

Faculty of Engineering Guidelines for Performance Reviews

Preamble

The Faculty of Engineering is committed to:

Excellence in Teaching – The Faculty is committed to excellence in its teaching programs. The measures of success are the quality of the undergraduate and graduate students who are attracted to the programs and the degree of success of our graduates.

Excellence in Research – The Faculty is committed to excellence in research. The measures of success are the quality of the faculty, the quality of the research, and the quality and success of our graduates at the Masters and Doctoral levels.

Excellence in Service – The Faculty is committed to excellence in service - both internal and external. Internal service involves service to the Department, the Faculty and the University. External service involves contributions to the profession, to a faculty member's research field and to the public.

The above is a basic mission statement. All of our policies and practices, i.e., hiring, tenure, merit, admission criteria, etc. and specifically these guidelines, must be interpreted in a manner consistent with this statement.

Duties and Responsibilities of a Faculty Member

To varying degrees, engineering faculty at Waterloo are responsible for the following activities: classroom and studio teaching; student advising; development of new curricula; writing of textbooks; laboratory development; courseware (software) development; keeping up-to-date in related disciplines; exploration of new teaching and research areas; raising funds to help support research needs; frontier research and technology transfer in their engineering discipline; the education and research supervision of graduate students; supervision of post doctoral fellows and research associates; supervision of research personnel; service to the Department, Faculty and the University; interaction with industry in consultative and collegial relationships; performance of public service via membership in international, national, provincial and local committees dealing with professional issues; review and editing of journal articles; review of research proposals and engineering projects of peers.

Assignment of Duties

The Chair or Director of the Department or School is responsible for the equitable assignment of duties. A "normal" load for full-time faculty members in the Faculty is:

- teaching a full load per year
- undergraduate and graduate student supervision
- research as measured by the usual processes
- appropriate internal and external service

The normal weights for assessment shall be 40 percent for teaching, 40 percent for scholarship, and 20 percent for service. Adjustments to the weightings arranged in accordance with Sec. 13.5.5(b) of the MOA are to be reported by the Department Chair to the Departmental Merit Committee. The adjustment for weights involve a change in expectations for quantity of work but not for quality. The maximum teaching load is six courses per year.

Performance Reviews

Performance reviews are necessary in order that well-informed recommendations can be made regarding a faculty member's career progress. Performance reviews are required for all regular faculty (Lecturers to Professors, on full-time, part-time and reduced load appointments). Performance evaluations shall occur on an annual basis for faculty members holding probationary or definite-term appointments, and on a biennial basis on odd numbered years for faculty members holding tenured or continuing appointments (Article 13.5.2(a) of MOA). Each faculty member will be invited to discuss his/her performance with the Departmental Merit Committee.

Normally, performance is assessed in three areas: *teaching, research and scholarship, and service* (see Notes a, b, c below). 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. Review procedures

Performance is assessed by the Chair of the Department/ Director of the School and a Departmental Merit Committee, jointly, in accordance with the practice outlined in Section 13.5 of the MOA signed between the Faculty Association and the University. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to provide the Chair with evidence of performance in each area of evaluation by following procedures established within each Department. The assessment will normally be done on the basis of this submission. The Dean may modify the ratings for a faculty member or members of a Department, if necessary, to maintain consistency of standards across the Faculty (Sec. 13.5.7 of MOA). The Chair and/or the committee may ask for and obtain additional information. The faculty member will be informed of the nature of this information and the weight given to it.

For faculty in their first year a score should be assigned based on actual performance or, when too little information is available, a score equal to the department average for their rank.

Performance in each area is assigned one of the following seven categories, clearly bearing in mind the Faculty of Engineering mission statement.

Numerical Rating	Meaning
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

An overall weighted performance assessment (from 0.00 to 2.00) is calculated per Note (d), below.

The results of the above deliberation are forwarded to the Dean who, in discussion with the Department Chairs, will make the final recommendations on its assessments. A faculty member on paid or unpaid leave where it is not possible to assess performance in all three categories during the evaluation year(s) shall receive a rating equal to the average ratings of the three previous years in which the faculty member was not on leave (Article 13.5.4(b) of MOA).

2. Communication with the faculty member

The Chair shall inform the faculty member in writing of her/his final individual and overall ratings, and shall provide an opportunity for the faculty member to discuss her/his performance evaluation. The Dean shall evaluate the performance of Department Chairs and Associate Deans, and shall forward proposed performance ratings in the three categories and overall to the VPA&P for approval. The VPA&P shall inform the Dean and the Chair or the Associate Dean in writing with reasons of any changes in the recommended ratings.

A faculty member who disagrees with her/his performance evaluation should proceed first to the Department Chair, and then, if not resolved, to the Dean of the Faculty for

disposition. A Department Chair or Associate Dean who disagrees with her/his performance evaluation should proceed first to the Dean and then, if not resolved, to the VPA&P for disposition. Performance evaluations and selective salary increases are not normally grievable except under Article 9.2.2 or 9.2.3 of the MOA.

