

Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines

Faculty of Arts

Approved May 2022, Arts Faculty Council

1. Preamble

Performance evaluations on an annual or biennial basis are mandatory for all regular faculty members at the University of Waterloo. It is the responsibility of Chairs/Directors to assess the performance of each regular faculty member annually or biennially, to provide a written performance review, and to be available to discuss it upon request.

Chairs/Directors are reminded that the annual/biennial performance review letter forms part of the faculty member's official file and that **these documents will be perused by tenure and promotion committees**: *The results of annual performance reviews carried out for each faculty member must be taken into account in considerations for reappointment, tenure or promotion.* (Policy 76, "Regular Faculty Appointments")

The UW/FAUW Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) states the following:

Each Faculty shall have Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines setting out the evaluation criteria for that Faculty. The Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines shall be reviewed and updated no less than once every five (5) years, and changes shall be approved by a majority vote of the Faculty Council no later than 15 October in the year before evaluation calendar year to which the changes would apply. (§ 13.5.1a)

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. (§ 13.5.1b)

Each Member shall receive performance evaluation based upon documentation provided by the Member, submitted in the format and by the deadline specified in the Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines. Performance evaluations shall occur on an annual basis for Members holding probationary or definite-term appointments, and on a biennial basis on odd numbered years for Members holding tenured or continuing appointments. A Member who does not submit the required documentation by the specified deadline normally will receive an overall rating of at most 0.5 as specified in 13.5.3. (§ 13.5.2a)

Members shall provide documentation for the calendar year(s) under evaluation (one year for Members holding probationary or definite-term appointments, and two years for Members holding tenured or continuing appointments). Members shall in addition provide documentation for the number of previous years specified by their Faculty Guidelines. Scholarship shall be assessed on the total evidence from a window of two years. Teaching and service shall be assessed on the evidence from the year(s) under evaluation. The remaining documented years shall provide context to the assessed evidence. (§ 13.5.2b)

When Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines or Departmental Addenda change during the course of a Member's probationary contracts, the Member will continue to be governed by the guidelines and addenda

in effect at the beginning of their first probationary contract, unless the Member elects to be governed by the new set of guidelines or addenda, at the Member's discretion. The Member shall advise their Department Chair if they elect to be governed by the new set. (§ 13.5.2c)

2. Purpose of Performance Evaluations

A professorial appointment, normally, involves three main responsibilities: (i) to communicate the knowledge and nature of one's discipline through teaching; (ii) to advance the state of one's discipline through scholarship; and (iii) to contribute to the administrative functions that support these goals through effective service. A lecturer appointment, normally, involves responsibilities in teaching and service.

The performance evaluation process has the following purposes:

- To permit the faculty member and their administrative colleagues (Chair/Director, Dean) to acknowledge accomplishments and to identify areas for improvement on an annual/biennial basis.
- To provide for general communication and understanding between the faculty member and their administrative colleagues.
- To provide a basis for selective salary increase ("merit") evaluation and for tenure and promotion assessments.
- To encourage the faculty member and the University to achieve the highest possible standards in teaching, scholarship, and service.

3. General Principles

- Faculty performance reviews will be carried out in accordance with Section 13.5 of the Memorandum of Agreement and with the scholarship, teaching, service, and professional conduct expectations as set out in Policy 77 (Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members).
- Judgements regarding a faculty member's teaching, scholarship/research creation, and service will respect the diverse ways in which these activities may be undertaken in the Faculty of Arts.
- Performance in teaching, scholarship, and service should be consistent with those in the relevant discipline(s) at comparable research-intensive institutions in Canada and/or elsewhere (as appropriate). Individual units are in the best position to understand the norms and expectations pertinent to their faculty members.
- Career path and outcomes vary by individual and throughout the course of a career; as a result, weightings can and should be adjusted to reflect an actual workload and individual circumstances, per the MOA (§ 13.5.5).
- Service to the institution is required of all faculty members (Policy 77). Professional engagement outside the institution is also encouraged. Community service related to a faculty member's scholarly activities (e.g., media appearances) is normally considered as service to the University. While laudable, volunteerism unconnected with the institution or with the scholarly/pedagogical mission of higher education in general, does not constitute service to the University of Waterloo.
- The evaluation system will be open and transparent. Sufficient feedback will be provided to faculty members after each performance evaluation, and during critical points such as the years leading to the application for tenure and promotion, to permit them to understand the judgements that have been made about their performance.

