval. In cross-cultural situations such authorization and ethics approval can be slow or difficult to obtain, and conducting such fieldwork is largely restricted to non-teaching terms or sabbatical leaves.
- Some kinds of anthropological research projects, such as archaeological excavations and ethnographic research, regularly take several years to complete the data collection necessary for synthesis and interpretation in publication.

- Some kinds of anthropological research are by their nature collaborative and involve the participation of a wide array of specialist scholars and technicians. An archeological dig, for example, may require the expertise of a biological anthropologist, a geologist, etc. Publication of research findings is regularly contingent on all members of the team completing their analysis. As outlined in the previous bullet, there may be an impact on the timing of publication(s).

## **Teaching**

The Anthropology department has a standard teaching load of four courses per year; evidence of effective teaching is required. Candidates for tenure and promotion may choose to document their teaching activities via a teaching dossier. The use of novel teaching methods and techniques, and participation in professional teaching and pedagogical development, will be taken into account.

## **Service**

Department service is required from all members, including probationary faculty. Nevertheless, the Department's practice is not to have untenured faculty hold major service positions, such as Associate Chair.

## Classical Studies – Discipline Standards for Faculty Performance Reviews 2020

### Overview

This document provides guidelines for the regular evaluation process and the performance expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service for faculty members within the Classical Studies Department at the University of Waterloo. These guidelines are supplemental to, and consistent with the member evaluation procedures outlined in the Memorandum of Agreement Article 13 between UW and FAUW and with Faculty of Arts guidelines for these issues.

These guidelines have been approved by the Department of Classical Studies (24 November 2020) and by the Dean of Arts (24 November 2020). Any changes to these guidelines will require ratification by the Department and further review by the Dean.

### The Annual Performance Review

Faculty members at the University of Waterloo fulfill their job descriptions by doing some combination of teaching, research, and service. The regular performance review is done so as to evaluate how well one is performing in each of these areas. It also provides an opportunity for ongoing feedback on a faculty member's performance, and provides critical information to probationary faculty preparing for a tenure review, as well as to Tenure and Promotion committees at various stages in each faculty member's career. Note: tenured faculty and continuing lecturers are evaluated biennially, in odd-numbered years, on the basis of the previous two years; probationary faculty and definite-term lecturers are evaluated annually.

Policy 77 states:

*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.*

The Performance Review issues a score out of 2, compounded out of scores out of 2 on each of the three listed job components, typically according to the formula:  $(0.4 \times \text{Teaching}) + (0.4 \times \text{Research}) + (0.2 \times \text{Service})$ . The points on the rating scale and their associated descriptors are:

0.00	Unsatisfactory
0.25	Needs Major Improvement
0.50	Needs Significant Improvement
0.75	Needs Some Improvement
1.00	Satisfactory
1.25	Good
1.50	Very Good
1.75	Excellent
2.00 <sup>1</sup>	Outstanding

The Department will vote every November as to how performance evaluations will be conducted

---

<sup>1</sup> In any of the categories, to receive a score of 2.0 the contribution must be truly outstanding, marking an extremely high level of accomplishment and/or demonstrating ability much beyond the departmental norm.

(either by the Chair alone or with the assistance of a committee of Department members, as specified in the Memorandum of Agreement Article 13).

Faculty (including untenured faculty, tenured faculty and continuing lecturers) should submit a completed Activity Report for the review period in question to the Chair normally by the end of the second week of January. While it was once the practice in this Department to submit student comments from the student perception surveys to the chair, instructors will no longer do so insofar as the APR process is concerned. The APR process will consider the survey's numerical scores and evaluate these in the context of other measures of teaching performance. Faculty should in addition submit course outlines and other course materials, article offprints, conference programs, editors' letters, copies of work in progress, and whatever else may be suggested in the Faculty of Arts APR template. If faculty members wish, they may also submit a memo that fleshes out the information in the Activity Report, or may simply use the Activity Report itself for such purposes. Faculty members are encouraged to take seriously the sections of this form that also solicit any further information they think relevant to their performance over the period. They should feel free to include and explain the widest selection of data they want the Chair to review, and to present fully but concisely their own strongest case.

On the basis of this information the Chair recommends numerical ratings for each faculty member, which are then discussed with the Dean of Arts and possibly revised in order to achieve fairness and consistency across the Faculty. The overall score for each faculty member is then used as a multiplier on the Faculty of Arts basic selective increment, and also serves as a snapshot of one's general performance in the period evaluated.

The expectation for each faculty member is that they will maintain high standards in the categories below.

## **Appraisal Categories**

### **Teaching**

High-quality teaching is an important goal for the Department of Classical Studies. In evaluating any faculty member, junior or senior, the Department follows the guidelines expressed in Policy 77:

*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.*

The following types of information will be taken into account when evaluating a department member's teaching:

- Quantitative information, including number of courses taught, number of students taught, retention rates, new course developments, the development of significant pedagogical materials, and the numerical scores of student perception surveys. As noted above, while the numerical scores of student perception surveys will be taken into account, these alone are an insufficient measure of teaching quality. They will be evaluated in the context of other measures of teaching performance.

- Qualitative information, such as: participation in professional development workshops relevant to pedagogy; degree of innovation or inventive teaching practices; course observations by peers; extra-curricular involvement in student success; awards and nominations for awards.
- Graduate student supervision will be evaluated as part of teaching, taking into account the number of students supervised, evidence of progress towards fulfilling degree requirements and professional development, and their successful degree completion. Extra-curricular faculty efforts to support graduate student success in research and pedagogy will also be taken into account.

## **Research**

It is expected that all faculty members will provide evidence of consistent commitment to research. Publications are particularly important evidence in the determination of scholarly performance. For the purposes of the review process, some kinds of publications are normally considered more significant than others. The intensity (quantity) of the research is also important but does not determine the satisfactory performance of the candidate in this area. Evidence of scholarly activity includes, but is not limited to, the following (in no particular order):

- Books published with publishers having a good academic reputation and with evidence of meaningful peer review
- Edited volumes with good presses or respected contributors; invited chapters in edited collections that feature influential and respected authors or editors, published by reputable presses
- Research papers published in high quality peer-reviewed journals
- Refereed conference proceedings
- Invited major or keynote addresses at prestigious conferences
- Book reviews
- Papers presented at major national and international conferences
- Other modes and/or venues of research dissemination as appropriate

The key measure of research activity is published or presented original research output. But other measures are also relevant, including: evidence of research impact; winning research grants and research awards; and organizing conferences that advance research and promote the research reputation of the individual and the Department.

The following factors will also be taken into account when evaluating a department member's research:

- Published work that straddles the assessment period (e.g. date of acceptance/date of publication) should be noted, and it can count towards both assessment periods, but will not be given equal weight in both.
- Work in progress is required for non-tenured members; tenured members may provide information on work in progress if they wish in order to demonstrate the ongoing nature of their activities or to provide context for future achievements.

## **Service**

Service is an essential part of our role as faculty members and it is highly valued. For tenured faculty, service is evaluated on the basis of work done since the previous evaluation. In keeping with the norms of the Faculty of Arts, the Department recognizes different kinds of service. Service can be performed within the Department, the Faculty, and the University as a whole; it can also include service to the discipline, to the profession, and to the community at large (faculty members are expected to make



service contributions within the University; service outside the University is optional but desirable). For Classical Studies, significant involvement in the Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies and its initiatives may count as service both to the discipline and to the Department/Faculty/University. Since service is expected, lack of service requires an explanation.

Policy 77 states:

*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.*

In determining and evaluating service criteria in Tenure and Promotion decisions, Policy 77 also notes:

*Candidates for tenure or promotion shall provide information on their service activities in sufficient detail to allow the DTTC to assess its quantity and quality. Where necessary, the DTTC should obtain statements from those who have personally observed the candidate's service contributions both internal and external to the University. Some service activities, such as chairing a curriculum committee or editing a professional society journal, may also provide indirect evidence for scholarship and teaching.*

Generally speaking, the assessment of service takes into consideration the following:

- Does the service being performed demonstrate leadership or place holding (e.g. sitting on a committee that meets once a year or does little)?
- Does the service being performed demonstrate a commitment to the work of the department/faculty/university/discipline?

In a memo from the Provost dated Nov. 22, 2010, it was announced that at the Faculty Relations Committee the University and the Faculty Association had issued the following clarification: *“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.*

Further to this, the Department of Classical Studies recognizes the following examples of what constitutes good “Citizenship” in the department (this list is not intended to be exhaustive or exclusive, nor is it in any particular order):

- Being available in the Department. A fair amount of informal business is conducted just through casual conversation around the Department. Questions come up, visitors stop by, and numerous other opportunities (and yes, time-consuming challenges) arise in unpredictable ways. Obviously, we cannot do any planning to cover this kind of activity. But by everyone being available at least some of the time, it does mean that it does not consistently fall on the shoulders of the same person(s) all the time. Availability also demonstrates a commitment to colleagues and to the Department, and a willingness to be engaged in the overall mission of our unit.
- Being available to students. The same points could be made as under the previous bullet.
- Attendance at student events, such as convocation and workshops.

- Regular attendance at and active engagement in committee meetings and other functions that fall within the mandate of our service obligations (for the Chair, e.g., General Group). Our role is not simply to be on the lookout for things concerning Classics – we are also citizens of the Faculty and of the University.
- Being mindful of the distinction between a research term and actual vacation time. Service obligations do not stop during a research term, and if 20% of our work is supposed to be service, that could theoretically equate to faculty members being at the University at least one day a week through the research term.

**Department of Communication Arts - Addendum to Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines**  
**(For approval - 2020)**

This document provides guidelines for the performance review process, and the expectations for teaching, research, and service for regular faculty members in the Department of Communication Arts at the University of Waterloo. These guidelines are supplemental to, and consistent with the member evaluation procedures outlined in Article 13 of the [Memorandum of Agreement between UW and FAUW](#); with Policy 77 on [Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members](#); and with [Faculty of Arts Guidelines](#), including Service Standards. They are intended to assist regular faculty members in completing the Department of Communication Arts Activity Report Template.

These Guidelines have been approved by the Department of Communication Arts and by the Dean of Arts. Any substantial changes to these Guidelines will require ratification by the Department and further review by the Dean.

**The Performance Review Process**

Faculty members at the University of Waterloo fulfill their job descriptions by doing some combination of teaching, scholarship, and service. Individual faculty members' contractual obligations related to teaching, research, and service vary according to type of appointment and, in some cases, individual circumstances.

The performance review is an opportunity for ongoing feedback on a faculty member's performance in all three areas, and provides critical information to probationary faculty preparing for tenure review, as well as to Tenure and Promotion Committees at various stages in each faculty member's career. Ratings also help determine annual salary increases, as explained in Article 13 of the Memorandum of Agreement between UW and FAUW.

The Annual Performance Review issues a score out of 2, compounded out of scores out of 2 on each of the three listed job components. The points on the rating scale and their associated descriptors are defined in in Article 13 of the Memorandum of Agreement between UW and FAUW as follows:

- 0.00 Unsatisfactory
- 0.25 Needs Major Improvement
- 0.50 Needs Significant Improvement
- 0.75 Needs Some Improvement
- 1.00 Satisfactory
- 1.25 Good
- 1.50 Very Good
- 1.75 Excellent
- 2.00 Outstanding

Each December the Department of Communication Arts will elect an APR advisory committee to assist the Chair in determining ratings for faculty members. That committee should consist of at least four faculty members: the Chair, two tenured members of the department, and at least one ad hoc member (i.e. a probationary term faculty member, a definite term lecturer, or a continuing lecturer). At least

two of the members of the committee should not have served the previous year. The committee should include equal gender representation. Each member must complete equity training prior to serving on the committee (e.g. "Equity 101: <https://uwaterloo.ca/human-rights-equity-inclusion/>).

Each year, all probationary tenure line faculty and all definite term lecturers will submit an activity report (following the Department of Communication Arts Activity Report Template) to the Chair in early January. Every other year (in odd numbered years: 2019, 2021, 2023 . . . ) all tenured faculty and all continuing lecturers will submit an activity report (following the department template) to the Chair in early January. The APR advisory committee will review these reports in January to help the Chair determine what ratings should be suggested to the Dean, by using the criteria articulated below. Following consultation with the Dean, the Chair will inform each faculty member of their rating by letter, normally in early March.

### **Department of Communication Arts Rubric for Scores in Teaching, Research, and Service**

The Department of Communication Arts has devised the following rubric for use by both individual faculty members in the preparation of Department of Communication Arts Activity Reports and by the APR advisory committee for the evaluation of reports. The goal of this rubric is to create transparency in the review process while offering clear, qualitative standards for the numerical ratings required by University policy.

Each department member's contractual obligations for teaching, research, and service are explicitly acknowledged on the Department of Communication Arts Activity Report, noting any exceptions where applicable.

*No activity should be included in more than one area of the APR form, unless there are exceptional circumstances, in which case the faculty member must provide an explanation.*

### **TEACHING**

Faculty members are required to demonstrate their teaching improvements and effectiveness in a qualitative summary, as outlined in the Department of Communication Arts Activity Report Template.

The normal teaching load for regular, tenure-stream faculty in the Department of Communication Arts is two teaching terms of two courses each. The normal load for regular, lecture-stream faculty is seven courses distributed over three terms, with one non-teaching term every second year. Teaching years follow the annual budget's S/F/W cycle. Exceptions, as approved by the Chair and the Dean, are noted on the Department of Communication Arts Activity Report Template.

Teaching effectiveness can be demonstrated qualitatively through a variety of methods, including but not exclusive to: professional development through Centre for Teaching Excellence or other training, receiving teaching awards, peer review of teaching, research into pedagogy, curriculum development, attendance in teaching and learning seminars or colloquia, participation in teaching initiatives, student achievements, supervisory work and external supervision or examination, workshop development, systematically solicited student feedback, willingness to undertake new teaching at short notice or under exceptional circumstances, and so on.

The Department of Communication Arts recognizes the increasing body of research evidence that student feedback surveys contain considerable bias. Feedback scores vary according to gender and gender performance, dis/ability, race, size of classroom, type of material taught, and other subjective measures. Inclusion of student evaluation scores is voluntary and considered by the committee as one of many potential components of the overall evaluation of the instructor. Other student feedback should be unsolicited, or systematically solicited. New teaching at short notice, or in exceptional circumstances, should also be considered in any evaluation of that teaching.

Where faculty members have no contractual research obligations, research that is in their field of teaching *may* be considered as part of their ongoing professional teaching development, providing the faculty member demonstrates how that research contributes to their teaching.

**2.0 – Outstanding:** Demonstrates exceptional or extraordinary achievement in teaching overall. The demonstration of outstanding teaching may be exhibited by a combination of several of the following: receiving a university or external teaching award, evidence of exceptional success from peer review of teaching, other demonstrations of highly successful attempts at new pedagogical methods or practices, attendance at seminars, colloquia, or publishing on pedagogy, invited participation to lead or participate in university or external initiatives related to improving teaching or developing curricula, developing and successfully delivering a new course at the request of the department or university, outstanding unsolicited or systematically solicited student feedback (which may include but is not exclusive to student evaluations), demonstrations of outstanding student achievements (student assignments, publications, etc.), student supervisory work (graduate student and/or research based), sharing of effective teaching techniques with colleagues in the department or university, or other evidence of teaching excellence (including, but not limited to details on assignments, syllabi, etc.).

**1.75 – Excellent:** Demonstrates an excellent level of achievement in the classroom, and achievements are characterized by sustained superior quality in more than one course. This is achieved by a combination of several of the factors described in the category of “outstanding.”

**1.5 – Very Good:** Demonstrates very good teaching in the classroom, and achievements are characterized by sustained quality in more than one course. This can be achieved by a combination of a few of the factors described in the category of “outstanding”.

**1.25 – Good:** Demonstrates effective teaching in the classroom, as evidenced in peer review of teaching, pedagogical practices, course development, participation in workshops on teaching effectiveness, or other forms of evidence. Evidence that faculty member provides a positive learning environment for students and employs competent and effective pedagogical methods and practices is essential.

**1.0 – Satisfactory:** Meets the minimum level expectations for teaching, but would benefit from improvements. Evidence of teaching success may fall below expected benchmarks and/or little evidence (for example from peer evaluations or supplementary materials) of teaching effectiveness has been submitted by faculty member.

**0.75 – Needs Some Improvement:** Meets the minimum expectations for teaching, but teaching needs improvement and observation. This level of performance occasionally leads to student complaints judged as significant by peers and department chair, by peer reviews of teaching that raise concerns, or other qualitative evidence of questionable teaching methods.

**0.5 – Needs Significant Improvement:** Significant problems as judged by peers and chair. Some indications of unacceptable teaching from peer and student feedback may include: making no effort to improve teaching, lack of preparation for classroom activities, lack of current knowledge of the subject matter, little enthusiasm for the subject matter or classroom interaction, not returning examinations and assignments in a timely manner, not managing the classroom well, not available to students, etc. This level of performance often leads to student complaints judged as significant by peers and department chair.

**0.25 – Needs Major Improvement:** Similar to a rating of .5 only includes a larger number of indicators of significant problems or evidence is of more complex, sustained, or troubling problems with teaching. No other supporting information submitted by faculty member.

**0.0 – Unsatisfactory:** Teaching is not acceptable, and/or no other supporting information was submitted by faculty member.

## RESEARCH

According to Policy 77: “In general, only work that is accessible for peer review or professional adjudication can be considered in assessing scholarship for performance reviews”. Faculty members are required to demonstrate their research contributions in a qualitative summary, as outlined in the Department of Communication Arts Activity Report Template.

The committee recognizes traditional and non-traditional research contributions, including (but not limited to) books, articles in refereed journals, creative research, design research, and community-engaged research. To the extent that it is possible, faculty members should arrange and demonstrate peer and/or professional evaluation of non-traditional research contributions and document those contributions. Faculty should support or expand upon quantitative evidence of research outputs by explaining disciplinary norms or standards, relevant evaluation processes, and the suggested weight given to any output.

Under normal circumstances, work should be included in the year of publication/exhibition/etc. However, given the vagaries of publication timelines and the sometimes difficult nature of indicating that work is on-going on a major multi-year project, if a faculty member wishes for a work accepted or in-press to be considered in one year as opposed to the year of publication, that should be indicated on the present and publication year’s APR submission.

Collaborative work may be indicated either with a % of the author’s contribution, and/or a qualitative measure describing the nature of the involvement in the project.

**2.0 – Outstanding:** Demonstrates superior or extraordinary achievement beyond what is normally expected or required in the development of a sustained research and/or creative program according to the benchmarks of the discipline. This could include a combination of several significant, high-quality publications or creative projects, along with awards or grants. Outstanding research or creative work usually requires quality indicators that may include significant peer-reviewed, highly respected publications or performance/artistic venues with high rates of readership/viewership along with evidence of peer review or professional adjudication; evidence of complexity of research or creative

work; and/or evidence of importance or impact on a field or larger audience. Completion of a major, complex, and sustained research program or creative project with all of the quality indicators above is often evidence of an “outstanding” rating.

**1.75 – Excellent:** Demonstrates excellent research and/or creative achievements according to the benchmarks of the discipline, and achievements are characterized by superior quality and quantity. Excellent creative and/or research work also requires the quality indicators in the category of “outstanding” but may demonstrate those indicators to a somewhat lesser degree.

**1.5 – Very Good:** Some combination of a significant range of quality publications, conference presentations, performances, creative projects, grants, or other evidence of an effective and impactful research/creative program. Quality indicators do not rise to the level of outstanding or excellent but are recognized as above-average outputs.

**1.25 – Good:** Solid range of research and/or creative work in respectable venues. At least some evidence of completed publications and/or creative projects (grants, publications, or artistic work), and evidence of work in process.

**1.0 – Satisfactory:** No publications and/or completed creative projects, but work has been submitted for consideration. Research and/or creative work is ongoing but has not yet resulted in outcomes.

**0.75 – Needs Some Improvement:** No publications, no completed creative projects, no conference activity, and no current submissions of work for consideration. Evidence that research and/or creative work is ongoing and approaching submission stages but remains incomplete.

**0.5 – Needs Significant Improvement:** Some evidence of research and/or creative activity, but that evidence is unclear, confusing, or indicates a relatively shallow or insignificant attempt to advance a research and/or creative program.

**0.25 – Needs Major Improvement:** Evidence of very minimal research or creative activity that is far below the normal expectations for the department and faculty.

**0.0 – Unsatisfactory:** No evidence of research or creative activity.

## **SERVICE**

Service contributions are recognized in terms of quantity and quality. Faculty members are required to demonstrate their service contributions in a qualitative summary, as outlined in the Department of Communication Arts Activity Report Template.

Faculty members undertaking major roles such as Chair or Associate Chair have the option to adjust their weightings, in accordance with section 13.5.5 of the Memorandum of Agreement, and with the approval of the Dean. When contractual service obligations specify 20% of one’s duties include service work, that work should add up to approximately 340 hours per year (1 day a week at 7 hours/day \* 48 weeks).

Committee membership and/or numbers of hours devoted to service are not in themselves sufficient evidence of the quality of service. The committee recognizes that some types of service work are more difficult than others. The APR form must include qualitative information about the effort required and quality of service work in addition to quantitative data about the number of hours worked. Generally speaking, service to the department is viewed as more significant in value than service to the academic community or other area of the university.

The committee recognizes that service obligations *and opportunities* vary with rank. Individual faculty members share responsibility with the Department for ensuring that they are making service contributions appropriate to their rank. Not being asked does not excuse lack of service. As a *medium-sized department*, according to Faculty of Arts Service Standards, internal service in the Department of Communication Arts is necessarily weighted towards departmental service. Service as director of a non-departmental program or Centre does not remove the expectation that a faculty member will make a departmental service contribution, including willingness to periodically take on roles involving a major service commitment to the department.

Examples of *university-level service* include but are not limited to faculty-wide or university-wide committees, organization of faculty or university-wide workshops, or administrative roles in university-wide research centres. Examples of *departmental-level service* include but are not limited to departmental committees, or administrative roles in the department. “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. Examples of *professional service* include but are not limited to: editorial appointments; scholarly society administration; manuscript, article, paper, and grant reviews; conference and symposium organization; external refereeing for promotion and tenure cases; departmental discipline assessments; major multi-institutional grant administration, etc. *Community service work* is only considered when that work directly relates to the faculty member’s work at the university, for instance, working with a university student club, running a workshop on one’s research open to the public, and so on. In accordance with Policy 77, community service work *related to a faculty member’s scholarly activities* is normally considered service to the University: This means, for instance, that supervising your child’s basketball club is not service to the University, but if you were supervising a child’s theatre group, this *may be* considered.

Where faculty have no research obligations according to their contract, research that is in their field and/or relevant to service commitments *may* be considered as part of their on-going service contributions, providing those faculty demonstrate in their narrative how that research contributes to their service.

**2.0 – Outstanding:** Goes far above and beyond the normal expectations for service to the department, faculty or university by taking on a significant leadership role and effectively managing that role. In the case of probationary faculty and lecturers, goes above and beyond the normal expectations for service related to those ranks – this means evidence of both outstanding quality and quantity of service contributions (not necessarily within a major leadership role). Demonstrates outstanding citizenship by being available in the department, being willing to take on hard-to-cover courses, and/or being available to students as an advisor, mentor, etc. A 2.0 score is usually offered to someone taking on the role of Chair, Associate Chair, or another major university role, but is not guaranteed to faculty serving in those positions.



**1.75 – Excellent:** Goes above and beyond the normal expectations for service to the department, faculty or university by making meaningful and important contributions to several initiatives or committees, or makes extended, significant, and meaningful contributions to the profession or community outside the university. Demonstrates good citizenship by being available in the department, being willing to take on hard-to-cover courses, and/or being available to students.

**1.5 – Very Good:** More than one significant or meaningful contribution to department, faculty or university, supplemented with meaningful commitments to the profession and/or community. Demonstrates good citizenship by being available in the department, being willing to take on hard-to-cover courses, and/or being available to students.

**1.25 – Good:** At least one significant or meaningful service contribution to department, faculty, or university, along with demonstrable commitment to professional or community initiatives. At least one of either a meaningful extra-departmental service contribution to the Faculty or University, or a meaningful external service to the academic discipline, profession or community. Demonstrates good departmental citizenship by being available in the department, being willing to take on hard-to-cover courses, and/or being available to students.

**1.0 – Satisfactory:** One example of a service contribution to the department, faculty, or university, along with some indication of a commitment to the profession or community. Refusal by a tenured faculty or continuing lecturer of reasonable requests to take on major service commitments to the department, such as Associate Chair, warrants a score below 1.25. Similarly, while there may be short periods in which an individual faculty member's service is focused on high impact extra-departmental service, if this is a persistent pattern, it warrants a score below 1.25.

**0.75 – Needs Some Improvement:** No meaningful contribution to the department, faculty, or university, minimal indication of service to the profession or community. Does not demonstrate good departmental citizenship.

**0.5 – Needs Significant Improvement:** No contribution to the department, faculty or university, and little to no demonstration of a commitment to the profession or the community.

**0.25 – Needs Major Improvement:** No persuasive evidence of service of any kind to the university or elsewhere.

**0.0 – Unsatisfactory:** No evidence of service of any kind to the university or elsewhere.

## Performance Reviews in the Department of English Language and Literature 2021-22 Evaluation Years

### COVID-19 Special Statement

In unprecedented fashion, the 2020 COVID-19 emergency affected all areas of performance for all faculty members and may continue to have severe negative effects for some faculty in subsequent years. Faculty members who believe that these effects make an assessment of their performance impossible in any of the three categories of research, teaching, or service during evaluation years 2021 and 2022 may request that their performance evaluations follow one of the two procedures available to faculty members as described in the Memorandum of Agreement's Clause 13.5.4.(b)—that is, they may ask to 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,” or “a rating equal to the [individual faculty member's] average ratings of the three previous years.”

Faculty who wish to be accommodated in this way should make a pro forma confidential request to the Chair, who will forward the request to the Dean. They may also wish to communicate with the University's Occupational Health and Safety Office or with the Faculty Association about the specific reasons that may underlie their request.

### Introductory

Performance Reviews in the Department of English conform in all respects to the requirements set out in the Memorandum of Agreement, Article 13.5, “Member Evaluation.” This document satisfies 13.5.1.b), which states: “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.”

Relative contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service vary over the course of a career. This document is intended to make Departmental practice transparent, in its historical and ongoing character, to outline elements of performance to be taken into account in the Review, and to identify the values informing it. The document is “living” and thus will be subject to biennial review.

### Responsibility of Faculty Members

All members holding regular faculty appointments (Definite-Term Lecturer, Continuing Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor) of at least 50% in the Department of English are assessed by the Department of English Faculty Performance Review Committee (FPR Committee). Cross-appointed faculty are not assessed.

Faculty members are normally required to submit all required material by the Tuesday of the second week of the winter term in the year in which they are being evaluated. Definite term and untenured faculty members are evaluated annually. Continuing and tenured faculty members are evaluated every

two years (performance in 2019 and 2020 will be evaluated in the winter 2021 term; performance in 2021 and 2022 will be evaluated in the winter 2023 term; and so on).

All faculty members are responsible for submitting an up-to-date *c.v.* and a discursive elaboration of their activities in each of their assigned areas, normally teaching, scholarship, and service for those in professorial ranks, and teaching and service for those in lecturer ranks. A format will be specified by the FPR committee.

Evidence is required to support all claims. For example, a letter or email from an editor indicating formal acceptance of a manuscript for publication; an off-print, URL, or copy of a book or journal as proof of publication; ACQ sheets for teaching scores; course syllabi for new course development, etc. Faculty members are also encouraged to highlight for the FPR committee what has changed over or developed from the previous year(s) (e.g. an article that was accepted has been published; an online course that was created has been offered; a committee was joined or a service role has ceased, etc.). The Memorandum of Agreement specifies that “A Member who does not submit the required documentation by the specified deadline normally will receive an overall rating of at most 0.5” (13.5.2a).

### Faculty Performance Review Committee (FPR Committee)

The Department elects three of its members to assist the chair in the assessment of faculty members. Together they constitute the FPR Committee. The committee will strive to take careful note of and to be fair in recognising the contributions of each individual member being assessed.

The chair will assign scores in each relevant area of performance (scholarship, teaching, service). The Faculty Performance Review results in a final score out of 2.0, calculated from the individual scores, also out of 2.0, in each of the two or three assigned areas. For tenured or tenure-track professorial faculty, normal calculations are: Teaching = 40%; Scholarship = 40%; Service = 20%. For definite-term or continuing lecturer faculty, normal calculations are Teaching = 80%; Service = 20%. These values may be adjusted from time to time, normally for at least two years for members whose Service commitments structurally impede their performance in Teaching and/or Scholarship. All adjustments are subject to the approval of the Dean.

Normally, faculty members' scores will fall between 1.25 (“good”) and 1.75 (“excellent”). Scores of 2.0 (“outstanding”) in a given area will be assigned only in those cases where Faculty performance exceeds expectations to an unusual degree in the given year or years (for example: winning a Teaching Award; publishing a monograph; performing a particularly challenging administrative role in a highly creditable manner). Scores under 1.0 are assigned as a clear indication that a faculty member must actively improve his or her performance.

It should be emphasized that scores do not correspond to any precise quantitative or qualitative achievement. Moreover, scores never describe merely a quantity of work accomplished in the given year or years since scholarship, for example, is a process and progress cannot be properly measured in yearly or biennial increments. For these reasons, it is necessary for the Chair and the FPR Committee members to be aware of historical scores and for members to submit an adequately elaborated account of their accomplishments along with the relevant materials.

## Teaching

Assessment of undergraduate teaching performance will take into account: productive innovation in pedagogy; course material indicating preparedness and perspicuity in course design; supervision of Honours theses; participation in teaching workshops; evidence of self-evaluation leading to improvement; peer review of teaching according to the Department's Peer Review Teaching Guidelines; unusual challenges faced; awareness of trends in pedagogy, and other signs of developments in teaching content and method; and perception surveys of teaching by students. In keeping with the MOA, quantitative data from student perception surveys or other instruments should not be the sole basis of assessment, and such data should always be considered in light of their context and in conjunction with other indicators.

It should be emphasized that neither the Department nor the University prescribes specific modes or techniques of teaching. (Due to their exceptional nature, as defined by the University of Waterloo, Professional Development courses will not form part of the performance evaluation of faculty members.) In assessing course perception surveys by students, due consideration will be given to anomalies. Instructors are encouraged to use written student feedback to improve their teaching and may share it with others if they wish for these purposes. However, student comments are not to be used in performance evaluations. Important scores in the Arts Course Questionnaire (ACQ) surveys will include Overall Evaluation of the Instructor and the overall average of all the scores (Q1-9). Caution will be exercised in interpreting results of EL student perception surveys, since the questions do not clearly distinguish between assessing the course instructor, the course author, and the teaching assistant. Although student perceptions of a course are relevant in providing information about the student experience<sup>1</sup> and for the formative development of an instructor, the FPR Committee will always balance student perceptions of a course against other evidence, as listed above. Further, research has shown that student course perception surveys "have been found to be biased against women and people of color."<sup>2</sup> For this reason, student perceptions of courses will be used primarily to document patterns in an instructor's feedback over time, not to compare individual faculty members to each other or to a department average.

Graduate teaching has a different character than undergraduate teaching. The graduate seminar is central to the graduate programs. Graduate teaching taken as a whole, however, emphasizes individual work with students to a great degree. Graduate teaching, then, should be seen as encompassing supervision of Major Research Papers and Projects, Master's theses, and PhD dissertations, in addition to teaching seminars. Supervising PhD students through to a successful defence of a dissertation is a particular accomplishment. Sitting on dissertation committees and Area Exam Committees may also be important

---

<sup>1</sup> Arbitrator Kaplan. Ryerson University v Ryerson Faculty Association, 2018 <https://www.canlii.org/en/on/onla/doc/2018/2018canlii58446/2018canlii58446.html>

<sup>2</sup> Basow, Susan A., and Julie L. Martin. 2012. "Bias in Student Evaluations." Pp. 40-49 in *Effective Evaluation of Teaching: A Guide for Faculty and Administrators*, edited by Mary E. Kite. Washington, DC: Society for the Teaching of Psychology. Retrieved from <http://teachpsych.org/ebooks/evals2012/index.php>.  
Spooren, Pieter, Bert Brockx, and Dimitri Mortelmans. 2013. "On the Validity of Student Evaluation of Teaching: The State of the Art." *Review of Educational Research* 83(4):598–642.

factors. Other activities that contribute to graduate student development, such as the mentoring and training of TAs and GIs during their teaching assignments, will also be considered. Accordingly, measures of performance in graduate instruction, such as student evaluation of graduate teaching, will be balanced with other metrics, especially the quantity of supervisions and any evidence of the quality of supervision available to the Chair and the FPR Committee.

