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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. 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.

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
- Good 1.25

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

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 a three-year period and teaching and service will be evaluated on the basis of work done in the year for which the evaluation is being provided.

Faculty on leave (e.g. sabbatical) will receive the average of up to the three previous years’ ratings.

**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

Course Evaluations
Assessment of teaching will be significantly influenced by course evaluations provided by the students. In particular, questions 4 (instructor attitude), 8 (overall evaluation of the instructor) and 9 (overall evaluation of the course) will be compiled for each course and compared to other faculty. All relevant factors will be considered including:

- Number of courses taught
- Number of sections taught
- Number of students taught
- Number of terms taught
- Student response rate on course evaluations

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 Content, Evaluation, and Delivery
The quality of course teaching and student workload can also be assessed, in part, by analysis of course outlines, reading lists, nature of evaluations/assessments, and the nature and extent of student participation and engagement when applicable.

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

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.

Awards
Teaching awards at UW or elsewhere will be considered.

Conferences
Participating in conferences related to teaching will be considered.

Supervision of Undergraduate and Masters Students
Supervision of undergraduate or masters students will be recognized in the teaching rating in the year the activity is completed.

Supervision of PhD Students before Dissertation
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 with the student occurs.

Additional Considerations
Teaching is broadly defined to include lecture, seminar and office consultation, undergraduate reading and independent study courses and masters 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 School 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 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.
**RATING OF SCHOLARSHIP**

**Publications**

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

Solo-authored papers will be viewed more positively than multi-authored papers. Publications in Tier 1 journals (Appendix 1) will be viewed more positively than publications in Tier 2 journals. Publications in Tier 2 journals will be viewed more positively than publications in lower tier journals.

Faculty who publish in journals outside of the fields of accounting, finance and information systems will need to support the “tier” of the journal in that particular field and indicate the quantity of annual publications normal for a faculty member in that field.

A rating of outstanding (2.0) will normally be given for a tier 1 publication (Appendix 1). This rating for solo-authored publications may be taken into account in the following year after considering WIP and other scholarship-related factors.

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**

Awards from academic bodies recognizing scholarship will be considered.

**Impact**

Credit will be given for work that has an impact but is not necessarily published in a top-tier journal. The onus is on the faculty member to provide evidence of its quality, impact and relevance.

**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 reduced to 20% then writing or updating an important textbook (or equivalent) may be considered for scholarship as long as it is not also considered under teaching.

To be equitable, someone with a teaching load of three sections will be expected to have a higher level of scholarship activity than someone teaching four or more sections 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.
To provide guidance to the Director and to faculty members, the School has developed categories of publications common to School research disciplines (Appendix 1). The Director and members of the appropriate committees should use judgment in applying this and any other journal rankings to the case and circumstances of any candidate. Other forms of scholarship are also important and will be considered in faculty performance assessments.

**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 will also be considered in the rating.
**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 (CA, CMA, 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 an editor or 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**

**Name:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>(Weighting %)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Needs major imp</th>
<th>Needs significant imp</th>
<th>Needs some imp</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of students:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of sections:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Graduate supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (awards, conferences)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship</th>
<th>(Weighting %)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Needs major imp</th>
<th>Needs significant imp</th>
<th>Needs some imp</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Thesis supervision (elected Teaching or Research)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Grants</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards/Impact</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>(Weighting %)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Needs major imp</th>
<th>Needs significant imp</th>
<th>Needs some imp</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAF</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/UW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards/Impact</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:

\textit{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.

\textbf{FACULTY MEMBERS ON:}

\textbf{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.

\textbf{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 year’s ratings in any category where assessment is not possible.

\textbf{Pregnancy, Adoption or Parental Leave}

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

\textbf{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.

\textbf{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.

\textbf{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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNTING JOURNALS</th>
<th>ACCOUNTING JOURNALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Organizations and Society</td>
<td>Abacus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Review</td>
<td>Accounting and Business Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Accounting Research</td>
<td>Accounting Horizons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Accounting &amp; Economics</td>
<td>Advances in Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Accounting Studies</td>
<td>Behavioral Research in Accounting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMATION SYSTEMS JOURNALS</th>
<th>INFORMATION SYSTEMS JOURNALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems Research</td>
<td>ACM Computing Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Management Information Systems</td>
<td>ACM Transactions on (Office) Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS Quarterly</td>
<td>Communications of the AIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision Support Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Journal of IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human-Computer Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IEEE Computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Systems Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Journal of E-Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Journal of H-C Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Computer Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Strategic IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of the ACM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINANCE JOURNALS</th>
<th>FINANCE JOURNALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Finance</td>
<td>European Finance Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Finance</td>
<td>Financial Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Financial Studies</td>
<td>Journal of Banking and Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Computational Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Corporate Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Derivatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Empirical Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Financial Intermediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Financial Markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Financial Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Financial Services Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Fixed Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Futures Markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of International Money and Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Money, Credit and Banking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Portfolio Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Risk and Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematical Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific-Basin Finance Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 x Teaching + 0.4 x Research + 0.2 x 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, 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
Assessment of teaching will be significantly influenced by course evaluations provided by the students. In particular, questions 4 (instructor attitude), 8 (overall evaluation of the instructor), 9
(overall evaluation of the course) and 10 (workload) will be examined for each course and compared to the results from other faculty members, and with historical data. 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 at UW or elsewhere 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 from other departments.

**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.
- Publication practices and outlets differ somewhat between the subdisciplines of Anthropology. For example, monographs are a somewhat more common form of publication in Social/Cultural Anthropology than in Biological or Archaeological Anthropology. The practices of the particular subdiscipline should be taken into account when assessing a faculty member’s output.
- 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 unpublished, do undergo a review process and should be considered as legitimate research products.

Conference Presentations
- Presentations at relevant conferences will be considered.

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

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. The achievement of tenure in the Anthropology Department requires a consistent record of publication with either good quantity and quality, or just outstanding quality. 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 several distinctive characteristics of anthropological research that may have a bearing on the quantity and nature of research output that can be expected from tenure-track faculty:

- Anthropological research frequently involves the collection of data through fieldwork undertaken in relatively remote locations within Canada or elsewhere around the world.
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Anthropologists employed at UW are therefore able to carry out the collection of original data only irregularly, at considerable cost in terms of both time and money, and during those blocks of time (the summer, sabbaticals) that many other academics use for a wider range of professional activities such as grant writing, data analysis, library research, writing, and course preparation.

- Some kinds of anthropological research projects, especially archaeological projects, regularly take several years for data collection. This means that there may be a long and unavoidable time lag before synthesis and interpretation can be undertaken.
- In order to conduct many kinds of anthropological research it is necessary to apply for and receive authorization from a local government. This is often a complex process that is difficult for the applicant to control, and this requirement may result in very considerable delays in the initiation or continuation of a research project or lead to its premature termination.
- In order to conduct some kinds of anthropological research ethics approval must be obtained, and this can be particularly difficult and time-consuming in cross-cultural situations.
- Many kinds of anthropological research are collaborative and involve the participation of a wide array of specialist scholars and technicians. This not only renders the research more complex, time-consuming, and expensive than research conducted in some other fields, but also results in a higher incidence of multi-authored publications.

More information concerning some of the unique considerations of anthropological research as it relates to tenure and promotion can be found at:


The Archaeological Institute of America’s “Considerations Regarding the Tenure and Promotion of Classical Archaeologists Employed in Colleges and Universities” website: http://www.archaeological.org/jobs/tenure

Teaching

The Anthropology department has a standard teaching load of four courses per year, so evidence of effective teaching is required. Candidates for tenure and promotion will be expected to have documented 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

Because of the small size of the department, significant departmental service will likely be required even from pre-tenure faculty members.
Overview

This document provides guidelines for the annual evaluation process and the performance expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service for faculty members within the Classical Studies Department at 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 and with Faculty of Arts guidelines for these issues.

These guidelines have been approved by the Department of Classical Studies (22 November 2011) and by the Dean of Arts (1 November 2013). Any substantial 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 annual 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.

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 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 x Teaching) + (0.4 x Research) + (0.2 x Service). The points on the rating scale and their associated descriptors are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Needs Major Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Needs Significant Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Needs Some Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Department will vote every November as to how performance evaluations will be conducted (either by the Chair alone or by a committee of Department members).

1 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.
Tenured faculty should submit a completed Activity Report for the year in question to the Chair by the end of the second week of January; course evaluations should be submitted at the same time (it has been the practice in this Department to submit also the student comments to the chair, but instructors are not obliged to do so). Probationary faculty should do likewise, but in addition will be asked to submit course outlines and other course materials, article offprints, conference programs, editors’ letters, copies of work in progress, and so on (tenured faculty may also submit all or any of these items if they feel they have a particular reason to do so). 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 year. They should feel free to include and explain the widest selection of data they want the Chair to review, and to 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 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.

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.*

Evidence regarding the quality of teaching is largely obtained from student course evaluations. 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, such as classroom visits made by the Chair or senior faculty members to lectures given by untenured faculty members. The development of new courses or programs is also seen to contribute to one’s teaching score, as are unsolicited comments from the students. Course materials, particularly if they are unusual or innovative, may also be valuable in assessing teaching.

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

- Quantitative information, such as: number of courses taught; number of students taught, including retention rates; scores on course evaluations.
• 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.

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 annual 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:

• 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 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 required to make service contributions within the University; service outside the University is optional). 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?