- It can be difficult to track a faculty member’s performance throughout the course of the year(s) (e.g., in research), and Chairs/Directors may not be aware of some performance issues until they receive a faculty member’s Activity Report. Nevertheless, where possible, significant performance issues should be discussed as they come to a Chair/Director’s attention (rather than being held until performance review).

4. Faculty Appointments, Career Stage, and Performance Evaluation Letters

Performance evaluations are necessary for all regular faculty members at all ranks (Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor) on full-time, part-time ($\geq 50\%$), reduced load, and joint appointments. In situations where an individual has held a fractional load appointment or has taken a leave of absence in the period for which evaluation data is being considered, expectations for quality shall remain the same, but expectations for quantity shall be adjusted. Performance ratings shall pertain to the portion of the evaluation year during which the member was a paid employee of the University, including sabbatical leave, but excluding pregnancy, adoption, parental, or sick leave.

Individuals in probationary appointments and on definite-term contracts will be evaluated annually; tenured faculty and continuing lecturers will be evaluated every two years, in odd-numbered years. In accordance with the MOA, scholarship is always assessed on the basis of a two-year window. For example:

Year in which performance evaluation is carried out (January – March)	Probationary (tenure-track) and definite-term faculty		Tenured faculty and continuing lecturers	
	Evaluation period for teaching & service	Evaluation period for scholarship (as applicable)	Evaluation period for teaching & service	Evaluation period for scholarship (as applicable)
2021	2020	2019 & 2020	2019 & 2020	2019 & 2020
2022	2021	2020 & 2021	NA	NA
2023	2022	2021 & 2022	2021 & 2022	2021 & 2022
2024	2023	2022 & 2023	NA	NA
2025	2024	2023 & 2024	2023 & 2024	2023 & 2024
2026	2025	2024 & 2025	NA	NA

Faculty who are awarded tenure in an even year will receive an additional annual evaluation (in the succeeding uneven year) in order to transition them to the biennial system.

The MOA states that both Faculty-level and Department-level Performance Guidelines/Addenda are to be approved *no later than 15 October in the year before the evaluation calendar year(s) to which the changes would apply*. For clarification, this means that (for example) the guidelines embedded in a **Departmental Addendum approved in October 2022 apply to the evaluation year 2023 and are first employed in the FPR process in January/February 2024. In other words, even though they may have been approved in late 2022, they are not employed in the FPR process that takes place in early 2023**. Since Departmental Addenda need review and approval every two years, it makes sense for Departments to aim, if possible, at carrying out such reviews **in even-numbered years**. That way, the new guidelines (approved in 2022) will apply not only to 2023 (and be employed in the limited FPR process carried out in 2024); they will also apply to 2024, and will be employed in the full biennial FPR process (for 2023 and 2024) carried out in 2025.

Probationary Faculty

The MOA stipulates the following: *For newly appointed Members, and for Members on paid or unpaid leave, it may not be possible to assess performance in all three categories during the evaluation year. In these cases only, the practices described in 13.5.1, 13.5.2, and 13.5.3 may be amended as follows: (1) A newly appointed Member shall receive, in any category where assessment is not possible, a rating equal to the average rating of Members in the Department who hold the same rank; and (2) A continuing Member who has been on leave shall receive in any category where assessment is not possible as a result of the leave, a rating equal to the average ratings of the three previous years in which the Member was not on leave (§ 13.5.4b).*

It is important to note that if there is at least some evidence for a given category, a score should be assigned; for example, a new faculty member who begins a contract on July 1 and teaches in the Fall term should be assessed on the basis of that term's teaching, even though it may not constitute a full annual load. If a new member is given an averaged rating that is not based on their own performance, it is important that this fact be clearly reflected in the performance evaluation letter.

Annual performance review letters for probationary faculty members will assess the faculty member's performance in each year with reference to expectations for tenure and promotion. The appointment letter for the second probationary appointment will also provide some assessment of where the faculty member stands in his/her progress towards tenure. It is particularly important that probationary members at risk of not receiving tenure and promotion have this spelled out clearly in the annual review letter(s) and/or probationary term reappointment letter; similarly, faculty members at risk of not receiving reappointment to a second probationary position must have this indicated to them through the annual performance evaluation process.