## Scholarship

Policy 77, on Tenure and Promotion, states that “Although the University looks for evidence of active continuing scholarship, the volume of scholarly output is less important than its quality, originality and impact.” This statement should guide the assessment of performance in scholarship. It will be the job of the FPR Committee to balance the assessment of quality and quantity, with quality always leading. Peer-reviewed scholarly work published in internationally-recognized venues provides the benchmark for assessment of scholarship. The scholarly monograph is the chief achievement followed by articles in highly-regarded journals. Valued work will also include accomplishments such as chapters or essays in edited collections; editing work, including editing collections of essays, editions of primary work, and the ongoing editing of journals; art work, especially juried art work, and other forms of research-creation; presentations, especially invited presentations that reflect status in the scholar’s field, such as plenaries and keynotes; book reviews; and activities that come under the rubric of “knowledge mobilization.” Research inputs, such as tri-council grants, will also be considered, as will evidence of scholarly impact, such as honours, reviews, and citations. It should be noted that this ranking is provisional. It will always be possible for individual faculty members to make the case for equivalences not captured here.

## Service

All faculty members will participate in service every year, except when they are on sabbatical. Where faculty members find their service contribution to be low, they are expected to seek out opportunities to strengthen their contribution.

Faculty members are expected to perform meaningful service at the Departmental level, as well as to contribute to the University, the discipline, the profession, or the community. They are expected to participate in collegial self-governance through regular attendance at Department meetings and through periodic service on Department committees. Faculty members also make important contributions to service in the various coordinator roles that support Departmental life, such as the speakers’ series, awards, and website coordinators. They are expected to respond to student and staff enquiries in a timely fashion, to attend some Department-sponsored events (with greater weight accorded to events related to Convocation, hirings, and graduate orientation, and to Departmental talks), to submit grades by specified deadlines, and to be regularly available in the Department for engagement with students and colleagues. Faculty members should be prepared to take on roles with greater responsibility as their careers proceed. In the Department, the most substantive service role is that of Chair. Acting as Associate Chair, normally for a three-year period, is the next most substantive role. Most faculty members will at some point hold the position of Associate Chair, if not Chair.

Just as service to the Department is always expected, so is service outside the Department. Faculty members will contribute to the University, chiefly through service on one or more of its many committees, and governing bodies such as Senate or FAUW; to the profession or discipline at large through committee membership, conference organizing, reviewing for journals, and so on; or to the

community through service related to a faculty member's scholarly activities.

### Performance Reviews and Tenure

Policy 77 of the University states that “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).” For this reason, the Chair’s annual report for untenured faculty members should always include explicit guidance about progress toward tenure.

### Conclusion

All of these varied activities associated with Teaching, Scholarship, and Service will be reviewed by the Chair in the Faculty Performance Review. It is customary for the Chair to write a draft report and show it to the faculty member, with no scores attached, before bringing the final report to the Dean who will, based on the Chair’s recommendation, assign scores to each report. This practice allows the member to ensure, with the Chair’s support, that nothing telling is omitted from the final report and that emphases are appropriate. It will always be possible for members later to appeal to the Dean where there is disagreement between the Chair and the faculty member about scores. It should be emphasized in closing that the Review depends greatly upon considered judgment that weighs all the different factors. The present document is intended to provide a window on the review process for everyone, to describe its central elements and to identify the values that inform it, and thus to stand as a shared impersonal, external reference for future conduct of the Review.

# Annual Performance Review Guidelines Department of Fine Arts

Approved October 2020

## 1. Overview, Procedure, and Ratings

### 1.1 Introduction

These Performance Review guidelines for the faculty complement of the Department of Fine Arts at the University of Waterloo have been composed and approved by all full-time faculty members in the Department and by the Dean of Arts, to become effective 1 January 2021, in accordance with:

- The UW/FAUW Memorandum of Agreement, section 13.5, '[Member Evaluation](#)';
- The [Arts Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines](#) (approved by Arts Faculty Council, January 2017);
- [Policy 77](#): Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members.

Faculty members are responsible for ensuring that the Chair has sufficient information to formulate an accurate assessment in the performance evaluation process. Such information should be provided to the Chair through the use of the [Arts Activity Report](#) and the Fine Arts

CV Template (available on the [Fine Arts Sharepoint](#) site), in addition to other relevant materials.

### 1.2 Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee

To assist the Chair with the annual faculty performance evaluations, three faculty members shall be elected on staggered terms to serve on this Committee. Each term shall last for 2 years and is renewable. Normally, all full-time tenured faculty members are eligible to serve. In addition, one probationary-term faculty member may sit on the Committee as an observer. In the event that three tenured faculty members are not available to serve, the next most senior faculty member, in his/her second probationary period, will be eligible. This committee will review all merit awards to ensure equity within a rank and across the Department of Fine Arts as a whole.

### **1.3 Chair's Responsibility**

While the Department of Fine Arts does involve an APR Committee in the performance evaluation exercise, it should be noted that the final responsibility for faculty performance assessment rests with the Chair.

### **1.4 Who is assessed?**

Performance reviews are required for all regular faculty (Lecturers to Professors on fulltime or reduced load appointments) with appointments of one year or more. Performance ratings shall pertain to the portion of the evaluation year during which the faculty member was a paid employee of the University, including sabbatical leave, but excluding pregnancy, adoption, or parental leave. Tenured faculty and continuing lecturers are evaluated on a biennial basis, with the review being held in odd-numbered years. Probationary-term faculty and definite-term lecturers are evaluated annually.

### **1.5 Connection to Tenure and Promotion**

Policy 77 requires that annual performance reviews be included in Department tenure and promotion considerations. Therefore, it is important that the Chair provide a written assessment of each faculty member's performance. Recommendations for selective merit increases are based on overall performance.

### **1.6 Three Components of Assessment**

Performance is assessed in three areas:

**Teaching:** broadly defined to include classroom instruction, student supervision, instructional/curricular material development, etc. Learning experiences conducted outside of the classroom and engaging in different ways of knowing are also represented here.

**Scholarship/Creative Work:** broadly defined as the intellectual/artistic advancement of a discipline.

**Service:** leadership or support to the Department, Faculty, University, the individual faculty member's discipline, broadly defined (art practice, media studies, visual culture, etc.), the wider academic community, and other relevant external communities.



Providing mentorship to each other and, specifically to untenured colleagues, is also valued in the Department.

## 1.7 Recommendations to the Dean

The Chair's recommendation to the Dean must indicate a level of performance in each area and must provide evidence supporting this assessment.

- **Unsatisfactory (0.0):** indicates poor performance. An overall unsatisfactory performance rating carries no selective merit increase. See 1.9 below.
- **Needs Major Improvement (0.25):** signals that significant improvement is necessary in order to attain a score approaching satisfactory. See 1.9 below.
- **Needs Improvement (0.5):** when performance in any one area is questionable, but is not clearly unsatisfactory. See 1.9 below.
- **Needs Some Improvement (0.75):** when performance in any one area is questionable, but is deemed approaching satisfactory. See 1.9 below.
- **Satisfactory (1.0):** when performance in a given area is deemed to have reached the bare minimum acceptable level; 'satisfactory' scores in a performance evaluation do not translate to scores that would be 'satisfactory' for tenure or promotion. See 1.8 below and the Arts Faculty Guidelines.
- **Good (1.25):** indicates a positive performance.
- **Very Good (1.5):** indicates substantial strong positive performance.
- **Excellent (1.75):** recognizes performance that is not quite at the level of outstanding, but is nonetheless remarkable.
- **Outstanding (2.0):** indicates performance at an extraordinary level and it is expected that such a rating will be rare (see the Arts Faculty Guidelines). Strong evidence is required and includes such distinctions as, internally, nomination for the Distinguished Teaching Award, the Faculty of Arts Awards for Teaching, Research, or Service, or, externally, publication of a sole-authored book or major form of artistic or curatorial dissemination, expressions of merit awarded by very prominent institutions or associations in the faculty member's field/ discipline, etc. (described in more detail in section 4).

## 1.8 Performance rated 'Satisfactory'

If overall performance is rated as satisfactory, the expectation is that performance is satisfactory in each of the three areas of assessment. This principle is most importantly illustrated in relation to teaching and scholarship. A regular faculty appointment carries two major commitments: the communication of the knowledge and nature of one's

discipline via teaching, and the advancement of the state of one's discipline via scholarship. The joint importance of these commitments is underlined in Policy 76 which states:

*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. During a term for which formal teaching duties are not assigned, faculty members are expected to increase their scholarly activity.*

This is further acknowledged by the heavy investment of time and energy most faculty devote to their work as both teachers of their discipline and active contributors to it.

It follows that, unless a faculty member's position has been formally changed to involve a different set of duties, satisfactory performance in *both* teaching and scholarship is expected if the faculty member's overall contribution is to be seen as a satisfactory one. Good performance in one area cannot normally compensate for needing improvement in the other because only part of the job has been performed in a satisfactory manner.

### **1.9 Performance rated 'Needs Improvement'**

If performance in a particular area is seen as needing improvement, some improvement, or major improvement, it is essential that the nature of the problem be communicated to the faculty member. The kind of improvement needed should be discussed, help provided when appropriate and an opportunity given to remedy the problem. This can be one of the most valuable functions of the annual review procedure. If, after a reasonable period of time, a "needs improvement" or "needs some improvement" continues, serious consideration must be given to the appropriateness of continuing the appointment in its present form. This is particularly important if the area needing improvement is that of teaching or scholarship.

### **1.10 Weightings**

The weight for each area shall be as specified in the member's letter of appointment. In the absence of specified weights, the normal weights, for tenured or tenure-track positions are 40% for teaching, 40% for scholarship, and 20% for service. For lecturers and continuing lecturers the normal weights are 80% for teaching and 20% for service.

Weightings and duties may be adjusted in a formal agreement between the faculty member and the Chair with the approval of the Dean. Normally, the weights shall be at least 20% in every category, except in the case of lecturer appointments. When a faculty member takes on a significant administrative role they may have a temporary adjustment of their weightings for purposes of merit evaluation. This adjustment involves a change in expectation for quantity of work in each area but not for quality. Any such re-weighting must be arranged with the Dean ahead of time.

The final overall rating is determined through a formula that applies these weightings to the individual scores in teaching, scholarship, and service.

### **1.11 Newly-Appointed Faculty**

For their first evaluation year, newly-appointed faculty will be assigned a score based on actual performance or, when too little information is available, assigned a score equal to the departmental average for their rank (or the Faculty average when there are too few Departmental members at that rank).

### **1.12 Fractional Load or Leave of Absence**

For faculty on fractional load or a leave of absence the expectations for quality remain the same while expectations for quantity change.

### **1.13 Insufficient Documentation**

It is essential that the faculty member provide sufficient information during the review process to allow an informed judgement in each area. Strong evidence must be demonstrated and provided. **A faculty member who does not submit the required documentation by the specified deadline normally will receive an overall rating of at most 0.5.**

## **2. Performance Measures**

### **2.1 Teaching**

#### **2.1.1 Courses taught**

All relevant factors will be considered including:

- Number of courses/sections taught;
- Level of each course taught;
- Lecture, seminar or studio courses;
- Number of students taught and enrollment levels in each course;
- Number of terms taught;
- Peer review assessment;
- Student Course Evaluations, in particular questions 4 (instructor attitude), 8 (overall evaluation of the instructor), 9 (overall evaluation of the course) and 10 (workload).

#### **2.1.2 Course Development or Revision**

The amount of work involved in the development or revision of course materials will be considered.

#### **2.1.3 Pedagogical Reflections**

Reflections that offer innovative tools for the study of Indigenous creation and literatures can include a methodological focus on the teaching of Indigenous texts, artwork and projects that go beyond the confines of the classroom, particularly in and with the community.

#### **2.1.4 Plan/Program-related Activities**

Recognition will also be given for leading or being involved with pedagogical/plan/program-related activities that take place outside the classroom, including formal and informal forms of mentorship, experiential learning activities.

#### **2.1.5 Graduate and 4th-year Honours Assessment**

A quorum of faculty is expected to participate in Graduate, 4th-year Honours Studio assessment, and 4th-year Visual Culture Honours presentations.

### **2.1.6 Awards**

Teaching awards at UW or elsewhere will be considered.

### **2.1.7 Conferences**

Participating in conferences related to teaching will be considered.

### **2.1.8 Supervision of Undergraduate and Graduate Students**

Supervision of undergraduate or graduate students (MA, MFA, MSc, PhD, etc.) will be recognized. The faculty member must be specific about the type, scope, and quantity of supervision. Indicate when engaged in co-supervision.

### **2.1.9 Additional Considerations**

- Attention should also be given to the ability and willingness of a faculty member to serve the general teaching needs of the department by teaching outside her/his area of particular expertise, by preparing new courses, and by accepting responsibility for required courses either on campus or through the Centre for Extended Learning.
- Material such as peer reviews and critiques by faculty colleagues and by students, alumni and TAs will be considered. Any information from students or alumni must be shown to have been collected systematically rather than selectively (Policy 77 §3, Assessment of Teaching: “The opinions of current and former students can be of value if solicited on a systematic basis”).

### **2.1.10 Materials to be submitted for APR assessment (see the [Activity Report template](#) on Faculty of Arts website)**

- New course preparation as evidenced by syllabi;
- Statement of changes/improvements to existing courses;
- Evidence of program/plan/curriculum development (this includes assignment/project descriptions, etc.);
- Evidence of innovative teaching methods<sup>1</sup>;

---

<sup>1</sup> It is understood that teaching does not need to take place in a classroom / studio setting in order to engage in knowledge mobilization. It is also understood that pedagogical content goes beyond that found in written documents and textbooks.

- Information on independent study courses;
- Peer reviews of teaching (optional);<sup>2</sup>
- Information from other units as appropriate;
- Nomination for DTA or other teaching awards;
- Recognition of teaching by graduating Departmental Award winners;
- Information on the modes of formal/informal mentorship, including number of students, types of opportunities, etc.
- Other materials as appropriate.

### **2.1.11 To be Considered Outstanding (2.0)**

Extremely positive evidence is required for this rating and such evidence is expected to be available for the year under review. An example of such evidence would be nomination for the Distinguished Teacher Award or the Arts Faculty Teaching Award.

## **2.2 Scholarship**

Research within Studio Practice and Visual Culture takes many different forms that correspond to and are consistent with specific disciplines or sub-disciplines, varying paths to knowledge, and engagement within a plurality of communities. Community is understood to refer to places or land-based communities, as well as thematic communities and communities of practice. Community involvement and the co-creation of knowledge can include interpretative approaches that are jointly developed, reviewed, and confirmed.

Consideration will be given to research based upon public dissemination, community engagement, and knowledge production and mobilization. Evidence of the dissemination and engagement should be provided (dates, venues, brief description if thought to be helpful). The faculty member may also wish to include supporting documentation, such as published reviews and critiques, programs from conferences, gatherings and symposia, correspondence with relevant professional colleagues and/or community members (for example, Indigenous elders), and other material they deem appropriate. Note: formal letters of reference need not be solicited for the APR process.

---

<sup>2</sup> These can be solicited from regular faculty who co-supervise MFA students and / or co-teach undergraduate courses. Observations of a colleagues' teaching can also be solicited via group critique situations and work that is displayed in the department and in the Artery, for example.

In judging research, emphasis must be placed on quality as well as quantity. The APR committee's assessment will include consideration of the complexity and/or time needed to produce the project, the innovation within the research area, the relevance and significance of the dissemination opportunity, and the impact of the project within its intended communities.

### **2.2.1 Evidence of scholarship common to all fields/disciplines practiced by faculty members of the Fine Arts Department:**

- Academic Awards (university, college distinctions, etc.).
- Grants
  - Grants applied for (provide description/profile of granting agency if not well-known to APR committee);
  - Indicate if internal (UW) or external;
  - Scope of application (scope of work, budget and role of researcher within the application, ie: PI, Co-PI, Collaborator, etc);
  - Status;
  - Indicate review process, noting if peer-reviewed.
- Conference Presentations
  - State venue;
  - Indicate if peer-reviewed.
- Keynote Addresses
  - Indicate venue.
- Editorial roles (these may count as either research or service depending on the nature of the role. For example, acting as the guest editor of a special issue of a journal, setting a theme and soliciting authors would count as a contribution to scholarship; being a member of a larger editorial board and carrying out the occasional manuscript review would be more of a service function).
- Organization of conferences, workshops, festivals, community-based activities and outreach, or academic events that advance scholarship and research (faculty members can choose whether to count these activities as scholarship or service or even teaching if relevant).

## Evidence of scholarship common to all fields/disciplines practiced by faculty members of the Fine Arts Department

### Research Creation:

- Solo and group exhibitions.
- Festivals.
- Screenings.
- Performance art.
- Research carried out using Indigenous knowledge and the practical applications or dissemination of such research generally, or specifically through engagement with Indigenous communities.
- Social practice.
- Community work.
- Material or technological innovation.
- Site-specific work.
- Curatorial practice.
- Bibliography:
  - Catalogue/peer-reviewed essays;
  - Published exhibition reviews;
  - Publications – work represented in;
  - Other media recognition.
- Collections (corporate, public, and notable private).
- Commissioning and/or purchase of art.
- Residencies and artist projects.
  - Indicate if invited, applied for, paid, unpaid.
- Artist talks.
- Other scholarly work (e.g., textbooks).
- Other relevant events.

**Note:** the onus is on the faculty member to provide evidence of the quality, impact, and relevance of this work. If the work has been subject to a review process, the faculty member should provide details of that process.

**Note:** for artworks produced as a result of creative collaboration, the faculty member must indicate the percentage of the overall work that is theirs.



### **Format and Supporting Documentation for the above:**

- List solo and group exhibitions chronologically, most recent first. Include upcoming confirmed exhibitions.
- Community-based projects, and events that take place outside of gallery spaces.
- Provide title, date, gallery/venue, city, curator, whether juried, whether a travelling exhibition.
- Append notices/announcements/invitations.
- Append conference/symposia programs.
- Append documentation for confirmed exhibitions.
- Append documentation for unconfirmed upcoming exhibitions.
- Indicate contribution to group exhibitions.
- Documentation of peer-review process.
- Documentation of work and activity that bridges all forms of knowledge production and dissemination.
- Engagement with elders and other knowledge holders is acknowledged as valued and vital to knowledge transmission within the context of Indigenous Peoples living in place.
- Research includes the results achieved in the form of partnerships and collaborative practices.
- Bibliographic information required for all solo and group exhibitions.
- For “Publications – works represented in” give title of work, date of work, full citation for publication, relevant page number.
- All foreign language titles must be translated.

### **Visual Culture-specific Research**

Publications are especially important evidence in the determination of scholarship performance. The following list includes the range of relevant publications. There is not a definitive list of tiered publications with the visual culture disciplines. However, those that are peer-reviewed will be assessed as more significant.

### **Peer-reviewed (documentation of peer review process must be provided):**

- Books with publishers having good academic reputations and meaningful peer review.

- Journal articles in high quality peer-reviewed journals. In general, high quality is evidenced by serious review process and/or evidence of scholarly impact in discipline and/or sub-field.
- Peer-reviewed edited books, edited special issues of a journal.
- Textbooks.
- Chapters in peer reviewed edited volumes.
- Peer-reviewed book reviews in scholarly journals.
- Conference papers (if peer-reviewed).
- Research papers in published conference proceedings (if peer-reviewed).

**Other:**

- Research and dissemination of Indigenous knowledge through community engagement.
- Books with little evidence of, or limited, peer review, or with lesser scholarly reputations.
- Articles in non-peer reviewed journals or books.
- Research notes or commentaries in scholarly journals.
- Non-peer-reviewed book reviews in scholarly journals.
- Conference papers (if non-peer-reviewed).
- Research papers in published conference proceedings (if non-peer-reviewed).
- Re-publications of past published work in scholarly outlets (e.g. in edited collections, translations of past work)
- Other non-refereed publications such as book reviews, magazine articles, newspaper articles, trade publications, briefing papers, research reports, and on-line scholarly commentary.
- Fellowships.
- Keynote addresses.
- Other forms of dissemination of research (significance should be adequately demonstrated).

**Note:** The University states that the onus is on the faculty member to provide evidence of the quality, impact, and relevance of these non-refereed publications. For example, their relevance may be that they disseminate research.

**For all publications:**

In the case of co-authored/co-edited publications, the faculty member must indicate the percentage of the overall work that is theirs.

#### **2.2.4 To be Considered Outstanding (2.0)**

Publication of a sole-authored book by an academic press with a demonstrated peer-review process or a major exhibition in a prominent and distinguished venue are normally rewarded by the Department with an outstanding evaluation (2.0). Such a rating will be rewarded either in the year of the publication or exhibition or in the subsequent year, but not both.

#### **2.2.5 Work-in-Progress**

The quantity of work-in-progress, submitted, prepared for exhibition and publication will be considered. Specific goals and timelines should be stated.

#### **2.2.6 Impact**

The onus is on faculty members to provide evidence of research impact, including providing contextual information as per the norms of their discipline or research area.

#### **2.2.7 Additional Notes**

The APR Committee and Chair will acknowledge that a faculty member's contribution to scholarship may be manifest in a range of forms. Scholarship, Research and Professional Activities refers to all activity that is made accessible to First Nations people, a faculty member who is a practicing artist may also curate exhibitions, publish in peer reviewed journals, etc.).

### **2.3 Service**

#### **2.3.1 General Comments**

Service is a very important part of our role as faculty members and it is highly valued. The APR Committee and the Chair attempt to evaluate both the quality and quantity of the service performed. Service is an important component of a faculty member's duties and should be properly encouraged and recognized. **It is understood that internal service is an essential duty of faculty members (Policy 77).** In a department such as Fine Arts, which has a relatively small faculty complement and a wealth of extracurricular activities and projects, any faculty member who performs little or no departmental

service places a significant additional administrative burden on his or her colleagues. Since service is expected, lack of service requires an explanation.

A “good citizenship” factor recognizes faculty for activities such as mentoring new faculty members, being available in the Department, being willing to take on hard-to-cover courses, and being available to students (joint memorandum from Vice-President Academic and Provost and Faculty Association President, 22 November 2010).

### **2.3.2 Service within the Department**

Internal service is an essential duty for faculty. Departmental service includes, but is not limited to the following:

- Administrative appointments, such as Chair or Associate Chair;
- Active service on Departmental Committees;
- Attendance at and participation in Departmental meetings;
- Taking on responsibility for specific Departmental initiatives (e.g., Visiting Artists, Experiential Learning, Brush with Art, etc.);
- Organization and distribution of course kits;
- Miscellaneous tasks, such as regular studio and equipment maintenance, etc.

#### **Departmental Committees (regular and ad hoc):**

- Undergraduate Curriculum and Scheduling Committee;
- Graduate Operations Committee;
- Master of Fine Arts Selection Committee;
- Space and Equipment Committee (including Airstream);
- Health and Safety Committee;
- Annual Performance Review Committee;
- Department Advisory Committee on Appointments;
- Department Tenure and Promotion Committee.

**Note:** Given the relatively small faculty complement, it is likely that each faculty member will serve on more than one committee within the Department. The Chair will do their best to ensure that Department service duties are distributed in an equitable fashion and in a manner consistent with the faculty member’s rank.

### 2.3.3 Service to the Faculty or the University

Service to the Faculty of Arts or the University of Waterloo will be considered and assessed at a rate consistent with the scope of the service. Activities may include, but are not be limited to:

- FAUW Representative/Committee Member/Board of Directors
- FTFC, UTPC
- Membership on Faculty or University-level committees, such as Academic Discipline, Strategic Planning, etc.
- Member of Senate

### 2.3.4 Service to the Discipline/Community

The Department and the University also recognize and encourage service to the wider discipline. Contributions to the wider community and discipline are valuable and reflect the recognition one has earned in the wider discipline.

- For Visual Culture, this can be contributions such as peer reviewing for academic journals, conference abstract and manuscript refereeing, journal editing, board membership in academic societies and community outreach, etc.
- For Studio, this can include board membership in public galleries and arts organizations; donation of artworks for fundraising; participation on juries for exhibitions or funding bodies, awards, grants and public commissions; recipient of award for contribution to arts association and community outreach, roundtable and workshops, etc.

In either case, higher assessment will be placed on the more senior roles in and prominence of the activities.

**Note:** Although such service is encouraged, it must be kept in mind that such service, particularly compensated activities, shall not interfere with the proper discharge of primary University duties. Faculty members should be aware of University policies on Extra-University Activity ([Policy 49](#)), Use of University Resources and Affiliation ([Policy 66](#)), and Conflict of Interest ([Policy 69](#)). Contract scholarship should be discussed with the Office of Research.

### **3. Role of Performance Review for Faculty on Probationary Term Appointments**

Performance reviews of probationary faculty must consider performance in the past year AND the total record to date. Assessment of the total record is important to provide an annual assessment of progress toward tenure. It is important to recall that a grade of “Satisfactory” (1.0) is not considered satisfactory for tenure and promotion purposes. Where appropriate, separate assessments should be given for each component (e.g., “while performance for the past year was satisfactory, the total record is a cause for concern because...”).

Where concern exists, this should be conveyed to the individual in as specific a form as possible and every effort should be made to assist the faculty member to identify and rectify the problem. An indication should be given of the likelihood of the individual being granted tenure if he/she continues to perform at the present level. While not required by policy, it is useful for the Chair to share any such concerns with the Department’s Tenure and Promotion Committee and seek its advice on wording. Policy 77 states that “annual performance reviews form part of the evidence in tenure considerations”. The University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Committee (UTPAC) has stated that: *It is understood that the objective of performance reviews is to be helpful and encouraging, and give an accurate account of the positive and negative aspects of the faculty member’s work. Reservations, if any, must be clearly expressed, and there should be no ambiguity between what is said and what is written. A major purpose is to give the faculty member the means to do a better job. The review should also remind the candidate that the tenure process will include outside assessment in the form of reports from external referees.* (Report to Senate, October 21, 1996).

If the DTPC expressed concern at the time of renewal of the probationary contract, the results of each subsequent annual performance assessment should be reviewed by that Committee. Upon receipt of the DTPC recommendation, the Dean shall decide whether to reappoint, and shall inform the candidate in writing, including reasons if the decision is negative.

### **4. Special Circumstances**

#### **4.1 Long-Term Disability**

A faculty member on long-term disability does not get a performance rating. The salary of a faculty member on long-term disability is paid, and adjusted to include any scale increases, under the LTD plan.

#### **4.2 Paid Leave (including Sabbatical Leave)**

A faculty member on paid leave shall be evaluated on the portion of the evaluation year during which the faculty member was a paid employee of the University. It may not be possible to assess performance in all three categories during the evaluation year. In such cases, a faculty member normally will receive the average of up to the three previous years' ratings in any category where assessment is not possible.

#### **4.3 Pregnancy, Adoption or Parental Leave**

For faculty members on approved pregnancy, adoption or parental leave, assessment is in a similar manner to paid leave.

#### **4.4 Sick Leave**

A faculty member on sick leave does not receive a performance rating. If information to evaluate the faculty member's performance is not available owing to the illness, the assessment is in a manner similar to paid leave.

#### **4.5 Unpaid Leave**

For faculty members on unpaid leave, the full scale increase shall apply, but the merit increase will be pro-rated by the fraction of the year served at the University.

#### **4.6 Administrative Duty**

In the case where a faculty member serves as Chair of a Department for part of a year, the Dean will provide a service rating to the Department for that fraction of the year.

## **French Department Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines for 2021 and 2022**

Discussed at the September 11, 2020 department meeting in Teams.

Approved via e-ballot September 22, 2020

### **Introduction**

This document provides guidelines for the evaluation process and the performance review expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service for faculty with the Department of French Studies at the University of Waterloo. These guidelines are supplemental to, and consistent with University of Waterloo Policies, the member evaluation procedures outlined in Article 13 of the Memorandum of Agreement between the University and FAUW, and the Faculty of Arts guidelines for these issues.

Faculty members at the University of Waterloo fulfill their job descriptions by doing some combination of teaching, research, and service. The performance appraisal is done so as to evaluate how well one is performing in each of these areas. It also provides an opportunity for ongoing feedback on a faculty member's performance, and provides critical information to Tenure and Promotion committees at various stages in each faculty member's career.

It is the normal practice in the Department of French Studies that newly appointed Faculty members be offered an internal mentor to help them understand the APR process and expectations, and to receive individualized guidance while they prepare for probationary contract renewal, application for tenure and promotion, or application to Continuing Lecturer status.

### **PROCEDURES**

The Department will vote every year in the fall as to how performance evaluations will be conducted – either by chair alone or by a committee of no more than 5 tenured or continuing department members who will advise the Chair.

Every two years, usually in the fall, the department will review and approve this document.

Documentation is to be provided that gives evidence of the activity/achievement being claimed. The Department of French Studies usually requires all course evaluations, offprints of articles, letters of commendation etc. to be submitted with the Activity Report.

### **THE FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATING SCALE**

0	Unsatisfactory
0.25	Less than satisfactory; needs improvement
0.5	Less than satisfactory; needs improvement
0.75	Less than satisfactory; needs improvement
1.0	Satisfactory
1.25	Good
1.5	Very Good
1.75	Excellent
2.0	Outstanding



### **Typical formula for professors:**

Research: 40%

Teaching: 40%

Service: 20%

Other weightings are sometimes negotiated for faculty members having special research, teaching, or administrative appointments, usually on a temporary basis.

### **Formula for lecturers:**

Teaching: 80%

Service: 20%

## **PRE-TENURE CONSIDERATIONS/EVALUATION/EXPECTATIONS**

At the departmental level, the view is that there is nothing inherently problematic in a probationary-term faculty member's having scores that initially fall at the lower end of the departmental or faculty distribution. Such scores may simply represent a nascent research program, lack of experience as an instructor, or initial adaptation to the service aspects of a professorial career. In these cases, what matters is that scores are not so low as to be objectively problematic (Unsatisfactory; Needs Improvement) and that they generally improve over the period of one's probationary term.

Overall scores that plateau in the Satisfactory-Good range over several years may be seen as marginal progress toward tenure; the interpretation of such scores will come down to specifics in the sub-scores and to the details of the faculty member's vita over that time period.

### **EXPECTATIONS (FOR ALL FACULTY MEMBERS)**

In any of the categories, to receive a score of 2.0 the contribution must be truly outstanding in terms of its impact or amount of effort required, or it must mark an extremely high level of accomplishment, or it must demonstrate ability much beyond the departmental norm.

Recent output and impending output can rightly influence an appraisal.

The expectation for each faculty member is that they will perform well in the categories below.

#### **1. APPRAISAL OF TEACHING**

For Professors, the standard teaching load in the Department is currently four courses per academic year. For Lecturers, the standard teaching load is currently 14 courses over two academic years. Teaching is an important aspect of the role of faculty members and is highly valued. Assessing teaching should not be based solely on course evaluations. The appraisal of teaching will consider both the quantity and quality of all teaching activities. The Chair or Performance Review Committee may consider all plausible evidence of effective teaching or supervision submitted by the faculty member.

The following factors will be taken into account when evaluating a department member's teaching:

- Quantitative information, such as: number of undergraduate courses and graduate seminars taught; number of students taught; scores on course evaluations; number of M.A. mémoires,

M.A. theses and Ph.D. dissertations supervised or co-supervised; number of graduate supervisory committees served on (as examiner, reader, internal/external).