“Citizenship” has recently been identified as a desirable component of a faculty member’s work performance.2 “The Faculty Relations Committee has produced a guideline for departments as they achieve consensus on what departmental citizenship means in their particular units: “‘Departmental citizenship’ includes, but is not limited to, mentoring new faculty members, being available in the Department/School, being willing to take on hard-to-cover courses, and being available to students. In keeping with Recommendation 4.1 of the Report of the Working Group on Faculty Evaluation, it is understood that internal service to the university (and in smaller units, to the department) is an essential duty of faculty members.””

---

2 Joint Memorandum of 22 November 2010 from the VPAP and the President of FAUW.
Addendum:
Service Standards for Faculty
Faculty of Arts
Approved by General Group, May 7, 2013

In response to the recommendations of two recent working groups jointly appointed by the University and the Faculty Association,\(^3\) the Faculty of Arts will employ the following criterion to clarify expectations for the Service component of a faculty member’s job, and to increase consistency in its evaluation between academic units.

**Expectations for faculty members to receive a score of 1.25 for Service.**

To receive a score of 1.25 for service in any year, a faculty member 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. A meaningful extra-departmental service contribution to the Faculty or University.
   b. Meaningful external service to the academic discipline, profession or community.

---

Appendix: Guidelines for interpreting the Service Evaluation criterion:

- The onus is on faculty members to ensure that they are making a service contribution—not having been asked does not excuse a lack of service activity. Departments should ensure that all faculty members, including new faculty members, have meaningful service opportunities.

- Service expectations differ for pre-tenure and tenured faculty members, and between lecturers and professors. Senior members of a department are expected to carry heavier and more responsible service roles commensurate with their rank—for instance, by policy a Chair must be an Associate Professor or Professor, and by practice and, except in extraordinary circumstances, so too should be Associate Chairs. However, pre-tenure faculty members are expected to make meaningful service contributions from the beginning of their appointment at Waterloo; departments should that the expectation to perform significant service is clear.

- The University and the Faculty Association have agreed at the Faculty Relations Committee that internal service is an essential aspect of the job of a faculty member, and that the internal service of members of small and medium-sized departments will be weighted towards service to the department. While over the course of a career 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 is a failure to perform all aspects of a faculty member’s job, and so warrants a score below 1.25. It may be that in some large departments, opportunities for service to the department will be more limited, simply because there are more hands available to perform such service. With the prior agreement of the Chair, a member of a large department may for a time substitute additional extra-departmental service to the Faculty or University for service to the department. There are many service roles at these levels that are consistently difficult to fill: serving on Senate; chairing PhD exams; service on the undergrad admissions committee, Arts Faculty Council Executive, the examinations and standings committee, the Arts Endowment Fund committee, or other Faculty of Arts committees; attending recruiting events; serving on Faculty Association committees; etc.

- The use of the word “meaningful” in the criterion must be taken seriously. That is, mere membership on a committee is not sufficient; the effort required and quality of contribution must be taken into account as well.

- This criterion is stated in a way that assumes a faculty member has the standard 20% weighting for Service. For those with higher service weightings, the amount of service activity to be expected is higher.

- People in roles such as Chair or Associate Chair have the option to adjust their weightings, as is allowed by section 13.5.5 of the Memorandum of Agreement; they should be informed of this when they are offered the position, and they should be encouraged to take advantage of it. The Memorandum of Agreement specifies that such adjustments reduce the expectations for the quantity of teaching and scholarship when their performance is reviewed, though not the quality. Correspondingly, a high score for Service should not be automatic simply because one is occupying such a role: the quality of the service should also be taken into account.

- Filling jobs involving a major service commitment to the department, such as Associate Chair, can be a challenge. Refusal by tenured faculty or continuing lecturers of reasonable requests to take on such jobs warrants a score below 1.25. In Special cases, such as major service appointments outside the department (including secondments) the terms of appointment should
include an explicit statement about how service shall be evaluated and by whom. Normally, the Chair will be part of that process.

- Service as director of a non-departmental program or Centre can be an important contribution to the University. Like other extra-departmental service, it 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. In the short term, it may shift the balance between departmental and extra-departmental service. However, such shifts must be temporary. In programs involving several departments, the jobs involved in running the programs should move among the departments involved.

- The 2009 review of the faculty APR includes a recommendation that “departmental citizenship” be considered in evaluations of service, as a mechanism for recognizing the work that is invisible (in the sense of not resulting in another line on a CV or in a performance review summary) but that is essential to the smooth functioning of an academic unit. In a memo from the Provost dated Nov. 10, 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.
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1. **INTRODUCTION**

This document provides guidelines for the evaluation process and the performance expectations for scholarship, teaching, and service for faculty in the Department of Drama and Speech Communication 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 of the Memorandum of Agreement between UW and FAUW; and the Faculty of Arts guidelines for tenure and promotion.

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.” In its Sixth Decade Plan, UW made a commitment to excellence, including a goal to have all existing academic programs “be assessed by peers to be at least in the top third of similar programs offered in Canada, or be unique and essential to the province”. Future candidates for tenure will be evaluated with this standard of excellence in mind.

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. It is also worth noting that the teaching, research, and service activities of the Department of Drama and Speech Communication are discipline-specific (i.e., fall within theatre, communication studies, and digital arts communication disciplinary frameworks); and also cross disciplines in significant and far-reaching ways.

The Department 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 DTPC will evaluate levels and modes of collaboration, the range of methodological components employed, and the complexity of research and creative oversight.

The DPTC intends the guidelines below to be specific enough to help faculty members understand the basis for their evaluations while general enough to accommodate ongoing changes in what it means to excel at teaching, research, and service. To this point, the DPTC invites members of the Department to submit suggestions – such as new categories of assessment or criteria of evaluation – for its consideration on an ongoing basis. Ideally, this is a living document: stable enough to help Department members plan their careers; flexible enough to grow with the Department – and reflect its changing realities – over time.
2. **RATING OF TEACHING**

2.1 **General Comments**
In the Department of Drama and Speech Communication, teaching is a core faculty activity, and includes a number of different kinds of student interaction. 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.”

2.2 **Categories of Teaching**
Categories of teaching in the Department of Drama and Speech Communication include:
- classroom lectures, studio work, and online course delivery;
- reading and independent study courses;
- theatre and performance production credits; and
- undergraduate thesis supervision.

2.3 **Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching**
As is the case for research and service, the two-fold criteria for evaluation of teaching are outcome and process. The DTPC Performance Review committee will use the following questions to evaluate teaching.

2.3.1 **Outcomes of Teaching (how consequential and valuable is the 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?
- In what ways did you investigate making meaning in your course?
- How did you set up reflective practice so that students demonstrated their understanding of course content or concepts?
- How did your course help students increase their knowledge of core disciplinary and course-related concepts?
- How have students under your supervision demonstrated, in and outside of the classroom, the significance of what they have learned?
- In what ways can students apply what they have learned to situations outside of the classroom?

2.3.2 **Process of Teaching (including development and components of all forms of student
teaching and supervision):

- To what extent did you pursue new forms of learning with your students (online, service-learning, community-based, production-related, etc.)?
- 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?
- What kinds of new course materials did you develop? How did students use them? To what effect?
- What supervisory duties did you assume with students? Describe these duties (in terms of quality and quantity – i.e. thesis projects, number of courses taught, students in courses, ratings, etc.)

2.3.3 Evidence of Teaching

- Course evaluations
- Student supervision in independent studies courses, etc.
- 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 department 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 and critiques by faculty or university colleagues and by students, alumni or Teaching Assistants
- 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.

3. RATING OF SCHOLARSHIP

3.1 General Comments

Faculty members contribute to the research profile of the Department, the Faculty of Arts, and University of Waterloo through the analysis of performance, representation, and communication; the design, production, critique and theory of theatre and performance; and multimedia design, production, critique and theory.

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.” The Department values a range of research and creative work (see section 3.3.3 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 Departmental scholarship include:

3.2.1. Publications and Conferences
Publications and conferences are the most “traditional” and well-defined venue for academic research. 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. Single-authored works are held in higher esteem than jointly authored works. The Department also recognizes the importance of work that is cross-disciplinary, multi-institutional, and collaborative.

3.2.2. Projects
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, research conceptual design, 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.

3.2.3. Productions and Performances
Productions and performances include any artistic and multimedia presentation for an audience that involves conceptualization, design, production, and collaboration. In the context of theatre and performance work, significant research is required in the processes of design and production. The communication of the results of this research is performance. The creative process is documented by the visual record of the production and by the graphics and organizational materials prepared in the planning of the production. Documentation may include designs, models, photographs, slides, and recordings of performance, prompt/production books, interviews, articles and essays that relate to the production, as well as reviews and evaluations by qualified respondents.

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 Department. For example, a funded research project may produce a series of publications and talks as well as result in a public performance.

3.3 Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarly Work

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 and performance/theatre production?
- What resources, personnel, and activities does collaboration require? What types of academics and artists are involved? What kinds of academic institutions and community organizations are contributing to the research and creative work, and how?
- What is the range of research and creative questions that the performance is raising?
- What types of performance are pursued by the researcher and creative team?

3.3.3 Evidence of Scholarly Activity

- Publications
- Presentations of research at conferences/workshops, guest talks, keynote addresses as well as discussant, chair, 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
- 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 (the onus is on faculty members to provide evidence)
- 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.
- Research grants. (Note: Probationary faculty are encouraged to apply for research grants, and the winning of research grants is positive indication of quality scholarship. At the same time, the department does not consider successful research grants to be necessary for tenure and promotion. The department recognizes that research funding in the humanities and social sciences is difficult to secure and that certain fields within drama and communication studies do not require large 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 Department, our Faculty, the University, and the academic and social communities in which we participate. 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 taken into account as service to the Department. Service as chair or associate chair normally earns a high service rating.