In composing the annual/biennial performance review letters, Chairs/Directors should keep in mind that they will form part of the faculty member's brief in support of application for tenure and/or promotion. All tenure and promotion committees – Department, Faculty, and University – will have access to these letters.

5. Ratings

A faculty member's overall numerical performance evaluation score is derived from weighted assessments of performance in each of the three areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The weights for tenure-line faculty are normally 40% scholarship, 40% teaching, and 20% service; for lecturers, the weights are normally 80% teaching, 20% service. There are a number of circumstances which may lead to adjusted weightings (MOA § 13.5.5); adjustment to the normal weights has implications only for the *quantity* of work in that area, not its *quality*.

The scores 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

A rating of 2.0 (“Outstanding”) in any category represents exceptional performance in that category. In teaching, a rating of 2.0 might be prompted by a major instructional innovation, award, or recognition by peers or students. In scholarship, exceptional performance should be measured by indicators appropriate to the discipline, such as a major publication, performance, or exhibition, or a prestigious scholarly award. To be outstanding in service requires extraordinary commitment of time and expertise to the Department, Faculty, UW, and/or the profession.

A rating of 1.0 (“Satisfactory”) represents the minimum level of acceptable performance in a given year. A consistent pattern of 1.0 ratings would be a particular concern for a definite-term member who might be considered for reappointment, a probationary-term member seeking reappointment or tenure, or any member intending to seek promotion, in light of requirements for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, as outlined in Policy 76 (Faculty Appointments) and Policy 77 (Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members).

It is important that those charged with carrying out performance assessments (Chairs/Directors, Dean) make judicious use of the full range of scores. If performance in a given area is less than satisfactory, then a score of less than 1.0 may be appropriate.

It is recognized and accepted that an individual’s level of performance in an area may vary from year to year. For example, a faculty member who accepts a heavy administrative load may suffer a temporary drop in scholarly output and do less teaching. A faculty member who embarks on a major change in research area may also incur a temporary reduction or lapse in scholarly output and/or may have less than the usual amount of time available for other activities. Circumstances such as these will be recognized and weighed in the overall assessment. Similarly, it is recognized that faculty members judged equally satisfactory overall may have significantly different levels of performance in each category. Note that significant changes to a faculty member’s workload distribution lasting longer than a year (such as taking on an Associate Chair or Chair position) should normally be reflected in a re-weighting as per the MOA (§ 13.5.5).

6. Process: Guidelines, Documentation, and Procedures

a. Guidelines and Documentation

The review process and standards are governed by the following documents:

- The Memorandum of Agreement;
- Policy 77 (Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members);
- The Faculty of Arts Performance Evaluation Guidelines (this document);
- Departmental Addenda to the Faculty of Arts Performance Evaluation Guidelines.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide adequate documentation for the purposes of performance evaluation (“*A Member who does not submit the required documentation by the specified deadline normally will receive an overall rating of at most 0.5*”; MOA § 13.5.2a). Deadlines for the submission of this documentation are set by the Department/School, but generally fall no later than early January. In the Faculty of Arts, faculty members are *required* to submit:

- A completed Faculty of Arts Activity Report;
- An up-to-date vita.

Faculty members may also choose to submit a document that identifies ways in which they think bias could possibly impact evaluation of their performance (for example, by students through course perception surveys, or by other parties).

Additional materials may be determined by the Department/School, particularly in the case of probationary and definite-term faculty.

See Appendix for further details.

b. Committees

Department/School

The MOA mandates the following:

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

For Departments with more than 15 full-time equivalent regular faculty positions, the Members of the Department shall elect an advisory committee of no more than five Members to assist the Chair in carrying the responsibility in 13.5.6 (a). (§ 13.5.6c)

Even in smaller Departments, there is an advantage to establishing an advisory committee. It can help to reduce the burden on the Chair; the multiple perspectives can assist in promoting equity and reducing bias or the apprehension of bias; it provides an opportunity for multiple members of the Department to gain experience in the process; and it has greater transparency.

Once the ratings are determined by the Chair/Director, with the assistance of the advisory committee, it is the responsibility of the Chair/Director to provide the Dean and the Faculty advisory committee with written summaries of the proposed ratings and the rationale for them (using the standard recommended ratings form; see Appendix 1).