- Qualitative information, such as: new or repeat course; degree of innovation or inventive teaching practices; course observations by others; training of graduate students; involvement in student success; awards; curriculum development or revision; teaching development (conferences or workshops pertaining to teaching); course coordination; mentoring and training TAs, RAs or Online Learning Assistants (OLA)

## 2. APPRAISAL OF RESEARCH

The assessment of research quality and intensity is particularly open to case-specific considerations. The key measure of research activity is published or presented original research output. But other measures are also relevant, including: evidence of research impact; winning research grants and research awards, especially Tri-Council and other external awards (foundations, government agencies, etc.); and organizing conferences and academic institutes that advance research and promote the research reputation of the Department. Equal consideration will be given to digital resources (web sites, databases, programs, etc.) when the dossier provides evidence that such work represents original and substantial scholarship. Types of assessment may include formal peer review, citation metrics, and public impact. 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, e-journals, and granting councils, and membership on government or professional committees. (Policy 77)

The following factors will be taken into account when evaluating a department member's research:

- Quantitative information, such as paper or on-line publications: number of books, chapters, articles, presentations, book reviews, reference articles, public press articles; number of edited volumes or special journal issues; number of presentations, workshops; research grants.
- Qualitative information, such as: review process of the publication/press; demonstrated impact of the member's work (e.g. reviews, proven usage of a website, database or other digital materials); invited or refereed conference presentations; awards.

Please note: Single or co-authorship is assessed according to the practices of discipline involved; published work that straddles the assessment period (e.g. date of acceptance -> date of publication) should be noted, and it can count towards both assessment periods, but in only one assessment period should it ever be considered outstanding; Work in progress is required for non-tenured members; tenured members may provide information on work in progress if they wish in order to demonstrate the ongoing nature of their activities or to provide context for future achievements.

Probationary faculty should ensure the maintenance of quantifiable research output over the short term, even if longer-term and larger-scale research projects are also under way.

### 3. APPRAISAL OF SERVICE

It should be taken as a faculty member's duty to find ways of contributing service-wise to the Department. Departmental affairs moreover require the existence of a range of committees. Some of these are standing committees, some are periodically and predictably reconstituted, and some are ad hoc committees intended to deal with specific issues.

Service in these committees too can be a substantial contribution, depending on the number of issues that fall to the committee in a given year.

This can be considered Open-Door service: the contribution that faculty members make to the Department by being present during regular office hours; by being readily available for consultation with students and other faculty members. Absenteeism, a reduced departmental presence, or chronic tardiness or disorganization in the completion of administrative tasks all lead to some burdens falling disproportionately upon those faculty who are in their offices, available, and responsive. They also create additional work for departmental administrators and support staff. Problematic performance in these aspects of Service is likely to be reflected in one's annual appraisal.

The Department and the University recognize and encourage service at the Faculty level, at University level and to the wider discipline, board membership in academic societies; community outreach; and academic mentorship not amounting to teaching. Some service activities, such as chairing a curriculum committee or editing a professional society journal, may also provide indirect evidence for scholarship and teaching.

"Citizenship" has not been expressly stated as a category, but it is understood that department members are expected to contribute positively to the life of the department, the faculty, the university, and the discipline.

These guidelines have been prepared in accordance with the following documents:

- Memorandum of Agreement between FAUW and UW.
- Policy 77: Tenure and Promotion.
- Review of the Faculty Performance Evaluation Process and its recommendations as revised by the Faculty Relations Committee. The Review will be available at: <https://uwaterloo.ca/provost/memos-reports>.
- Faculty of Arts Guidelines for the Faculty Performance Evaluation: <https://uwaterloo.ca/arts/information-faculty-and-staff/faculty-arts-internal-documents>.

## Department Performance Review Guidelines

*last approved September 2019 - and approved again Sept. 15, 2020*



**UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO**  
**FACULTY OF ARTS**  
Department of Germanic  
and Slavic Studies

### General Information

- The Department will vote every evaluation cycle in November as to how performance evaluations will be conducted – either by chair alone or by a committee of department members.
- Documentation is to be provided that gives evidence of the activity/achievement being claimed. GSS usually requires all course evaluations, offprints of articles, letters of commendation etc. to be submitted with the Activity Report.
- In any of the categories, to receive a score of 2.0 the contribution must be truly outstanding in terms of its impact or amount of effort required, or it must mark an extremely high level of accomplishment, or it must demonstrate ability much beyond the departmental norm.
- The expectation for each faculty member is that they will perform well in the categories below.

### Appraisal of Teaching

The following factors will be taken into account when evaluating a department member's teaching:

- Quantitative information, such as: number of courses taught; number of students taught; scores on course evaluations; number of theses/dissertations supervised; number of grad defence committees served on.
- Qualitative information, such as: new or repeat course; degree of innovation or inventive teaching practices; written feedback from students; course observations by others; training of graduate students; involvement in student success; awards.

Please note:

- o Research on teaching is evaluated under research.
- o Work with graduate students is evaluated under teaching.

### Appraisal of Research

The following factors will be taken into account when evaluating a department member's research:

- Quantitative information, such as: number of books, chapters, articles, presentations, book reviews, reference articles, public press articles; number of edited volumes or special journal issues; number of presentations, workshops; research grants.
- Qualitative information, such as: review process of the publication/press; demonstrated impact of the member's work (e.g. reviews); invited or refereed conference presentations; awards.

Please note:

- o Single or co-authorship is assessed according to the practices of discipline involved.
- o Published work that straddles the assessment period (e.g. date of acceptance -> date of publication) should be noted, and it can count towards both assessment periods, but in only one assessment period should it ever be considered outstanding.
- o Work in progress is required for non-tenured members; tenured members may provide information on work in progress if they wish in order to demonstrate the ongoing nature of their activities or to provide context for future achievements.

## **Appraisal of Service**

What counts as service?

- o University service, such as: service on university/faculty/department committees; performing officer duties in the department; other contributions to the life of the department, faculty, or university; outreach work connecting the university to the community at large.

- o Discipline service, such as: service with associations; journal editorial work; conference organization; other contributions.

How is service evaluated?

- o Does the service being performed demonstrate leadership or place holding (e.g. sitting on a committee that meets once a year or does little)?

- o Does the service being performed demonstrate a commitment to the work of the department/faculty/university/discipline?

Please note:

- o "Citizenship" has not been expressly stated as a category, but it is understood that department members are expected to contribute positively to the life of the department/faculty/university/discipline.

**UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO HISTORY DEPARTMENT ADDENDUM TO  
FACULTY OF ARTS PERFORMANCE REVIEW GUIDELINES,**

**Preamble:**

In accordance with Policy 77 and the Memorandum of Agreement, the History Department has prepared a 'living document', which represents guidelines for the Performance Review Committee and regularly employed faculty members to use for the bi-annual evaluation. The expectation is that this document will be subject to regular review. Performance is normally assessed in three areas: teaching, scholarship and service and the evaluation score is based on the scale found in the Memorandum of Agreement at <http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/OfficialDocuments/MoA.htm>.

As each of the following sections demonstrates, the Chair (in consultation with a duly elected Advisory Performance Review Committee when agreed upon by the department) undertakes the bi-annual performance evaluation for all regular faculty holding appointments of one year or more. The evaluation includes the portion of the year that the faculty member was a paid employee of the University, including sabbatical leave, but excluding pregnancy, adoption or parental leave.

Policy 77 requires that bi-annual performance reviews be included in tenure and promotion considerations. Therefore, it is important that the Chair provides a written assessment of each faculty member's performance which will normally reflect values of 40% for teaching, 40% for scholarship and 20% for service. Recommendations for selective merit increases are based on overall performance.

**TEACHING**

**Preamble:**

In accordance with Policy 77, all regular faculty members are expected to contribute to undergraduate teaching and, where possible, to contribute to graduate teaching and project/thesis supervision. Faculty members are expected: to be fair and constructive in the evaluation of student work; to be available for consultation outside the classroom at reasonable times; to respect their students' integrity and maintain strict confidentiality with regard to students' personal lives and political and religious views; and to be as fair and objective as possible when making assessments and providing letters of recommendation.

**Types of Teaching:**

Faculty members are normally expected to teach a 2-2 course load per year, as well as engage in other teaching activities like graduate supervision, PhD fields, and directed studies as needed. Teaching in the Department falls into two broad categories: undergraduate and graduate. In both categories the Department normally expects strong teaching from all faculty members. Undergraduate teaching may include lecture courses, tutorials, seminars, experiential learning, courses taught through Online Learning, and individual student supervision. It also includes setting and grading of assignments and examinations, interactions with students outside the classroom, and curriculum development. Graduate teaching may include formal course offerings (at both the MA and Ph.D. level), experiential learning, as well as graduate supervision. Graduate supervision includes: reviewing potential MA and Ph.D. students; participation on Tri-University MA and Ph.D. committees, either as supervisor or regular member; pedagogical mentoring for teaching assistants and doctoral candidates; and mentoring for grantsmanship and post-graduate employment.

**Principles for Evaluation:**

In accordance with Policy 77, teaching quality should be assessed broadly using evidence gathered from as many sources as practicable. Responsibility for providing documentary evidence on teaching rests with the candidate and, to a lesser degree, the Department Chair.

In evaluating one's quality of teaching, the Performance Review Committee may take into account such factors as class size, undergraduate versus graduate, service versus core, seminar versus lecture, for example. University teaching involves much more than classroom performance. Hence, a fair assessment of one's teaching activities includes taking into account contributions to project and thesis supervision, graduate seminars, oral and thesis examinations, preparation of new courses and significant course revision, and curriculum development.

Measures of the quality of undergraduate and graduate classroom teaching may usefully include:

- student evaluation forms (when available);
- peer evaluation;
- copies of course syllabi;
- evidence that courses are kept up-to-date with current scholarship and/or presentation methods;
- significant external recognition of teaching excellence;
- and any other evidence one might wish to introduce as a measure of teaching quality.

Measures of the quality of graduate supervision may include:

- availability to one's students;
- reasonable turn-around on written work;
- willingness to participate on other committees;
- successful guidance of students through the program and preparation for post-graduate success.

## SCHOLARSHIP

**Preamble:**

In accordance with Policy 77, scholarship generally is considered to include the discovery of new knowledge, including the generation of new concepts, ideas, principles and theories, as well as the innovative coordination, synthesis or integration of knowledge. As well, significant new applications of knowledge to the problems of society represent important scholarly contributions. Peer-reviewed research with respect to pedagogy and peer-reviewed research with respect to innovative teaching also constitute scholarly activity.

In addition, scholarship in the discipline of history may take, and is increasingly taking, a variety of forms. This is especially true for two reasons. First, there is a drive within the profession to reach broader audiences than the traditional one of fellow scholars, which can necessarily affect the focus and nature of the work without compromising its intellectual and scholarly integrity. Second, the possible forms of publication are in a considerable state of flux with the advent of electronic publishing of all forms and, more generally, the increasing sophistication of the internet as a venue for communication. With the profession's mission to reach beyond its traditional audience, the Department of History recognizes that it must be receptive to both new and innovative ways of publishing scholarly work and to new kinds of scholarly work, while remaining respectful of those works that advance an individual's field of research in the more traditional manner.

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.

### **Types of Scholarship:**

Scholarship may take any number of equally valid forms within the broad provisions of Policy 77, such as:

- a scholarly journal article (peer-reviewed);
- a book-length academic monograph (published with a university or other academic press and subject to peer review);
- editing a collection of essays;
- an essay in a collection of essays;
- encyclopedia or dictionary entries;
- e-publications, either the equivalent of book-length or article-length or shorter;
- textbooks;
- engagement in the development of public policy, as a consultant or an author of a commissioned report, for example;
- film, media or artistic productions that contribute to the advancement of the discipline;
- historical consultant on film, media or artistic productions that contribute to the advancement of the discipline;
- books and/or articles published with trade presses (and therefore not necessarily peer-reviewed) that contribute to the advancement of the discipline;
- presentation of papers at academic conferences;
- invited addresses to scholarly bodies;
- contributions to broader public debate in the role of "public intellectual."

Note: This list is not considered to be either comprehensive or prioritized.

### **Principles for evaluation:**

The basic principles for evaluation of scholarship must begin with a recognition of the target audience for any particular work - whether it be the traditional audience of scholars or a non-academic audience - and the differing requirements for effective communication with those target audiences. In each case, the objective is an assessment of the originality, the significance, and the impact of the work in terms of the target audience. In the discipline of history, the evaluative norm is the peer review process and it is recognized as such for the purposes of these guidelines.

For more traditional forms of academic scholarship, an assessment of the value of the work's contribution may be based on such evidence as grants received to support the project; the peer-review process of the publisher; the work's final, confirmed acceptance for publication; and acceptance rates of the publisher.



Subsequent to publication, further assessments of its quality worth noting and considering as a part of a candidate's evaluation, without being exclusive, are reviews of the work and any awards it may have won, recognizing that these may occur some time after the work's initial release.

For other forms of scholarly activity, the Department will necessarily entertain alternative measures of originality, significance and impact. These measures may include (without implying that this list is comprehensive):

- peer review of a work, if it is available;
- the size of the audience reached (for example, the number of hits on a website; the number of times a film or documentary is shown and the venues in which it has played);
- any grants acquired in support of the project;
- press or other media reviews of the project;
- any institutional support provided for the project (either from the University of Waterloo or other institutions).

Given the nature of historical research in which it can take some time to see a research project through to its fruition, bi-annual evaluation of scholarly activity cannot be based solely on the production of a final product. Instead, bi-annual reviews should seek evidence of steady progress towards the completion of any particular project, within the norms of the profession.

## **SERVICE**

### **Preamble:**

In accordance with Policy 77, all 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 when asked. As well, many faculty members also provide valuable service to groups outside the University, such as disciplinary or professional organizations, conferences, journals and granting councils and agencies. Community service related to a faculty member's scholarly activities is normally considered as service to the University.

### **TYPES OF SERVICE**

#### **Service to the Department**

Service to the department includes such "good citizenship" activities as serving on *ad hoc* and standing committees, undertaking departmental officerships, mentoring new faculty, being available to students, engaging in promotional activities, serving as a guest scholar or moderator in colleague's courses, for example.

#### **Service to the Faculty of Arts**

Service to the Faculty of Arts includes but is not limited to service on standing and *ad hoc* committees, serving as an administrative officer, for example.

#### **Service to the University**

Service to the University includes but is not limited to service on standing and *ad hoc* committees, participation in university-led initiatives, service on the Faculty Association and its committees, serving as an external appraiser during program reviews, for example.

### **Service to the Discipline**

Service to the discipline includes officerships in societies/associations, serving on editorial boards, organizing conferences, providing manuscript reviews, serving as an external examiner on graduate theses, providing expert assessments for external promotion and tenure candidates, serving on review committees or providing external assessments for granting agencies, for example.

### **Service to the Community**

Sharing the results of our research with the community is an important component of academic life and may take the form of public addresses, media interviews, community outreach, op-ed pieces, film screenings, digital websites, blogs, for example.

### **Principles for Evaluation:**

Service is highly valued by the History Department and as such is to be encouraged and appropriately recognized during deliberations on tenure, promotion and merit.

According to Policy 77, candidates for tenure or promotion shall provide information on their service activities in sufficient detail to allow the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee to assess its quantity and quality. The DTPC may also request statements from those who have observed the candidate's service contributions both inside and outside the University.

For the purpose of tenure, promotion and merit evaluation, evidence must be provided for all forms of service. For example, the time required to prepare for and attend meetings should be provided. Likewise, the time spent reviewing manuscripts, grant applications, external master's and doctoral theses, and tenure and promotion dossiers for external scholars should be calculated and included in the performance review material. Similar information should be provided for association/society officerships, conference organizing, and other duties performed for external groups.

For community service, evidence such as flyers and posters should be included as well as an indication of the number of hours required to create the talk, op-ed piece, article, web site, for example. Additional information such as the URL for digital contributions, letters, emails or other indications of impact may be provided.

September 13, 2011

Updated Sept. 2015, and approved at Department Meeting. Sept. 18, 2015

Reviewed, edited, and approved October 30, 2018 via an email vote.

Reviewed and Approved at Department Meeting, September 24, 2020 (meeting held on MS Teams).

## ***Performance appraisals and progress toward tenure and promotion***

*Advice for understanding the current (October 2020) faculty performance appraisal process and its relation to tenure and promotion in the Department of Philosophy*

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Faculty members at the University of Waterloo fulfill their job descriptions by doing some combination of teaching, research, and service. Faculty performance appraisals rate how well one is performing each of these elements of one's job. This process determines faculty members' selective salary increment each year through the process described in Article 13 of the Memorandum of Agreement. It also constitutes one component of ongoing feedback on their performance, and provides important information to Tenure and Promotion committees at various stages in each faculty member's career.

The following are default standards and desiderata for the appraisal process. This is a living document, to be updated as circumstances change and as good arguments for revisions come to light. Its role is to describe the procedures and heuristics by which performance is appraised and to sketch the reasons underlying those heuristics. With this information, all faculty may better understand the needs and expectations of the Department and the University as these bear on their job performance and its evaluation; and faculty may better understand the relation between performance appraisals and the tenure and promotion process. There is a standing invitation to bring proposed revisions to this document to the Chair, or to departmental meetings.

Across the University the provisions of Article 13 in the M.O.A. are implemented in somewhat different ways, reflecting different sizes, disciplines, and orientations of faculties and departments. The Department of Philosophy, like many smaller departments, until 2014 left the appraisal process to the Chair. Beginning in January 2015, since the Department now has more than 15 regular faculty members, the reviews will be conducted by a Departmental Performance Review Committee headed by the Chair, as is required by university policy.

To say that the standards described in the document are default is to flag their defeasibility when a reasonable case can be made for departing from them; this is not a one-size-fits-all model. But to say that these are default guidelines is also to indicate the need for such a reasonable case in order to motivate a departure from them.

### **2. THE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL**

The Performance Appraisal issues in a score out of 2, compounded out of the scores out of 2 on each of the three listed job components, typically according to the formula:  $(.4 \times \text{Teaching}) + (.4 \times \text{Research}) + (.2 \times \text{Service})$ . The points on the rating scale and their associated descriptors are:

0 – Unsatisfactory

0.25 – Needs major improvement

0.5 – Needs significant improvement 0.75 – Needs some improvement

1.0 – Satisfactory

1.25 – Good

1.5 – Very Good

1.75 – Excellent  
2.0 – Outstanding

Weightings other than 40% each for Teaching and Research and 20% for Service are sometimes negotiated for faculty having special research, teaching, or administrative appointments, usually on a temporary basis. Lighter duties or changed weightings are understood to influence expectations of the quantity of one's contributions in that area, but not their quality.

Every year (over December and January, traditionally), probationary and fixed-term contract regular faculty members are invited to submit information detailing their accomplishments in each of the three evaluation areas during the previous year. Tenured and continuing faculty members complete the process every second year. A standard form is available in the Faculty of Arts for the presentation of common categories of information. But faculty members are encouraged to take seriously the sections of this form that also solicit any further information they think relevant to their performance since their previous performance review. Faculty members should feel free to include and explain the widest selection of data they want the Chair and Committee to review, and to generally present their own strongest case.

Once the work of the Departmental Performance Review Committee is completed, the Chair recommends numerical ratings for each faculty member, which are then discussed with the Dean of Arts and possibly revised in order to achieve fairness and consistency across the Faculty.

The overall score for each faculty member is then used to determine that faculty member's multiplier ("adjusted R") on the Faculty of Arts basic selective increment, and also serves as a snapshot of one's general performance in the years evaluated. [The elaborate process for calculating annual salary increases is described in section 13.3.3 of the Memorandum of Agreement.] There is no very precise set of year- by-year scores necessary for tenure; moreover, any remarks in these guidelines must be understood only as advisory to faculty members without being binding on Faculty or University-level committees or adjudicators. But at the departmental level, at least, the view is that there is nothing inherently problematic in a probationary-term faculty member's having scores that initially fall at the lower end of the departmental or faculty distribution. Such scores may simply represent a nascent research program, lack of experience as an instructor, or initial adaptation to the service aspects of a professorial career. In these cases, what matters is that scores are not so low as to be objectively problematic (below 1.0) and that those that do start at the low end of the distribution generally improve over the period of one's probationary term. Fluctuating overall or specific scores are not an absolute barrier to tenure; indeed, if the fluctuations occur higher up the scale – between Excellent (1.75) and Very Good (1.5), for example – they are likely to be of little moment. But scores that dip down below Satisfactory on any measure, and especially on Teaching or Research, are likely to be of some concern to Tenure and Promotion Committees, who will want to see a trend of quick recovery from any scores of that nature. Overall scores that plateau in the Satisfactory-Good range over several years may be seen as marginal progress toward tenure; the interpretation of such scores will come down to specifics in the sub-scores and to the details of the faculty member's vita over that time period.

Over the longer course of a career, appraisals should reflect the fact that performance in each of the three measures, and most particularly on research, neither materializes nor disappears within a single year. Recent output and impending output can rightly influence an appraisal. The process should negotiate a middle path between anachronistic ratings, on which a long-quiescent professor receives unwarrantedly high evaluations for “lifetime achievement”, and a mercenary approach, on which one’s contributions are instantly and completely forgotten from one year to the next.

### **3. DEPARTMENT PERFORMANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE (DPRC)**

The DPRC assists and advises the Chair in the assignment of performance evaluation scores, though the final responsibility for rankings rests with the Chair, who submits a recommendation to the Dean (in accordance with M of A section 13.5.6).

*Eligibility:* All regular faculty members with a continuing appointment in the department (i.e., tenured professors or continuing lecturers) are eligible to serve. Regular faculty with probationary appointments are eligible to serve as non-voting members of the DPRC as described below. Committee members will recuse themselves for the discussion of their own or their spouses’ files, and declare other possible causes of conflict of interest.

*Scope:* The DPRC will normally assess the performance of all members of the Department other than those who, by policy, are not evaluated in the Department (e.g., the Chair, members holding administrative appointments at the rank of Associate Dean or higher). The committee will recommend scores in each of the categories (Teaching, Scholarship and Service) for each department member evaluated in every category for which her/his appointment requires an evaluation.

*Information provided and confidentiality:* Members of the DPRC will have access to the activity reports submitted by all department members to be evaluated, and to other information relevant to performance evaluation. This includes the weightings of scholarship, teaching and service of each faculty member, information about reduced loads, the performance ratings from the previous year, and other things that may arise on an individual basis. Since university policy and practice dictates that “smoothing” of scores over a number of years is often appropriate, the Chair will share information with the DPRC about whether “smoothing” happened in recent years for any particular faculty member. Much of this information is sensitive; the deliberations of the DPRC will therefore be confidential, and members will treat the confidential portions of the assessment material appropriately.

*Membership:* The DPRC will include the department Chair, who shall chair the committee, and two other eligible department members. Normally, members will be elected for a two-year term, with the terms staggered to provide continuity; after the completion of a term on the committee, a department member will not be eligible for membership on the committee for two years (except in the case where s/he becomes Chair). Each year the Chair may appoint one probationary faculty member as a non-voting member of the committee. In the first year after a new Chair is appointed, the Chair may choose to appoint the previous Chair as a non-voting adviser to the committee.

*Selection of Committee:* During the Fall term, ballots will be circulated to all regular faculty members in the department; the ballot will list all members of the department eligible for election to the DPRC, and will include available information about who will be on sabbatical or other leave at the time the committee's work will be carried out. Each department member will vote for up to three department members. When the results are tallied, the Chair will approach members about their willingness to serve in order by decreasing number of votes.

#### 4. TEACHING

Teaching in the Department falls into two broad categories: undergraduate and graduate. Each of these has various forms, moreover. In both categories the Department expects engaged, quality teaching of all faculty members. Among other things this means teaching accurate information, engaging students, grading fairly, organizing courses well, following Departmental policies for teaching, and generally treating students with respect. Most of the appraisal of one's teaching contributions will be based on evidence regarding the intensity and quality of one's performance in these two categories. However, the boundaries between them can be blurred in some situations, and there are also forms of mentorship that are partly educational and partly research or service oriented – such as supervising a Research Assistantship or professionally mentoring the Teaching Assistants for one's courses. Heavy work obligations or significant successes in one of these less central or less sharply defined domains are also worth taking into account, especially if the former were imposed or requested by the Department. It should be noted, however, that the Faculty of Arts has adopted the view that “overload” teaching for which a stipend is paid and that was not assigned by the department will not count as an increase in teaching workload, and that such work, even when assigned by the Department, must be evaluated in light of the fact that the faculty member has already received some extra financial compensation for it. Such additional considerations should be clearly articulated in one's activity report to the Chair.

Faculty should also feel free to seek out extra information about their teaching – e.g., by requesting extra classroom visits by faculty members – with the aim of improving their instruction, without fear that such additional information, if negative in some respect, would be used in their summative evaluations.

The standard teaching load in the Department is currently four courses per academic year for professors and seven courses per year for lecturers (or an equivalent assignment of responsibilities). For professors, often the four courses will be organized as two in the Fall term and two in the Winter term, but there are sometimes also options to teach in the Spring. Given the Department's historical faculty and student numbers, it is rare for faculty to teach more than one graduate seminar per academic year, and not uncommon to teach no graduate seminar in an academic year. So the bulk of one's course-based teaching in any given year, and possibly all of it, will be undergraduate teaching.

Faculty should include information about curriculum development work and whether a course was a new prep in the material they submit as part of the annual performance review process.

Undergraduate teaching is the largest single undertaking of the University and the Department. It

encompasses lecture instruction, pedagogy through feedback on coursework, and the evaluation of student work. The clearest analogue of undergraduate teaching at the graduate level is the graduate seminar. Through some combination of lecturing and student participation, professors bring their students to the cutting edge of research in some sub-field, introducing students to the scholarship and methods that will enable them to contribute to academic philosophy as researchers. In large measure the Department's standards and expectations for the structure and orientation of such seminars can be gleaned by examining the range of seminars recently offered by other faculty members. However, some explicit guidelines for graduate teaching do exist. These include grade-level rubrics for graduate work, periodically circulated by the Departmental Graduate Chair and available from the Graduate Coordinator.

Policy 77 says that university teaching includes both classroom teaching and other activities, and that "teaching quality should be assessed broadly using evidence gathered from as many sources as practicable."

In accordance with Policy 77, classroom teaching "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." Some factors relevant to this evaluation include information about classes taught, such as class size, undergraduate versus graduate, service versus core, and seminar versus lecture.

With respect to other activities, evaluation of teaching will also take into account factors related to graduate supervision, such as contributions to project and thesis supervision, participation in MA and PhD thesis committees, serving as an internal or external examiner, willingness to serve as *pro tem* advisors and teaching mentors, and other qualitative factors such as mentoring students through the process of applying for grants, fellowships, graduate programs, post-docs and positions, preparation of new courses, and significant course revision and curriculum development. See further details below.

The primary intended purposes of the Waterloo Student Course Perceptions (WSCP) surveys are 1) to collect formative and summative data to help improve the design and delivery of courses and the student learning experience; and 2) to provide students with an avenue to voice their learning experiences. The Chair and the DPRC should always be sensitive to evidence of bias in student evaluations, and also balance student perceptions of a course against other evidence, such as peer reviews of teaching.

With respect to graduate teaching, much of it is the form of individual work with Philosophy graduate students: PhD Research Area supervision, M.A. research papers, and thesis supervision at both the Master's and Doctoral levels. Supervision in each of these domains is a matter of teaching, guiding the revision of work, monitoring students' progress, and providing timely feedback, each in a manner appropriate to the particular student. Faculty have a part in seeing that students complete their work to an appropriate standard and on a reasonable schedule. Faculty members' obligations therefore include avoiding a range of potential problematic behaviors: frequently slow feedback on draft work, disorganization, poor communication,

shifting or inconsistent advice, or inaccessibility for meetings. Supervisory conduct that unreasonably slows the completion of students' programs amounts to unsatisfactory teaching.

High quality graduate supervision is thus properly understood as encompassing teaching, among other things. It is not merely gate-keeping into the academy. Some students may thrive on nearly independent work, but supervision includes more focused guidance for those students who require more intense and more regular interaction with faculty. It is difficult to measure fine degrees of excellence in supervision, but quality supervision is indicated by such outcomes as student work that gets published or given at refereed conferences, and by graduate placement in desirable jobs, while problematic supervision may be manifest as a student dissertation, area study, or coursework that requires departmental intervention or otherwise falls on some other faculty member to remedy. However, these outcomes can also partly reflect the abilities and efforts of the students themselves. Regular Departmental discussions regarding graduate students, as well as direct feedback from supervisors in their annual reports, assist the Chair in recognizing when weaker or struggling students are getting good supervision in spite of not necessarily producing the best or most highly appreciated work. For some such students, merely completing the degree may be a sign of outstanding supervision. Thus the aim of these remarks is not to dissuade faculty from supervising any but the most talented graduate students, but rather to emphasize the need for good supervision of any student, and the goal of using all plausible metrics to measure the quality of supervision.

It takes a department to raise a graduate student. Delivering the components of a graduate degree to all the students the Department admits is a shared responsibility in Philosophy. Every faculty member, over the long run, should discharge this obligation by substantial contribution to as many facets of graduate instruction as possible, supplementing fewer contributions in one respect (e.g., thesis supervision) with greater contributions in another (e.g., thesis committee work). Graduate teaching that overlaps with service and is essential to the smooth functioning of the Department includes serving as a reader or thesis committee member for graduate theses; arranging and conducting oral defenses of theses; professionally and academically advising students, including in one's role as *pro tem* advisor; and conducting mock interviews for students with impending academic job interviews.

## 5. RESEARCH

The assessment of research quality and intensity is particularly open to case-specific considerations. Policy 77 reflects the breadth of endeavours apt to count as research contributions:

"Scholarship may take several equally valuable forms. One is the discovery of new knowledge, which may differ from discipline to discipline, and includes the generation of new concepts, ideas, principles and theories. A second form involves the innovative coordination, synthesis or integration of knowledge. This type of scholarship seeks and promotes understanding in a broader context by organizing knowledge in a new and useful way, by illustrating new relationships between the parts and the whole, by relating the past in a new way to the present and future, or by demonstrating new and significant patterns of meaning. Scholarship may also be observed in new and useful applications. Indeed, significant new applications of knowledge to the problems of society represent important scholarly contributions."



Nevertheless, disciplinary and sub-disciplinary standards and practices can rightly influence how research contributions of these various sorts are evaluated. Sound and fair evaluation will reflect the standards of the relevant field or sub-field, without penalizing breadth or innovation that is appropriately linked to the relevant field.

Normally the key measure of research activity is published or presented original research output. But other measures are also relevant, including: evidence of research impact; winning research grants and research awards, especially Tri-Council awards; and organizing conferences and academic institutes that advance research and promote the research reputation of the Department. Hence it is important to reemphasize both the default nature of these Departmental guidelines and the invitation for faculty members to bring forward and explain any evidence they consider relevant to their evaluation.

#### *5a. Research quality*

The following schema for the evaluation of research performance serves as a *prima facie* categorization of research venues. The relative rankings can be overridden on the basis of the properties of specific pieces of work. Faculty members can make a case for regarding some piece of research as coeval with other (*prima facie* more significant) kinds of research, or for regarding forms of work not listed here as having a research component that merits consideration.

The categories have both fuzzy borders and a great deal of internal variety; one should expect overlapping categories and room for negotiation about, e.g., rankings among journals, among presses, and among conferences. Distinct sub-disciplines have different premier journals, and place varying emphases on the relative merits of books and articles in prestigious journals, so the assessment of research contributions should be relative to sub-disciplinary context. In general, however, evidence of high quality will comprise evidence of serious (preferably anonymous) review processes, low acceptance rates (roughly, below 15%, and lower if possible), and evidence of research impact in the discipline. Non-traditional publication venues and formats such as online journals, or works published under “creative common license,” may well demonstrate these features.