Generally, there are three categories of service that may be reported in annual performance reviews (service to the department, university, and profession), and there is an expectation of faculty members to contribute to the department. Beyond these three categories, extra-university activity 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 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 Departmental
Service at the Departmental level is a core requirement. Members' contributions ensure the efficient and effective operations of the Department. Examples include:
• filling officer positions (e.g., Chair, Director, Undergraduate Advisor, etc.)
• membership and participation in Departmental committees (e.g., Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, etc.)
• organizing and managing special events or leading groups in the Department (e.g., Silverside lectures, Speech Communication Society, etc.)
• initiatives that contribute to the functioning of the Department
• 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, 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):
• Service to other units that is not contractually obligated. Such service is valued by the Department
• Committee work
• Leadership roles
• Coordinator of speakers series
• University service awards
• 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 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 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. 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 terms of output and process in the following ways:

4.3.1. Outcomes

- What are the chief contributions of the service in various contexts (department, 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 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.”

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 Chair 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 lecturers) are eligible to serve. This committee will review all merit awards to ensure equity within a rank and within the Department as a whole.

5.1.2 Chair’s Responsibility
While the Department does involve a committee in the performance evaluation exercise, it should be noted that the final responsibility for faculty performance assessment rests with the Chair (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.

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.

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 Department, Faculty, University, profession, academic community, and other relevant communities.

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) An overall Unsatisfactory performance rating carries no selective merit increase. It is Faculty practice to review cases where a rating of Unsatisfactory has been earned for three consecutive years in either teaching or scholarship.

Needs Improvement (0.5) If performance in any one area is questionable, but is not clearly unsatisfactory, it should be assigned a rating of Needs Improvement (0.5).

Satisfactory (1.0) A rating of more than 1.0 is inappropriate when teaching and/or scholarship needs to improve.

Good (1.25) To be implemented starting for 2011

Very Good (1.5) To be considered Very Good (1.5), strong positive evidence must be presented, particularly in the areas of teaching and scholarship.

Excellent (1.75) Performance that is not quite at the level of Outstanding, but is nonetheless remarkable, can be acknowledged with the rating of Excellent (1.75).

Outstanding (2.0) It is expected that ratings of Outstanding (2.0) will be rare. Strong evidence of excellence will be required. Here we are looking at performance at an extraordinary level as demonstrated by the Distinguished Teaching Award or the University of Waterloo Award for Excellence in Research, external recognition such as the Canadian Academic Accounting Association's Haim Falk Award for Distinguished Contribution to Accounting Thought, etc.

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 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 Chair 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 departmental average for their rank. [The MOA currently requires that newly-appointed faculty will normally receive a rating of 1.0 (satisfactory) in any category where assessment is not possible. It is proposed that this be changed.]

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 three-year period and teaching and service will be evaluated on the basis of work done in the prior year.

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 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 (DTPC) 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 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.

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 years’ 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 of a department for part of a year, the Dean will provide a service rating to the Department for that fraction of the year.
PREAMBLE

This document provides guidelines for the evaluation of faculty members in the Department of Economics, and outlines the expectations and criteria for faculty performance with respect to scholarship, teaching and service. 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 (MOA) between UW and FAUW, and the Faculty of Arts guidelines for these issues.¹ The Department of Economics first adopted these guidelines on October 11, 2011.

The Department of Economics is committed to upholding high standards in teaching, scholarship, and service and the promotion of an environment that fosters creativity and is conducive to free enquiry and the collegial exchange of ideas and criticism. The Performance Review is intended to support the attainment of these goals.

Policy 77 requires that Performance Reviews be included in department tenure and promotion considerations. Performance evaluation that is consistent with the standards for tenure and promotion is therefore desirable, and the process and evaluations are meant to help faculty in their career progress. Candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to provide sufficiently detailed information on their activities to allow the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee to assess the quantity and quality of the activities. The Activity Reports and Performance Reviews are designed to help in this requirement.

By necessity, assessment of performance is subjective. This document therefore does not provide formulae or fixed rules, but provides guidelines only. While the same broad performance expectations and rules apply to everyone independent of rank, the precise expectations differ somewhat by career stage. Performance Reviews will take into account, and where appropriate explicitly reference, individual career path circumstances.

¹ The MOA is available at https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/documents-potential-interest/memorandum-agreement-uw-fauw. Applicable policies with respect to the expectations and performance criteria are 77 (tenure and Promotion), 76 (Faculty Appointments), 69 (Conflict of Interest), 49 (Extra-University Activity), and 3 (sabbatical/leaves). Policies are available at https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines
Performance Review is governed foremost by the MOA 13.5 “Member Evaluation”. According to MOA 13.5.2, performance evaluations shall occur on an annual basis for faculty members holding probationary or definite-term appointments, and on a biennial basis in odd numbered years for faculty members holding tenured or continuing appointments. According to MOA 13.5.6(b), Departments with more than 15 full time equivalent regular faculty positions shall elect an advisory committee of not more than five members to assist the Chair with performance evaluations.

Department Performance Review Committee (DPRC)

The DPRC will assist the Chair with faculty performance evaluations. The DPRC will be comprised of three elected members plus the department Chair, who chairs the committee. Members of the committee will normally be elected for two year terms in order to provide some continuity. All regular faculty members (full, associate and assistant professors, and continuing lecturers) are eligible to serve. At least two of the three elected members must be tenured. The committee will review and assess all activity reports in the department (other than for the Chair), develop ratings, and endeavour to ensure equity within rank and within the Department as a whole. Members will recuse themselves from the discussions of their own or their spouse's files, and declare other potential causes of conflict of interest.

Chair’s Responsibility

While the DPRC assists and advises the Chair with respect to evaluations, the final responsibility for faculty performance assessment at the department level rests with the Chair, who submits a recommendation to the Dean (MOA 13.5.6.). The Chair also has access to the entire history of each faculty member's evaluations, while the committee sees only the previous year's ratings.

Since performance reviews are included in department tenure and promotion considerations, it is important that the Chair provide a detailed written assessment of each faculty member's performance. Recommendations for selective merit increases are based on overall performance.

Who is assessed?

According to Article 13.5.2 of the MOA, each regular faculty member who is being assessed in a given year shall receive a performance evaluation based upon documentation provided by the member, submitted in the format and by the deadline specified in the Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines. For those faculty on a biennial performance review cycle, during non-review years, the rating given will be the same as it was in the previous year (MOA 13.3.3).

Regular faculty members include those 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.
Three components of assessment

Performance is assessed separately in three areas:

- **Teaching** – activities related to instruction and student development (p.5)
- **Scholarship** – activities related to the advancement of the discipline (p.8)
- **Service** – activities related to the development of the Department, University, and other relevant communities (p.10)

Weighting of components

The weight for each component shall be as specified in the member’s letter of appointment. In the absence of specified weights, the weights for tenured or tenure-track positions are 40 percent for teaching, 40 percent for scholarship, and 20 percent for service.

Duties and weights 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 percent in both teaching and scholarship for tenured faculty.

Recommendations to the Dean

The Chair's recommendation to the Dean must indicate a level of performance for each component of assessment and must provide evidence supporting this assessment. The available rankings for each component are:

- Unsatisfactory (0.0)
- Needs Major Improvement (0.25)
- Needs Significant Improvement (0.5)
- Needs Some Improvement (0.75)
- Satisfactory (1.0)
- Good (1.25)
- Very Good (1.5)
- Excellent (1.75)
- Outstanding (2.0)

The overall performance rating, which determines selective merit, is computed as the weighted average of the individual components. Exceptions arise in cases of less than Satisfactory performance in one of the components.

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 satisfactory.

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, assistance provided if appropriate, and opportunity given to remedy the problem. This can be one of the most valuable functions of the performance review. With respect to continuing ratings of “Unsatisfactory”, faculty members should be aware of Section 8.5 of the MOA.

Newly-Appointed Faculty

The process for newly appointed faculty is detailed in article 13.5.4 of the MOA. For their first evaluation year, newly-appointed faculty will be assigned a score based on actual performance or, where assessment is not possible, assigned a score equal to the average rating of faculty members in the Department who hold the same rank.

Significant Administrative Roles

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

Sabbatical Leaves

Faculty on sabbatical leaves are evaluated for the whole period of their leave. In cases where assessment in a category is not possible as a result of the leave, the MOA specifies that the member shall receive the average of up to the three previous years' rating. There is no expectation for teaching or service contributions, including seminar attendance, while on sabbatical.

Other Leaves

Faculty on leaves other than sabbaticals are not evaluated for the period of their leave.
Years Considered in the Evaluation

Consistent with Section 13.5.2 (b) of the MOA and the Arts Activity Report Form, faculty members shall provide documentation for the calendar year (or years) under evaluation (one year for Members holding probationary or definite-term appointments, and two years for Members holding tenured or continuing appointments) plus the two previous years. Teaching and service are assessed on the evidence for the year under evaluation, while documentation for the other years will provide context for the assessment. Scholarship is assessed on the basis of activities over the last two year period.