Faculty

The Dean shall review the ratings proposed by the Chair, and may establish an advisory committee to assist with this review. The Dean may modify the ratings for a Member or Members of a Department, if necessary, to maintain consistency of standards across the Faculty. (MOA § 13.5.7)

Such modifications, if necessary, are generally carried out in consultation with the Chair/Director; nevertheless, the Dean's decision is final.

A Member who disagrees with her/his performance evaluation should proceed first to the Department Chair, and then, if not resolved, to the Dean of the Faculty for disposition. (MOA § 13.5.10a)

7. Assessment Criteria

Departments and Schools should outline their own discipline-specific criteria for assessing teaching, scholarship, and service in their Addenda to the Faculty Guidelines. Those criteria must align with the Memorandum of Agreement, Policy 77, and the Faculty Guidelines (MOA § 13.5.1c). It is the responsibility of the units and ultimately of the Dean to ensure this consistency.

a. Teaching

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

University teaching encompasses a wide range of activities. It takes many different forms (e.g., undergraduate and graduate courses, graduate seminars, distance education, project and thesis supervision), has many different components (e.g., lectures, tutorials, setting and grading of assignments and examinations, interaction with students outside the classroom, curriculum development), and can occur in many different environments (e.g., large lecture theatres, small seminar rooms, off-campus short courses and workshops, clinics, laboratories, one-on-one supervision, and online). (Policy 77, “Performance Standards – Teaching”)

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. (Policy 77, “Performance Assessment – Teaching”)

Mitigating factors that may be considered in weighing student input are whether: 1) the instructor is teaching a course for the first time and/or has introduced a major innovation; 2) the instructor is teaching in an area not aligned with their area of expertise; 3) the course has a substantial number of non-major enrolments (particularly if it is a required course); 4) the instructor is teaching the course at short notice; 5) there is potential for bias or discrimination against the instructor. **Note: this is not an exclusive list – other mitigating factors may also be identified.** It is important to bear in mind the message in Policy 77 that student input should be supplemented by other methods of assessing teaching quality, such as peer review.

University teaching involves much more than classroom performance and, hence, it is important to develop a fair assessment of competence and effectiveness across the candidate’s full spectrum of teaching activities. Contributions to project and thesis supervision, clinical supervision and instruction, graduate seminars, oral and thesis examinations, and curriculum development are all relevant in assessing overall teaching activity. The opinions of current and former students can be of value if solicited on a systematic basis. (Policy 77, “Performance Assessment – Teaching”)

Note on student comments: if a faculty member wishes to have student comments form part of an FPR or a T&P submission, they need to demonstrate the “systematic basis” on which those comments were solicited. If comments from course evaluations/course perception surveys are to be included, there needs to be a clear demonstration that *all* the comments – not a select few – have been included.

b. Scholarship

Scholarship will be evaluated on demonstrated performance based on the previous two years. In light of the fact that views on scholarship vary among disciplines and units, no single model of scholarship will be followed in evaluating faculty members’ performance. The disciplines and domains in the Faculty of Arts represent a great breadth of scholarly endeavour, in methodologies, concepts, theoretical approaches, and subject matter. Moreover, there is considerable research innovation within Arts that involves the creative arts, at times in synergy with more traditional scholarly analysis. It is therefore impossible to take a “one size fits all” approach to assessing scholarship in the Faculty of Arts. Individual units are in the best position to understand the norms and expectations pertinent to their faculty members.

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. Novel applications may take many forms, such as creative writing, design, fine and performing arts, innovative clinical or professional practice, 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. (Policy 77, “Performance Standards – Scholarship”)

High quality contributions to the synthesis of knowledge (e.g., books, monographs, review articles) and to non-traditional forms of scholarship (e.g., artistic exhibitions and performances, innovative design) can provide direct evidence of effective scholarship. Consulting reports and planning documents that are accessible for peer review and evidence of having produced improvements in clinical or professional practice may also be submitted as evidence of a candidate’s scholarly contributions. (Policy 77, “Performance Assessment – Scholarship”)

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. (Policy 77, “Performance Assessment – Scholarship”)

Other less direct indicators [of quality, originality and impact] include the rigor of the review processes for journals and conferences in which the candidate has published, the standards of publishing houses for books, and the extent to which other scholars have made reference to the work. In areas such as the fine and performing arts, similar information may be derived from the prestige of exhibitions and performances to which the candidate has contributed, professional reviews and the receipt of awards or prizes. (Policy 77, “Performance Assessment – Scholarship”)

Policy 77 speaks of the equal value of “discovery of new knowledge” and “synthesis or integration of knowledge”. In the Faculty of Arts, invited chapters in major texts, invited addresses, authoring of textbooks, and so forth are all highly valued. Such scholarly synthesis may also apply to knowledge dissemination in the broader public realm beyond the university. Public lectures or media interviews may in some cases constitute service activity; when there is significant original scholarly content, however, it may be more appropriate to consider such public dissemination under the heading of scholarship.