From most significant to least significant, the default categories of research significance are:

1. Books published with presses having strong academic reputations, and with evidence of meaningful peer review.
2. High quality peer-reviewed journal articles, as these terms are understood above.
3. Edited volumes with good presses or respected contributors; invited chapters in edited collections that feature influential and respected authors or editors, published by reputable presses; and textbooks, especially those with reputable presses, with evidence of novel contributions to the discipline.
4. Books with less prestigious presses, but with evidence of some non-trivial refereeing process.
5. Refereed, but non-competitive publications in well-known venues (e.g., Stanford Encyclopedia).
6. Research papers in lesser-known journals having relatively high acceptance rates.
7. Invited major or keynote addresses to prestigious conferences.

8. Research papers presented in longer sessions at major international conferences with evidence of substantial peer review and prearranged commentary.
9. Books with presses that facilitate self-publishing.
10. Book reviews in top journals.
11. Poster presentations at major international conferences with evidence of substantial peer review.
12. Research papers in minor, unrefereed journals or proceedings.
13. Book reviews in minor, unrefereed, or simply book-reviewing journals.
14. Non-academic or purely introductory presentations, popular talks; newspaper or (non-academic) magazine articles.

#### 5b. *Research intensity*

In sketchiest general terms, one to three items annually in Categories 2 or 3, or a proportional rate of Category 1 book publication, or, of course, combinations of these with compensating adjustments in frequency, should be considered very strong research output for Philosophy faculty, especially when supplemented with other output in further categories. However, a dearth of research output for a few years after hiring is not a good start, even if this results in a book eventually. Probationary faculty should ensure the maintenance of quantifiable research output over the short term, even if longer-term and larger-scale research projects are also under way.

As has been noted elsewhere in this document, department members are free to include and explain any information they feel is relevant to the evaluation of their performance in their activity reports. Additionally, though, in cases where there is concern—due to variation in subdisciplinary norms or for other legitimate reasons—that there is a persistent risk that one’s rate of publication could be misjudged by the DPRC and DTTPC, faculty members are invited to work with the Department Chair to develop useful information that can be shared with the DPRC and the DTTPC about what rate of publication is appropriately expected.

It is worth reemphasizing that appraisals should reflect the fact that performance as a researcher neither materializes nor disappears within a single year. Throughout one’s career, research output can be “streaky,” so in general a pattern of productivity is more important than one’s output over any particular year. At the same time, in any given year (factoring out special circumstances) it is important to show signs of research activity at some levels on the above scale, preferably as part of a trend for work to move upwards on the above scale from year to year. For example, a conference paper has added significance when it occurs as part of a research career in which conference papers have frequently turned into journal articles.

The above remarks apply to most of the research activity normally reported by members of the Department. Some scholarly activity undertaken by faculty members, perhaps for instance a “significant new application of knowledge to the problems of society,” might not be reflected in publication in traditional venues. The Department recognizes the value of such work, provided it relates in appropriate ways to philosophy as a discipline. However, it is up to the faculty member to provide evidence of the significance of this work, bearing in mind this passage from Policy 77:

"Although any of these scholarly activities may be carried out on a confidential basis, the expectation of the University is for communicated 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."

Note also that Indigenous scholars and scholars involved in Indigenous research may choose to be evaluated in a manner consistent [with S S HRC 's Guidelines for the Merit Review of Indigenous Research](#).

Finally, lower categories on the above list have a fairly rapidly diminishing marginal utility; a few book reviews or newspaper articles are part of a healthy research profile, but a multitude of book reviews or newspaper articles on their own do not "make up for" a lack of peer-reviewed books and articles. Rather, this would be a sign of mistaken use of professional time and energy.

## 6. SERVICE

The University recognizes work of various kinds, at various administrative levels, as apt for the partial satisfaction of the Service element of a continuing lecturer, tenured or tenure-track appointment. Faculties and departments may emphasize more specific kinds of service, however, and indeed both the Faculty of Arts and the Department do so. In a smaller department, such as Philosophy, the fixed administrative load of a department (especially one with a PhD program) is less widely distributed on faculty members than in a large department. Since there is a substantial minimum amount of administration that must be done in order for the Department to sustain its various programs, and to interact effectively with the University, any faculty member who performs little or no departmental service thereby places a significant additional administrative burden on his or her colleagues to do it. In Philosophy, therefore, while the appraisal of each faculty member's Service component recognizes wider institutional and disciplinary service, it emphasizes Departmental work in the first instance. Service of these broader institutional and disciplinary sorts, to be recognized and valued, should proceed in addition to or parallel with Departmental service over at least the medium term, and should not be viewed as a longer-term alternative to Departmental service.

In the absence of competition among faculty members to hold committee and Associate Chair positions, these are typically distributed by nomination from the Chair or by active voluntarism from faculty members, followed by discussion and consensus among the Department, rather than by a wider nomination and voting process. It is a faculty member's duty to find ways of contributing service-wise to the Department both within and outside the department – perhaps simply by indicating to the Chair a willingness to serve in appropriate roles.

The positions of Department Chair, Associate Chair of Undergraduate Studies, and Associate Chair of Graduate Studies are the most substantial forms of departmental service. They are positions in which faculty members are effectively "on call" to deal with specific administrative issues at any time, and which require not only a major investment of time but also an element of leadership and assistance for other faculty members. Each of these positions carries with it a stipend and a reduction in teaching duties, which must be taken into account when performance

is evaluated. However, the roles, diligently undertaken, typically involve a much larger investment of time and energy than is compensated for in this way. Responsible and highly effective performance in one of these positions is the most certain determinant of a high Service rating.

Other formalized positions in the Department of Philosophy at the time of writing include: Gender and Social Justice Advisor; Cognitive Science Advisor; Applied Philosophy Advisor; Social Media Coordinator; Library Officer; Undergraduate Philosophy Student Society (“Philsoc”) Liaison Officer; GSJ Society Liaison Officer; Computing/IT Officer; Colloquium and event organizer; Alumni Relations Officer; Careers Advisor; St. Jerome’s Philosophy Department Liaison Officer; and Departmental FAUW Representative. The Library, Undergrad, Computing, Colloquium and FAUW Representative positions may be particularly well-suited for junior faculty members, since they are both less time-intensive and presuppose somewhat less familiarity with the intricacies of the University. Yet it is to be expected that each of these positions involves periodic meetings, maintaining contact with designated extra-departmental staff or students, some organizational commitments, and a responsibility to keep the Department informed of relevant developments, normally via written reports but in other means if circumstances warrant. From year to year their commitments can vary significantly; their contributions to one’s Service rating vary accordingly.

Departmental affairs moreover require the existence of a range of committees. Some of these are standing committees, some are periodically and predictably reconstituted, and some are ad hoc committees intended to deal with specific issues. For example:

Standing committees:

Graduate Committee

Undergraduate Committee

Gender and Social Justice Committee

Performance Review Committee

Recurring committees constituted as necessary:

DACA (Hiring Committee)

DTPC (Tenure and Promotion)

Service in these committees too can be a substantial contribution, depending on the number of issues that fall to the committee in a given year.

There is also a more diffuse yet significant sense in which the Department of Philosophy depends on faculty service: the contribution that faculty members make to the Department by being present during regular office hours; by being readily available for consultation with

students and other faculty members; and by their inclination to answer email and telephone messages promptly, and to complete administrative necessities (grades, letters of recommendation, etc.) quickly and without reminders. Service of this broad sort helps to evenly distribute the inevitable daily burdens of running a department. Absenteeism, a reduced departmental presence, or chronic tardiness or disorganization in the completion of administrative tasks all lead to some burdens falling disproportionately upon those faculty who are in their offices, available, and responsive. They also create additional work for departmental administrators and support staff. Problematic performance in these aspects of Service is likely to be reflected in one's annual appraisal.

There are many opportunities to meet the expectations for University-level service such as: various Faculty of Arts committees (Arts Faculty Council Executive, Admissions; appeal committees of various sorts); University committees; Senate; with the Faculty Association; or in conjunction with student organizations; in roles such as chairing PhD examinations in other departments; and so on. These will have widely diverging levels of commitment, however, and the degree of these commitments is a factor in weighing the significance of the service. Membership on several quiescent University committees may not be evaluated as highly as membership on the Department's DACA during a hiring year.

Finally, the Department and the University also recognize and encourage service to the wider discipline, in the form of work such as journal, conference, and manuscript refereeing; journal editing; administrative and leadership roles in extra- Departmental programs; board membership in academic societies; community outreach; and academic mentorship not amounting to teaching. This is valuable work indicating a well-rounded contribution to the academy, and reflecting the respect and recognition one has earned in the wider discipline. It should be so recognized in performance appraisals. (These may also be contributions that weigh especially heavily in later-career decisions about promotion to Full Professor rank.) Nevertheless, every faculty member's career as a successful contributor to the wider discipline asymmetrically depends upon having a functionally administered department, and service evaluations within the Department ought to reflect this.

## Department of Political Science

# GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS AND PROGRESS TOWARD TENURE & PROMOTION

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This document provides guidelines for the evaluation process and the performance expectations for scholarship, teaching, and service for faculty with the Political Science department at University of Waterloo. These guidelines supplement and are consistent with [University of Waterloo Policies](#), the member evaluation procedures outlined in Article 13 of the [Memorandum of Agreement between UW and FAUW](#), and the [Faculty of Arts guidelines](#) for these issues.

This document will be reviewed, updated, and approved by the members of the Department at the start of each academic year.

### 1.1 General comments about performance reviews

#### 1.1.1 Who is assessed?

Performance reviews are required for all regular faculty with appointments of more than one year (Lecturers to Professors on full-time or reduced load appointments). Reviews will be conducted annually for faculty on probation and biennially for other faculty. Performance ratings will pertain to the portion of the evaluation year during which the faculty member was a paid employee of the University, including sabbatical leave, but excluding pregnancy, adoption or parental leave. Policy 77 requires that annual performance reviews be included in tenure and promotion considerations.

*Faculty on Long Term Disability:* A faculty member on long term disability is not subject to a performance review. The salary of a faculty member on long term disability is paid, and adjusted to include any scale increases, under the LTD plan.

*Newly-Appointed Faculty:* For new faculty in their first year, a score will be assigned in each category based on actual performance, or, when too little information is available, a score equal to the departmental average for their rank.

*On Paid Leave (including Sabbatical Leave):* A faculty member on paid leave will be evaluated on the portion of the evaluation year during which the faculty member was a paid employee of the University. It may not be possible to assess performance in all three categories during the evaluation year. In such cases, a faculty member normally

will receive the average of up to the three previous years' ratings in any category where assessment is not possible.

*On Pregnancy, Adoption or Parental Leave:* For faculty members on approved pregnancy, adoption or parental leave, the full scale and selective increases shall apply.

*On Sick Leave:* A faculty member on sick leave is subject to performance review. If information to evaluate the faculty member's performance is not available owing to the illness, the average of up to three years could be used.

*On Unpaid Leave:* For faculty members on unpaid leave, the full scale increase shall apply, but the merit increase will be prorated by the fraction of the year served at the University.

*Administrative Duty:* In the case where a faculty member served as Chair of a Department for part of a year, the Dean will provide a service rating to the Department for that fraction of the year.

### **1.1.2 Ratings, weightings and process**

#### *Ratings and Weightings:*

Performance is assessed out of a score of 2.0 in three areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. The scoring categories are as follows: Unsatisfactory (0.0), Needs Improvement (0.25, 0.5, 0.75), Satisfactory (1.0), Good (1.25), Very Good (1.5), Excellent (1.75), Outstanding (2.0).

For the overall performance rating, scores across the three areas are averaged according to a weighting system. The weight for each area shall be as specified in the member's letter of appointment (or subsequent revisions). In the absence of specified weights, the normal weights shall be deemed to be 40 percent for scholarship, 40 percent for teaching, and 20 percent for service. Faculty members can request a temporary adjustment of their weightings when they take on a significant administrative role. The adjustment involves a change in expectations for quantity of work in each area but not for quality.

*Process:* Within the Department, responsibility for performance evaluations rests with the Chair. The Chair is advised by a performance review committee which includes: the Chair, three members elected each year from all full-time faculty within the Department, and (where possible) one probationary faculty appointed by the Chair as a non-voting member. All members of the performance review committee must be provided with each faculty member's respective weightings of scholarship, teaching and service for the year.

The Chair's recommendation to the Dean must indicate whether performance in each area is satisfactory or not and must provide evidence supporting this assessment. Because performance reviews are included in tenure and promotion deliberations, it is important that Chairs provide a thorough written assessment of each faculty member's performance.

It is essential that the faculty member provide sufficient information during the performance review process to allow an informed judgement in each area. It is the responsibility of faculty members to ensure that all information, e.g., page numbers for articles, is complete. A faculty member who does not submit the required documentation by the specified deadline normally will receive an overall rating of at most 0.5.

### **1.1.3 Probationary faculty**

*Probationary Faculty:* Performance reviews of probationary faculty are important in providing an annual assessment of progress toward tenure. Where appropriate, separate assessments should be given for each component (e.g., while performance on research for the past year was satisfactory, the total record is a cause for concern because, etc.). All concerns should be conveyed to the individual in as specific a form as possible and every effort should be made to assist the faculty member to identify and rectify the problem. An indication should be given of the likelihood of the individual being granted tenure if he/she continues to perform at the present level. While not required by policy, it is useful for the Chair to share any such concerns with the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee (DTPC) and seek its advice on appropriate feedback to faculty.

Policy 77 states that “annual performance reviews form part of the evidence in tenure considerations”. The University Tenure Appeals Committee (UTAC) has stated that: *“It is understood that the objective of performance reviews is to be helpful and encouraging, and give an accurate account of the positive and negative aspects of the faculty member’s work. Reservations, if any, must be clearly expressed, and there should be no ambiguity between what is said and what is written. A major purpose is to give the faculty member means to do a better job. The review should also remind the candidate that the tenure process will include outside assessment in the form of reports from external referees.”* (Report to Senate, October 21, 1996)

From a departmental standpoint, there is nothing inherently problematic if a probationary-term faculty member has scores that initially fall at the lower end of the departmental or faculty distributions. Such scores may simply represent a nascent research program, lack of experience as an instructor, or initial adaptation to the service aspects of a professorial career. In these cases, what matters is that scores are not so low as to be objectively problematic (i.e. Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement) and that they generally improve over the period of the faculty member’s probationary term. Overall scores or specific scores that dip down below Satisfactory on any measure, and especially on teaching or scholarship, are likely to be of some concern to



Tenure and Promotion Committees who will want to see a trend of quick recovery from any scores of that nature. Overall scores that plateau in the Satisfactory-Good range over several years may be seen as marginal progress towards tenure; the interpretation of such scores will come down to specifics in the sub-scores and to the details of the faculty member's curriculum vita over that time period.

Faculty members at risk of not receiving reappointment to a second probationary position should have this spelled out clearly in the annual review letter(s).

If the DTPC has expressed concern at the time of renewal of the probationary contract, the results of each subsequent annual performance assessment should be reviewed by that Committee. Upon receipt of the DTPC recommendation, the Dean shall decide whether to reappoint, and shall inform the candidate in writing, including reasons if the decision is negative.

#### **1.1.4 Tenured Associate Professors**

In accordance with Policy 77, the objective of performance reviews is to provide helpful feedback on the work of faculty. The Chair and the DTPC are available to provide mentorship to faculty regarding their progress towards promotion to full Professor.

## **2. Scholarship**

Policy 77 notes: *"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."* Further, as the university-wide review of the Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation Process notes (recommendation 3.2), *"scholarly work outside of the usual peer reviewed venues is valued, but the onus is on the faculty member to provide evidence of its quality, impact and relevance."*

### *2.1 Quality of Scholarship*

Distinct sub-fields in political science have different premier journals, and place varying emphases on the relative merits of books and articles in prestigious journals; accordingly, the assessment of research contributions will be relative to sub-field context. In general, however, evidence of serious peer review, low acceptance rates and citation impact will be considered *prima facie* evidence of high quality.

The three major categories of peer-reviewed research are books, journal articles, and edited books/chapters in edited books. In evaluating each of these, emphasis will be placed on quality.

1. Books with publishers having good academic reputations and meaningful peer review.

Books with leading university presses will usually be more favourably regarded than peer-reviewed books with other presses, but standards vary across sub-fields of the disciplines and it is recognized that some non-university presses can have stronger academic reputations than some university presses.

2. Journal articles in peer-reviewed journals.

Many political scientists publish in multi-disciplinary journals devoted to country or area studies, or to specific fields such as feminist thought, race and class, international political economy, global governance, or security studies. In most of these areas, as with subfields of the discipline, there is substantial agreement in the relevant epistemic community on the relative quality of journals: this ranking is usually closely correlated with the rigour of peer review and the demonstrated impact of articles published in the journals.

Faculty should aim to publish in journals that are included in InCites Journal Citation Reports (Web of Science/Social Sciences Citation Index): (<https://jcr-clarivate-com.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/JCRLandingPageAction.action?Init=Yes>) and/or Scopus (<https://www.scopus.com/sources>). These citation reports provide comprehensive coverage in many fields but the Department recognizes that there may be some journals significant for some subfields that are not included in these reports.<sup>1</sup> For these journals, the onus will be on faculty to provide evidence of serious peer review and of the impact of their publication.

3. Edited books/chapters in peer-reviewed edited books. Emphasis will be placed on the reputation of the publisher and the rigour of peer review. The Department acknowledges that edited collections are often the product of workshops that are valuable for reasons such as establishing a research profile and facilitating networking. Generally, however, chapters in edited collections do not have the impact of articles published in high quality journals.

Candidates with a published book are encouraged to submit evidence of the good reputation and rigour of the review processes of the book's publisher. Candidates with published journal articles are encouraged to submit evidence of the "high quality" of the journals in which they have published. Candidates are also encouraged to include evidence of the extent to which other scholars have made reference to their work.

---

<sup>1</sup> In July 2020, Scopus listed 636 journals in international relations and political science; InCites included 180 political science journals, 77 categorized as Area Studies, and 95 as international relations.

The research of some faculty engages with public policy. The Department acknowledges that the optimal outlet for such research may not be conventional academic publications but, for instance, policy papers. In evaluating such outputs, the Department will place emphasis on peer review and on the demonstrated impact of the research. It borrows the definition of “impact” used in the UK’s 2020 Research Excellence Framework: “an effect on, change or benefit to the economy, society, culture, public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life, beyond academia”.<sup>2</sup> The Department, however, recognizes the challenges involved in measuring impact.<sup>3</sup>

In the case of co-authored/co-edited publications, the Chair and performance review committee will assume that the division of work among the authors/editors was shared equally unless faculty members provide evidence otherwise. Co-authored/co-edited publications generally will carry less weight than single-authored publications.

Non-peer-reviewed outputs are often a valuable part of regular scholarly activity. They may play a role in establishing or maintaining faculty profiles in the profession or in service to national or international professional bodies. Conference presentations are valued but the expectation is that research presented at a conference will eventually be disseminated via a publication. Authoring, editing or contributing to textbooks sometimes afford opportunities for creative syntheses of work published in the subfield: faculty can either ask for them to be considered as scholarship or as part of their contribution to teaching. Book reviews can be a means for junior faculty to establish a profile: unless, however, they take the form of an extended review essay, they seldom reflect original research.

Other non-refereed publications such as magazine articles, newspaper articles, trade publications, briefing papers, research reports, and scholarly commentary in the media can be considered under the category of scholarship. The University has noted, however, that the onus is on the faculty member to provide evidence of the quality, impact and relevance of these non-refereed publications if they are to be considered as part of scholarship. Faculty members alternatively may choose to have these non-refereed publications considered under the category of service.

Substantial output of non-refereed publications will not be regarded as offsetting a weak record in refereed publications.

---

<sup>2</sup> Research Excellence Framework REF2021 (2019), 'Guidance on submissions (2019/01)' paragraph 297, (<[https://www.ref.ac.uk/media/1092/ref-2019\\_01-guidance-on-submissions.pdf](https://www.ref.ac.uk/media/1092/ref-2019_01-guidance-on-submissions.pdf)>.

<sup>3</sup> As documented, for example, in Boswell, Christina and Smith, Katherine (2017), “Rethinking policy ‘impact’: four models of research-policy relations”, *Palgrave Communications*, 3 (1), 44.

## *2.2 Other Evidence of Excellence in Scholarship*

Evidence of excellence in scholarship can be provided by:

- Success in winning competitive external grants
- Receipt of prizes from local, national or international professional bodies for scholarly work
- Election to learned societies
- Invitations to present “keynote” addresses
- Service as a journal editor, member of an editorial board, or as a referee for journals, scholarly prize competitions or granting councils
- Membership on government or professional committees
- Invitations to present submissions to government enquiries, parliamentary committees or other policy-making processes
- Supervision of student research. Faculty members should specify whether supervision is to be counted as scholarship or teaching.
- Invitations to participate in collaborative projects from established leaders in a field

This list is not exhaustive. Other activities may be included but faculty must make a case for their relevance in light of Policy 77.

### **3. TEACHING**

#### **3.1 General comments**

Teaching is broadly defined to include lecture, seminar and laboratory instruction, office consultation, undergraduate reading and independent study courses, graduate and undergraduate supervision and course and program development or revision. Ratings of teaching performance will be based on evidence relevant to any or all these areas. Faculty members in political science engage in both graduate and undergraduate teaching and supervision, and all forms of these teaching activities are taken into account in performance review, tenure and promotion decisions. Faculty are expected to display professionalism in all aspects of their teaching.

#### **3.2 Evaluation**

*Policy 77 notes: "Teaching quality should be assessed broadly using evidence gathered from as many sources as practicable. Responsibility for providing documentary evidence on teaching rests with the candidate and, to a lesser degree, with the Department Chair. A teaching dossier developed by the candidate may be the most effective way of assembling this information. 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."*

Faculty are encouraged to submit evidence of teaching excellence. This may include evidence of supervision and mentoring of graduate students, course outlines, student course perceptions, evidence of professional development such as participation in or organization of teaching or pedagogical workshops, evidence of other teaching-related activities outside the classroom such as training or mentoring teaching assistants, mentoring junior faculty, and supervision of students in independent studies courses.

Faculty can also count publication of textbooks towards their teaching activities. If a textbook contributes to the synthesis of knowledge, it may be counted under "scholarship" instead. Faculty members must indicate under which category they would like textbooks to be considered; these publications cannot be double-counted under both categories.

### **3.2.2 Supervision**

Most supervision in the political science department is graduate supervision, but in some cases faculty members supervise undergraduate students in reading or research courses. Supervision in the political science department counts as teaching, rather than research, unless a faculty member makes a strong case to the contrary. Supervision in programs to which political science contributes teaching resources (such as the Global Governance, Master of Public Service, and Master of Peace & Conflict Studies programs), or in programs to which the faculty member has a formal, contractual relationship, is considered part of a faculty member's supervisory load within the Department.

Supervision outside of the Department is valued, but all faculty members are expected to share the burden of supervision within the Department. Delivering the components of a graduate degree to all the students the Department admits is a shared responsibility in Political Science. There is no simple relationship between the supply of supervision and the demand for supervision. Some Department members may have lower supervision loads but have accepted every student who has asked to work with them. Every faculty member, over the long run, should discharge their supervisory obligations by substantial contribution to as many facets of graduate instruction as possible, supplementing fewer contributions on one dimension (e.g., thesis supervision) with greater contributions on another (e.g., thesis committee work). Graduate teaching that overlaps with service and is essential to the smooth functioning of the Department includes: serving as a reader or thesis committee member for graduate theses; arranging and conducting oral defenses of theses; professionally and academically advising students; and conducting mock interviews for students with impending academic job interviews. Faculty can choose whether they count these activities as teaching or as service.

## **4. SERVICE**

### **4.1 General comments**

*Policy 77 notes: "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."*

Service is a very important and essential part of our role as faculty members and it is highly valued. For tenured faculty, service is evaluated on the basis of work done since the previous evaluation. In keeping with the norms of the Faculty of Arts, the Department recognizes different kinds of service. Service can be performed within the Department, the Faculty, and the University as a whole. It can also include service to the discipline or to the profession and to the community at large. Service is an important component of a faculty member's duties and should be properly encouraged and recognized. Since service is expected, lack of service requires an explanation.

Generally, the three categories of service noted above are reported in performance reviews; and there is an expectation that all faculty members will contribute to service in the Department. Beyond these three categories, extra-university activity (such as consulting, research or external teaching for which payment is received) should be reported to the Chair on a yearly basis. Care should be taken that such activity does not interfere with the proper discharge of primary University duties. Faculty members should be aware of University policies on [Extra-University Activity \(Policy #49\)](#) and [Conflict of Interest \(Policy #69\)](#). Contract research should be discussed with the Office of Research.

The Department takes note of the Service Standards for the Faculty in the Faculty of Arts. According to those Standards, to receive a score of 1.25 for service in any year, a faculty member normally must present evidence of all the following during that year:

1. Membership on and a meaningful contribution to some important departmental committee (or an equivalent meaningful service contribution to the Department).
2. Good departmental citizenship (explained below).
3. At least one of the following:
  - a. A meaningful extra-departmental service contribution to the Faculty or University.
  - b. Meaningful external service to the academic discipline, profession or community.

Those Standards also include "[Guidelines for Interpreting the Service Evaluation](#)" that Department members are encouraged to consult.

All Department members are expected to be good Department citizens (including attending Department meetings) and, normally, should expect to do some minimum level of Department service that cannot normally be replaced by service to other academic programs with which the Department has a formal relationship (e.g., Global Governance graduate programs at BSIA, the MPS program) except by agreement in advance with the Chair. Beyond that requirement, Department members will have the flexibility to treat their additional service contributions to these other academic programs as either additional departmental service or university service.

## 4.2 Departmental service

Internal service to the Department and departmental citizenship are an essential duty. Faculty members are expected to be involved in the collegial academic and professional life of the Department and to share committee and other responsibilities. All Department members are encouraged to participate in Department meetings, ceremonies, and other professional activities when possible. Probationary candidates are not expected to fill major administrative roles. Where service to other units is required by the nature of the position (e.g. joint appointment, directorship), this will be considered as service to the Department. Service as chair or associate chair normally earns a high service rating. Some examples of activities that can be counted as evidence of departmental service include (this list is not meant to be exhaustive):

- ✓ Student advising
- ✓ Committee work
- ✓ Administrative roles
- ✓ Coordinator of speakers' series
- ✓ Organization of workshops and conferences
- ✓ "Good citizenship" such as mentoring new faculty, being available in the Department, being willing to take on hard-to-cover courses, sponsoring or mentoring student groups, and generally being available to students.

## 4.3 University service

Some examples of activities that can be counted as evidence of university service include (this list is not meant to be exhaustive):

- ✓ Service to other units that is not contractually obligated. Such service is valued by the Department (eg., BSIA, MPS).
- ✓ Committee work
- ✓ Leadership roles
- ✓ Coordinator of speakers series
- ✓ University service awards
- ✓ Organization of workshops and conferences
- ✓ Serving on adjudication committees for grant applications

Policy 77 notes: "*Community service related to a faculty member's scholarly activities is normally considered as service to the University.*" Included in this category are the following kinds of activities (this list is not meant to be exhaustive): media and community outreach, engagement with policymakers, engagement with community and civil society groups, involvement with think tanks, and testimony before government bodies. Some of these kinds of activities may be counted under research dissemination. Faculty members must clearly specify how they would prefer these



activities be counted; double-counting across categories is not permitted. Note that paid work or consultancy (including work done for CIGI as part of a faculty member's normally paid CIGI duties) does not normally count as service, but consultancy (e.g. for the government) does count as service where only expenses are reimbursed.

#### **4.4 Service to the profession**

Some examples of activities that can be counted as service to the profession include (this list is not meant to be exhaustive):

- ✓ Editorial roles (more value is placed on the more senior roles and on higher-tier publications)
  - ✓ Editorial board and advisory board roles
  - ✓ Service in professional committees or organizations
- ✓ Scholarly manuscript reviewing activities for journals and book publishers (with higher value placed on reviews for higher-tier publications)
- ✓ Providing formal or informal mentorship to colleagues within or outside the university
- ✓ Reviewing activities for granting agencies, tenure and promotion at other universities, program reviews at other institutions, awards/prizes etc.
- ✓ Adjudication of Service awards from academic or professional bodies
- ✓ Articles, editorials, commentary, interviews in media (faculty can choose whether to count this as service or dissemination of research under scholarship)
- ✓ Serving on adjudication committees of external agencies granting scholarships and research funding

## 5. Applications for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

### 5.1 General comments

Policy 77 notes: *“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.”* The Policy continues: *“By the time candidates are considered for tenure they will have had ample opportunity to develop their teaching skills and to make original contributions to their fields of endeavour. These original contributions must be of sufficient magnitude to give witness to a candidate's depth of understanding and scholarly and professional competence.”*

Standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are not reducible to a quantitative formula. Qualitative judgements will have an important bearing on tenure decisions. In reaching these judgements, the views of external referees on the quality of the contributions of faculty members will be particularly important.

### 5.2 Scholarship

The Department encourages publication of dissertation research but expects the candidate to show evidence by the time of submitting an application for tenure of establishing a research agenda that goes beyond the dissertation. Policy 77 notes: *“Particular attention will be paid to assessing the likelihood that candidates will continue their scholarly activities once tenure has been awarded.”*

Policy 77 continues: *“Although the University looks for evidence of active continuing scholarship, the volume of scholarly output is less important than its quality, originality and impact.”*

In evaluating the quality of faculty members' scholarship, the DTTC will rely on the criteria for scholarly excellence outlined in section 2.1 of this document.

Although the primary emphasis is on quality of scholarly output, candidates for tenure are expected to publish at a rate commensurate with the standards for faculty at research-intensive universities. Minimum expectations (noting the statement in section two regarding how preferred outputs may vary across sub-fields), would typically be either:

a single-authored book with a publisher with a good academic reputation and meaningful peer review, and two single-authored articles in high quality, peer-reviewed journals

**or**

six peer-reviewed outputs, the majority of which would be single-authored articles in high quality peer-reviewed journals.

It is important to emphasize that this advice is provided only as a rough guideline. It is a minimum standard: meeting it is no guarantee that tenure will be awarded. Quality considerations will be paramount in the Department's recommendation on tenure. High quality is usually closely correlated with the rigour of peer review and the demonstrated impact of published work.

Candidates with a published book are encouraged to submit evidence of the good reputation and rigour of the review processes of the book's publisher. Candidates with published journal articles are encouraged to submit evidence of the "high quality" of the journals in which they have published. Candidates are also encouraged to include evidence of the extent to which other scholars have made reference to their work.

Research unconditionally accepted for publication at the time of the tenure application will be counted as equal to work already published.

In the case of co-authored or co-edited publications, candidates must include some indication of the division of work between the authors or editors. If not indicated, the Department will assume that all authors contributed equally to a publication.

Other kinds of evidence beyond publications will be considered in evaluations of scholarship performance for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. These are listed in section 2.2. By the time of their promotion application, the expectation is that junior faculty will be establishing a profile within the profession nationally and/or internationally. Evidence of this might include serving as a referee for journals or as a member of editorial boards, invitations to give keynote addresses, invitations to make a submission to a government inquiry, parliamentary committees or other policy-making processes, or contribute in other ways to knowledge mobilization in the profession.

Probationary faculty are encouraged to apply for research grants, and the winning of research grants is a positive indication of recognition of quality scholarship. The Department does not, however, consider successful research grant applications to be necessary for tenure and promotion. The Department recognizes that research funding in the social sciences is difficult to secure and that certain fields within political science do not require large research grants.

### **5.3 Teaching**

Candidates for tenure and promotion are evaluated on their entire teaching record. They should assemble a teaching dossier that includes student course perceptions, peer review(s) of their teaching, course syllabi, supervisory achievements (graduate and

undergraduate), and involvement in oral and thesis examinations. Candidates can also include evidence of novel teaching methods and techniques, evidence of participation in professional teaching and pedagogical development, curriculum development, teaching citations or awards, course content, and course materials, and other indications of teaching excellence as discussed in section 3.2.