Insufficient Documentation

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

RATING OF TEACHING

Introduction

The department offers general and honours Bachelors of Arts in Economics degrees, as well as a Masters of Arts in Economics and a PhD in Applied Economics at the graduate level. In addition, the department provides service teaching for several thousands of undergraduate students from various departments and faculties. There is a high proportion of international students at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

Teaching is an important aspect of the role of faculty members and is highly valued. The goal of the evaluation of teaching is to recognize and encourage high quality teaching. Since teaching is one of the defining duties for all ranks, ratings of less than “satisfactory” will require an explanation.

The department values a set of broad learning outcomes as outlined in the departmental “Statement of Learning Outcomes” and commits to provide all students with high quality teaching and learning opportunities. The department strives to maintain high standards for the discipline with respect to the content and delivery of material. Faculty members are expected to make significant contributions to teaching within the department and to help achieve its goals.

Teaching is broadly defined in Policy 77:

The purpose of teaching is to facilitate learning. Thus, effective teaching draws the strands of a field together in a way that provides coherence and meaning, places what is known in context, lays the groundwork for future learning, and opens the way for connections between the known
and the unknown. High-quality teaching is an important goal of the University. All regular faculty members are expected to contribute to undergraduate teaching and, where possible, to contribute to graduate teaching and to participate in project/thesis supervision.

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).

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. (…) Assessing teaching in this broad context is difficult. Consequently, there is no single hard and fast rule or formula to determine the teaching rating. The committee will consider all relevant information available in formulating its judgement. It will assess both the quantity and the quality of teaching activities. Given a fixed number of course assignments, quantity judgements will be mainly influenced by course design considerations (exam type, number of assessment opportunities, etc.) and supervisory activity. The evaluation of quality will take into account course design, course curriculum, and differences in class sizes, course levels, and course type (mandatory, quantitative), etc.

These considerations are consistent with Policy 77.3, which states that 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.

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.
Course Evaluation Forms

The standard Arts course evaluation forms are administered at the end of each term. These forms are anonymous, and use of these forms is mandatory as long as there are at least 5 respondents. These scores, together with the average score on the first 9 questions of the form, provide the first piece of evidence of teaching performance. The committee will take into account factors that are known to influence the score received from these evaluations, such as:

1. Whether the course is mandatory for students or an elective
2. Size of the class
3. Student response rate
4. Quantitative content
5. Class Composition with respect to student backgrounds

Classroom Evaluation

For tenure and promotion Policy 77 recommends peer evaluation. As part of the evaluation and mentoring process for junior faculty, there will be at least one classroom visit per academic year for each tenure track faculty member. One key purpose of these visits will be formative, and a detailed debriefing and discussion should follow. A joint report will be submitted as part of the performance review documentation. A classroom visit may be scheduled for tenured faculty members if the Chair has identified a need for a peer review of classroom teaching, or if requested by the individual faculty member. The resulting joint report will be considered in the DPRC's assessment. The classroom visit will be by a tenured faculty member, chosen by the Chair, mainly on the basis of familiarity with the course subject matter.

Course Material

Course outlines will be considered by the DPRC. Faculty members are encouraged to submit additional material that will help the committee evaluate what has been taught, and the student feedback and evaluation mechanisms, for each course. Such material may include (but is not limited to) reading lists, and samples of assignments and exams.

Course Development or Revision

The department recognizes that the most time and effort is spent on the first time that a particular course is taught. Faculty members should thus indicate which courses are new preps and also what changes have been made to courses that have been taught previously. Faculty members should also indicate any courses that they would consider to be outside their particular area of expertise.

Awards

Faculty members should indicate any teaching related awards that they have won or for which they have been nominated.
Teaching Development

Faculty members should indicate if they have participated in any conferences or workshops pertaining to teaching.

Reading Courses

Faculty members should indicate if they engaged in any non-credit teaching, such as conducting a reading course.

Supervision

All faculty members are expected to share in the supervision and the development of scholarly capacity of students. Faculty members should indicate any supervisory activity, starting with course based projects/papers, Econ 472 papers, and Major Research Papers. Note that MRP Reader and academic advising fall under the Service category.

Supervision of PhD students

The supervision of PhD students is highly valued by the department and can be very time consuming. Faculty members should indicate if they are on any student’s dissertation committee. They should clearly identify the nature of their involvement (supervisor, committee member), the stage of the dissertation and the progress made in the last year.

RATING OF SCHOLARSHIP

Introduction:

Scholarship is an important aspect of our role as faculty members and is highly valued. The goal of its evaluation is to recognize and encourage scholarship and research. Since scholarship is one of the defining duties of the professorial ranks, ratings less than “satisfactory” will require an explanation.

The department recognizes that refereeing and publication delays in economics are such that an annual stream of acceptances should not be expected. As does the University in its tenure policy, the department does “look for evidence of active continuing scholarship, but the volume of scholarly output is less important than its quality, originality and impact” (Policy 77.) Consequently, the committee will look for evidence of continuing scholarship as outlined below, not necessarily measured just by annual publications, and will evaluate and comment on both the quality and quantity of the scholarship.

Scholarship is broadly defined. In keeping with the usual standards in the discipline, emphasis is placed on publications in refereed journals, but published monographs, books, articles in professional publications, papers in conference proceedings, and intellectual works published in other forms will also be considered. In accordance with Policy 77, any research should be communicated and be accessible for peer review or professional adjudication. As outlined further below, work in progress, external grants, awards, impact
of previous work, and some aspects of graduate supervision will also be considered. The judgement of “originality and impact” of scholarship is guided by the relative rank/tier of the outlet on the one hand. However, occasionally highly original research that will have a big impact is not published in top tier journals. The committee therefore will as well consider measures of the impact of past research, as evidenced by citations to past work or the reprinting of articles in subsequent years. It will also consider evidence of policy impact.

Performance in teaching, scholarship, and service should be consistent with those in that discipline at comparable research-intensive institutions in Canada and/or elsewhere (as appropriate).

**Publications**

There is an expectation of ongoing publication of high quality peer reviewed scholarship, including peer reviewed journal articles. Standards for the quantity and quality of journal articles will be consistent with those in comparable research intensive economics departments in Canada. High quality publications are evidenced by a serious review process, lower acceptance rates, respected publishers and editors, and scholarly impact. A high quality publication is also evidenced by a high ranking across several of the published journal rankings commonly accepted in the discipline. Faculty who publish in journals outside of the usual economics and economics field journals should indicate and support the quality of the publication (rejection rates, editor and publisher information, impact measures, etc.)

The Department recognizes the benefits, in terms of research excellence and productivity, of faculty working with other researchers. For papers with joint authorship, faculty should provide a brief description of their contribution to the work.

Publications will generally be recognized in the year they are accepted for publication as evidenced by an editor's acceptance letter. Inclusion of a previously published paper into a collection of papers will not count as a new publication, but instead be considered as demonstrating the impact of the paper.

**Work in Progress**

The existence, quantity and quality of work submitted to journals and work in progress will be considered in order to establish ongoing scholarly activity. This pipeline of work is of particular importance to faculty on tenure track and the reports on tenure track faculty should explicitly comment on their activity level.

**Conference Presentations/ Invited Seminars**

Presentations at relevant conferences and invited seminars will be considered as positive indicators of activity. Keynote addresses will be more highly regarded than invited conference papers, which in turn are more highly regarded than submitted papers. Conference participation as a panel member or discussant will also be considered. The
committee will consider information on the “quality” of conferences (rejection rates, reputation, etc.)

**External Grants and Research Contracts**

The receipt of external grants and research contracts is a positive indication of quality scholarship. Since grant sizes differ across fields, the competitiveness of the grant process is as much of importance as the grant amount. The department recognizes that success rates are low and will consider the fact that grant applications are made as positive.

**Awards**

Awards recognizing scholarship will be considered in the year of their award.

**Impact**

Credit will be given for work that has an impact but is not necessarily published in a top-tier journal. The onus is on the faculty member to provide evidence of its quality, impact and relevance. This can cover policy reports, or working papers and manuscripts that in their unpublished state already have an impact. Since the impact of papers is often only apparent with a time lag, the impact of previously published work (foremost evidenced by citations and policy impact) will be considered and represents an exception to the rule that a publication only receive credit once. Ongoing citations to previously published work are one key indicator of the impact and relevance of said work. For applied and policy oriented work, evidence of policy impact will be considered, such as reference to the work in policy documents or the “grey literature”.

**Additional Considerations**

The onus lies on the faculty member to provide information on any “non-standard” activities.

**RATING OF SERVICE**

**Introduction:**

According to the Arts Faculty Performance Guidelines “Service to the institution is required of all faculty members; professional engagement is also encouraged.”

Service is an important and essential part of our role as faculty members, is highly valued and is encouraged and recognized. 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, if relevant and related. Since service is expected, ratings less than “satisfactory” require an explanation.

**Service According to Policy 77:**

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.

There is an expectation that all faculty members contribute to a vibrant and collegial department in academic and professional matters. One aspect of good departmental citizenship is presence in the department and active participation in the academic life of the department throughout the year.

Policy 76 defines a regular faculty appointment and 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. (...) In special circumstances, a faculty member and the department Chair may arrange a different assignment of responsibilities. Any such arrangement must be documented and must have the formal approval of the Faculty Dean.

Care should be taken that outside activities do not interfere with the proper discharge of primary University duties. In this respect, faculty members should be aware of University policy on Extra-University Activity (Policy 49) and Conflict of Interest (Policy 69).

Policy 69 defines a Conflict of Commitment:
• Undertaking external consulting, professional or other activities which, by virtue of their time commitment, prevent the faculty or staff member from fulfilling her/his obligations to the University.
• Involvement in external organizations which bring a faculty or staff member into a position of divided loyalty between the mission of the University and the interests of the external organization.