Given the wide variety of disciplines and scholarly methodologies embraced by the Faculty of Arts, and the fact that different kinds of scholarship demand varying amounts of funding, there is no single model of grant expectation in the Faculty. Faculty members are encouraged to apply for research funding, but granting agencies, rate of success, and dollar amounts will differ greatly. While successful grant applications, along with other indicators, may be a positive indication of quality scholarship, the number of grants (or contracts) received in a year and the dollar value of funds secured will not by themselves be viewed as indicators of scholarly activity or quality.

Arts disciplines feature differing traditions in terms of joint and sole authorship. Both kinds of scholarly contributions are equally valued. Committees are expected to take into account the fact that volumes of scholarly output tend to be higher among faculty embedded in large teams and networks than among faculty who work alone. Such teams will often feature graduate students: in some Arts disciplines, scholarship has an integral link to graduate supervision. In others, there may be no direct connection between research and graduate teaching. Committees are expected to be cognizant of disciplinary differences in terms of the expectations (on the research side) for graduate supervision.

In assessing venues of publication, Department and School Chairs/Directors/Committees need to keep in mind that much innovative scholarship, especially interdisciplinary research, may not find a home within traditional disciplinary journals whose impact has been well-measured over the years.

c. Service

In addition to their primary duties of teaching and scholarship, regular faculty members have a responsibility to participate in the effective functioning of the University through service on committees, student advising, coordination of activities and in administrative positions. It is important that all faculty members be willing to assist with administrative duties when their help is needed. Many faculty members also provide valuable service to groups outside the University, such as disciplinary or professional organizations, conferences, journals and granting councils. Community service related to a faculty member’s scholarly activities is normally considered as service to the University. (Policy 77, “Performance Standards – Service”)

Service will be evaluated on demonstrated performance based on the year(s) under evaluation. Faculty members are required to describe the nature and scope of their service contributions including a brief explanation of the time and effort spent on each item.

Undertaking voluntary training (e.g., in support of student mental health) may be counted as faculty service.

Appendix:

Stages and Documents Employed in the Faculty of Arts FPR Process

- **Faculty member's vita and Arts Activity Report.** All faculty members are required to submit these materials to the Chair/Director as the first stage in the FPR process. The Activity Report template is available online. Departments/Schools which already have an in-house equivalent of the Activity Report may continue to use it, but in order to ensure equity across the Faculty, these Departments/Schools need to ensure that their tools consistently collect the same kind of information as the Activity Report.
- **Recommended Ratings Sheet.** This is a standardized one- (or, at the most, two-) page form submitted by the Chair/Director to the Dean. It provides the Dean with a summary of the recommended ratings for each faculty member in each of the three categories, along with a very brief (bullet points are fine) rationale for those ratings. It should not reproduce all the material included in the Activity Report, which does not need to be sent to the Dean's office – it simply needs to summarize the most salient reasons behind the recommended ratings. These sheets generally form the basis for discussion between the Chair/Director and the Dean, and do not form part of the faculty member's employee record. Among the other information, the form should include:
 - Current recommended ratings.
 - Previous ratings in all categories.
 - Numerical scores from course evaluations/course perception surveys.
- **Informal e-mail to faculty members.** In order to accommodate room for appeals in the process, the approved ratings should be communicated by the Chair/Director to faculty members via e-mail (this e-mail should include the rationale for the rankings: these rationales should form the basis for the text of the final letter). This will allow room for appeals of the scores to the Chair/Director and/or the Dean prior to the generation of the final FPR letter.
- **Final FPR letter.** The final FPR letter should be sent to faculty members once the appeals period is over. It should communicate the numerical rankings, and should also include a summation of the rationale for those rankings, along with any relevant advice that might be necessary. It is particularly important that probationary members receive a clear and explicit message on their progress towards tenure. **Note: the FPR letter becomes a permanent part of the faculty member's employee record and is made available to tenure and promotion committees.**