To be assessed with a record of 'satisfactory' performance in teaching, a candidate must have at least earned teaching scores that averaged 1.0 over the last three probationary years in the annual performance review process. To be assessed with a record of "strong" performance in teaching, a candidate must have at least earned teaching scores in the annual performance review that were close to the departmental average over the last two probationary years. To be assessed with a record of "very strong" performance in teaching, a candidate must have at least earned teaching scores that were significantly higher than the departmental average over the last four probationary years, and present a wider body of extremely positive supporting evidence drawn from items in Section 3.2, demonstrating major instructional innovation, nomination and/or winning of a teaching award, or other kinds of unusually positive recognition by peers or students.

These standards are minimum standards; that is, they are expected but not necessarily sufficient conditions to meet the standards of "satisfactory", "strong" or "very strong" teaching records. Information from other aspects of a candidate's teaching dossier will also enter into the evaluation.

#### **5.4 Service**

In determining and evaluating service criteria in Tenure and Promotion decisions, Policy 77 notes: *"Candidates for tenure or promotion shall provide information on their service activities in sufficient detail to allow the DTPC to assess its quantity and quality. Where necessary, the DTPC should obtain statements from those who have personally observed the candidate's service contributions both internal and external to the University. Some service activities, such as chairing a curriculum committee or editing a professional society journal, may also provide indirect evidence for scholarship and teaching."*

Probationary candidates are not expected to fill major administrative roles. Policy 77 notes that *"service expectations are lower for probationary faculty than for tenured faculty, and service is not weighted as heavily as scholarship or teaching in tenure considerations"*. Like all other faculty, however, probationary candidates are expected to be good departmental citizens and to participate in Department meetings, ceremonies, and other professional activities. They are expected to be active members of the departmental committees to which they have been appointed and to undertake other activities listed in Section 4.2. By the time of their promotion application, faculty will be expected to have begun to undertake service activities in the profession outside the University.

## 6. Promotion to Professor

### *General Remarks*

Policy 77 notes that *“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...Promotion to Professor is not an assured step in the career of a faculty member, and some will not attain this rank.”*

Policy 77 continues: *“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.”*

### **6.1 Scholarship**

Candidates for promotion to Professor will be evaluated on their career scholarship. The Department notes that the full impact of research published before candidates were promoted to Associate Professor may not have been obvious at that time. However, consistent with the emphasis in Policy 77 on continuing excellence in scholarship, scholarly outputs since the granting of tenure will be of particular importance in the promotion decision for most candidates. Policy 77 states that *“A continuous program of scholarship with positive peer review by nationally and internationally recognized scholars is essential for promotion to Professor.”* The normal expectation is that faculty will have significant publications in at least one major project that goes beyond work completed when tenure was granted. Policy 77 states that it is unusual for promotion to Full Professor to occur prior to five years of full-time service as Associate Professor, indicating that scholarly output in this period is expected to at least match in quantity and quality that required by the Department for tenure.

The Department expects that the professional achievements of candidates for Professor normally will have been recognized through several of the following:

- Success in winning major external research funding
- Receipt of prizes for outstanding scholarship
- Invitations to give keynote addresses to major conferences or workshops
- Playing a role in editing a leading journal within their field
- Membership of editorial boards of leading national and international journals
- Membership of committees determining the award of prizes in their fields
- Invitation to make submissions to government inquiries, parliamentary committees or other policy-making processes
- Office-holding in a major professional association
- Election to one or more learned societies

## **6.2 Teaching**

Candidates for promotion to Professor are evaluated on their entire teaching record. They should assemble a teaching dossier that includes student course perceptions, peer review(s) of their teaching, course syllabi, supervisory achievements (graduate and undergraduate), and involvement in oral and thesis examinations. Candidates can also include evidence of novel teaching methods and techniques, evidence of participation in professional teaching and pedagogical development, curriculum development, teaching citations or awards, course content, and course materials, and other indications of teaching excellence as discussed in section 3.2.

Candidates for promotion to Professor will normally be expected to have played a significant role in graduate education, including the supervision of research theses where opportunities were available.

## **6.3 Service**

As noted in paragraph 4.1, the Department recognizes various forms of service including those to the Department, the Faculty, the University as a whole, to the profession and to the community as a whole.

By the time that they apply for promotion to Professor, the expectation is that faculty members at some point normally will have held one of the major administrative positions in the Department, e.g., Associate Chair, or Director of one of the programs with which the Department is affiliated, e.g., MPS, Global Governance, or a role of equivalent administrative seniority in the University. They will also demonstrate satisfactory performance in the activities identified in paragraphs 4.2 through 4.4 including a consistent record of good departmental citizenship.

**Department of Psychology Guidelines Regarding Faculty Performance Expectations and  
the Evaluation Process  
(Addendum to the Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines for Arts)**

**October 2020**

**Preamble**

In 2010, the Faculty Relations Committee (composed of members from the university administration and the Faculty Association) made a series of recommendations for improving the evaluation process. Among these was the requirement that each department produce a “document outlining the evaluation process and the performance expectations in their department for scholarship, teaching, and service.” This document is to be approved by a majority vote of the members of the department and then to be updated, reviewed, and approved biennially. Faculty members are to be provided with the updated document biennially to assist with the preparation of their Activity Reports. Faculty members are also to receive the current “Faculty of Arts Guidelines for the Annual Performance Review for Faculty” (updated every five years; [see here](#)).

In 2016, the Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) was revised such that evaluation of tenured faculty and continuing lecturers now occurs biennially at the beginning of odd-numbered years (e.g., in early 2021 for the calendar years 2019 and 2020). Evaluation of all others continues to occur annually.

**Process**

Every year (for untenured faculty and definite-term lecturers), or every second year (for tenured faculty and continuing lecturers), activities and accomplishments must be reported in three domains: teaching, research, and service. Ordinarily, these three domains are considered to represent 40%, 40%, and 20% of a tenure-stream faculty member’s activity. The weightings for lecturers ordinarily are 80%, 0%, and 20% (i.e., there is no expectation of research). Evaluation in each of the domains is accomplished by generating a rating on a 9-point scale in 0.25 steps from 0.00 to 2.00. In Psychology, together with the Chair, an elected committee of 5 faculty members—the Annual Performance Review Committee (APRC)—examines these Activity Reports. By policy, this committee makes recommendations to the Chair concerning the evaluation of all faculty members. In practice, it is the aggregated ratings of this committee plus the Chair (i.e., the average of all six) that the Chair then uses for determining the final evaluations. In the event of notable discrepancy within the committee concerning the evaluation of any faculty member, the committee provides guidance to the Chair to assist in resolving the discrepancy.

Under the modified MoA of 2016, scholarship (research) is to be assessed on the total evidence from a window of two years whereas teaching and service are to be assessed on the evidence from the year(s) under evaluation. Additional documented years can provide context to the assessed evidence. In Psychology, we use the following intervals. For evaluation of the 2019 and 2020 calendar years (in early 2021), tenured and continuing faculty will submit a *biennial* Activity Report in December 2020 covering two years of activity in Research, Teaching, and

Service (from January 1, 2019 to December 31, 2020). The full two years of evidence in each of the three areas will inform ratings for the 2021 merit increases, ratings which will carry forward for the 2022 merit increases as well. Definite-term and probationary faculty will submit an *annual* Activity Report each December. This annual report will detail two years of activity in Teaching and Service (e.g., for the 2020 report, 2020 teaching and service activity will be the evidence for the evaluation; 2019 activity will provide context for the evidence) and, for probationary faculty, detailing *all research activity so far in career* (2019 and 2020 activity will be the evidence for the 2020 evaluation; previous years will provide context for the evidence).

## Expectations

All faculty members in Psychology are expected to use the most recent version of the Department of Psychology Activity Report (the latest version of the template will accompany this document). The categories and their sequence must be the same as in the template to facilitate the work of the APRC. In what follows, the three components of the Activity Report are described in the order that they appear in the Activity Report. Note that each section of the Activity Report begins with a summary and that the Report ends with a section for awards.

**Research.** The section on scholarship begins with a list of publications, including books, book chapters, and journal articles, either published or in press/accepted. This section also requests reporting of work under review: In Psychology, all faculty members may use this section, indicating the journal and the date of submission. Note, however, that the section on work in progress is to be used only by probationary (untenured) faculty, indicating the current status of the project. As context, untenured faculty also are expected to cover their entire research career to date, not just the two-year window that applies to tenured faculty. This is followed by conference presentations and invited colloquia and presentations, and then by grants held and applied for. Note that, except in the case of untenured faculty, these lists are to be restricted to the two calendar years of the report. It is important to indicate which work has been independently assessed, peer reviewed, etc. In Psychology, it is expected that faculty members will publish with graduate students (and possibly undergraduate students), so student co-authors should be identified in all publications. Where there are explicit quality indicators, such as journal impact factors or an exceptional evaluation from an editor, this information may be provided to assist in the evaluation of quality. For conference presentations, the list should include only those on which the faculty member is an author. The final qualitative section should be used to highlight accomplishments—to assist in making the case for the quality of the faculty member's scholarship. A partial list of influential factors would include citation counts and other personal impact factors (e.g., *h-index*, *i10*, or similar measures), visibility in textbooks, reprinted articles, book reviews, grant ranking, etc.

The question may arise as to where to assign certain kinds of activities: In particular, are they research or service? Illustrations might include consulting or knowledge mobilization work, for example. In no case should an activity be reported in more than one section of the Activity Report. As a guideline, where such work is done on a contractual basis and is paid, it is ordinarily best to list the work as service. But where the work is done primarily for scholarly purposes, as when it leads to publications, assists with the development of graduate student



skills, or the like, it may fit best into scholarship. Consultation with the Chair can help to resolve ambiguities.

**Teaching.** In the Department of Psychology, we hold a broad conceptualization of teaching effectiveness that includes an instructor's ability to communicate and achieve stated learning objectives and have a broad impact on student learning (e.g., motivate and engage with students to support their educational and professional development). As such, and in accordance with Policy 77, teaching effectiveness will be assessed broadly using multiple sources of evidence.

There are two major parts to the section on teaching activities: one on undergraduate and one on graduate teaching and supervision. For the undergraduate part, all courses that have been taught in the two-year window must be listed, indicating any that were not part of the faculty member's regular load. Policy 77 states that "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." The university requires that Student Course Perception Surveys (SCPS) be part of the APR process, which typically entails reporting the mean rating for questions 1-9 on the Arts Course Questionnaire for each undergraduate course taught. The Department recognizes SCPSs as relevant in providing information about student experience and for the formative development of an instructor. However, the Department also recognizes concerns with the validity of these measures as indicators of instructors' effectiveness per se, and further recognizes that there are many other indicators of effectiveness in teaching. As such, faculty members are strongly encouraged to provide the APRC with evidence for teaching effectiveness in the open-ended, "Qualitative" section of the teaching report (see below).

Following the section on courses taught, there is a section in which to report all undergraduate supervision, including honours theses, directed or independent studies, co-op work terms, research assistant work, summer internships (e.g., NSERC USRA), and any other related activities. Where new courses have been constructed, or significant revisions have been made to existing courses, these should be described in the section on "New Course Development," with syllabi attached. Where significant revisions have been made to existing courses, please include the old and new syllabi. Other information related to the quality of undergraduate teaching and supervision should be presented in the "Qualitative" section at the end of the undergraduate part. Appropriate indicators will vary depending on features of the teaching activity (e.g., large survey classes, senior seminars, honours thesis supervisions), but could include demonstrations of *effective classroom behaviours* (e.g., clear communication of learning outcomes to students, incorporation of active learning techniques, improvements in curricular design, development of effective course material that is used by other instructors) and *effective research supervision* (e.g., regular evaluation of student progress towards learning outcomes, regular meetings with students, awards won by students, student presentations at conferences, student success in admission to postgraduate programs and job placements). Please honour the two-year window here as well.

The second part closely parallels the first and is used to report activities with respect to graduate teaching and supervision. All courses that have been taught in the two-year window should be listed. Afterward, any new course development should be described; ideally, syllabi would accompany this description. The major task follows—to list all graduate supervisory activity.

The first few sections list completed and ongoing M.A. and Ph.D. supervision, both as major advisor (or co-advisor) and as committee member. Faculty may include an additional section listing postdoctoral fellows, as appropriate. In the Clinical Area, a section on clinical supervision and preparation for the licensing exam may also be added here. There is also a place to indicate other activities related to graduate training, such as serving as an external examiner or the like. Other information related to the quality of graduate teaching and supervision may be presented in the “Qualitative” section at the end of the graduate part. Faculty members are encouraged to use this section to report on *effective teaching behaviours* and *effective research supervision* as noted in the Undergraduate section above. In addition, graduate teaching effectiveness might include information about graduate student research awards, graduate student grant council awards, postdoctoral fellowships, academic positions, and jobs in industry. Citations of publications and conference presentations involving students will be listed under Research, as set out above, so only graduate student involvement should be described here. For example, it might be informative to present a count of publications and presentations involving graduate students, and to indicate regular lab meetings in which graduate students (as well as undergraduates) take part. Ordinarily, the information in this section will also be limited to the two-year window; however, exceptions may exist and should be reported here (e.g., a former graduate student winning a major research award).

**Service.** The service component of the Activity Report is divided into several sections. The first three sections relate to departmental, faculty, and university service. In the first section, departmental committees (e.g., Executive, DTPC, APRC) should be listed, as well as any other administrative roles in the department (e.g., Associate Chair, Area Head). Corresponding entries should be made for Faculty of Arts and university committees (e.g., FTPC, Office of Research Ethics, Chair of Ph.D. thesis orals) in the second and third sections.

Next is professional service internationally and nationally. Internationally, items might include: Editorial appointments (e.g., Associate Editor of a journal), professional offices (e.g., Secretary of a society), professional selection committees (e.g., Fellows Selection Committee), paper and grant reviews, conference and symposium organization, external refereeing for promotion and tenure cases. At the national level, items might include grant council membership, graduate fellowship/scholarship adjudication committees, and so on.

The final section covers community service, where the list might include such contributions as media coverage of research, media interviews, judging a science fair, supervising a high school co-op student, giving a talk at a local library, service on a community committee or board, providing a report to a national or local agency, and the like.

As with the other parts of the Activity Report, this part ends with a qualitative section. Although the benchmarks for quality are less clear with regard to service, it nevertheless is the case that faculty members can and should present evidence for quality. This is also one situation where quantity is relevant and could be discussed, as when a particular role entails an extensive time commitment.

## Postscript

Where faculty members are uncertain about how to report any component of the Annual Report, or where they have suggestions for improving this document, they are encouraged to contact the Chair.

These guidelines have been prepared in accordance with the Faculty of Arts Guidelines, which in turn were prepared in accordance with the following documents:

- Memorandum of Agreement between FAUW and UW: <https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat-general-counsel/documents-potential-interest/memorandum-agreement-uw-fauw>
- Policy 77: Tenure and Promotion: <https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat-general-counsel/policies-procedures-guidelines/policy-77>
- Review of the Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation Process and its recommendations as revised by the Faculty Relations Committee (August 13, 2010). The Review is available at: <https://uwaterloo.ca/provost/sites/ca.provost/files/uploads/files/Revised-Performance-Evaluation-Recommendations.pdf>

## **UW Department of Religious Studies Performance appraisals and progress toward tenure**

Advice from the Chair for understanding the current (September 2020) annual appraisal process and its relation to tenure and promotion in the Department of Religious Studies

The Department of Religious Studies consists of faculty members appointed by and accountable to one of the following five agencies: University of Waterloo Faculty of Arts, St. Jerome's University, Renison University College, St. Paul's University College, and Conrad Grebel University College. This document applies to those appointed by the University of Waterloo Faculty of Arts. Other agencies may elect to make use of this advice.

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Faculty members at the University of Waterloo fulfill their job descriptions by doing some combination of teaching, research, and service. An annual performance appraisal rates how well one is performing each of these elements of one's job. This process determines faculty members' selective salary increment each year through the process described in Article 13 of the Memorandum of Agreement. It also constitutes one component of ongoing feedback on their performance, and provides important information to the Appointments and Promotions Committee at various stages in each faculty member's career.

The following are default standards and desiderata for the annual appraisal process. This is a living document, to be updated as circumstances change and as good arguments for revisions come to light. Its role is to describe the procedures and heuristics by which performance is appraised and to sketch the reasons underlying those heuristics. With this information, all faculty members may better understand the needs and expectations of the Department and the University as these bear on their job performance and its evaluation; and untenured faculty members may better understand the relation between performance appraisals and the tenure process. There is a standing invitation to bring proposed revisions to this document to the Chair, or to departmental meetings.

Across the University the provisions of Article 13 in the M.O.A. are implemented in somewhat different ways, reflecting different sizes, disciplines, and orientations of faculties and departments. The Department of Religious Studies, like many smaller departments, has historically left the appraisal process to the Chair rather than a committee headed by the Chair, as in some larger departments. (Each year, at the start of the Fall term, the Department will conduct a secret ballot on whether to strike a committee to perform appraisals or to leave the process to the Chair.) In the past, the departmental component of the appraisal process has simply reflected the Chair's personal considered judgment, in light of both the faculty cohort in that year and what was known about relevant historical standards. The current document aims to make this process more transparent, and to rationalize it in the process.

To say that the standards described in the document are default is to flag their defeasibility when a reasonable case can be made for departing from them; this is not a one-size-fits-all model. But to say that these are default guidelines is also to indicate the need for such a reasonable case in order to motivate a departure from them.

## 2. THE ANNUAL PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

The Annual Performance Appraisal issues in a score out of 2, compounded out of the scores out of 2 on each of the three listed job components, typically according to the formula:  $(.4 \times \text{Teaching}) + (.4 \times \text{Research}) + (.2 \times \text{Service})$ . The points on the rating scale and their associated descriptors are:

- 0 – Unsatisfactory
- 0.25 – New rating point effective 2012
- 0.5 – Needs Improvement
- 0.75 – New rating point effective 2012
- 1.0 – Satisfactory
- 1.25 – Good
- 1.5 – Very Good
- 1.75 – Excellent
- 2.0 – Outstanding

Weightings other than 40% each for Teaching and Research and 20% for Service are sometimes negotiated for faculty members having special research, teaching, or administrative appointments, usually on a temporary basis. Lighter duties or changed weightings are understood to influence expectations of the quantity of one's contributions in that area, but not their quality.

Every year (over December and January, traditionally), faculty members are invited to submit information detailing their accomplishments in each of the three evaluation areas during the previous year. A standard form is available in the Faculty of Arts for the presentation of common categories of information. But faculty members are encouraged to take seriously the sections of this form that also solicit any further information they think relevant to their performance over the past year. Faculty members should feel free to include and explain the widest selection of data they want the Chair (or Committee) to review, and to generally present their own strongest case.

On the basis of this information the Chair (or committee) recommends numerical ratings for each faculty member, which are then discussed with the Dean of Arts and possibly revised in order to achieve fairness and consistency across the Faculty. The Dean of Arts in turn meets with the Provost to settle evaluation averages across the University, a process which can also necessitate revisions to the proposed ratings.

The overall score for each faculty member is then used as a multiplier on the Faculty of Arts basic selective increment, and also serves as a snapshot of one's general performance in the year evaluated. There is no very precise set of year-by-year scores necessary for tenure; moreover, any remarks in these guidelines must be understood only as advisory to faculty members without being binding on Faculty or University-level committees or adjudicators. But at the departmental level, at least, the view is that there

is nothing inherently problematic in a probationary-term faculty member's having scores that initially fall at the lower end of the departmental or faculty distribution. Such scores may simply represent a nascent research program, lack of experience as an instructor, or initial adaptation to the service aspects of a professorial career. In these cases, what matters is that scores are not so low as to be objectively problematic (Unsatisfactory; Needs Improvement) and that they generally improve over the period of one's probationary term. Fluctuating overall or specific scores are not an absolute barrier to tenure; indeed, if the fluctuations occur higher up the scale – between Excellent (1.75) and Very Good (1.5), for example – they are likely to be of little moment. But scores that dip down below Satisfactory on any measure, and especially on Teaching or Research, are likely to be of some concern to the Appointments and Promotions Committee, who will want to see a trend of quick recovery from any scores of that nature. Overall scores that plateau in the Satisfactory-Good range over several years may be seen as marginal progress toward tenure; the interpretation of such scores will come down to specifics in the sub-scores and to the details of the faculty member's vita over that time period.

Over the longer course of a career, appraisals should reflect the fact that performance in each of the three measures, and most particularly on research, neither materializes nor disappears within a single year. Recent output and impending output can rightly influence an appraisal. The process should negotiate a middle path between anachronistic ratings, on which a long-unpublished professor receives unwarrantedly high evaluations for “lifetime achievement”, and a mercenary approach, on which one's contributions are instantly and completely forgotten from one year to the next.

### 3. TEACHING

Teaching in the Department falls into two broad categories: undergraduate and graduate. While all faculty members teach undergraduate courses, some will be quite involved in graduate teaching and others may have little formal involvement with the graduate program beyond the general oversight exercise by the Department. The Department expects strong teaching of all faculty members. Among other things this means teaching accurate information, engaging students, grading fairly, organizing courses well, following Departmental policies for teaching, and generally treating students with respect. Most of the appraisal of one's teaching contributions will be based on evidence regarding the intensity and quality of one's performance

Faculty should also feel free to seek out extra information about their teaching – e.g., by requesting extra classroom visits by faculty members – with the aim of improving their instruction, without fear that such additional information, if negative in some respect, would be used in their summative evaluations.

The standard teaching load for those faculty members accountable to the Faculty of Arts is currently four courses per academic year; typically these will be organized as two courses in the Fall term and two in the Winter term.

#### 3a. *Undergraduate teaching*

Undergraduate teaching is the largest single undertaking of the University and the Department. It encompasses lecture instruction, pedagogy through feedback on coursework, and the evaluation of student work.

Evidence regarding the quality of undergraduate teaching is largely extracted from student course evaluations, administered by faculty members *on a voluntary basis* (except for occasional years in which evaluations are required for all University courses), and calculated by the Arts Computing Office. The two scores regarded as most significant for this exercise are *Overall Evaluation of the Course* and *Overall Evaluation of the Instructor*. The Departmental average on each of these scores in a given year is assumed to indicate broadly acceptable teaching; non-trivial departures from the average on either measure will tend to modify the assessment of one's UG teaching in the same direction.

Context relevant to the interpretation of this evidence includes the course size, level, degree of technicality, status as required or optional, proportion of Religious Studies majors/honours among the students, and one's teaching load in that term. Large courses at the first or second year level that are required courses for students from other faculties may have a lower natural evaluation level, while small courses taught primarily to Religious Studies majors/honours students are expected to have higher course evaluations. Such differences will normally be factored into the evaluation of the scores. Other relevant evidence can include such factors as independent student complaints, and nominations for teaching excellence awards.

### 3b. *Graduate teaching*

The clearest analogue of undergraduate teaching at the graduate level is the graduate seminar. Through some combination of lecturing and student participation, professors bring their students to the cutting edge of research in some sub-field, introducing students to the scholarship and methods that will enable them to contribute to academic Religious Studies as researchers. In large measure the Department's standards and expectations for the structure and orientation of such seminars can be gleaned by examining the range of seminars recently offered by other faculty members.

Course evaluations can be conducted for graduate seminars, but these too are voluntary. These evaluations normally will be substantially higher than average undergraduate evaluation scores, but they do provide an opportunity for information about problematic teaching, should it exist, to come to the fore. Hence they are worth administering at regular intervals for all faculty members (say, at least every second seminar), and every time for probationary faculty.

Much graduate teaching is in the form of individual work with Religious Studies graduate students: supervision of comprehensive exams and/or doctoral dissertations. Supervision in each of these domains is a matter of teaching, guiding the revision of work, monitoring students' progress, and providing timely feedback, each in a manner appropriate to the particular student. Faculty members have a part in seeing that students complete their work to an appropriate standard and on a reasonable schedule. Faculty members' obligations therefore include avoiding a range of potential problematic behaviors: frequently slow feedback on draft work, disorganization, poor communication, shifting or inconsistent advice, or inaccessibility for meetings.

Supervisory conduct that unreasonably slows the completion of students' programs amounts to unsatisfactory teaching.

Strong graduate supervision is thus properly understood as encompassing teaching, among other things. It is not merely gate-keeping into the academy. Some students may thrive on nearly independent work, but supervision includes more focused guidance for those students who require more intense and more regular interaction with faculty. It is difficult to measure fine degrees of excellence in supervision, but strong supervision is indicated by such outcomes as student work that gets published or given at refereed conferences, and by graduate placement in desirable jobs, while problematic supervision may be manifested as a student dissertation, area study, or coursework that requires departmental intervention or otherwise falls on some other faculty member to remedy. However, these outcomes can also partly reflect the abilities and efforts of the students themselves. Regular Departmental discussions regarding graduate students, as well as direct feedback from supervisors in their annual reports, assist the Chair in recognizing when weaker students are getting strong supervision in spite of not necessarily producing the strongest work. For some such students, merely completing the degree may be a sign of outstanding supervision. Thus the aim of these remarks is not to dissuade faculty members from supervising any but the most talented graduate students, but rather to emphasize the need for good supervision of any student, and the goal of using all plausible metrics to measure the quality of supervision.

It takes a department to raise a graduate student. Delivering the components of a graduate degree to all the students, the Department admits, is a shared responsibility in Religious Studies. This shared responsibility exists even though some faculty members will have little directly involvement with students as seminar instructor, member of thesis committee, or supervisor. Graduate teaching that overlaps with service and is essential to the smooth functioning of the Department includes serving as a reader or thesis committee member for graduate theses; arranging and conducting oral defenses of theses; professionally and academically advising students, including in one's role as *pro tem* supervisor; and conducting mock interviews for students with impending academic job interviews.

#### 4. RESEARCH

The assessment of research quality and intensity is particularly open to case-specific considerations. Hence it is important to reemphasize both the default nature of these guidelines and the invitation for faculty members to bring forward and explain any evidence they consider relevant to their evaluation.

The key measure of research activity is published or presented original research output. But other measures are also relevant, including: evidence of research impact; winning research grants and research awards, especially Tri-Council awards; and organizing conferences and academic institutes that advance research and promote the research reputation of the Department.

##### 4a. *Research quality*

The following schema for the evaluation of research performance serves as a *prima facie* categorization of research venues. The relative rankings can be overridden on the basis



of the properties of specific pieces of work. Faculty members can make a case for regarding some piece of research as coeval with other (prima facie more significant) kinds of research, or for regarding forms of work not listed here as having a research component that merits consideration.

The categories have both fuzzy borders and a great deal of internal variety; one should expect overlapping categories and room for negotiation about, e.g., rankings among journals, among presses, and among conferences. Distinct sub-disciplines have different premier journals, and place varying emphases on the relative merits of books and articles in prestigious journals, so the assessment of research contributions should be relative to sub-disciplinary context. In general, however, evidence of serious review and low acceptance rates will be considered evidence of high quality. From most significant to least significant, the default categories of research significance are:

1. Books published in Religious Studies, with publishers having good academic reputations, and with evidence of meaningful peer review.
2. Research papers published in high quality peer-reviewed Religious Studies journals having low acceptance rates.
3. Edited volumes with good presses or respected contributors; invited chapters in edited collections that feature influential and respected authors or editors, published by reputable presses in Religious Studies; and textbooks, especially those with reputable presses, with evidence of novel contributions to the discipline.
4. Books with undistinguished presses, but with evidence of some non-trivial refereeing process.
5. Research papers in lesser-known journals having relatively high acceptance rates.
6. Invited major or keynote addresses to prestigious conferences.
7. Research papers presented in longer sessions at major international conferences with evidence of substantial peer review and prearranged commentary.
8. Books with presses that essentially facilitate self-publishing.
9. Book reviews in top journals.
10. Poster presentations at major international conferences with evidence of substantial peer review.
11. Research papers in minor, unrefereed journals or proceedings.
12. Book reviews in minor, unrefereed, or simply book-reviewing journals.
13. Non-academic or purely introductory presentations, popular talks; newspaper or (non-academic) magazine articles. (These may alternately be counted as service.)

#### 4b. *Research intensity*

In sketchiest general terms, a Category 1 book every three or four years, or one to three items annually in Categories 2 or 3, should be considered strong research output for Religious Studies faculty members, especially when supplemented with other output in further categories. However, a dearth of research output for a few years after hiring is not a good start, even if this results in a book eventually. Probationary faculty members should ensure the maintenance of quantifiable research output over the short term, even if longer-term and larger-scale research projects are also under way.

It is worth reemphasizing that appraisals should reflect the fact that performance as a researcher neither materializes nor disappears within a single year. Throughout one's career, research output can be "streaky," so in general a pattern of productivity is more important than one's output over any particular year. At the same time, in any given year (factoring out special circumstances) it is important to show signs of research activity at some levels on the above scale, preferably as part of a trend for work to move upwards on the above scale from year to year. For example, a conference paper has added significance when it occurs as part of a research career in which conference papers have frequently turned into journal articles.

Finally, lower categories on the above list have a fairly rapidly diminishing marginal utility; a few book reviews are part of a healthy research profile, but a multitude of book reviews on their own do not "make up for" a lack of peer-reviewed books and articles. Rather, this would be a sign of mistaken use of professional time and energy.

##### 5. SERVICE

The University recognizes work of various kinds, at various administrative levels, as apt to satisfy the Service element of a tenured or tenure-track appointment. Faculties and departments may emphasize more specific kinds of service, however. In a smaller department, such as Religious Studies, the fixed administrative load of a department (especially one with a PhD program) is less widely distributed on faculty members than in a large department. Since there is a substantial minimum amount of administration that must be done in order for the Department to sustain its various programs, and to interact effectively with the University, any faculty member who performs little or no departmental service thereby places a significant additional administrative burden on his or her colleagues to do it. In Religious Studies, therefore, while the appraisal of each faculty member's Service component recognizes wider institutional and disciplinary service, it emphasizes Departmental work in the first instance.

In the absence of competition among faculty members to hold committee and officer positions, these are typically distributed by nomination from the Chair or by active voluntarism from faculty members, followed by discussion and consensus among the Department, rather than by a wider nomination and voting process. It should be taken as a faculty member's duty to find ways of contributing service-wise to the Department – perhaps simply by indicating to the Chair a willingness to serve in particular roles.

The positions of Department Chair, Undergraduate Officer, and Graduate Officer are the most substantial forms of departmental service. They are positions in which faculty members are effectively "on call" to deal with specific administrative issues at any time, and which require not only a major investment of time but also an element of leadership and assistance for other faculty members. The responsible performance of one of these positions is the most certain determinant of a high Service rating.

Other formalized positions in the Department of Religious Studies at the time of writing include: Events coordinator, Distance Education and Co-op Representative, Peace and Conflict Studies Representative, Library Representative, Scheduling Coordinators, OGS Selection Committee Representative, Faculty Association Representative(s), Student Society Liaison. Some of these positions may be particularly

well-suited for junior faculty members, since they are both less time-intensive and presuppose somewhat less familiarity with the intricacies of the University. Yet it is to be expected that each of these positions involves periodic meetings, maintaining contact with designated extra-departmental staff or students, some organizational commitments, and a responsibility to keep the Department informed of relevant developments via written reports. From year to year their commitments can vary significantly; their contributions to one's Service rating vary accordingly.

Departmental affairs moreover require the existence of a range of committees. Some of these are standing committees, some are periodically and predictably reconstituted, and some are ad hoc committees intended to deal with specific issues. For example:

Standing committees:

- Appointments and Promotions Committee
- Graduate Committee
- Curriculum Committee
- Policy Committee
- Publicity Committee
- Lectures Committee

Recurring committees constituted as necessary:

- Hiring Committee

Service in these committees too can be a substantial contribution, depending on the number of issues that fall to the committee in a given year.

There is also a more diffuse yet significant sense in which the Department of Religious Studies depends on faculty service. This can be considered Open-Door service: the contribution that faculty members make to the Department by being present during regular office hours; by being readily available for consultation with students and other faculty members; by their inclination to answer email and telephone messages promptly, and to complete administrative necessities (grades, letters of recommendation, etc.) quickly and without reminders; and thereby to help evenly distribute the inevitable daily burdens of running a department. Absenteeism, a reduced departmental presence, or chronic tardiness or disorganization in the completion of administrative tasks, all lead to some burdens falling disproportionately upon those faculty who are in their offices, available, and responsive. They also create additional work for departmental administrators and support staff. Problematic performance in these aspects of Service is likely to be reflected in one's annual appraisal.