Policy 49 B.4 reads:
Regular appointments to the University must be construed as constituting a full-time occupation. Given this understanding, any extra-University occupation that requires more than one work day a week should be examined and judged very carefully. It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to inform the department Chair and Dean concerning any activities where expenditure of time is substantial.

Contract research should be discussed with the Office of Research and formal arrangements should be made with the Chair of the Department and the Dean of the Faculty.

Policy 77 requires that
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. (...)
For consistency and continuity, faculty members should be required to provide
information on their service activities in sufficient detail to allow the
Performance Review committee to assess its quantity and quality in a similar
manner to that which is required by the DTPC.

Departmental Service

Internal service to the department and departmental citizenship are an essential duty. Faculty
members are expected to be actively involved in the collegial academic and professional life
of the department and to share committee and other responsibilities. They are expected to
participate in the collegial exchange of opinions on scholarly and administrative matters.
All department members are encouraged to participate in department meetings, ceremonies,
and other professional activities whenever possible. Probationary candidates are not
expected to fill major administrative roles. Some examples of activities that are counted
as evidence of departmental service include (this list is not meant to be exhaustive):

1. Student advising (as opposed to supervision, which is teaching); letters of reference
2. Serving as Reader for MRPs
3. Committee work, including \textit{ad hoc} committees such as PhD admissions
4. Administrative roles
5. Coordinator of speakers series
6. Organization of departmental workshops
7. “Good citizenship” such as mentoring new faculty, being available in the
department, helping others with research and teaching, being willing to take on
hard-to-cover courses, and being available to students
8. Attending seminars, in particular departmental and hiring seminars
9. Attending Convocation

Faculty and University service

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

1. Service to other units that is not contractually obligated. Such service is valued
by the department. (Where service to other units is required by the nature of the
position (e.g. joint appointment, directorship), this will not be taken into
account.)
2. Faculty or University Committee work
3. Coordinator of speakers series at Faculty or University
4. University service awards
5. Organization of workshops and conferences
6. Serving on internal adjudication committees for grant applications
7. Serving as internal-external examiners for, or chairing, a PhD defence.
8. Community service related to a faculty member's scholarly activities. Included
in this category are the following kinds of activities (this list is not meant to be
exhaustive):
   · media and community outreach
   · editorials, commentary, interviews in media
• engagement with policy makers
• engagement with community and civil society groups
• involvement with think tanks
• testimony before government bodies.

Note: Some of these kinds of activities may be counted under research dissemination (e.g., engagement with policy makers or think tanks). Faculty members must clearly specify how they would prefer these activities be counted; double-counting across categories is not permitted. Paid work or consultancy does not normally count as service, but consultancy (e.g. for the government) does count as service where only expenses are reimbursed.

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):

1. Editorial roles (more value is placed on the more senior roles and higher-tier publications)
2. Editorial board and advisory board roles
3. Serving as external PhD examiners
4. Service in professional committees or organizations
5. Scholarly manuscript reviewing activities for journals and book publishers (with higher value placed on reviews for higher-tier publications)
6. Reviewing activities for granting agencies, tenure and promotion at other universities, program reviews at other institutions, awards/prizes etc.
7. Service awards from academic or professional bodies
8. Serving on adjudication committees of external agencies granting scholarships and research funding
Performance Reviews in the Department of English Language and Literature
2017-18 Evaluation Years
(approved 25 November 2016)

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 2017 and 2018 will be evaluated in the winter 2019 term; performance in 2019 and 2020 will be evaluated in the winter 2021 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 two 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 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 formal evaluations of teaching by students. The FPR Committee will also consider evidence such as course material indicating preparedness and perspicacity in course design; supervision of Honours theses; productive innovation in pedagogy; and unusual challenges faced. 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. It should be
emphasized, however, 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 evaluations 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) evaluations 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 course evaluations, since the questions do not clearly distinguish between assessing the course instructor, the course author, and the teaching assistant. Although the relevance of student evaluation is incontrovertible, the FPR Committee will always balance its assessment of student evaluation of a course against other evidence, as listed above. Further, course evaluation exercises can be compromised by factors such as bias (e.g. gender and race) in perceptions of course and instructional quality.

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, 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.

**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 annual 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.
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1 Overview, Procedure and Ratings

1.1 Introduction
These Annual 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 of the Department of Fine Arts January 9, 2013 to become effective January 1, 2013, in accordance with:

- ‘Member Evaluation’, section 13.5 of the Memorandum of Agreement – UW/FAUW (http://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/documents-potential-interest/memorandum-agreement-uw-fauw);
- Policy 77: Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members (http://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/policy-77);
- ‘Faculty of Arts Guidelines for the Annual Performance Review for Faculty’, issued by the Dean of Arts, December 2011;
- the Fine Arts ‘Model for Promotion - Studio’, passed by the faculty of the Department of Fine Arts in May 2011;
- APR guidelines approved in other departments in the Faculty of Arts, namely the School of Accounting and Finance, and the departments of Political Science and Philosophy.

Please note: These guidelines are meant to be read in conjunction with:

- The Faculty of Arts APR template, provided annually by the Dean of Arts office;
- the ‘Model for Promotion - Studio’, available on the Fine Arts Sharepoint site (faculty/staff website);
- ‘Guidelines for Brief Submission for Application for Promotion to Professor, Application for the Award of Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor, and Application for Renewal of Probationary Term’, approved by the Fine Arts Department Tenure and Promotion Committee in Fall 2011 and available on the Fine Arts Sharepoint site (faculty/staff website).

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 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 (see Memorandum of Agreement 13.5.6.).

1.4 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 Department tenure and promotion considerations. Therefore, it is important that the Chair provides a written assessment of each faculty member's performance. Recommendations for selective merit increases are based on overall performance.

1.5 Three components of assessment:
Performance is assessed in three areas:

**Teaching**: broadly defined to include classroom instruction, student supervision, instructional/curricular material development, etc. Please note: graduate and undergraduate teaching are to be assessed at parity (i.e. graduate teaching is not to be privileged over undergraduate teaching).

**Scholarship**: broadly defined as the intellectual advancement of a discipline.

**Service**: leadership or support to the Department, Faculty, University, the individual faculty member's discipline (art practice, art history, film studies, media studies, visual culture, etc.), the wider academic community, and other external communities.

1.6 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 in all areas. An overall Unsatisfactory performance rating carries no selective merit increase. It is the Faculty of Arts' practice to review cases where a rating of Unsatisfactory has been earned for three consecutive years in either teaching or scholarship.

**Needs Improvement (0.5)**: when performance in any one area is questionable, but is not clearly unsatisfactory. See 1.8 below.

**Needs Some Improvement (0.75)**: when performance in any one area is questionable, but is deemed approaching satisfactory. See 1.8 below.

**Satisfactory (1.0)**: An overall rating of more than 1.0 is inappropriate when teaching and/or scholarship needs to improve. See 1.7 below.

**Good (1.25)**: indicates a positive performance, especially in the areas of teaching and scholarship.

**Very Good (1.5)**: indicates substantial strong positive performance, particularly in the areas of teaching and scholarship.

**Excellent (1.75)**: indicates 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. Strong evidence is required and includes such distinctions as, internally, the Distinguished Teaching Award or the University of Waterloo Award for Excellence in Research, or, externally, publication of a solo-authored book or solo exhibition, 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).

1.7 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.

1.8 Performance rated ‘Needs Improvement’ or ‘Needs Some Improvement’
If performance in a particular area is seen as needing improvement or some 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.

1.9 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 60% for teaching and 40% 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 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.

1.10 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.

1.11 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.

1.12 Years Considered in the Evaluation
Scholarship, Teaching and Service will be evaluated on the basis of a three-year period.

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. **TEACHING**

2.1 **Courses taught**
All relevant factors will be considered including:

- Number of courses taught;
- Level of each course taught;
- Lecture, seminar or studio courses;
- Number of sections taught;
- 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).

2.2 **Course Development or Revision**
The amount of work involved in the development or revision of course materials will be considered.

2.3 **Plan/Program-related Activities**
Recognition will also be given for leading or being involved with pedagogical/plan/program-related activities which take place outside the classroom, for example, forms of experiential learning, etc.

2.4 **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.

2.5 **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. Revised editions will receive less credit than first editions. Solo-authored textbooks will be viewed more positively than multi-authored textbooks.

2.6 **Awards**
Teaching awards at UW or elsewhere will be considered.

2.7 **Conferences**
Participating in conferences related to teaching will be considered.

2.8 **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.

2.9 **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 Distance Education.
- Material such as peer reviews and critiques by faculty colleagues and by students, alumni and TAs will be considered.

2.10 **Materials to be submitted for APR assessment (see APR template provided by the Dean of Arts’ Office)**
• New course preparation as evidenced by syllabi;
• Statement of changes/improvements to existing courses;
• Program/plan/curriculum development (this includes assignment/project descriptions, etc.);
• Distance education courses;
• Experimental teaching methods;
• Independent study courses;
• Supporting letters concerning teaching;
• Student Course Evaluations summary sheets;
• Nomination for DTA;
• Recognition of teaching by graduating Departmental Award winners;
• Etc.

2.11 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.