Notes

a. Teaching

Teaching is broadly defined to include class instruction, individual student consultation, undergraduate and graduate student supervision, and curriculum and course development. All faculty members are expected to be involved in the above, unless specific arrangements to the contrary have been made.

For professors the normal teaching "load" is defined by your department. Professors are expected to teach a full load unless special arrangements, duties, etc. have been previously approved by the Department Chair. There shall be an explicit record of such arrangements. For professors who choose to teach more than the normal load per year the expectations to supervise the normal number of graduate and undergraduate students appropriate for his or her rank will be reduced. Such an arrangement should be made in advance and in writing, and approved by the Department Chair.

For lecturers the normal teaching load is defined by your department. Graduate student supervision is normally not expected.

Classroom instruction includes organization of subject matter, preparation 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; however, other sorts of evidence of teaching quality will be considered.

Teaching involves more than classroom instruction. Hence it is expected that a faculty member demonstrate competence and effectiveness across the full spectrum of teaching activities including undergraduate project supervision; graduate student supervision; participation in graduate seminars; and contributions to curricula and course development.

Teaching performance will be assessed on the evidence from the year(s) under evaluation (Article 13.5.2(b) of MOA). However, faculty members will provide data for the last 3 calendar years to provide context to the assessed evidence.

b. Research and Scholarship

Scholarship in research is broadly defined to include research articles in refereed journals, research monographs, books, expository articles at all levels, innovative designs and patents, curated exhibitions and publications of designs, conference papers, reports, reviews, invited talks and addresses to professionally/learned societies, etc. Also it is recognized that involvement in committees responsible for national or international design standards is a form of scholarship. It is expected that contract work through the university will lead to scholarly output in one of these forms, and similarly,

that grant records of researchers will be an indication of scholarly accomplishment. However, neither contract nor grant activity per se are to be taken as evidence of scholarship.

Engineering is a professional faculty and some faculty, by virtue of their expertise, will become involved in private consulting activities. Private consulting which relates only marginally, or not at all, to the faculty members research program will not normally be considered during the review process. Consulting activity involving unique or original designs or concepts, etc., may be considered as contributing to scholarship, however the onus is on the faculty member to demonstrate and document the relevance, uniqueness, and significance of the consulting activity to scholarship. Such activities should not interfere with a faculty member's internal duties and obligations.

Research performance will be assessed on the evidence from a window of two years (Article 13.5.2(b) of MOA).

Supervision of postdoctoral fellows and non-student research personnel will be assessed as research.

c. Service

The successful operation of the university depends on the willingness of individuals to contribute. Good citizenship and a willingness to volunteer is a significant aspect of service.

Service includes internal contributions within the department, faculty, and university, and external service outside of the university. Internal service is a priority.

Internal service includes, but is not limited to, contributions through administrative appointments, memberships on comprehensive, defense, and other committees at all levels within the University, reading MASc theses, mentoring, high school liaison activities, liaison with local industry and related activities.

External service includes, but is not limited to, service on NSERC committees, code committees, editorial boards, conference organizing committees, working committees of professional societies, executive positions in professional societies, performing manuscript and grant reviews, etc.

The faculty member should document the significance, responsibilities (e.g., committee chairing) and time commitments of all reported service activities.

Service performance will be assessed on the evidence from the year(s) under evaluation (Article 13.5.2(b) of MOA). However, faculty members will provide data for the last 3 calendar years to provide context to the assessed evidence.

Faculty members are expected to demonstrate "Departmental citizenship" which includes, but is not limited to, mentoring new faculty members, being available in the

Department, being willing to take on hard-to-cover courses, and being available to students.

d. Assessment

A regular faculty appointment involves three main responsibilities: to communicate effectively the knowledge and nature of one's discipline via teaching, to advance the state of one's discipline via research, and to contribute to the administrative functions which support these goals through effective service. The overall rating for each faculty member shall be computed as the weighted average of the individual ratings in teaching, scholarship, and service, with the weights as arranged under "assignment of duties."

For faculty members on a biennial performance review cycle, the rating for non-review years shall be equal to the rating for the previous review year (Article 13.5.5(a) of MOA).

A Satisfactory performance in all three areas is expected of a faculty member.

It is recognized and accepted that an individual's level of performance in an area may vary considerably from year to year. For example, a faculty member who accepts a heavy administrative load may suffer a temporary drop in scholarly output and do less teaching. A faculty member who embarks on a major change in research area may also incur a temporary reduction or lapse in scholarly output and/or may have less than the usual amount of time available for other activities. Circumstances such as these will be recognized and weighed in the overall assessment. Similarly, it is recognized that faculty members judged equally satisfactory overall may have significantly different levels of performance in each category.

December 20, 2016