There are many opportunities for University-level service in various Faculty of Arts or University committees, on Senate, with the Faculty Association, or in conjunction with student organizations. These will have widely diverging levels of commitment, however, and the degree of these commitments is a factor in weighing the significance of the service. Membership on several quiescent University committees may not be evaluated as highly as membership on the Department's Hiring Committee during a hiring year.

Finally, the Department and the University also recognize and encourage service to the wider discipline, in the form of work such as journal, conference, and manuscript refereeing; journal editing; board membership in academic societies; community outreach; and academic mentorship not amounting to teaching. This is valuable work indicating a well-rounded contribution to the academy, and reflecting the respect and recognition one has earned in the wider discipline. It should be so recognized in annual appraisals. (These may also be contributions that weigh especially heavily in later-career decisions about promotion to Full Professor rank.) Nevertheless, there is significance in the way that a faculty member's career as a successful contributor to the wider discipline asymmetrically depends upon having a functionally administered department. Service of these broader sorts should proceed in addition to or parallel with departmental service, over the longer run, and not as an alternative to it.

Reviewed in September 2020

Accepted by Departmental vote: September 24, 2020



## **Addendum to the Faculty of Arts Guidelines for the Performance Review for Faculty**

**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND LEGAL STUDIES** Effective

date: 01 January 2021 to 31 December 2022

(Approved with Amendments 15 October 2020)

**See MOA 13.5.1c on course evaluations – does cite policy**

### **1. Introduction**

1.1. This document provides Departmental evaluation expectations and procedures for the assessment of research, teaching, and service activities of regular faculty and for Departmental decisions on tenure and promotion. The guidelines are supplemental to the relevant University of Waterloo policies and the evaluation procedures delineated in Article 13 of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the University of Waterloo and the Faculty Association of the University of Waterloo, Policy 77 of the university, and the Faculty of Arts Guidelines for Performance Review for Faculty. If there is a conflict between the Guidelines and the MOA, or the criteria of Policy 77, or the Faculty of Arts Guidelines for Performance Review for Faculty, the provisions of the MOA or Policy 77 or Faculty of Arts Guidelines shall take precedence.

### **2. Objective**

2.1. The objectives of performance reviews are to be helpful and encouraging, to give an accurate account of the Member's work, and to provide the Member with the means to improve their performance.

### **3. Performance Review**

3.1. Performance reviews, which determine the selective salary increments for each year, are required for all regular faculty in the Department. Performance ratings are for the portion of the evaluation period during which the Member was a paid employee of the university, including paid and unpaid leave.

3.2. 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 such cases, the practice 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 (or in the Faculty should there not be enough members in the Department of the same rank); (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.

3.2.1. Members on Long-term Disability are not evaluated.

3.3. Performance Review Committee

3.3.1. While the responsibility for doing the performance review of each Member resides with the Chair of the Department, the Chair is advised by a Performance Review Committee which will be chaired by the Chair of the Department. This Committee will consist of three regular faculty members, elected for staggered two-year terms, in the spring of each year, from among the regular faculty members in the Department, tenured and untenured, who are available to serve (i.e., not on sabbatical or some other form of official leave). Based on the Committee's recommendations, the Chair will write a performance evaluation for each Member, with consideration for rank. The Committee may request that a Member attend a meeting to discuss their performance report.

3.4. It is incumbent on Members to supply the Chair with a report documenting, with sufficient information, their activities in the areas of research, teaching, and service by the deadline set by the Department. Members are encouraged to provide complete, accurate, and clear information in their report. The Chair and the Performance Review Committee will work with the information provided. They may request more information, but it is not their responsibility to secure this information if it is not provided by the deadline.

3.5. Each Member is given an overall assessment on the basis of a rating from 0-2. A rating from 0-2 is provided for each of three areas of activity: research, teaching, and service. The overall rating is the average of the three ratings according to a weighting system whereby 40% of the rating is for research, 40% for teaching, and 20% for service. This is the normal weighting formula to be used unless otherwise specified in the Member's letter of appointment, or if the weighting formula has been temporarily adjusted (for at least two years) by prior agreement with the Chair and with the consent of the Dean (e.g., when a faculty member has taken on a significant administrative role). Adjustments to the weighting will affect the expectations for the quantity of the activity undertaken in the three areas of assessment; it does not change the expectations with regard to the quality of the work.

3.6. The evaluation of the Chair of the Department will be undertaken by the Dean of Arts.

3.7. The scoring categories are as follows:

- 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

3.8. Performance evaluations shall occur:

- On an annual basis for probationary or definite-term appointments
- On a biennial basis, in odd numbered years, for tenured or continuing appointments
  - For Members on a biennial performance review cycle, the rating for non-review years shall be equal to the rating for the previous review year.

3.9. Members shall provide documentation for:

- One year for probationary or definite-term appointments
- Two years for tenured or continuing appointments

3.10. Assessment Window:

- Research will be assessed on a two-year window.
- Teaching and Service will be assessed for the year(s) under evaluation (with remaining documented years used to provide context to the assessed evidence).

3.11. Concerns or questions about the ratings or comments received on evaluation should be raised first with the Chair of the Department, and then, if desired by the Member, with the Performance Review Committee. The committee will then advise the Chair (see also MOA 13.5.10).

3.12. The Chair will recommend the scores for each Member to the Dean of Arts, providing evidence to support the assessments. As stated in the MOA (13.5.7): “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.”

3.13. Once ratings have been finalized with the Dean, the Chair shall inform the Members of their individual ratings in each category and their overall rating in writing and provide an opportunity to discuss their performance evaluation.

3.14. Probationary Members

3.14.1. Performance reviews play an important role in preparing Members for tenure and promotion, and guiding decisions at the Departmental, Faculty and University levels when Members apply for tenure and promotion. It is important that they be as accurate and informative as possible.

3.14.2. Reviews of probationary Members should consider both their performance and their overall progress towards renewal of the probationary position and securing tenure. This is the case for all three areas of assessment: research, teaching, and service. Specific comments about the progress towards tenure and promotion must be conveyed to the Member in writing as part of their annual assessment. Any concerns identified by the Performance Review Committee and/or the Chair of the Department should be carefully documented and conveyed in writing to the Member in question. Some fluctuation in

scores is acceptable, but consistently low scores or scores that stay in the Satisfactory range for several years, especially for research and teaching, constitute marginal progress towards tenure.

- 3.14.3. When Faculty-level Performance Evaluation Guidelines or Departmental Addenda change during a Member's probationary contract, 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 the Department Chair if they elect to be governed by the new set.

#### **4. Research**

- 4.1. The University of Waterloo is a research-intensive institution and the Department places a premium on the research activity of its Members. As Policy 77 stipulates, scholarship may take several equally valuable forms, ranging from the discovery of new knowledge, to the innovative coordination, synthesis or integration of knowledge, to new and useful applications of knowledge. "In general, [however], only work that is accessible for peer review or professional adjudication can be considered in assessing scholarship for performance reviews, tenure or promotion." The policy refers, it should be noted, to work that is "accessible for peer review or professional adjudication." It is not necessary for the work to have already been reviewed or adjudicated. Nevertheless, the key measure of research activity is published or presented research of an original nature, with peer reviewed work being valued more highly than others.
- 4.2. In practice, many kinds of research activity can count as evidence of scholarship, and the assessment of both the amount and the quality of research activity is subject to some interpretation and negotiation on a case specific basis. In order of significance, both within and between categories, from most to least significant, the evidence of research activity is sorted into three categories: primary, secondary, and tertiary.
  - 4.2.1. Primary:
    - a) Books with publishers with distinguished academic reputations. While leading university presses will generally be accorded the highest value, it is recognized that status rankings of publishers can vary within disciplinary subfields.
    - b) Articles published in peer-reviewed academic journals. Articles in high quality or leading journals in the discipline or in specific fields will be valued more. High quality is usually indicated by a serious review process, lower acceptance rates, and evidence of scholarly impact in the discipline or field.
    - c) Edited books with publishers with distinguished academic reputations. While leading university presses will generally be accorded the highest value, it is recognized that status rankings of publishers can vary within disciplinary subfields.



- d) Chapters in peer-reviewed edited books, with books published with good academic reputations being valued more highly than others, while recognizing that in some fields other presses can have equally strong or stronger reputations.
  - e) Awarded or applied for research grants, especially from significant sources of funding (e.g. the Tri-Councils) or for particularly large and significant projects.
  - f) Data production and data development activities including the production of new materials and compiling material from existing sources.
- 4.2.2. Secondary:
- g) Invited major or keynote addresses at prestigious academic and professional conferences.
  - h) Textbooks, with books published with major presses in the discipline or specific fields of study being valued more highly.
  - i) Regular conference papers presented at major international and national conferences;
  - j) Research or technical reports for significant professional groups or audiences (e.g., government or social agencies). In the case of research reports produced for a fee (outside the University), the Member shall demonstrate how the work is aligned with their academic research program. Otherwise, such activity should be considered part of the dissemination of knowledge to the public and considered a service activity.
- 4.2.3. Tertiary:
- k) Book reviews in leading journals.
  - l) Articles, reviews, and other kinds of commentary published in non-refereed sources.
  - m) Presentations to government or community groups.
  - n) Books published with presses that essentially facilitate self-publishing.
  - o) Other kinds of academic presentations (e.g., poster presentations, panel discussions at conferences).
- 4.3. The Chair and the Performance Review Committee may exercise some discretion in determining the relative significance of these different kinds of activity given the many relevant variables that cannot be specified. Winning a highly competitive, prestigious, or unusually large or significant research grant, for example, may be deemed as more important than some of the research activities ranked higher in the list above. Given variation in kinds of scholarly activity and expectations associated with the subfields of sociology and legal studies it is recognized that there is latitude in making assessments of research activity.
- 4.4. This document delineates normal expectations and criteria of assessment for research, but Members may call attention to, and explain other kinds of, evidence which they think should be considered in evaluating their research activity.
- 4.5. In the case of co-authored or co-edited research activities it will normally be assumed that the work and credit is shared equally, unless the Member provides evidence otherwise. Members are responsible for indicating their contribution to the activity.

- 4.6. Research outputs will be recognized as contributions to research activity primarily for the year in which they are published, awarded, disseminated, etc. Prior to being published, awarded, disseminated, etc., some credit for overall research activity will be extended for research reported as “under review,” “accepted for publication,” etc.

## 5. Teaching

- 5.1. Teaching involves both undergraduate and graduate level activities and are treated separately below. The Department expects all Members to seek excellence as instructors and supervisors. Teaching encompasses giving lectures, leading seminars, administering extended learning courses, supervising undergraduate and graduate research projects, holding regular office hours, serving on graduate committees for comprehensive examinations and dissertations, and the design and implementation of new courses. Members are expected to engage in all of these activities and to display professionalism in all aspects of teaching. Amongst other things this entails providing accurate and up-to-date information, organizing their courses well, grading fairly, being available to advise students, and treating students with respect.

### 5.2. Undergraduate Teaching

- 5.2.1. High quality undergraduate teaching is, in part, responsive to from the feedback received from students via standard Course Perception Surveys (CPS) which each Member is required to administer for all of the courses taught each year. CPS are considered by the Department to be important formative measures in the pursuit of teaching excellence and the promotion of a positive student learning experience. The Department encourages instructors to consider CPS feedback, both quantitative scores and qualitative comments, in their course preparation and delivery.
  - a) Due to the potential for bias in CPS assessments (UW Senate Report, May 2020), CPS information is for instructor use only and should not be submitted for the purpose of performance evaluation.
- 5.2.2. For the purposes of performance evaluation, Members will be assessed by a review of course content and materials and peer evaluation (per Policy 77), a review of supervisory activities and course development, and a review of supplemental information related to their skills as instructors.
  - a) Peer evaluation will be undertaken using best practices at the University of Waterloo. It is understood that peer evaluation of instructors is both a teaching and learning tool, that the review of an instructors teaching performance can also be formative for evaluators, and that sharing best practices among Members fosters teaching excellence. All Members are therefore encouraged to participate in the process of evaluation and evaluators should be broadly distributed among the Members.

- b) The review of course content and course materials is an important means of assessing Member contributions to the goal of teaching excellence and contributions to the Department's undergraduate programming. The review of course content and material will consider both the overall merits of course content and materials and the relative contribution of course content and materials to the Department's undergraduate Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and corresponding University's Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs).
- c) In making the evaluation of a Member's teaching, contextual factors will be taken into consideration (e.g., structural location, course size, level of the course, the degree of technical difficulty, status of the course as required or optional, the member's teaching load that term, and willingness to take on courses on short notice).
- d) Assessment of undergraduate teaching will also consider the work involved in supervising Senior Honours Essays and developing new courses. These activities significantly enhance the quality of the education we offer undergraduates, promote teaching excellence, support a positive student experience, and contribute to the Department's program objectives.
- e) Members are also encouraged to submit for review any supplemental information about the nature and development of their skills as an instructor (e.g., nominations for and/or receiving awards of excellence, applying for and/or receiving grants to support teaching innovations, participation in special workshops or training).

### 5.3. Graduate Teaching and Supervision

- 5.3.1. Not all faculty members have the opportunity to teach graduate seminars, but all are encouraged to do so. Graduate seminars differ significantly from most undergraduate courses in their size, format, style of interaction, modes of evaluation, and objectives. Faculty may wish to submit course syllabi with their assessment to provide the Performance Review Committee with a clearer sense of the nature of the courses taught. Much of the instructional task at the graduate level, however, involves individual supervision and mentoring. This activity can be described for the evaluation period, but it is difficult to assess the quality of the activity. There is no simple correlation between the quality of the supervision and the success of individual graduate students. Much depends on the abilities, effort, and circumstances of the students.
- 5.3.2. Good graduate supervision may manifest in a high level of quality academic work from the student. Good graduate supervision may also be indicated by students winning external scholarships and awards, presenting their research at conferences, achieving academic publications, and securing placement in good graduate programs or jobs. Members may also provide additional evidence of good graduate supervision. Supervisors have an obligation to be cognizant of the milestones set for the program of

study and to encourage and facilitate the timely completion of these milestones (e.g., the student's course work, comprehensive examinations, and dissertation proposal) and the completion of the degree.

- 5.3.3. Members involved in the successful supervision of large numbers of students should receive special recognition for this instructional burden and accomplishment. But successful graduate instruction depends on the efforts of the entire faculty complement and their willingness to serve on graduate supervisory committees for comprehensive examinations and dissertations, and to provide other kinds of formal and informal instruction and support. Good supervision entails being well organized and aware of the needs and abilities of students, providing prompt, effective, and fair feedback, communicating clearly with them, offering consistent and thoughtful advice, and being reasonably accessible for meetings. Supervisory conduct that unreasonably slows the completion of students' programs amounts to unsatisfactory teaching. In evaluating graduate teaching and supervision, the Performance Review Committee may consider all plausible evidence submitted by the faculty member.

## 6. Service

- 6.1. Given the collegial nature of the university it is important that all Members engage in service activity, sharing responsibility for committee work, administrative duties, and participating in Departmental meetings, as well as other Departmental, Faculty, and University ceremonies and special events. As stated in Policy 77: "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."
- 6.2. Probationary candidates are not expected to take on major administrative roles, but some meaningful contribution to service is required to secure tenure and promotion. Where service to other units is required by the nature of a Member's position (e.g., joint appointment, directorship), this service will be considered service to the Department. Service as Chair or Associate Chair is normally given a high service rating.
- 6.3. Three types of service are recognized for evaluation: service to the Department, service to the University, and community service related to the member's scholarly activities.
- 6.4. Departmental Service: Activities that can be counted as evidence of Departmental service include but are not limited to (the list is not necessarily ranked):
- a) Serving as Chair
  - b) Serving as Associate Chair for Undergraduate or Graduate Affairs
  - c) Serving on committees
  - d) Coordinating speaker series
  - e) Organizing workshops and conferences
  - f) Organizing departmental student events and activities

- g) Willing to take on hard-to-cover courses
- h) All Members are expected to be “good citizens,” which entails maintaining regular office hours and being available to advise students, mentoring new faculty, attending Department meetings, participating in candidate interviews for positions in the Department, participating in Departmental events (e.g., speaker series, student events), and assisting the Chair and Associate Chairs in the performance of their duties.

6.5. University Service: Activities that can be counted as evidence of university service include but are not limited to (the list is not necessarily ranked):

- a) Committee work
- b) Organizing workshops and conferences
- c) Coordinating speaker series
- d) Chairing doctoral defences
- e) Other kinds of leadership roles
- f) Service awards

6.6. Community Service: Activities that can be counted as evidence of community service related a Member’s scholarly activities include but are not limited to (the list is not necessarily ranked):

- a) Editorial roles (with the value being commensurate with the amount of work required and the reputation of the publications involved)
- b) Editorial and advisory board roles
- c) Service for academic and professional societies, organizations, and committees
- d) Adjunct appointments to other departments or universities
- e) Visiting Professorship appointments, involving teaching or supervising activities, at other universities
- f) Review of manuscripts for scholarly journals and book publishers (with the value being commensurate to the number of reviews and the reputation of journals and publishers)
- g) Serving on the adjudication committees of external funding agencies for scholarships and research grants, serving as external examiner
- h) Articles, editorials, commentary, or interviews in the media
- i) Invitations to speak to and/or advise policy-makers, community and civil society groups, think tanks, and testimony before government bodies
- j) Service awards from academic and professional groups

6.7. Service Standards:

To receive a score of at least 1.25 for service, Members normally must present evidence of all of the following during that year:

- 1) Membership on, and a meaningful contribution to, some important Departmental committee (or an equivalent meaningful service contribution to the Department)
- 2) Good Departmental citizenship
- 3) At least one of the following:

- a) Meaningful extra-Departmental service contribution to the Faculty or University
- b) Meaningful external service to the academic discipline, profession, or community

Low levels of departmental service will result in an unsatisfactory rating. Since there is a substantial amount of administrative work that must be done to sustain the Department and ensure the success of its programs, as well as its interactions with the rest of the university, any Member who performs little or no departmental service is placing a significant and unfair strain on their colleagues.

- 6.8. Some activities may be counted as contributing to the dissemination of research, or as teaching, and Members must clearly specify how they would prefer these activities to be counted. Double-counting across categories is not permitted. Paid work or consultancy does not normally count as research or service. Where only expenses are reimbursed such work (e.g., for the government) may be counted as service, or if related to an active program of research, it may be counted as research. It is the Member's responsibility to be aware of the university policies on Extra-University Activity (#49) and Conflict of Interest (#69).

## **7. Tenure and Promotion**

- 7.1. Progress towards tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is guided by Policy #77 and subject to the same Departmental guidelines (as specified above).

## **8. Revising the Guidelines**

- 8.1. The Addendum shall be reviewed and updated biennially, and changes approved by a majority vote of regular faculty members of the Department and by the Dean no later than 15 October in the year before the evaluation calendar year(s).
- 8.2. Current versions of faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines and Departmental Addenda shall be posted on the relevant Faculty website and publicly accessible.

**GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL  
PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS SEPTEMBER 2020**

**INTRODUCTION**

This document provides guidelines for the evaluation process and the performance expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service for faculty within the Department of Spanish and Latin American Studies at University of Waterloo. These guidelines are supplemental to, and consistent with University of Waterloo Policies, the member evaluation procedures outlined in Article 13 of the Memorandum of Agreement between UW and FAUW, and the Faculty of Arts guidelines for these issues.

Performance Reviews in the Department of Spanish and Latin American Studies conform in all respects to the requirements set out in the Memorandum of Agreement, Article 13.5., “Member Evaluation.” This document satisfies 13.5.1.b), which states: “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.” Relative contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service vary over the course of a career. This document is intended to make Departmental practice transparent, in its historical and ongoing character, to outline elements of performance to be taken into account in the Review, and to identify the values informing it. The document is “living” and thus will be subject to biennial review.

**THE ANNUAL PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL**

**General Information**

The Department will vote every two years in the Fall term as to how performance evaluations will be conducted – either by Chair alone or by a committee of department members. Documentation is to be provided that gives evidence of the activity/achievement being claimed. Spanish and Latin American Studies usually requires all course evaluations, offprints of articles, letters of commendation, conference programmes, etc. to be submitted with the Activity Report.

In any of the categories, to receive a score of 2.0 the contribution must be truly outstanding in terms of its impact or amount of effort required, or it must mark an extremely high level of accomplishment, or it must demonstrate ability much beyond the departmental norm.

Policy 77 states:

*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.*

The Annual Performance Appraisal issues a score out of 2, compounded out of scores out of 2 on each of the three listed job components, typically according to the following formulas:

Faculty:        Research 40%  
                  Teaching 40%  
                  Service 20%

Lecturers:     Teaching 80%  
                  Service 20%

The points on the rating scale and their associated descriptors are:

0.00    Unsatisfactory  
0.25    New rating point effective 2012  
0.50    Needs Improvement  
0.75    New rating point effective 2012  
1.00    Satisfactory  
1.25    Good  
1.50    Very Good  
1.75    Excellent  
2.00    Outstanding

Every year in early January untenured faculty members and Continuing Lecturers, and those members holding a Definite Term Appointment, are invited to submit information detailing their activities in each of the three evaluation areas since the previous evaluation cycle.

Tenured faculty members are evaluated on a two-year cycle.

Faculty members should feel free to include and explain the widest selection of data they wish the Chair to review, and to generally present their own strongest case.

On the basis of this information the Chair recommends numerical ratings for each faculty member, which are then discussed with the Dean of Arts and possibly revised in order to achieve fairness and consistency across the Faculty. The Dean of Arts in turn meets with the Provost to settle evaluation averages across the University, a process that can also necessitate revisions to the proposed ratings.



The overall score for each faculty member is then used as a multiplier on the Faculty of Arts basic selective increment, and also serves as a snapshot of one's general performance in the year evaluated.

In any of the categories, to receive a score of 2.0 the contribution must be truly outstanding in terms of its impact or amount of effort required, or it must mark an extremely high level of accomplishment, or it must demonstrate ability much beyond the departmental norm.

The expectation for each faculty member is that he/she will perform well in the categories below.

### **Appraisal of Teaching**

High-quality teaching is an important goal for the Department. In evaluating any faculty member, junior or senior, the Department follows the guidelines expressed in Policy 77:

*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.*

Evidence regarding the quality of teaching is largely obtained from student course perception surveys. The two scores regarded as most significant for this exercise are Overall Evaluation of the Course and Overall Evaluation of the Instructor. Quality of teaching can be determined and evaluated also from other sources, ie: classroom visits made by the Chair or senior faculty members to lectures given by untenured faculty members. Advance notice of such visits would be given to the faculty member and the faculty member is also welcome to invite colleagues to his / her / their class for feedback. The development of new courses or programs is also seen to contribute to one's teaching evaluation, as are unsolicited comments from the students.

The following factors will also be considered when evaluating teaching:

- Quantitative information, such as: number of courses taught; number of students taught; scores on student course perception surveys.
- Qualitative information, such as: new or repeat course; degree of innovation or inventive teaching practices; written feedback from students; course observations by others; involvement in student success; awards and curriculum development.

- Participation in teaching workshops, evidence of self-evaluation leading to improvement, or of awareness of trends in pedagogy, and other signs of developments in teaching content and method may also be taken into account.

## **Appraisal of Research**

The assessment of research quality and intensity is particularly open to case-specific considerations. Hence it is important to reemphasize both the default nature of these guidelines and the invitation for faculty members to bring forward and explain any evidence they consider relevant to their evaluation. In evaluating any faculty member, junior or senior, the Department follows the guidelines expressed in Policy 77:

*University teaching is informed and enriched by the research and scholarship of the professoriate. The University expects its regular faculty members to be active participants in the evolution of their disciplines and professions, to keep academic programs and courses current with developments in their fields, and to communicate both their discoveries and their commitment to scholarship and research. Where feasible, faculty members are expected to seek external funding to support their scholarly work.*

It is expected that both senior and junior faculty members will provide evidence of progress in the area of research. Such dedication should be normally endorsed by the quality of the research. Publications are particularly important evidence in the determination of scholarship performance. For the purposes of the Annual Review Process, some kinds of publications are considered more significant than others. The intensity of the research is also important but does not determine the satisfactory performance of the candidate in this area. The default categories of research significance include:

- Books published with publishers having a good academic reputation and with evidence of meaningful peer review
- Edited volumes with good presses or respected contributors; invited chapters in edited collections that feature influential and respected authors or editors, published by reputable presses
- Research papers published in high quality peer-reviewed journals
- Invited major or keynote addresses to prestigious conferences
- Research papers in professional non-refereed journals
- Introduction to a book
- Refereed conference proceedings
- Book reviews in top journals
- Papers presented at major national and international conferences
- Book reviews in minor, non-refereed, or simply book-reviewing journals
- Other Publications (translations, creative writings, articles for newspapers or magazines, etc).

The key measure of research activity is published or presented original research output. But

other measures are also relevant, including evidence of research impact; winning research grants and research awards; and organizing conferences that advance research and promote the research reputation of the Department.

Types of assessment may include formal peer review, citation metrics, and public impact. 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, e-journals, and granting councils, and membership on government or professional committees.

The following factors will also be considered when evaluating a faculty member’s research:

- Single or co-authorship is assessed according to the practices of the discipline involved
- Published work that straddles the assessment period (e.g. date of acceptance -> date of publication) should be noted, and it can count towards both assessment periods, but in only one assessment period should it ever be considered outstanding.
- Work in progress is required for non-tenured members; tenured members may provide information on work in progress if they wish so as to demonstrate the ongoing nature of their activities or to provide context for future achievements.

### **Appraisal of Service**

Service is an essential part of our role as faculty members and it is highly valued. Faculty members will participate in service every year, except when they are on sabbatical. Where faculty members find their service contribution to be low, they are expected to seek out opportunities to strengthen their contribution.

Faculty members are expected to perform meaningful service at the Departmental level, as well as to contribute to the University, the discipline, the profession, or the community. They are expected to participate in collegial self-governance through regular attendance at Department meetings and through periodic service on Department committees. Faculty members also make important contributions to service in the various coordinator roles that support Departmental life, such as the speakers’ series, awards, and website coordinators. They are expected to respond to student and staff enquiries in a timely fashion, to submit grades by specified deadlines, and to be regularly available in the Department for engagement with students and colleagues.

Service can be performed within the Department, the Faculty, and the University as a whole. It can also include service to the discipline or to the profession and to the community at large. Service is an important component of a faculty member’s duties and should be properly encouraged and recognized. Since service is expected, lack of service requires an explanation.

Policy 77 states:

*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.*

In determining and evaluating service criteria in Tenure and Promotion Decisions, Policy 77 also notes:

*Candidates for tenure or promotion shall provide information on their service activities in sufficient detail to allow the DTPC to assess its quantity and quality. Where necessary, the DTPC should obtain statements from those who have personally observed the candidate's service contributions both internal and external to the University. Some service activities, such as chairing a curriculum committee or editing a professional society journal, may also provide indirect evidence for scholarship and teaching”*

The assessment of service takes into consideration the following:

- University service, such as: service on university/faculty/department committees; performing officer duties in the department; other contributions to the life of the department, faculty, or university; outreach work connecting the university to the community at large.

Discipline service, such as: service with associations; journal editorial work; conference organization; other contributions.

- Does the service being performed demonstrate leadership or place holding (e.g. sitting on a committee that meets once a year or does little)?
- Does the service being performed demonstrate a commitment to the work of the department/faculty/university/discipline?
- Please note:  
“Citizenship” has not been expressly stated as a category, but it is understood that department members are expected to contribute positively to the life of the department/faculty/university/discipline.

In more specific terms, the assessment of service is done on the following basis:

## **1. Departmental Service**

Internal service to the department and departmental citizenship are an essential duty. Faculty members are expected to be involved in the collegial academic and professional life of the Department and to share a wide range of responsibilities. All department members are encouraged to participate in department meetings, ceremonies, and other professional activities when possible.

The positive contribution that faculty members make to the life of the department is also important. This can be considered Open-Door service. Being available for both students and colleagues is expected. Moreover, departmental affairs often require the existence of a range of sub-committees or working groups. Some of these are standing committees, and some are hoc committees intended to deal with specific issues. Service in these committees can be a substantial contribution, depending on the number of issues that fall to the committee in a given year. Some examples of activities that can be counted as evidence of departmental service include (this list is not meant to be exhaustive):

- Chair
- Associate Chair-Undergraduate Studies,
- Member of the Undergraduate Advisors Group
- Director of the Translation Plan
- Coordinator of Special Programs
- Course Coordinator
- Departmental Co-op Report Evaluator
- Coordinator of the Study Abroad Programs
- Faculty Library Representative
- Coordinator of High School Outreach Program
- Department Scholarship Coordinator
- Member of the Faculty Association Council of Representatives

## **2. Faculty / University service**

Some examples of activities that can be recognized as evidence of university service include (this list is not meant to be exhaustive):

- Committee work
- Leadership roles
- Coordinator of Speaker Series
- University service awards
- Organization of workshops and conferences
- Serving on adjudication committees for grant applications

## **3. Service to the Profession**

Some examples of activities that can be counted as service to the profession include (this list is not meant to be exhaustive):

- Editorial roles (more value is place on the more senior roles and higher-tier publications)
- Editorial board and advisory board roles
- Service in professional committees or organizations
- Scholarly manuscript reviewing activities for journals and book publishers (with higher value placed on reviews for higher-tier publications)
- Reviewing activities for granting agencies, tenure and promotion at other universities, program reviews at other institutions, awards/prizes etc.
- Service awards from academic or professional bodies
- Articles, editorials, commentary, interviews in media (faculty can chose whether to count this as service or dissemination of research under scholarship)
- Serving on adjudication committees of external agencies granting scholarships and research funding

#### **4. Service to the community**

- Public lectures
- Interviews
- Learning opportunities offered to the community (ie: Conversation Classes)

# **Guidelines for Tenure, Promotion and Faculty Evaluation**

## **Stratford School of Interaction Design and Business**

Initial date of approval: November 8, 2018

Renewed: November 13, 2020

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

This document provides guidelines for the evaluation process and the performance expectations for scholarship, teaching, and service for faculty in the Stratford School of Interaction Design and Business at the University of Waterloo. These guidelines are supplemental to, and consistent with, the University of Waterloo policies (including Policy 77, Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members); the member evaluation procedures outlined in Article 13.5 of the Memorandum of Agreement between UW and FAUW; and the Faculty of Arts guidelines for tenure and promotion.

The School recognizes the importance of two criteria in evaluating faculty work. These criteria are outcome and process. Outcome assesses the significance of scholarly activities in particular contexts. These contexts include disciplinary, classroom, scholarly and professional venues, communities, digital mediated settings, and others. Process attends to the components, scope, and scale of the academic and creative activities required to engage in successful research, teaching, and service. In considering process, the STPC will evaluate levels and modes of collaboration, the range of methodological components employed, and the complexity of research and creative oversight.

## **2. RATING OF TEACHING**

### **2.1 General Comments**

In the Stratford School of Interaction Design and Business, teaching is a core faculty activity, and includes teaching in a variety of settings from lectures, to workshops, studio courses and seminars. Policy 77 notes: “Teaching quality should be assessed broadly using evidence gathered from as many sources as practicable. Responsibility for providing documentary evidence on teaching rests with the candidate and, to a lesser degree, with the department Chair. A teaching dossier developed by the candidate may be the most effective way of assembling this information. 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.” In other words, course evaluations are only one source of assessment.

### **2.2 Criteria**

The STPC Performance Review committee will use the following questions to evaluate teaching.

#### *2.2.1. Outcomes of Teaching*

- In what ways does your course involve students in theoretically-informed practice?
- How did you implement project-based learning in your course?
- What experiential learning methods did you employ in your course?
- What assessment methods did you use?



- In what ways can students apply what they have learned to situations outside of the classroom?
- What supervisory duties did you assume with students?