3 SCHOLARSHIP

3.1 Evidence of scholarship common to all fields/disciplines practised 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 (university) or external (beyond the university);
  - scope of application;
  - status;
  - indicate review process, noting if peer-reviewed.
- Conference Presentations
  - state venue;
  - indicate if peer-reviewed.
- Keynote Addresses
  - indicate venue
- Editorial roles (faculty members can choose whether to count this as research or service)
- Organization of 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)

3.2 Studio specific research

- Solo Exhibitions
- Performance Art
- Site Specific Work
- Group Exhibitions
- Bibliography
  - catalogue / peer-reviewed essays;
  - published exhibition reviews;
  - publications – work represented in
- Collections (corporate and public)
- Residencies and Artist Projects
  - indicate if invited, applied for, paid, unpaid
- Artist Talks
- Other Scholarly Work
  - **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.

**Format and Supporting Documentation for the above:**
- List solo exhibitions chronologically, most recent first. Include upcoming confirmed exhibitions.
- Provide title, date, gallery/venue, city, curator, whether juried, whether a travelling exhibition.
- Append notices/announcements/invitations.
- Append documentation for confirmed exhibitions.
- Append documentation for unconfirmed upcoming exhibitions.
- List group exhibitions chronologically, most recent first. Include upcoming confirmed group exhibitions.
- Indicate contribution to group exhibition.
- Documentation of peer-review process.
- 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 titles must be translated.

### 3.3 Art History, Film Studies, 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:**

Please note: 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.
- Chapters in peer reviewed edited volumes.
- Peer-reviewed book reviews in scholarly journals.

**Other:**
- 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.
- Research papers in published conference proceedings.
- Re-publications of past published work in scholarly outlets (e.g. in edited collections, translations of past work)
- Other non-refereed publications such as magazine articles, newspaper articles, trade publications, briefing papers, research reports, and on-line scholarly commentary.

**Note:**

The university has noted 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.

3.4 **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 solo 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.

3.5 **Work-in-Progress**
The quantity of work-in-progress, submitted, prepared for exhibition and publication will be considered.

3.6 **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, outlined above in 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 (e.g. a faculty member who is a practicing artist may also publish in peer-reviewed journals, etc.)

3.7 **Impact**
The onus is on faculty members to provide evidence of research impact.

4 **SERVICE**

4.1 **General comments**
Service is a very important part of our role as a faculty member 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.** In a department such as Fine Arts which has a small faculty complement, 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.

4.2 **Service within the Department**
Internal service is an essential duty for faculty.

**Major service positions by group, in order of responsibility:**

**Group 1:**
- Department Chair
- Associate Chair, Undergraduate Studies
- Associate Chair, Graduate Studies.

These positions are the most substantial forms of departmental service 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.

**Group 2:**
- Visiting Artists Co-ordinator
  - Includes organizing talks, workshops, critiques, co-ordinating 302/402 course syllabus

**Group 3:**
- Course scheduling
- Studio Operations
  - Includes overseeing of kits, experiential learning (FINE 243/343 & 344)
- Fine Arts gallery exhibitions co-ordinator/halls co-ordinator/SoFA liaison
- Department promotion
- Department website design and maintenance
- FINE 100 co-ordinator
  - Includes first-year portfolio review

**Group 4:**
- Library Liaison
- Annual Fine Arts Awards Day co-ordinator
- Jury exchange exhibitions with other institutions

**Additional significant committees, annual or when needed:**
- Department Tenure and Promotion Committee
- Master of Fine Arts selection committee
- Hiring committees
- Curricula committees
- Etc.

**Note:**
It is expected that each faculty serve on more than one committee within the Department, given the small faculty complement. The Chair will do her/his best to ensure that Department service duties are distributed in an equitable fashion and in a manner consistent with the faculty member’s ranking.

### 4.3 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.

### 4.4 Service to the Discipline/Community

The Department and the University also recognizes and encourages 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 Art History, Film Studies and Visual Culture this can be contributions such as peer reviewer to journal, conference 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, awards, grants and public commissions; recipient of award for contribution to arts association and community outreach, 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, 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.

### 5 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. 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 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 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.

6 FACULTY MEMBERS ON:

6.1 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.

6.2 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.

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

6.4 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.

6.5 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.

6.6 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 2017 and 2018
Approved at the November 18, 2016 departmental meeting.

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%

Formula for lecturers:

Teaching: 80%
Service: 20%

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.

The Department will vote every spring as to how performance evaluations will be conducted – either by chair alone or by a committee of tenured department members who will advise the Chair.

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.

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 eight courses per academic year.

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 defense committees served on.

- 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.

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.
General Information

- The Department will vote every November before the new evaluation cycle 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.
- 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:
- 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

FACULTY 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 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 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 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. 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, 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) 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 (that may or may not be peer reviewed);
- an essay in a collection of essays (that may or may not be peer reviewed);
- encyclopedia or dictionary entries (that may or may not be peer reviewed);
- e-publications, either the equivalent of book-length or article-length or shorter (that may or may not be peer-reviewed);
- 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, annual evaluation of scholarly activity cannot be based solely on the production of a final product. Instead, 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 8, 2011
Performance appraisals and progress toward tenure and promotion
Advice for understanding the current (December 2016) 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 ANNUAL 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 x Teaching) + (.4 x Research) + (.2 x 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 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 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 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 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 appointed 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 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 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; typically these will be organized as two courses in the Fall term and two in the Winter term. Teaching assignments are occasionally available in the Spring term, but this is not the norm. 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.

Policy 77, when describing the evaluation of teaching for tenure and promotion, notes that “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,” including curriculum development. Preparing a course for teaching the first time, if done conscientiously, is often a more time-intensive process than re-teaching one. 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.

4a. 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 three scores regarded as most significant for this exercise are Overall Evaluation of the Course and Overall Evaluation of the Instructor and the overall average of scores for questions 1-9. 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 Philosophy majors/honours among the students, response rate, average grade in the course, the teaching evaluations of sections of the same course when it has been offered over the past several years, 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 Philosophy Honours students are expected to have higher course evaluations. Such differences will
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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.

4b. 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 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 Secretary.

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 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.

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 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 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 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 supervisor; 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.
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.
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, or 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 FPRC 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.
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 evaluation of Service in the Department will be consistent with the Faculty of Arts Service Standards. A copy of these standards is posted on the Department Sharepoint site.

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, while 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. As the Faculty Standard document makes clear, 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, provided the other expectations described in the Faculty Standard are met.

Other formalized positions in the Department of Philosophy at the time of writing include: Women’s Studies Advisor; Cognitive Science Advisor; Applied Philosophy Advisor; Social Media Coordinator; Library Officer; Undergraduate Philosophy Student Society (“Philsoc”) Liaison Officer; Women’s Studies Student Society (“WSSoc”) Liaison Officer; Computing/IT Officer; Colloquium 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
   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.
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 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.

Prior to the commencement of the calendar year to be evaluated, this document will be reviewed and updated, and approved by the members of the department.

1.1 General comments about the annual performance reviews

1.1.1 Who is assessed?

Annual performance reviews are required for all regular faculty and research professors with appointments of more than one year (Lecturers to Professors on full-time or reduced load appointments). 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 tenure and promotion considerations. Therefore, it is important that Chairs provide a thorough written assessment of each faculty member's performance.

Faculty 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.

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

On 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.

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 does get a performance rating. 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 have 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 annual 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 faculties within the department who are assessed by 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.

It is essential that the faculty member provide sufficient information during the annual performance 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.

**1.1.3 New and probationary faculty**

*New Faculty:* New faculty in their first year are assigned a score in each category based on actual performance, or, when too little information is available, a score equal to the departmental average for their rank.

*Probationary Faculty:* Performance reviews of probationary faculty must consider 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, etc.). 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 tenure and promotion committee (DTPC) 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 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.

1.2 General comments about the process of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor
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.”

In its Sixth Decade Plan, UW made a commitment to excellence, including a goal to have all existing academic programs “be assessed by peers to be at least in the top third of similar programs offered in Canada, or be unique and essential to the province”. Future candidates for tenure will be evaluated with this standard of excellence in mind.
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.

Annual performance reviews are an important input into tenure and promotion decisions. 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 adaption 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 changes to these guidelines are made after a probationary faculty has begun working in the department, that faculty member may choose whether to be judged by the new version of the guidelines or the guidelines that were in existence at the moment she or he began working in the department.
2. SCHOLARSHIP

2.1 General comments
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.” From a departmental standpoint, many kinds of activities can count as evidence of scholarship, including:
- Publications (see below)
- Presentations of research at conferences/workshops, guest talks, keynote addresses as well as discussant, chair, 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
- Editorial roles (faculty members can choose whether to count this as research or service)
- 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 (the onus is on faculty members to provide evidence)

Other activities may be included in this list but the faculty member must make a case for their relevance in light of Policy 77. As the university-wide Review of the Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation Process noted (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”.

Graduate supervision is considered by the department for teaching rather than scholarship, unless a faculty member makes a strong case for counting it as research.
For tenured faculty, scholarship is evaluated on the basis of a two year period (see further comments below under “Publications”).

2.2 Publications within annual performance review process

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. Subject to the caveats and clarifications noted below, the following list includes the kinds of publications that will be considered as scholarship, ordered from most significant to least significant for the purposes of the annual review process:

1. Books with publishers having good academic reputations and meaningful peer review. Books with leading university presses will usually count more heavily 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 high quality peer-reviewed journals. The definition of high quality journals will vary across subfields and academic peer groups, and will also change over time. In general, high quality is evidenced by serious review process, lower acceptance rates, and/or evidence of scholarly impact in discipline and/or sub-field.

