

Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines for Arts

(as required by UW/FAUW MOA 13.5.1a)

General Principles

- Faculty performance reviews will be carried out in accordance with section 13.5 of the [Memorandum of Agreement](#) (MOA) and with the scholarship, teaching, service, and professional conduct expectations as set out in [Policy 77 - Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members](#).
- 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).
- Career path and outcomes vary by individual and throughout the course of a career; as a result, weightings can and should be adjusted to reflect an actual workload and individual circumstances, per the [MOA, 13.5.5](#).
- Service to the institution is required of all faculty members; professional engagement is also encouraged.

Performance Reviews

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

For definite-term, continuing lecturer, and tenured faculty members, a review of teaching, scholarship, and service (as appropriate) will be undertaken on a regular basis, according to the schedule set out in the Memorandum of Agreement.

Ratings

"Outstanding"

To be outstanding in any category, a faculty member should have given exceptional performance in that category. In teaching, an outstanding rating might be prompted by a major instructional innovation, award, or recognition by peers or students. In scholarship, exceptional performance should be measured by indicators appropriate to the discipline, such as a major publication, performance, or exhibition, or a prestigious scholarly award. To be outstanding in service requires extraordinary commitment of time and expertise to the department, Faculty, UW and/or the profession.

Approved by Arts Faculty Council in January 2017, in keeping with changes to the MOA approved in October 2016 and to take effect for the 2017 performance year

Updated November 2013

First issued in December 2011

Ratings (continued)

“Satisfactory”

A rating of 1.0 represents the minimum level of acceptable performance in a given year. A rating below this level in a given year, or a consistent pattern of 1.0 ratings in one or more categories over time, indicates the need for active consultation and problem-solving strategies between the Chair and faculty member.

A consistent pattern of 1.0 ratings would be a particular concern for a definite-term member who might be considered for reappointment, a probationary-term member seeking reappointment or tenure, or any member intending to seek promotion, in light of requirements for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, as outlined in [Policy 76-Faculty Appointments](#) and [Policy 77-Tenure and Promotion](#).

Less-than-Satisfactory

Ratings below 1.0 (0.75, 0.5, 0.25 and 0) will be used to identify areas in need of improvement.

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

- [Memorandum of Agreement – UW/ FAUW](#).
- [Policy 77: Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members](#)