2.2.2. *Process of Teaching (including development and components of all forms of student teaching and supervision):*

- Did you pursue new forms of learning with your students?
- What kind of work was involved in developing or revising courses? How did you draw on existing models of course delivery, and how did you devise new methods of course delivery?

2.2.3. *Evidence of Teaching*

- Number of courses/sections taught
- Level of each course taught
- Lecture, seminar, project, or studio courses
- Number of students taught and enrolments in each course
- Student supervision in independent studies courses, etc.
- Course evaluations
- Course syllabi and assignments
- Nominations for, and/or winning of teaching excellence awards
- Evidence of professional development, such as participation in, or organization of, conferences related to teaching or pedagogical workshops
- The ability and willingness of a faculty member to serve the general teaching needs of the School by teaching outside her or his area of particular expertise, by preparing new courses, and by accepting responsibility for service and required courses either on campus or through the Centre for Extended Learning (CEL)
- Evidence of other teaching-related activities outside the classroom, such as training or mentoring teaching or research assistants, mentoring students or junior colleagues in the profession, or assisting student groups
- Peer reviews
- Publication of textbooks. If a textbook contributes to the synthesis of knowledge, it may be counted under “scholarship” instead. Faculty members must indicate which category they would like textbooks to be considered; these publications cannot be double-counted under both categories.

2.2.4. *Graduate Supervision (where appropriate)*

- Number and level of students supervised (complete and in progress)
- Evidence of strong graduate supervision, which may manifest itself in a high level of quality academic work from the student, students winning external scholarships and awards, presenting their research at conferences, achieving academic publications, securing placement in good graduate programs or jobs, etc.

### 3. **RATING OF SCHOLARSHIP**

### **3.1 General Comments**

Faculty members contribute to the research profile of the School, the Faculty of Arts, and University of Waterloo through critical analysis, design, creative output, theoretical inquiry, data analysis.

Policy 77 notes: “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.” The School values a range of research and creative work (see section 3.2 of this document), and encourages faculty to note the university’s emphasis on peer review and evidence of impact for all scholarly activity.

### **3.2 Categories of Scholarship**

The three main categories of the School’s scholarship include:

#### *3.2.1. Publications, conferences, and other peer reviewed scholarship*

Typically, venues that are vetted by well-established and respected experts are given the highest rating by the University of Waterloo and most other institutions. The School recognizes the importance of work that is cross-disciplinary, multi-institutional, and collaborative.

#### *3.2.2. Studio specific research*

- Solo Exhibitions
- Group Exhibitions
- Screenings
- Festivals
- Curatorial Practices
- Performance Art
- Site Specific Work
- Publications - indicate if invited
- Artist Talks
- Other Scholarly Work

#### *3.2.3. Other forms of scholarly activity*

This category includes such activities as the formulation of policy, white papers, and preliminary research development; consultation and collaboration in specific settings, both inside and outside the University (including industry, governmental, social service, not-for-profit, educational, etc.); significant contributions to research and creative work (this work might include the gathering of multi-purpose data, dissemination/distribution activities, and contributions to knowledge mobilization and implementation efforts). Work on grants and other funding avenues constitute an additional type of project. Funded projects will be assessed by the academic or professional vetting process, the

prestige of the funding body, and the relative rarity of the award.

**Note:** the onus is on the faculty member to provide evidence of the quality, impact and relevance of this work. If the work has been subject to a review process, the faculty member should provide details of that process.

**Note:** if a group project, the faculty member must indicate the percentage of the overall work that is theirs.

Some activities will fall exclusively into one category. Other activities, however, may start in one category and then migrate to others – an outcome encouraged by the School. For example, a funded research project may produce a series of publications and talks as well as result in an exhibition.

### **3.3 Criteria**

Scholarship is assessed in the following ways:

#### *3.3.1. Outcomes*

- How has the activity contributed to and/or changed the discipline, affected a community, influenced other researchers, or generated new research activities?
- What are the concrete outcomes of the research and creative work? How are these outcomes significant in particular settings?
- How do experts in the research or production field evaluate the output and identify significance and relevance?
- What is distinctive about the research in terms of creativity, innovation, and/or the ways in which it contributes to and/or challenges the discipline/field?
- How does the candidate's research build on, compare to, and/or further that produced by prominent scholars in the field?

#### *3.3.2. Process*

- What are the methods of research?
- What resources, personnel, and activities does collaboration require? What types of academics/researchers are involved?
- What kinds of academic institutions, industry partners, community organizations are contributing to the research and creative work, and how?

#### *3.3.3. Evidence of Scholarly Activity*

- Publications
- Presentations of research at conferences/workshops, guest talks, keynote addresses as well as discussant, director, and other participant roles at conferences/workshops
- Other forms of dissemination of research (faculty members may choose to count some forms of dissemination to the wider community as service instead)
- Winning external funding, through a process involving peer review or professional adjudication, to support scholarly research

- Winning of research awards through a process involving peer review or professional adjudication
- Work in progress: Research creation, production and development activities, including the production of new materials and compiling material from existing sources
- Organizing conferences, workshops or academic institutes that advance scholarship and research (faculty members can choose whether to count these activities as scholarship or service or even teaching if relevant)
- Evidence of research impact
- Evidence of other items mentioned in the following section of Policy 77: “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.”
- Other indirect measures of scholarship, including other awards, citations, reviews, reprints, or other qualitative assessments of merit.
- Peer reviewed research grants

## **4. RATING OF SERVICE**

### **4.1 General Comments**

Policy 77 notes: “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.”

Service is a very important part of our role as members of the School, our Faculty, the University, and the academic and social communities in which we participate. All School members are encouraged to participate in School meetings, ceremonies, Convocation, and other professional activities. Probationary candidates normally are not expected to fill major administrative roles. Where service to other units is required by the nature of the position (e.g., joint appointment, directorship), this will be taken into account as service to the School. Service as Director or Associate Director normally earns a high service rating.

Generally, there are four categories of service that may be reported in annual performance reviews (service to the School, Faculty, University, and profession), and there is an expectation of faculty members to contribute to the School. Care should be taken that such activity does not interfere with the proper discharge of primary University duties. Faculty members should be made aware of University policies on Extra-University Activity (Policy #49) and Conflict of

Interest (Policy #69). Contract research should be discussed with the Office of Research.

## **4.2 Categories of Service**

Service encompasses activities in a variety of contexts:

### *4.2.1. School*

Service at the School level is a fundamental requirement. Members' contributions ensure the efficient and effective operations of the School. Examples include:

- filling officer positions (e.g., Director, Associate Director, etc.)
- membership and participation in School committees (e.g., School Tenure and Promotion Committee, etc.)
- organizing and managing special events
- coordinator of capstone course(s)
- initiatives that contribute to the functioning of the School
- Student advising
- committee work
- administrative roles
- coordinator of speakers series
- organization of workshops and conferences
- “Good citizenship” such as mentoring new faculty, being available in the School, being willing to take on hard-to-cover courses, and being available to students

### *4.2.2. Faculty*

Service at the faculty level contributes to the operations and initiatives of the Arts Faculty.

### *4.2.3. University*

Some examples of activities that can be counted as evidence of university service include (this list is not meant to be exhaustive):

- Committee work
- Leadership roles
- Coordinator of speakers series
- University service awards
- Serving as external examiner in graduate examinations, dissertation committees, defense committees
- Organization of workshops and conferences
- Serving on adjudication committees for grant applications

### *4.2.4. Academic Community*

Some examples of activities that can be counted as service to the profession include (this list is not meant to be exhaustive):

- Editorial roles (more value is placed on the more senior roles and higher-tier publications)
- Editorial board and advisory board roles
- Service in professional committees or organizations

- Scholarly manuscript reviewing activities for journals and book publishers (with higher value placed on reviews for higher-tier publications)
- Reviewing activities for granting agencies, tenure and promotion at other universities, program reviews at other institutions, awards/prizes etc.
- Service awards from academic or professional bodies
- Articles, editorials, commentary, interviews in media (faculty can choose whether to count this as service or dissemination of research under scholarship)
- Serving on adjudication committees of external agencies granting scholarships and research funding

#### 4.2.5. *Community-at-Large*

Service to communities-at-large encompasses the various ways in which faculty activities contribute to, and connect with, the social and cultural fabric of communities beyond the university. This type of service must relate to a faculty member's area of expertise.

Examples include:

- Work that contributes to the mission and activities of not-for-profit, advocacy, and educational organizations
- Collaboration with social service, industry, governmental, and other institutional organizations in ways that contribute to knowledge creation and dissemination
- Research and creative work with various organizations that responds to a community-based need articulated by an organization

### 4.3 **Criteria**

Service is assessed in the following ways:

#### 4.3.1. *Outcomes*

- What are the chief contributions of the service in various contexts (School, Faculty, University, community, professional, etc.)?
- What was achieved?
- How did the service performed demonstrate faculty contributions to the social and cultural fabric of a community or communities?
- Who is served and/or affected by the service?

#### 4.3.2. *Process*

- What is the nature of the service in terms of time commitment and other resources?
- What did the service involve, in terms of collaboration, individuals and organizations who contributed, length and components of planning process, complexity of structures engaged, etc.?
- What were specific challenges related to design, implementation, and delivery of the service?

#### 4.3.3. *Evidence*

In most cases, it is sufficient that faculty provide a statement of service, and when possible, supporting documents (i.e., email confirmation of responsibility, etc.). In determining and evaluating service criteria in Tenure and Promotion Decisions, Policy 77

notes: “Candidates for tenure or promotion shall provide information on their service activities in sufficient detail to allow the DTTC to assess its quantity and quality. Where necessary, the DTTC should obtain statements from those who have personally observed the candidate's service contributions both internal and external to the University.”

## **5. UNIVERSITY-LEVEL TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES AND INFORMATION**

### **5.1 General Comments about the Annual Performance Reviews**

#### *5.1.1. Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee*

To assist the Director with the annual faculty performance evaluations, three faculty members are elected annually to serve on this Committee. All full-time faculty members (full, associate and assistant professors, continuing lecturers and definite-term lecturers) are eligible to serve. This committee will review all merit recommendations to ensure equity within a rank and within the School as a whole.

#### *5.1.2. Director's Responsibility*

While the School does involve a committee in the performance evaluation exercise, it should be noted that the final responsibility for faculty performance recommendation rests with the Director (see Memorandum of Agreement 13.5.6.).

#### *5.1.3. Who is assessed?*

Performance reviews are required for all regular faculty (Lecturers to Professors on full-time or reduced load appointments) with appointments of one year or more. Performance ratings shall pertain to the portion of the evaluation year during which the faculty member was a paid employee of the University, including sabbatical leave, but excluding pregnancy, adoption or parental leave. Performance reviews will be carried out every year for Members holding probationary or definite-term appointments, and every two years for Members holding tenured or continuing appointments (see Memorandum of Agreement 13.5.2)

Policy 77 requires that performance reviews be included in School tenure and promotion considerations. Therefore, it is important that the Director provide a written assessment of each faculty member's performance. Recommendations for selective merit increases are based on overall performance.

### **5.2. Assessment Components and Ratings**

Performance is assessed in three areas:

- Teaching* – broadly defined including classroom instruction, individual program-related work with students, student supervision, instructional material development, etc.,
- Scholarship* – including intellectual advancement of a discipline, and
- Service* – leadership or support to the School, Faculty, University, profession, academic community, and other relevant communities.

### Recommendations to the Dean

The Director's recommendation to the Dean must indicate a level of performance in each area and must provide evidence supporting this assessment.

Each Member shall receive one of the following nine numerical performance ratings in each of teaching, scholarship and service:

- 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

**Note:** Please see Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines for Arts for definitions of 'Outstanding,' 'Satisfactory,' 'Needs Improvement.'

### Performance is Satisfactory

If overall performance is rated as satisfactory, the expectation is that performance is satisfactory in each of the three areas of assessment.

This principle is most importantly illustrated in relation to teaching and scholarship. A regular faculty appointment carries two major commitments: the communication of the knowledge and nature of one's discipline via teaching, and the advancement of the state of one's discipline via scholarship. The joint importance of these commitments is underlined in Policy 76, which states: "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. During a term for which formal teaching duties are not assigned, faculty members are expected to increase their scholarly activity."

This is further acknowledged by the heavy investment of time and energy most faculty devote to their work as both teachers of their discipline and active contributors to it.

It follows that, unless a faculty member's position has been formally changed to involve a different set of duties, satisfactory performance in both teaching and scholarship is expected if the faculty member's overall contribution is to be seen as a satisfactory one. Good performance in one area cannot, normally, compensate for needing improvement in the other because only part of the job has been performed in a satisfactory manner.



### Performance Needs Improvement

If performance in a particular area is seen as needing improvement, it is essential that the nature of the problem be communicated to the faculty member. The kind of improvement needed should be discussed, help provided when appropriate and an opportunity given to remedy the problem. This can be one of the most valuable functions of the annual review procedure. If, after a reasonable period of time, a “needs improvement” continues, serious consideration must be given to the appropriateness of continuing the appointment in its present form. This is particularly important if the area needing improvement is that of teaching or scholarship.

### Weightings

The weight for each area shall be as specified in the member’s letter of appointment. In the absence of specified weights, the normal weights, for tenured or tenure-track positions are 40 percent for teaching, 40 percent for scholarship, and 20 percent for service. For definite-term lecturers and continuing lecturers the normal weights are 80 percent for teaching and 20 percent for service. Weightings and duties may be adjusted for a minimum of two years in a formal agreement between the faculty member and the Director with the approval of the Dean. Normally, the weights shall be at least 20 percent in teaching and scholarship for tenured faculty.

When a faculty member takes on a significant administrative role, they can have a temporary adjustment of their weightings for purposes of merit evaluation. This adjustment involves a change in expectation for quantity of work in each area but not for quality.

### **5.3 Newly-Appointed Faculty**

For their first evaluation year, newly-appointed faculty will be assigned a score based on actual performance or, when too little information is available, assigned a score equal to the School or Faculty average for their rank.

### Fraction Load or Leave of Absence

For faculty on fraction load or a leave of absence the expectations for quality remain the same while expectations for quantity change.

### Years Considered in the Evaluation

Scholarship will be evaluated on the basis of a two-year period and teaching and service will be evaluated on the basis of work done in the prior year or prior two years.

### Insufficient Documentation

It is essential that the faculty member provide sufficient information during the review process to allow an informed judgment in each area. A faculty member who does not submit the required documentation by the specified deadline normally will receive an overall rating of at most 0.5.

### Performance Review for Faculty on Probationary Term Appointments

Performance reviews of probationary faculty must consider performance in the past year AND the total record to date. Assessment of the total record is important to provide an annual

assessment of progress toward tenure. Where appropriate, separate assessments should be given for each component (e.g., while performance for the past year was satisfactory, the total record is a cause for concern because...). Where concern exists, this should be conveyed to the individual in as specific a form as possible and every effort should be made to assist the faculty member to identify and rectify the problem. An indication should be given of the likelihood of the individual being granted tenure if they continue to perform at the present level. While not required by policy, it is useful for the Director to share any such concerns with the STPC and seek its advice on wording.

Policy 77 states that, “annual performance reviews form part of the evidence in tenure considerations”. If the STPC expressed concern at the time of renewal of the probationary contract, the results of each subsequent annual performance assessment should be reviewed by that Committee. Upon receipt of the STPC recommendation, the Dean shall decide whether to reappoint, and shall inform the candidate in writing, including reasons if the decision is negative.

#### **5.4 Faculty Appointments Types and Evaluation Procedures**

##### Long Term Disability

A faculty member on long-term disability does not get a performance rating. The salary of a faculty member on long-term disability is paid, and adjusted to include any scale increases, under the LTD plan.

##### Paid Leave (including Sabbatical Leave)

A faculty member on paid leave shall be evaluated on the portion of the evaluation year during which the faculty member was a paid employee of the University. It may not be possible to assess performance in all three categories during the evaluation year. In such cases, a faculty member normally will receive the average of up to the three previous ratings in any category where assessment is not possible.

##### Pregnancy, Adoption or Parental Leave

For faculty members on approved pregnancy, adoption or parental leave, assessment is in a similar manner to paid leave.

##### Sick Leave

A faculty member on sick leave does receive a performance rating. If information to evaluate the faculty member’s performance is not available owing to the illness, the assessment is in a manner similar to paid leave.

##### Unpaid Leave

For faculty members on unpaid leave, the full-scale increase shall apply, but the merit increase will be prorated by the fraction of the year served at the University.

##### Administrative Duty

In the case where a faculty member serves as Chair or Director for part of a year, the Dean will provide a service rating to the School for that fraction of the year.



## **Addendum to the Faculty of Arts Guidelines for the Performance Review for Faculty**

### **DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND LEGAL STUDIES**

Effective date: January 1, 2023 – December 31, 2024

(Approved August 29, 2022 – Department Meeting)

#### **1. Introduction**

1.1. This document provides Departmental evaluation expectations and procedures for the assessment of research, teaching, and service activities of regular faculty and for Departmental decisions on tenure and promotion. The guidelines are supplemental to the relevant University of Waterloo policies and the evaluation procedures delineated in Article 13 of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the University of Waterloo and the Faculty Association of the University of Waterloo, Policy 77 of the University, and the Faculty of Arts Guidelines for Performance Review for Faculty. If there is a conflict between the Guidelines and the MOA, or the criteria of Policy 77, or the Faculty of Arts Guidelines for Performance Review for Faculty, the provisions of the MOA or Policy 77 or Faculty of Arts Guidelines shall take precedence.

#### **2. Objective**

2.1. The objectives of performance reviews are to be helpful and encouraging, to give an accurate account of the Member's work, and to provide the Member with the means to improve their performance.

#### **3. Performance Review**

3.1. Performance reviews, which determine the selective salary increments for each year, are required for all regular faculty in the Department. Performance ratings are for the portion of the evaluation period during which the Member was a paid employee of the university, including paid and unpaid leave.

3.2. *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 such cases only, the practice... 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 (or in the Faculty should there not be enough members in the Department of the same rank); (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. MOA 13.5.4 (b)*

- 3.2.1. Members on Long-term Disability are not evaluated.
- 3.3. Performance Review Committee
- 3.3.1. While the responsibility for doing the performance review of each Member resides with the Chair of the Department, the Chair is advised by a Performance Review Committee which will be chaired by the Chair of the Department. This Committee will consist of three regular faculty members, elected for staggered two-year terms, in the spring of each year, from among the regular faculty members in the Department, tenured and untenured, who are available to serve (i.e., not on sabbatical or some other form of official leave). Based on the Committee's recommendations, the Chair will write a performance evaluation for each Member, with consideration for rank. The Committee may request that a Member attend a meeting to discuss their performance report.
- 3.4. It is incumbent on Members to supply the Chair with a report documenting, with sufficient information, their activities in the areas of research, teaching, and service by the deadline set by the Department. Members are encouraged to provide complete, accurate, and clear information in their report. The Chair and the Performance Review Committee will work with the information provided. They may request more information, but it is not their responsibility to secure this information if it is not provided by the deadline.
- 3.5. Each Member is given an overall assessment based on a rating scale from 0-2. A rating from 0-2 is provided for each of three areas of activity: research, teaching, and service. The overall rating is the average of the three ratings according to a weighting system whereby 40% of the rating is for research, 40% for teaching, and 20% for service. This is the normal weighting formula to be used unless otherwise specified in the Member's letter of appointment, or if the weighting formula has been temporarily adjusted (for at least two years) by prior agreement with the Chair and with the consent of the Dean (e.g., when a faculty member has taken on a significant administrative role). Adjustments to the weighting will affect the expectations for the quantity of the activity undertaken in the three areas of assessment; it does not change the expectations regarding the quality of the work.
- 3.6. The evaluation of the Chair of the Department will be undertaken by the Dean of Arts.
- 3.7. The scoring categories are as follows:
- 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

- 3.8. Performance evaluations shall occur:
- On an annual basis for probationary or definite-term appointments
  - On a biennial basis, in odd numbered years, for tenured or continuing appointments
    - For Members on a biennial performance review cycle, the rating for non-review years shall be equal to the rating for the previous review year.
- 3.9. Members shall provide documentation for:
- One year for probationary or definite-term appointments
  - Two years for tenured or continuing appointments
- 3.10. Assessment Window:
- Research will be assessed on a two-year window.
  - Teaching and Service will be assessed for the year(s) under evaluation (with remaining documented years used to provide context to the assessed evidence).
- 3.11. Concerns or questions about the ratings or comments received on evaluation should be raised first with the Chair of the Department, and then, if desired by the Member, with the Performance Review Committee. The committee will then advise the Chair (see also MOA 13.5.10).
- 3.12. The Chair will recommend the scores for each Member to the Dean of Arts, providing evidence to support the assessments. As stated in the MOA (13.5.7): *“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.”*
- 3.13. Once ratings have been finalized with the Dean, the Chair shall inform the Members of their individual ratings in each category and their overall rating in writing and provide an opportunity to discuss their performance evaluation.
- 3.14. Probationary Members
- 3.14.1. Performance reviews play an important role in preparing Members for tenure and promotion, and guiding decisions at the Departmental, Faculty and University levels when Members apply for tenure and promotion. It is important that they be as accurate and informative as possible.
- 3.14.2. Reviews of probationary Members should consider both their performance and their overall progress towards renewal of the probationary position and securing tenure. This is the case for all three areas of assessment: research, teaching, and service. Specific comments about the progress towards tenure and promotion must be conveyed to the Member in writing as part of their annual assessment. Any concerns identified by the Performance Review Committee and/or the Chair of the Department should be carefully documented and conveyed in writing to the Member in question. Some fluctuation in scores is acceptable, but consistently low scores or scores that stay

in the Satisfactory range for several years, especially for research and teaching, may lead to a negative tenure decision, as are scores consistently in the 1.25 range (without other offsetting factors).

- 3.14.3. When Faculty-level Performance Evaluation Guidelines or Departmental Addenda change during a Member's probationary contract, 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 the Department Chair if they elect to be governed by the new set.

#### **4. Research**

- 4.1. The University of Waterloo is a research-intensive institution, and the Department places a premium on the research activity of its Members. As Policy 77 stipulates, scholarship may take several equally valuable forms, ranging from the discovery of new knowledge, to the innovative coordination, synthesis or integration of knowledge, to new and useful applications of knowledge. *"In general, [however], only work that is accessible for peer review or professional adjudication can be considered in assessing scholarship for performance reviews, tenure or promotion."* While the policy refers to work that is *"accessible for peer review or professional adjudication,"* it is not necessary for the work to have already been reviewed or adjudicated. Nevertheless, the key measure of research activity is published or presented research of an original nature, with peer reviewed work being valued more highly than others.
- 4.2. In practice, many kinds of research activity can count as evidence of scholarship, and the assessment of both the amount and the quality of research activity is subject to some interpretation and negotiation on a case specific basis. In order of significance, both within and between categories, from most to least significant, the evidence of research activity is sorted into three categories: primary, secondary, and tertiary.
  - 4.2.1. Primary:
    - a) Books with publishers with distinguished academic reputations. While leading university presses will generally be accorded the highest value, it is recognized that status rankings of publishers can vary within disciplinary subfields.
    - b) Articles published in peer-reviewed academic journals. Articles in high quality or leading journals in the discipline or in specific fields will be valued more. High quality is usually indicated by a serious review process, lower acceptance rates, and evidence of scholarly impact in the discipline or field.
    - c) Edited books with publishers with distinguished academic reputations. While leading university presses will generally be accorded the highest value, it is recognized that status rankings of publishers can vary within disciplinary subfields.

- d) Chapters in peer-reviewed edited books, with books published with presses of good academic reputations being valued more highly than others, while recognizing that in some fields other presses can have equally strong or stronger reputations.
- e) Awarded or applied for research grants, especially from significant sources of funding (e.g. the Tri-Councils) or for particularly large and significant projects.
- f) Data production and data development activities including the production of new materials and compiling material from existing sources.
- g) Research creation, community-engaged research, or knowledge mobilization work.

4.2.2. Secondary:

- h) Invited major or keynote addresses at prestigious academic and professional conferences.
- i) Textbooks, with books published with major presses in the discipline or specific fields of study being valued more highly.
- j) Regular conference papers presented at major international and national conferences.
- k) Research or technical reports for significant professional groups or audiences (e.g., government or social agencies). In the case of research reports produced for a fee (outside the University), the Member shall demonstrate how the work is aligned with their academic research program. Otherwise, such activity should be considered part of the dissemination of knowledge to the public and considered a service activity.

4.2.3. Tertiary:

- l) Book reviews in leading journals.
- m) Articles, reviews, and other kinds of commentary published in non-refereed sources.
- n) Presentations to government or community groups.
- o) Books published with presses that essentially facilitate self-publishing.
- p) Other kinds of academic presentations (e.g., poster presentations, panel discussions at conferences).

4.3. The Chair and the Performance Review Committee may exercise some discretion in determining the relative significance of these different kinds of activity given the many relevant variables that cannot be specified. Winning a highly competitive, prestigious, or unusually large or significant research grant, for example, may be deemed as more important than some of the research activities ranked higher in the list above. Given variation in kinds of scholarly activity and expectations associated with the subfields of sociology and legal studies it is recognized that there is latitude in making assessments of research activity.

4.4. This document delineates normal expectations and criteria of assessment for research, but Members may call attention to, and explain other kinds of, evidence which they think should be considered in evaluating their research activity.

- 4.5. In the case of co-authored or co-edited research activities, it will normally be assumed that the work and credit is shared equally unless the Member provides evidence otherwise. Members are responsible for indicating their contribution to the activity.
- 4.6. Research outputs will be recognized as contributions to research activity primarily for the year in which they are published in print or online, awarded, or disseminated, etc. Prior to being published, awarded, disseminated, etc., some credit for overall research activity will be extended for research reported as “under review,” “accepted for publication,” etc. Members must clearly identify activities in the current period that were already credited as “prior to being published, awarded, disseminated,” in a previous review period.

## 5. Teaching

- 5.1. Teaching involves both undergraduate and graduate level activities and are treated separately below. The Department expects all Members to seek excellence as instructors and supervisors. Teaching encompasses giving lectures, leading seminars, administering extended learning courses, supervising undergraduate and graduate research projects, holding regular office hours, serving on graduate committees for comprehensive examinations and dissertations, and the design and implementation of new courses. Members are expected to engage in all of these activities and to display professionalism in all aspects of teaching. Amongst other things this entails providing accurate and up-to-date information, organizing their courses well, grading fairly, being available to advise students, and treating students with respect.
- 5.2. Undergraduate Teaching
  - 5.2.1. High quality undergraduate teaching is, in part, responsive to the feedback received from students via standard Course Perception Surveys (CPS) which each Member is required to administer for all of the courses taught each year. CPS are considered by the Department to be important formative measures in the pursuit of teaching excellence and the promotion of a positive student learning experience. The Department encourages instructors to consider CPS feedback, both quantitative scores and qualitative comments, in their course preparation and delivery.
    - a) Due to the potential for bias in CPS assessments (UW Senate Report, May 2020), CPS information is for instructor use only and should not be submitted for the purpose of performance evaluation.
  - 5.2.2. For the purposes of performance evaluation, Members will be assessed by a review of course content and materials and peer evaluation (per Policy 77), a review of supervisory activities and course development, and a review of supplemental information related to their skills as instructors.
    - a) Peer evaluation will be undertaken using best practices at the University of Waterloo. It is understood that peer evaluation of instructors is both a teaching and learning tool, that the review of an instructors teaching performance can also be



formative for evaluators, and that sharing best practices among Members fosters teaching excellence. All Members are therefore encouraged to participate in the process of evaluation and evaluators should be broadly distributed among the Members.

- b) The review of course content and course materials is an important means of assessing Member contributions to the goal of teaching excellence and contributions to the Department's undergraduate programming. The review of course content and material will consider both the overall merits of course content and materials and the relative contribution of course content and materials to the Department's undergraduate Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and corresponding University's Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs).
- c) In making the evaluation of a Member's teaching, contextual factors will be taken into consideration (e.g., structural location, course size, level of the course, the degree of technical difficulty, status of the course as required or optional, the member's teaching load that term, and willingness to take on courses on short notice).
- d) Assessment of undergraduate teaching will also consider the work involved in supervising Senior Honours Essays and developing new courses. These activities significantly enhance the quality of the education we offer undergraduates, promote teaching excellence, support a positive student experience, and contribute to the Department's program objectives.
- e) Members are also encouraged to submit for review any supplemental information about the nature and development of their skills as an instructor (e.g., nominations for and/or receiving awards of excellence, applying for and/or receiving grants to support teaching innovations, participation in special workshops or training).

### 5.3. Graduate Teaching and Supervision

- 5.3.1. Not all faculty members have the opportunity to teach graduate seminars, but all are encouraged to do so. Graduate seminars differ significantly from most undergraduate courses in their size, format, style of interaction, modes of evaluation, and objectives. Faculty may wish to submit course syllabi with their assessment to provide the Performance Review Committee with a clearer sense of the nature of the courses taught. Much of the instructional task at the graduate level, however, involves individual supervision and mentoring. This activity can be described for the evaluation period, but it is difficult to assess the quality of the activity. There is no simple correlation between the quality of the supervision and the success of individual graduate students. Much depends on the abilities, effort, and circumstances of the students.

- 5.3.2. Good graduate supervision may manifest in a high level of quality academic work from the student. Good graduate supervision may also be indicated by students winning external scholarships and awards, presenting their research at conferences, achieving academic publications, and securing placement in good graduate programs or jobs. Members may also provide additional evidence of good graduate supervision. Supervisors have an obligation to be cognizant of the milestones set for the program of study and to encourage and facilitate the timely completion of these milestones (e.g., the student's course work, comprehensive examinations, and dissertation proposal) and the completion of the degree.
- 5.3.3. Members involved in the successful supervision of large numbers of students should receive special recognition for this instructional burden and accomplishment. But successful graduate instruction depends on the efforts of the entire faculty complement and their willingness to serve on graduate supervisory committees for comprehensive examinations and dissertations, and to provide other kinds of formal and informal instruction and support. Good supervision entails being well organized and aware of the needs and abilities of students, providing prompt, effective, and fair feedback, communicating clearly with them, offering consistent and thoughtful advice, and being reasonably accessible for meetings. Supervisory conduct that unreasonably slows the completion of students' programs amounts to unsatisfactory teaching. In evaluating graduate teaching and supervision, the Performance Review Committee may consider all plausible evidence submitted by the faculty member.

## **6. Service**

- 6.1. Given the collegial nature of the university it is important that all Members engage in service activity, sharing responsibility for committee work, administrative duties, and participating in Departmental meetings, as well as other Departmental, Faculty, and University ceremonies and special events. As stated in Policy 77: "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."
- 6.2. Probationary candidates are not expected to take on major administrative roles, but some meaningful contribution to service is required to secure tenure and promotion. Where service to other units is required by the nature of a Member's position (e.g., joint appointment, directorship), this service will be considered service to the Department.
- 6.3. Three types of service are recognized for evaluation: service to the Department, service to the University, and community service related to the member's scholarly activities.
- 6.4. Departmental Service: Activities that can be counted as evidence of Departmental service include but are not limited to (the list is not necessarily ranked):

- a) Serving as Chair
  - b) Serving as Associate Chair for Undergraduate or Graduate Affairs
  - c) Serving on committees
  - d) Coordinating speaker series
  - e) Organizing workshops and conferences
  - f) Organizing departmental student events and activities
  - g) Willing to take on hard-to-cover courses
  - h) All Members are expected to be “good citizens,” which entails maintaining regular office hours and being available to advise students, mentoring new faculty, attending Department meetings, participating in candidate interviews for positions in the Department, participating in Departmental events (e.g., speaker series, student events), and assisting the Chair and Associate Chairs in the performance of their duties.
- 6.5. University Service: Activities that can be counted as evidence of university service include but are not limited to (the list is not necessarily ranked):
- a) Committee work
  - b) Organizing workshops and conferences
  - c) Coordinating speaker series
  - d) Chairing doctoral defences
  - e) Other kinds of leadership roles
  - f) Service awards
- 6.6. Community Service: Activities that can be counted as evidence of community service related to a Member’s scholarly activities include but are not limited to (the list is not necessarily ranked):
- a) Editorial roles (with the value being commensurate with the amount of work required and the reputation of the publications involved)
  - b) Editorial and advisory board roles
  - c) Service for academic and professional societies, organizations, and committees
  - d) Adjunct appointments to other departments or universities
  - e) Visiting Professorship appointments, involving teaching or supervising activities, at other universities
  - f) Review of manuscripts for scholarly journals and book publishers (with the value being commensurate to the number of reviews and the reputation of journals and publishers)
  - g) Serving on the adjudication committees of external funding agencies for scholarships and research grants, serving as external examiner
  - h) Articles, editorials, commentary, or interviews in the media
  - i) Invitations to speak to and/or advise policy-makers, community and civil society groups, think tanks, and testimony before government bodies
  - j) Service awards from academic and professional groups

#### 6.7. Service Standards:

To receive a score of at least 1.25 for service, Members normally must present evidence of all of the following during that year:

- 1) Membership on, and a meaningful contribution to, some important Departmental committee (or an equivalent meaningful service contribution to the Department)
- 2) Good Departmental citizenship
- 3) At least one of the following:
  - a) Meaningful extra-Departmental service contribution to the Faculty or University
  - b) Meaningful external service to the academic discipline, profession, or community

Low levels of departmental service will result in an unsatisfactory rating. Since there is a substantial amount of administrative work that must be done to sustain the Department and ensure the success of its programs, as well as its interactions with the rest of the university, any Member who performs little or no departmental service is placing a significant and unfair strain on their colleagues.