3. Peer reviewed edited books, edited special issues of a journal, or textbooks that contribute to the synthesis of knowledge (revised editions of textbooks will receive less credit than first editions).

4. Chapters in peer reviewed edited volumes or articles in other peer reviewed journals.

5. Books with little evidence of, or limited, peer review, or with lesser scholarly reputations.

6. Articles in non-peer reviewed journals or books.

7. Research notes or commentaries in scholarly journals.

8. Book reviews in scholarly journals.


10. Re-publications of past published work in scholarly outlets (e.g. in edited collections, translations of past work)

11. Other non-refereed publications such as magazine articles, newspaper articles, trade publications, briefing papers, research reports, and on-line scholarly commentary. As noted above, if these
publications are to be considered under the category of scholarship, the university has noted 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. Faculty members may choose instead to have these non-refereed publications considered under the category of service.

Some caveats and clarifications apply to this list and ordering:

- The department recognizes the subfield-specific nature of scholarly expectations. As a result, the ordering systems are intended to be general in scope and leave room for interpretation and negotiation. If faculty members want to make a case that a publication should count in a higher category, they are welcome to do so.
- 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 retain their significance within the ordering system outlined above, but they carry less weight than single-authored publications.
- Although the scholarship of tenured faculty is evaluated on a two year basis, publications will be recognized only once during the year they were published. Publications are recognized in other ways during previous years by being recorded and evaluated under categories such as: conference papers, papers under review, papers accepted for publication, etc. Similarly, faculty members are encouraged to submit evidence of reviews of published work (and other pieces of evidence of impact) in the years following a publication.
- In cases where a faculty member holds a joint appointment with another academic unit, the faculty member may request that special consideration be given to the scholarship expectations of the other unit.
- Evidence of impact of publications can be provided (e.g. reviews, citations etc)
- Publications in category 1 are normally rewarded by the department with an outstanding evaluation (2.0). Faculty members can choose whether to claim credit for this category of publication during the year in which it was published or during the subsequent year.
2.3 Scholarship within the process of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor

2.3.1 Minimum publication standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor

Peer-reviewed publications will be the central consideration in determining performance in the area of scholarship vis-à-vis tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The department sets a minimum level of publications that normally must at least be met to be considered for the “satisfactory”, “strong” and “very strong” performance standards in scholarship that are noted in Policy 77:

To be considered for the “strong” performance standard in scholarship, a candidate must at least have a publication record that meets both of the following two standards that draw on the publication categories outlined in section 2.2 above:
- Standard A: EITHER one book from category 1 OR three articles from category 2
- Standard B. Three other items from categories 1-4.

To be considered for the “very strong” performance standard in scholarship, a candidate must at least have a publication record that meets Standard A twice and B once.

To be considered for the “satisfactory” performance standard in scholarship, a candidate must at least have a publication record that meets Standard A.

The standards for publication levels outlined above are minimum standards; that is, they are expected but not necessarily sufficient conditions to meet the standards of “satisfactory”, “strong” or “very strong” scholarship records. As Policy 77 notes, “the primary assessment of quality, originality and impact is made by referees and DTPC members on the basis of examining examples of the candidate's work.” Publications other than those in categories 1-4 will be considered by referees and the department tenure and promotion committee in evaluating the candidate's overall scholarship performance.

Some extra points on publications in relation to the tenure and promotion process:
Policy 77 notes: “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 exceptional circumstances, the DPTC may decide that a candidate has “satisfactory”, “strong” or “very strong” performance in scholarship because of the unusually high quality, originality and impact of their publications, even if those publications do not meet the minimum level standards outlined above. To be considered for this exceptional treatment, candidates must provide evidence of this kind of quality, originality and impact of their publications.

Policy 77 notes: “The candidate is responsible for documenting contributions made to team research and jointly authored work. Joint work with students supervised by the candidate should be identified.” 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. The DTPC may determine that additional publications are required to meet Standards A and B when candidates for tenure and promotion have co-authored or co-edited publications in categories 1-4.

Policy 77 notes: “Particular attention will be paid to assessing the likelihood that candidates will continue their scholarly activities once tenure has been awarded.” Although the candidate’s entire publication output counts towards the tenure and promotion decision, the candidate must demonstrate evidence of active publication and research during the probationary period.

Publications accepted for publication at the time of the tenure application will be counted equally to those already published.

The department encourages publication of dissertation research but expects the candidate to show evidence of establishing a research agenda that goes beyond the dissertation.

Candidates with a published book are encouraged to submit evidence of the good reputation and meaningful 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 according to the criteria outlined above (i.e. serious review process, lower acceptance rates, and/or evidence of scholarly impact in discipline and/or sub-field). Candidates are also encouraged to include evidence about the extent to which other scholars have made reference to their work. Work that was published in an outlet not normally considered as falling within Category 1 and 2 may be considered by the
DTPC to fall within these categories if it has been very widely referenced by other scholars.

- In cases where a faculty member holds a joint appointment with another academic unit, the faculty member may request that special consideration be given to the publication expectations of the other unit.

2.3.2 Other evidence of scholarship for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor

Other kinds of evidence will be considered in evaluations of scholarship performance for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor beyond publications. These include:

- Evidence of the other activities listed in section 2.1 above as evidence of scholarship
- 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.
- Research grants. Probationary faculty are encouraged to apply for research grants, and the winning of research grants is positive indication of quality scholarship. At the same time, the department does not consider successful research grants 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 or are not conducive to joint participation with other scholars.
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 should be based on evidence relevant to any or all of 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.

3.1.1 Course evaluations
Assessment of teaching will be significantly influenced by course evaluations provided by students. The two scores regarded as most significant for this exercise are question 8 (Overall Evaluation of the Course) and question 9 (Overall Evaluation of the Instructor). Undergraduate and graduate courses are evaluated each time they are taught, and faculty members are responsible to ensure that this occurs.

Not all courses are the same. Context relevant to the interpretation of student evaluations includes: the course size, level, degree of technicality, status as required or optional, proportion of Political Science majors/honours among the students, number and experience of Teaching Assistants, response rate on the evaluation, whether the course involved new preparation, and one’s teaching load in that term (including number of new preparations). 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 Political Science Honours students are expected to have higher course evaluations. Such differences will normally be factored into the evaluation of the scores.

3.1.2 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 for counting it as research. Supervision in programs to which
political science contributes teaching resources (such as the Global Governance, Master of Public Service, and Master in 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. 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. Delivering the components of a graduate degree to all the students the Department admits is a shared responsibility in Political Science. 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; and conducting mock interviews for students with impending academic job interviews. Faculty can choose whether they count these activities as teaching or as service.

It is the department’s goal to provide good supervision for all students. Good supervision depends not simply on the faculty member’s effort but also on the abilities of the student and the supervision style that the supervisor and supervisee decide on. For some students, merely completing the degree may be a sign that they are receiving outstanding supervision. The department recognizes that strong output may not necessarily be correlated with strong supervision, and vice versa. Faculty members are not dissuaded from taking on weaker students; indeed, a willingness to take on more difficult cases should be recognized.

The quality of supervision can often be assessed by reports of external thesis examiners and by the impact of the thesis itself (i.e., did it become an enduring part of the literature in the field). However, because of variances in student ability and commitment, providing evidence for good supervision is difficult. A student’s publications, presentations at conferences, or placements in good graduate programs or jobs may be evidence of good supervision, but may also just be evidence of a student’s abilities. Problematic supervision may be
manifest in the need for another faculty member to take on work that ought to have been completed by the supervisor; on the other hand, a broken supervisory relationship might not reflect a lack of good supervision. While recognizing that a supervisee’s performance is not entirely in the control of the supervisor, faculty members are expected to avoid problematic behaviours that are in their control, such as frequently slow feedback on draft work, disorganization, poor communication, shifting or inconsistent advice, or inaccessibility for meetings. In such cases, reports are likely to come to the Department Chair (either directly or indirectly via the Graduate or Undergraduate Advisor), and relevant information should be reported by the Chair to the performance review committee. Supervisory conduct that unreasonably slows the completion of students’ programs amounts to unsatisfactory teaching. When evaluating supervision, context matters, and the committee will consider all plausible metrics submitted by the faculty member or received by the Chair from students or the Graduate or Undergraduate Advisor.

3.1.3 Other evidence of teaching performance
In addition to student evaluations and information about supervision, other sorts of evidence of teaching performance might include the following items that have been submitted by the faculty member or have otherwise come to the attention of the Chair or the performance review committee:

- 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 department 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 and critiques by faculty or university colleagues and by students, alumni or Teaching Assistants
• 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.

3.2 Teaching within annual performance reviews

For annual performance reviews, the Department Chair will provide the performance review committee with information about each faculty member’s required teaching load for the year being evaluated, as well as the scores from the course evaluations of all faculty members being reviewed. In addition to listing the courses they have taught (including new preparations) and supervisory loads, faculty members may submit other sources of evidence, such as those relating to items outlined in section 3.1.3, as part of their annual activity report relating to teaching performance. Faculty members are also welcome to explain other circumstances that may be relevant to an evaluation of their teaching performance.

Assessment of teaching for the performance review will be significantly influenced by course evaluations provided by students, in keeping with the points noted above. Faculty receiving student evaluations that were significantly above the departmental average (taking into consideration the contexts noted above, as well as the possibility that the overall level of teaching quality in the department was unusually high by Faculty of Arts standards in that year) would normally earn a teaching performance score above the departmental average. Faculty receiving student evaluations that were significantly below the departmental average (taking into consideration the contexts noted above, as well as the possibility that the overall level of teaching quality in the department was unusually high by Faculty of Arts standards in that year) would normally earn a teaching performance score below the departmental average.