- 6.8. Some activities may be counted as contributing to the dissemination of research, or as teaching, and Members must clearly specify how they would prefer these activities to be counted. Double-counting across categories is not permitted. Paid work or consultancy does not normally count as research or service. Where only expenses are reimbursed such work (e.g., for the government) may be counted as service, or if related to an active program of research, it may be counted as research. It is the Member's responsibility to be aware of the university policies on Extra-University Activity (#49) and Conflict of Interest (#69).

### 7. Tenure and Promotion

- 7.1. Progress towards tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is guided by Policy 77 and subject to the same Departmental guidelines (as specified above).

### 8. Revising the Guidelines

- 8.1. The Addendum shall be reviewed and updated biennially, and changes approved by a majority vote of regular faculty members of the Department and by the Dean no later than 15 October in the year before the evaluation calendar year(s).
- 8.2. Current versions of faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines and Departmental Addenda shall be posted on the relevant Faculty website and publicly accessible.

**GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL  
PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS SEPTEMBER 2022**

**INTRODUCTION**

This document provides guidelines for the evaluation process and the performance expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service for faculty within the Department of Spanish and Latin American Studies at University of Waterloo. These guidelines are supplemental to, and consistent with University of Waterloo Policies, the member evaluation procedures outlined in Article 13 of the [Memorandum of Agreement](#) between UW and FAUW, and the [Faculty of Arts guidelines](#) for these issues.

Performance Reviews in the Department of Spanish and Latin American Studies conform in all respects to the requirements set out in the Memorandum of Agreement, Article 13.5., “Member Evaluation.” This document satisfies 13.5.1.b), which states: “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.” Relative contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service vary over the course of a career. This document is intended to make Departmental practice transparent, in its historical and ongoing character, to outline elements of performance to be taken into account in the Review, and to identify the values informing it. The document is “living” and thus will be subject to biennial review.

**THE ANNUAL PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL**

**General Information**

The Department will vote every two years in the Fall term as to how performance evaluations will be conducted – either by Chair alone or by a committee of department members. Documentation is to be provided that gives evidence of the activity/achievement being claimed. Spanish and Latin American Studies usually requires all course evaluations, offprints of articles, letters of commendation, conference programmes, etc. to be submitted with the Activity Report.

In any of the categories, to receive a score of 2.0 the contribution must be truly outstanding in terms of its impact or amount of effort required, or it must mark an extremely high level of accomplishment, or it must demonstrate ability much beyond the departmental norm.

Policy 77 states:

*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.*

The Annual Performance Appraisal issues a score out of 2, compounded out of scores out of 2 on each of the three listed job components, typically according to the following formulas:

Faculty:        Research 40%  
                  Teaching 40%  
                  Service 20%

Lecturers:     Teaching 80%  
                  Service 20%

The points on the rating scale and their associated descriptors are:

0.00    Unsatisfactory  
0.25    New rating point effective 2012  
0.50    Needs Improvement  
0.75    New rating point effective 2012  
1.0 0    Satisfactory  
1.25    Good  
1.50    Very Good  
1.75    Excellent  
2.00    Outstanding

Every year in early January untenured faculty members and Continuing Lecturers, and those members holding a Definite Term Appointment, are invited to submit information detailing their activities in each of the three evaluation areas since the previous evaluation cycle.

Tenured faculty members are evaluated on a two-year cycle.

Faculty members should feel free to include and explain the widest selection of data they wish the Chair to review, and to generally present their own strongest case.

On the basis of this information the Chair recommends numerical ratings for each faculty member, which are then discussed with the Dean of Arts and possibly revised in order to achieve fairness and consistency across the Faculty. The Dean of Arts in turn meets with the Provost to settle evaluation averages across the University, a process that can also necessitate revisions to the proposed ratings.

## Connection to Tenure and Promotion

[Policy 77](#) requires that annual performance reviews be included in Department tenure and promotion considerations. Therefore, it is important that the Chair provide a written assessment of each faculty member's performance.

The overall score for each faculty member is then used as a multiplier on the Faculty of Arts basic selective increment, and also serves as a snapshot of one's general performance in the year evaluated.

The expectation for each faculty member is that he/she will perform well in the categories below.

### Appraisal of Teaching

High-quality teaching is an important goal for the Department. In evaluating any faculty member, junior or senior, the Department follows the guidelines expressed in Policy 77:

*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.*

Evidence regarding the quality of teaching is largely obtained from student course perception surveys. The two scores regarded as most significant for this exercise are Overall Evaluation of the Course and Overall Evaluation of the Instructor. Quality of teaching can be determined and evaluated also from other sources, i.e.: classroom visits made by the Chair or senior faculty members to lectures given by untenured faculty members. Advance notice of such visits would be given to the faculty member and the faculty member is also welcome to invite colleagues to his / her / their class for feedback. The development of new courses or programs, or the revision of course materials, is also seen to contribute to one's teaching evaluation.

The following factors will also be considered when evaluating teaching:

- Quantitative information, such as: number of courses taught; number of students taught; scores on student course perception surveys.

- Qualitative information, such as: new or repeat course; degree of innovation or inventive teaching practices; written feedback from students; course observations by others; involvement in student success; awards and curriculum development.
- Reflections that offer innovative tools on the inclusion, study, and centering of knowledge production and/or creative activity from those that sit outside of the Western canon, and/or who are under-represented within existing constructs, including, but not limited to Black, Indigenous, and non-Western cultures.
- Inclusion of anti-racist learning opportunities within the classroom.
- Participation in teaching workshops, evidence of self-evaluation leading to improvement, or of awareness of trends in pedagogy, and other signs of developments in teaching content and method may also be taken into account.

## **Appraisal of Research**

The assessment of research quality and intensity is particularly open to case-specific considerations. Hence it is important to reemphasize both the default nature of these guidelines and the invitation for faculty members to bring forward and explain any evidence they consider relevant to their evaluation. In evaluating any faculty member, junior or senior, the Department follows the guidelines expressed in Policy 77:

*University teaching is informed and enriched by the research and scholarship of the professoriate. The University expects its regular faculty members to be active participants in the evolution of their disciplines and professions, to keep academic programs and courses current with developments in their fields, and to communicate both their discoveries and their commitment to scholarship and research. Where feasible, faculty members are expected to seek external funding to support their scholarly work.*

It is expected that both senior and junior faculty members will provide evidence of progress in the area of research. Such dedication should be normally endorsed by the quality of the research. The peer-reviewed mobilization of research findings provides particularly important evidence in the appraisal of scholarship performance. Different kinds of knowledge mobilization activities are considered. These are generally weighted according to their quality and impact, and include:

- Books published with publishers having a good academic reputation and with evidence of meaningful peer review
- Edited volumes with good presses or respected contributors; invited chapters in edited collections that feature influential and respected authors or editors, published by reputable presses
- Research papers published in high quality peer-reviewed journals



- Invited major or keynote addresses to prestigious conferences
- Research papers in professional non-refereed journals
- Introduction to a book
- Refereed conference proceedings
- Book reviews in top journals
- Papers presented at major national and international conferences
- Book reviews in minor, non-refereed, or simply book-reviewing journals
- Other Publications (translations, creative writings, articles for newspapers or magazines, etc.).

The key measure of research activity is published or presented original research output. But other measures are also relevant, including evidence of research impact; winning research grants and research awards; and organizing conferences that advance research and promote the research reputation of the Department.

Types of assessment may include formal peer review, citation metrics, and public impact. 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, e-journals, and granting councils, and membership on government or professional committees.

The following factors will also be considered when evaluating a faculty member’s research:

- Single or co-authorship is assessed according to the practices of the discipline involved
- Published work that straddles the assessment period (e.g. date of acceptance -> date of publication) should be noted, and it can count towards both assessment periods, but in only one assessment period should it ever be considered outstanding.
- Work in progress is required for non-tenured members; tenured members may provide information on work in progress if they wish so as to demonstrate the ongoing nature of their activities or to provide context for future achievements.

### **Appraisal of Service**

Service is an essential part of our role as faculty members and it is highly valued. Faculty members will participate in service every year, except when they are on sabbatical. Where faculty members find their service contribution to be low, they are expected to seek out opportunities to strengthen their contribution.

Faculty members are expected to perform meaningful service at the Departmental level, as well as to contribute to the University, the discipline, the profession, or the community. They are expected to participate in collegial self-governance through regular attendance at Department meetings and through periodic service on Department committees. Faculty

members also make important contributions to service in the various coordinator roles that support Departmental life, such as the speakers' series, awards, and website coordinators. They are expected to respond to student and staff enquiries in a timely fashion, to submit grades by specified deadlines, and to be regularly available in the Department for engagement with students and colleagues.

Service can be performed within the Department, the Faculty, and the University as a whole. It can also include service to the discipline or to the profession and to the community at large. Service is an important component of a faculty member's duties and should be properly encouraged and recognized. Since service is expected, lack of service requires an explanation.

Policy 77 states:

*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.*

In determining and evaluating service criteria in Tenure and Promotion Decisions, Policy 77 also notes:

*Candidates for tenure or promotion shall provide information on their service activities in sufficient detail to allow the DTTC to assess its quantity and quality. Where necessary, the DTTC should obtain statements from those who have personally observed the candidate's service contributions both internal and external to the University. Some service activities, such as chairing a curriculum committee or editing a professional society journal, may also provide indirect evidence for scholarship and teaching"*

The assessment of service takes into consideration the following:

- University service, such as: service on university/faculty/department committees; performing officer duties in the department; other contributions to the life of the department, faculty, or university; outreach work connecting the university to the community at large.

Discipline service, such as: service with associations; journal editorial work; conference organization; other contributions.

- Does the service being performed demonstrate leadership or place holding (e.g. sitting on a committee that meets once a year or does little)?

- Does the service being performed demonstrate a commitment to the work of the department/faculty/university/discipline?
- Please note:  
“Citizenship” has not been expressly stated as a category, but it is understood that department members are expected to contribute positively to the life of the department/faculty/university/discipline.

In more specific terms, the assessment of service is done on the following basis:

### **1. Departmental Service**

Internal service to the department and departmental citizenship are an essential duty. Faculty members are expected to be involved in the collegial academic and professional life of the Department and to share a wide range of responsibilities. All department members are encouraged to participate in department meetings, ceremonies, and other professional activities when possible.

The positive contribution that faculty members make to the life of the department is also important. This can be considered Open-Door service. Being available for both students and colleagues is expected. Moreover, departmental affairs often require the existence of a range of sub-committees or working groups. Some of these are standing committees, and some are hoc committees intended to deal with specific issues. Service in these committees can be a substantial contribution, depending on the number of issues that fall to the committee in a given year. Some examples of activities that can be counted as evidence of departmental service include (this list is not meant to be exhaustive):

- Chair
- Associate Chair-Undergraduate Studies,
- Member of the Undergraduate Advisors Group
- Coordinator of Special Programs
- Course Coordinator
- Departmental Co-op Report Evaluator
- Coordinator of the Study Abroad Programs
- Faculty Library Representative
- Coordinator of High School Outreach Program
- Department Scholarship Coordinator
- Member of the Faculty Association Council of Representatives

### **2. Faculty / University service**

Some examples of activities that can be recognized as evidence of university service include (this list is not meant to be exhaustive):

- Committee work
- Leadership roles
- Coordinator of Speaker Series
- University service awards
- Organization of workshops and conferences
- Serving on adjudication committees for grant applications

### **3. Service to the Profession**

Some examples of activities that can be counted as service to the profession include (this list is not meant to be exhaustive):

- Editorial roles (more value is place on the more senior roles and higher-tier publications)
- Editorial board and advisory board roles
- Service in professional committees or organizations
- Scholarly manuscript reviewing activities for journals and book publishers (with higher value placed on reviews for higher-tier publications)
- Reviewing activities for granting agencies, tenure and promotion at other universities, program reviews at other institutions, awards/prizes etc.
- Service awards from academic or professional bodies
- Articles, editorials, commentary, interviews in media
- Serving on adjudication committees of external agencies granting scholarships and research funding

### **4. Service to the community**

- Public lectures
- Interviews
- Learning opportunities offered to the community (ie: Conversation Classes)

# **Guidelines for Tenure, Promotion and Faculty Evaluation**

## **Stratford School of Interaction Design and Business**

Initial date of approval: November 8, 2018

Renewed: October 17, 2022

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

This document provides guidelines for the evaluation process and the performance expectations for scholarship, teaching, and service for faculty in the Stratford School of Interaction Design and Business at the University of Waterloo. These guidelines are supplemental to, and consistent with, the University of Waterloo policies (including Policy 77, Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members); the member evaluation procedures outlined in Article 13.5 of the Memorandum of Agreement between UW and FAUW; and the Faculty of Arts guidelines for tenure and promotion.

The School recognizes the importance of two criteria in evaluating faculty work. These criteria are outcome and process. Outcome assesses the significance of scholarly activities in particular contexts. These contexts include disciplinary, classroom, scholarly and professional venues, communities, digital mediated settings, and others. Process attends to the components, scope, and scale of the academic and creative activities required to engage in successful research, teaching, and service. In considering process, the STPC will evaluate levels and modes of collaboration, the range of methodological components employed, and the complexity of research and creative oversight.

## **2. RATING OF TEACHING**

### **2.1 General Comments**

In the Stratford School of Interaction Design and Business, teaching is a core faculty activity, and includes teaching in a variety of settings from lectures, to workshops, studio courses and seminars. Policy 77 notes: “Teaching quality should be assessed broadly using evidence gathered from as many sources as practicable. Responsibility for providing documentary evidence on teaching rests with the candidate and, to a lesser degree, with the department Chair. A teaching dossier developed by the candidate may be the most effective way of assembling this information. 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.” In other words, course evaluations are only one source of assessment.

### **2.2 Criteria**

The STPC Performance Review committee will use the following questions to evaluate teaching.

#### *2.2.1. Outcomes of Teaching*

- In what ways does your course involve students in theoretically-informed practice?
- How did you implement project-based learning in your course?
- What experiential learning methods did you employ in your course?
- What assessment methods did you use?

- In what ways can students apply what they have learned to situations outside of the classroom?
- What supervisory duties did you assume with students?

2.2.2. *Process of Teaching (including development and components of all forms of student teaching and supervision):*

- Did you pursue new forms of learning with your students?
- What kind of work was involved in developing or revising courses? How did you draw on existing models of course delivery, and how did you devise new methods of course delivery?

2.2.3. *Evidence of Teaching*

- Number of courses/sections taught
- Level of each course taught
- Lecture, seminar, project, or studio courses
- Number of students taught and enrolments in each course
- Student supervision in independent studies courses, etc.
- Course evaluations
- Course syllabi and assignments
- Nominations for, and/or winning of teaching excellence awards
- Evidence of professional development, such as participation in, or organization of, conferences related to teaching or pedagogical workshops
- The ability and willingness of a faculty member to serve the general teaching needs of the School by teaching outside her or his area of particular expertise, by preparing new courses, and by accepting responsibility for service and required courses either on campus or through the Centre for Extended Learning (CEL)
- Evidence of other teaching-related activities outside the classroom, such as training or mentoring teaching or research assistants, mentoring students or junior colleagues in the profession, or assisting student groups
- Peer reviews
- Publication of textbooks. If a textbook contributes to the synthesis of knowledge, it may be counted under “scholarship” instead. Faculty members must indicate which category they would like textbooks to be considered; these publications cannot be double-counted under both categories.

2.2.4. *Graduate Supervision (where appropriate)*

- Number and level of students supervised (complete and in progress)
- Evidence of strong graduate supervision, which may manifest itself in a high level of quality academic work from the student, students winning external scholarships and awards, presenting their research at conferences, achieving academic publications, securing placement in good graduate programs or jobs, etc.

### 3. **RATING OF SCHOLARSHIP**

### **3.1 General Comments**

Faculty members contribute to the research profile of the School, the Faculty of Arts, and University of Waterloo through critical analysis, design, creative output, theoretical inquiry, data analysis.

Policy 77 notes: “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.” The School values a range of research and creative work (see section 3.2 of this document), and encourages faculty to note the university’s emphasis on peer review and evidence of impact for all scholarly activity.

### **3.2 Categories of Scholarship**

The three main categories of the School’s scholarship include:

#### *3.2.1. Publications, conferences, and other peer reviewed scholarship*

Typically, venues that are vetted by well-established and respected experts are given the highest rating by the University of Waterloo and most other institutions. The School recognizes the importance of work that is cross-disciplinary, multi-institutional, and collaborative.

#### *3.2.2. Studio specific research*

- Solo Exhibitions
- Group Exhibitions
- Screenings
- Festivals
- Curatorial Practices
- Performance Art
- Site Specific Work
- Publications - indicate if invited
- Artist Talks
- Other Scholarly Work

#### *3.2.3. Other forms of scholarly activity*

This category includes such activities as the formulation of policy, white papers, and preliminary research development; consultation and collaboration in specific settings, both inside and outside the University (including industry, governmental, social service, not-for-profit, educational, etc.); significant contributions to research and creative work (this work might include the gathering of multi-purpose data, dissemination/distribution activities, and contributions to knowledge mobilization and implementation efforts). Work on grants and other funding avenues constitute an additional type of project. Funded projects will be assessed by the academic or professional vetting process, the



prestige of the funding body, and the relative rarity of the award.

**Note:** the onus is on the faculty member to provide evidence of the quality, impact and relevance of this work. If the work has been subject to a review process, the faculty member should provide details of that process.

**Note:** if a group project, the faculty member must indicate the percentage of the overall work that is theirs.

Some activities will fall exclusively into one category. Other activities, however, may start in one category and then migrate to others – an outcome encouraged by the School. For example, a funded research project may produce a series of publications and talks as well as result in an exhibition.

### **3.3 Criteria**

Scholarship is assessed in the following ways:

#### *3.3.1. Outcomes*

- How has the activity contributed to and/or changed the discipline, affected a community, influenced other researchers, or generated new research activities?
- What are the concrete outcomes of the research and creative work? How are these outcomes significant in particular settings?
- How do experts in the research or production field evaluate the output and identify significance and relevance?
- What is distinctive about the research in terms of creativity, innovation, and/or the ways in which it contributes to and/or challenges the discipline/field?
- How does the candidate's research build on, compare to, and/or further that produced by prominent scholars in the field?

#### *3.3.2. Process*

- What are the methods of research?
- What resources, personnel, and activities does collaboration require? What types of academics/researchers are involved?
- What kinds of academic institutions, industry partners, community organizations are contributing to the research and creative work, and how?

#### *3.3.3. Evidence of Scholarly Activity*

- Publications
- Presentations of research at conferences/workshops, guest talks, keynote addresses as well as discussant, director, and other participant roles at conferences/workshops
- Other forms of dissemination of research (faculty members may choose to count some forms of dissemination to the wider community as service instead)
- Winning external funding, through a process involving peer review or professional adjudication, to support scholarly research

- Winning of research awards through a process involving peer review or professional adjudication
- Work in progress: Research creation, production and development activities, including the production of new materials and compiling material from existing sources
- Organizing conferences, workshops or academic institutes that advance scholarship and research (faculty members can choose whether to count these activities as scholarship or service or even teaching if relevant)
- Evidence of research impact
- Evidence of other items mentioned in the following section of Policy 77: “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.”
- Other indirect measures of scholarship, including other awards, citations, reviews, reprints, or other qualitative assessments of merit.
- Peer reviewed research grants

#### **4. RATING OF SERVICE**

##### **4.1 General Comments**

Policy 77 notes: “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.”

Service is a very important part of our role as members of the School, our Faculty, the University, and the academic and social communities in which we participate. All School members are encouraged to participate in School meetings, ceremonies, Convocation, and other professional activities. Probationary candidates normally are not expected to fill major administrative roles. Where service to other units is required by the nature of the position (e.g., joint appointment, directorship), this will be taken into account as service to the School. Service as Director or Associate Director normally earns a high service rating.

Generally, there are four categories of service that may be reported in annual performance reviews (service to the School, Faculty, University, and profession), and there is an expectation of faculty members to contribute to the School. Care should be taken that such activity does not interfere with the proper discharge of primary University duties. Faculty members should be made aware of University policies on Extra-University Activity (Policy #49) and Conflict of

Interest (Policy #69). Contract research should be discussed with the Office of Research.

## **4.2 Categories of Service**

Service encompasses activities in a variety of contexts:

### *4.2.1. School*

Service at the School level is a fundamental requirement. Members' contributions ensure the efficient and effective operations of the School. Examples include:

- filling officer positions (e.g., Director, Associate Director, etc.)
- membership and participation in School committees (e.g., School Tenure and Promotion Committee, etc.)
- organizing and managing special events
- coordinator of capstone course(s)
- initiatives that contribute to the functioning of the School
- Student advising
- committee work
- administrative roles
- coordinator of speakers series
- organization of workshops and conferences
- “Good citizenship” such as mentoring new faculty, being available in the School, being willing to take on hard-to-cover courses, and being available to students

### *4.2.2. Faculty*

Service at the faculty level contributes to the operations and initiatives of the Arts Faculty.

### *4.2.3. University*

Some examples of activities that can be counted as evidence of university service include (this list is not meant to be exhaustive):

- Committee work
- Leadership roles
- Coordinator of speakers series
- University service awards
- Serving as external examiner in graduate examinations, dissertation committees, defense committees
- Organization of workshops and conferences
- Serving on adjudication committees for grant applications

### *4.2.4. Academic Community*

Some examples of activities that can be counted as service to the profession include (this list is not meant to be exhaustive):

- Editorial roles (more value is placed on the more senior roles and higher-tier publications)
- Editorial board and advisory board roles
- Service in professional committees or organizations

- Scholarly manuscript reviewing activities for journals and book publishers (with higher value placed on reviews for higher-tier publications)
- Reviewing activities for granting agencies, tenure and promotion at other universities, program reviews at other institutions, awards/prizes etc.
- Service awards from academic or professional bodies
- Articles, editorials, commentary, interviews in media (faculty can choose whether to count this as service or dissemination of research under scholarship)
- Serving on adjudication committees of external agencies granting scholarships and research funding

#### 4.2.5. *Community-at-Large*

Service to communities-at-large encompasses the various ways in which faculty activities contribute to, and connect with, the social and cultural fabric of communities beyond the university. This type of service must relate to a faculty member's area of expertise.

Examples include:

- Work that contributes to the mission and activities of not-for-profit, advocacy, and educational organizations
- Collaboration with social service, industry, governmental, and other institutional organizations in ways that contribute to knowledge creation and dissemination
- Research and creative work with various organizations that responds to a community-based need articulated by an organization

### 4.3 **Criteria**

Service is assessed in the following ways:

#### 4.3.1. *Outcomes*

- What are the chief contributions of the service in various contexts (School, Faculty, University, community, professional, etc.)?
- What was achieved?
- How did the service performed demonstrate faculty contributions to the social and cultural fabric of a community or communities?
- Who is served and/or affected by the service?

#### 4.3.2. *Process*

- What is the nature of the service in terms of time commitment and other resources?
- What did the service involve, in terms of collaboration, individuals and organizations who contributed, length and components of planning process, complexity of structures engaged, etc.?
- What were specific challenges related to design, implementation, and delivery of the service?

#### 4.3.3. *Evidence*

In most cases, it is sufficient that faculty provide a statement of service, and when possible, supporting documents (i.e., email confirmation of responsibility, etc.). In determining and evaluating service criteria in Tenure and Promotion Decisions, Policy 77

notes: “Candidates for tenure or promotion shall provide information on their service activities in sufficient detail to allow the DTTC to assess its quantity and quality. Where necessary, the DTTC should obtain statements from those who have personally observed the candidate's service contributions both internal and external to the University.”

## **5. UNIVERSITY-LEVEL TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES AND INFORMATION**

### **5.1 General Comments about the Annual Performance Reviews**

#### *5.1.1. Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee*

To assist the Director with the annual faculty performance evaluations, three faculty members are elected annually to serve on this Committee. All full-time faculty members (full, associate and assistant professors, continuing lecturers and definite-term lecturers) are eligible to serve. This committee will review all merit recommendations to ensure equity within a rank and within the School as a whole.

#### *5.1.2. Director's Responsibility*

While the School does involve a committee in the performance evaluation exercise, it should be noted that the final responsibility for faculty performance recommendation rests with the Director (see Memorandum of Agreement 13.5.6.).

#### *5.1.3. Who is assessed?*

Performance reviews are required for all regular faculty (Lecturers to Professors on full-time or reduced load appointments) with appointments of one year or more. Performance ratings shall pertain to the portion of the evaluation year during which the faculty member was a paid employee of the University, including sabbatical leave, but excluding pregnancy, adoption or parental leave. Performance reviews will be carried out every year for Members holding probationary or definite-term appointments, and every two years for Members holding tenured or continuing appointments (see Memorandum of Agreement 13.5.2)

Policy 77 requires that performance reviews be included in School tenure and promotion considerations. Therefore, it is important that the Director provide a written assessment of each faculty member's performance. Recommendations for selective merit increases are based on overall performance.

### **5.2. Assessment Components and Ratings**

Performance is assessed in three areas:

- Teaching* – broadly defined including classroom instruction, individual program-related work with students, student supervision, instructional material development, etc.,
- Scholarship* – including intellectual advancement of a discipline, and
- Service* – leadership or support to the School, Faculty, University, profession, academic community, and other relevant communities.

### Recommendations to the Dean

The Director's recommendation to the Dean must indicate a level of performance in each area and must provide evidence supporting this assessment.

Each Member shall receive one of the following nine numerical performance ratings in each of teaching, scholarship and service:

- 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

**Note:** Please see Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines for Arts for definitions of 'Outstanding,' 'Satisfactory,' 'Needs Improvement.'

### Performance is Satisfactory

If overall performance is rated as satisfactory, the expectation is that performance is satisfactory in each of the three areas of assessment.

This principle is most importantly illustrated in relation to teaching and scholarship. A regular faculty appointment carries two major commitments: the communication of the knowledge and nature of one's discipline via teaching, and the advancement of the state of one's discipline via scholarship. The joint importance of these commitments is underlined in Policy 76, which states: "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. During a term for which formal teaching duties are not assigned, faculty members are expected to increase their scholarly activity."

This is further acknowledged by the heavy investment of time and energy most faculty devote to their work as both teachers of their discipline and active contributors to it.

It follows that, unless a faculty member's position has been formally changed to involve a different set of duties, satisfactory performance in both teaching and scholarship is expected if the faculty member's overall contribution is to be seen as a satisfactory one. Good performance in one area cannot, normally, compensate for needing improvement in the other because only part of the job has been performed in a satisfactory manner.

### Performance Needs Improvement

If performance in a particular area is seen as needing improvement, it is essential that the nature of the problem be communicated to the faculty member. The kind of improvement needed should be discussed, help provided when appropriate and an opportunity given to remedy the problem. This can be one of the most valuable functions of the annual review procedure. If, after a reasonable period of time, a “needs improvement” continues, serious consideration must be given to the appropriateness of continuing the appointment in its present form. This is particularly important if the area needing improvement is that of teaching or scholarship.

### Weightings

The weight for each area shall be as specified in the member’s letter of appointment. In the absence of specified weights, the normal weights, for tenured or tenure-track positions are 40 percent for teaching, 40 percent for scholarship, and 20 percent for service. For definite-term lecturers and continuing lecturers the normal weights are 80 percent for teaching and 20 percent for service. Weightings and duties may be adjusted for a minimum of two years in a formal agreement between the faculty member and the Director with the approval of the Dean. Normally, the weights shall be at least 20 percent in teaching and scholarship for tenured faculty.

When a faculty member takes on a significant administrative role, they can have a temporary adjustment of their weightings for purposes of merit evaluation. This adjustment involves a change in expectation for quantity of work in each area but not for quality.

### **5.3 Newly-Appointed Faculty**

For their first evaluation year, newly-appointed faculty will be assigned a score based on actual performance or, when too little information is available, assigned a score equal to the School or Faculty average for their rank.

### Fraction Load or Leave of Absence

For faculty on fraction load or a leave of absence the expectations for quality remain the same while expectations for quantity change.

### Years Considered in the Evaluation

Scholarship will be evaluated on the basis of a two-year period and teaching and service will be evaluated on the basis of work done in the prior year or prior two years.

### Insufficient Documentation

It is essential that the faculty member provide sufficient information during the review process to allow an informed judgment in each area. A faculty member who does not submit the required documentation by the specified deadline normally will receive an overall rating of at most 0.5.

### Performance Review for Faculty on Probationary Term Appointments

Performance reviews of probationary faculty must consider performance in the past year AND the total record to date. Assessment of the total record is important to provide an annual

assessment of progress toward tenure. Where appropriate, separate assessments should be given for each component (e.g., while performance for the past year was satisfactory, the total record is a cause for concern because...). Where concern exists, this should be conveyed to the individual in as specific a form as possible and every effort should be made to assist the faculty member to identify and rectify the problem. An indication should be given of the likelihood of the individual being granted tenure if they continue to perform at the present level. While not required by policy, it is useful for the Director to share any such concerns with the STPC and seek its advice on wording.

Policy 77 states that, “annual performance reviews form part of the evidence in tenure considerations”. If the STPC expressed concern at the time of renewal of the probationary contract, the results of each subsequent annual performance assessment should be reviewed by that Committee. Upon receipt of the STPC recommendation, the Dean shall decide whether to reappoint, and shall inform the candidate in writing, including reasons if the decision is negative.

#### **5.4 Faculty Appointments Types and Evaluation Procedures**

##### Long Term Disability

A faculty member on long-term disability does not get a performance rating. The salary of a faculty member on long-term disability is paid, and adjusted to include any scale increases, under the LTD plan.

##### Paid Leave (including Sabbatical Leave)

A faculty member on paid leave shall be evaluated on the portion of the evaluation year during which the faculty member was a paid employee of the University. It may not be possible to assess performance in all three categories during the evaluation year. In such cases, a faculty member normally will receive the average of up to the three previous ratings in any category where assessment is not possible.

##### Pregnancy, Adoption or Parental Leave

For faculty members on approved pregnancy, adoption or parental leave, assessment is in a similar manner to paid leave.

##### Sick Leave

A faculty member on sick leave does receive a performance rating. If information to evaluate the faculty member’s performance is not available owing to the illness, the assessment is in a manner similar to paid leave.

##### Unpaid Leave

For faculty members on unpaid leave, the full-scale increase shall apply, but the merit increase will be prorated by the fraction of the year served at the University.

##### Administrative Duty

In the case where a faculty member serves as Chair or Director for part of a year, the Dean will provide a service rating to the School for that fraction of the year.