All other things being equal, when a faculty member’s supervisory load is consistent with departmental norms, that faculty member shall normally be considered to be performing at the “good” (1.25) level, and evidence of the quality of supervision may raise or lower the score accordingly. Please note that evidence will be required to warrant a rating of Satisfactory (1.0) or above in teaching. To warrant a rating of Outstanding (2.0) in teaching, extremely positive evidence is required, such as major instructional
innovation, nomination and/or winning of a teaching award, or other kinds of extremely positive recognition by peers or students.

For tenured faculty, teaching is evaluated on the basis of work done since the previous evaluation.

3.3 Teaching within the process of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor
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. 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, 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.”

Candidates for tenure and promotion in the department should assemble a teaching dossier that includes: student evaluations, 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, student comments if they are solicited on a systematic basis, peer evaluation of teaching skills, course content, and course materials, and other indications of teaching excellence. Candidates for tenure and promotion are evaluated on their entire teaching record.
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 that were close to the departmental average over the last two probationary years in the categories of Overall Evaluation of the Course and Overall Evaluation of the Instructor (taking into consideration the contextual factors noted above, as well as the possibility that the overall level of teaching quality in the department was unusually high by Faculty of Arts standards in those two 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 in the categories of Overall Evaluation of the Course and Overall Evaluation of the Instructor (taking into consideration the contextual factors noted above, as well as the possibility that the overall level of teaching quality in the department was unusually high by Faculty of Arts standards in those four years). However, to earn a “very strong” performance in teaching, student evaluation scores alone are not sufficient. A wider body of extremely positive supporting evidence drawn from items in Section 3.1.3 is required, 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.
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.”

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.”

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, there are three categories of service that may be reported in annual performance reviews, and there is an expectation of faculty members to contribute to the department. Beyond these three categories, extra-university activity 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 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.

The department takes notes 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 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. A meaningful extra-departmental service contribution to the Faculty or University.
   b. Meaningful external service to the academic discipline, profession or community.

As an Appendix, 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 displaced 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 should 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 home 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 taken into account as service to the department. Service as chair or associate chair is 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, and 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 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

This document was first approved unanimously by the Department on May 12, 2011. Re-approved unanimously since then each year. Most recently approved in December 2015 for use in 2016.
Faculty Performance Expectations and the Evaluation Process
Department of Psychology

November 2016

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 annually. Faculty members are to be provided with the updated document annually to assist with the preparation of their Activity Reports. Faculty members are also to receive the annually updated “Faculty of Arts Guidelines for the Annual Performance Review for Faculty” (attached).

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 2019 for the calendar years 2017 and 2018). 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 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 will use the following intervals. Beginning with evaluation of the 2017 and 2018 calendar years (in early 2019), tenured and continuing faculty will submit an Activity Report in December 2018 covering two years of activity in Research, Teaching, and Service (from January 1, 2017 to December 31, 2018). The full two years of evidence in each of the three areas will inform ratings for the 2019 merit increases, ratings which will carry forward for the 2020 merit increases as well. Beginning with evaluation of the 2017 calendar year (in early 2018), definite-term and probationary faculty will submit an annual Activity Report each December. This report will detail two years of activity in Teaching and Service (for the 2017 report, 2017 teaching and service activity will be the evidence for the evaluation; 2016 activity will provide context for the evidence), and detailing all research activity so
far in career (2016 and 2017 activity will be the evidence for the 2017 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 is attached). The categories and their sequence must be the same as in the template, greatly facilitating the work of the APRC. In what follows, the three components of the Activity Report are described in the order that they are currently set out in the template. [Note that each section of the Activity Report begins with a summary and that a section for awards concludes the Activity Report.]

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 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., $h$, $i_{10}$, 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 ordinarily will be 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. 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. As well, it is required by the Faculty of Arts that the ratings for each course be summarized at the right in the table of courses taught. At minimum, this course rating summary will consist of the mean rating for questions 1-9 on the Arts Course Questionnaire for each course taught. 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. Other information related to the quality of undergraduate teaching and supervision may be presented in the “Qualitative” section at the end of the undergraduate part. Faculty members are encouraged to use this section to report, for example, such accomplishments as awards won by undergraduate students, student feedback, student presentations at conferences, and student success in admission to postgraduate programs. 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. [Where course ratings are available, these should be summarized in the table of courses.] 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 wish to 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, for example, graduate student research awards, graduate student grant council awards, postdoctoral fellowships, academic positions, etc. [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, DTPE, 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 & 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, 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.
Faculty should also consult the Service Standards for Faculty (Faculty of Arts).

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 (May 2011) 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 x Teaching) + (.4 x Research) + (.2 x 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.
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.
Addendum to the Faculty of Arts Guidelines for the Performance Review for Faculty

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND LEGAL STUDIES
(Approved with Amendments 17 November 2016)
Effective dates: 01 January 2017 to 31 December 2018

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 about 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 objective of performance reviews is to be helpful and encouraging, to give an accurate account of the positive and negative aspects of the Member’s work, and to provide the Member the means to do a better job.

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 these 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; 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.

3.3. Members on Long Term Disability are not evaluated. The evaluation of the Chair of the Department will be undertaken by the Dean of Arts.
3.4. **Performance Review Committee**

3.4.1. 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 two 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.

3.5. 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.

3.6. 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 by prior agreement with the Chair (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.

3.7. 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, on odd numbered years, for tenured or continuing appointments
  o 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. After consulting 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 the course of 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, 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 good academic reputations. Leading university presses will usually be given a higher value, but in some fields other presses can have equally strong or stronger reputations.
   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 good academic reputations. Leading university presses will usually be given a higher value, but in some fields other presses can have equally strong or stronger reputations.
   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) 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) Contractual research and/or invited presentations for significant professional groups and audiences (e.g., government and other social agencies). If the research and/or presentation was undertaken on a fee for service basis it should only constitute evidence of scholarly productivity only if it can be demonstrated to be part of a program of research resulting in published articles or books. 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) Books published with presses that essentially facilitate self-publishing.

  n) 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 the variation in kinds of scholarly activity and expectations associated with the different sub-fields 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 to indicate 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 their 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. Evidence of the quality of undergraduate teaching is derived largely from the standard student course evaluations administered by the Faculty of Arts, or an equivalent approved by the Chair, which each Member is required to administer for all of the courses taught each year. Official course evaluation scores are to be submitted with the performance report. Two scores from these evaluations are of greatest significance: “Overall Evaluation of the Course,” and “Overall Evaluation of the Instructor.” Written comments from the student evaluations are for instructor use only and should not be submitted for the purpose of performance evaluation. Credit will also be given to the work involved in supervising Senior Honours Essays and developing new courses as these activities significantly enhance the quality of the education we offer undergraduates in our program.

5.2.2. In making the evaluation of a Member’s teaching, contextual factors will be taken into consideration (e.g., course size, level of the course, the degree of technical difficulty, status as required or optional, the member’s teaching load that term). Members may also wish to submit reports from outside observers, their peers or otherwise, who have attended their lectures or other kinds of 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 appropriate 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 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 (the list is not meant to be exhaustive):
   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) Willing to take on hard-to-cover courses
   g) 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 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.
   h) Low levels of 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 assure 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.

6.5. **University Service**: Activities that can be counted as evidence of university service include (the list is not meant to be exhaustive):
   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
   g) Editorial roles (with the value being commensurate with the amount of work required and the reputation of the publications involved)
   h) Editorial and advisory board roles
   i) Service for academic and professional societies, organizations, and committees
   j) Adjunct appointments to other departments or universities
k) Visiting Professorship appointments, involving teaching or supervising activities, at other universities

6.6. **Community Service:** Activities that can be counted as evidence of community service related a Member’s scholarly activities include (the list is not meant to be exhaustive):

a) 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)

b) Serving on the adjudication committees of external funding agencies for scholarships and research grants, serving as external examiner

c) Articles, editorials, commentary, or interviews in the media

d) Invitations to speak to and/or advise policy-makers, community and civil society groups, think tanks, and testimony before government bodies

e) Service awards from academic and professional groups

6.7. **Service Standards:**

To receive a score of 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

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 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 publically accessible.
INTRODUCTION

This document provides guidelines for the evaluation process and the performance expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service for faculty within the Spanish and Latin American Studies Department 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.

Faculty members at the University of Waterloo fulfill their job descriptions by doing some combination of teaching, research, and service. The annual 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.

THE ANNUAL PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

General Information

The Department will vote every 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. Spanish and Latin American Studies 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 formula: (.4 x Teaching) + (.4 x Research) + (.2 x Service).
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 (over December and January, traditionally), faculty members are invited to submit information detailing their activities 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 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.

The expectation for each faculty member is that they 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 evaluations.
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. 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 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.

- 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.

**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.

It is expected that senior and junior faculty members will provide evidence of constant dedication to 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. From most significant to least significant, the default categories of research significance are:

- 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.

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 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**

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 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”*
Generally speaking, 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. 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
- Representative to the Faculty of Arts Language and Laboratory Advisory Committee
- Coordinator of High School Outreach Program
- Exchange Program Coordinator
- Department Scholarship Coordinator
- Member of the Faculty Association Council of Representatives
The candidate’s academic service is normally evaluated through evidence of a great sense of responsibility and commitment in performing the assigned duties.

2. Faculty / University Service

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
- 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
- Outreach Activities