

**FACULTY OF ENVIRONMENT  
SCHOOL OF ENVIRONMENT, ENTERPRISE AND DEVELOPMENT**

**SEED PERFORMANCE REVIEW GUIDELINES**

**University and Faculty Policies**

Performance review of faculty members is conducted in accordance with the following University and Faculty policies, guidelines and forms:

- The Memorandum of Agreement between the University and Faculty Association
- University Policy 77
- Faculty Performance Review Regulations and Procedures
- Faculty Performance Evaluation Form (and Instructions)

These guidelines ought to be interpreted to be consistent with the above noted documents. In the event of a conflict between the SEED Guidelines and University or Faculty level guidance, the University and Faculty guidance shall prevail.

**Application of Guidelines**

These guidelines and the process described herein apply to all faculty members that are subject to performance evaluation within SEED; namely those faculty members who hold an appointment of greater than 50% in SEED. Where a faculty member holds a joint appointment with the majority appointment in SEED, the Chair of the other department shall be invited to give input into that member's performance.

Those faculty members that hold an appointment of less than 50% in SEED are evaluated in the unit in which they hold a majority appointment. The SEED Director shall provide written input into the evaluation of that member at the request of the other Chair.

These guidelines are intended to provide guidance for the conduct of annual performance evaluations. The performance expectations contained within these guidelines are not intended to provide minimum standards for the purposes of tenure and promotion. Clearly, as stated in University Policy 77, 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 School Tenure and Promotion Committee.

## **Context**

The purpose of these guidelines is to ensure that the annual performance reviews of SEED faculty are carried out in a manner that is transparent, consistent and fair. To achieve these ends, the guidelines ought to be applied with the following principles in mind:

- Assessment should account for stage of career considerations. It is the expectation of SEED that the standards across all three evaluation areas (teaching, research and service) increase as faculty members proceed through the academic ranks.
- As a workplace, SEED respects the need for faculty members to maintain an appropriate work life balance.
- SEED values interdisciplinarity and diversity of scholarship. Assessment of scholarship should account for diverse methods and approaches, as well as a variety of scholarly outputs. At the same time, SEED recognizes that traditional academic metrics, such as peer review and impact, remain at the centre of scholarly assessment.
- Engagement of external stakeholders is an important value within SEED. With this in mind, evaluation in all three evaluation areas should account for activities that promote knowledge mobilization to communities and individuals in areas within SEED's teaching and research mandates.
- SEED is a community of ideas. Collegiality among faculty and a willingness to contribute to the School's internal goals is highly valued.

## **Performance Evaluation Committee**

SEED shall use a Performance Evaluation Committee (PEC) that shall consist of two tenured or tenure-track faculty members (in addition to the Director of SEED) who are subject to these guidelines. The PEC shall provide advice to the SEED Director. The SEED Director, however, remains responsible for the evaluations and ratings.

The SEED Director shall appoint the PEC annually. The appointment shall be subject to approval by those Faculty members subject to these guidelines. Members of the PEC will typically serve a two year term. Appointments may be staggered to provide continuity on the PEC.

The PEC and SEED Director will meet at least once to review each faculty member's Faculty Activity Report (FAR). The evaluation shall be based on the information disclosed in the FAR. Members of the PEC or the Chair may seek clarification from faculty members with regard to any matter set out in the FAR.

## **Basis of Annual Evaluations**

Faculty shall be assessed on the basis of their contribution and output during the period of their assessment, which may be one or two calendar years. Probationary appointments and those on definite-term contracts will be evaluated annually; tenured faculty and continuing lecturers will be evaluated every two years. Assessments cannot be based on expected future outputs or on past achievements for which recognition has been received. Weighting shall be based on research/teaching/service division contained in the faculty members contract or as agreed upon in writing between the Director and the faculty member, in accordance with Faculty Performance Review Regulations and Procedures.

## **Teaching**

Faculty members shall be assessed on their undergraduate and graduate teaching responsibilities. The typical teaching expectation in SEED is one half course (.5 credit) or equivalent for each 10% points dedicated to teaching in that faculty member's appointment. (For example, a faculty member with a 40/40/20 division shall be expected to undertake four teaching tasks.)

Undergraduate and graduate student supervision forms part of each faculty members teaching assessment. Student supervision is undertaken in addition to the teaching tasks described above. Supervision includes Ph.D. and masters student theses, masters level major research papers and project supervision (unless teaching credit is given under an agreed upon arrangement). Levels of student supervision shall be based on an equitable distribution of supervisory functions among all faculty members. The factors that determine an equitable distribution include the number of incoming SEED students/projects with supervisory requirements, the faculty member's existing supervisory load, the faculty member's participation in other graduate student committee activities and personal and sabbatical leaves. Pre-tenured faculty members are expected to supervise fewer students than tenured faculty members and increase their numbers as they approach tenure.

Teaching evaluation is based primarily on the quality of teaching done. In assessing quality, the primary gauge of quality shall be course evaluations. It is expected that faculty ratings should be maintained at a course average of 75% (or higher) of students rating the instructor in the range of excellent (4 or 5 on the standard UW evaluation sheet). Consideration will also be given for factors such as class size, core versus elective courses, graduate versus undergraduate courses, number of contact hours, and other factors.

## **Scholarship**

It is understood that Indigenous scholars and scholars involved in Indigenous research can decide to be evaluated in a manner consistent with [SSHRC's Guidelines for the Merit Review of Indigenous Research](#)

### ***Funding***

Faculty members are expected to secure appropriate research funding to support their research activities. It is recognized that different research programs have varying funding support requirements, in assessing research funding the following factors shall be accounted for:

- The number of grants currently held
- Whether funding is peer reviewed / competitive and the degree of competitiveness (Faculty are encouraged to report rankings and success ratios in their FAR)
- The size and complexity of the grant application and subsequent management of grant once received
- The degree of responsibility within the grant by the faculty member
- The benefit of the grant to the scholarly objectives of the department, faculty and university, including training of highly qualified persons, support for student research, and support for knowledge mobilization

It is expected that untenured faculty shall apply for appropriate funding opportunities. It is expected that tenured faculty have an active funded research program.

### ***Publications***

Faculty members are expected to publish the results of their research in high quality, peer reviewed venues. It is also recognized that non-peer reviewed venues provide important avenues for knowledge mobilization, and as such faculty members are also encouraged to publish in venues that are suitable for a variety of intended audiences. Publications with students are also valued, and faculty members are encouraged to support student publications in both peer reviewed and non-peer reviewed venues through co-authorship.

In assessing research merit, priority will be given to refereed scholarly publications (as defined in Faculty Performance Review Regulations and Procedures). These are considered 'major' publications. Specifically this includes: Articles in journals – where journals with international and national stature will receive more emphasis than those in local journals; Books and monographs by recognized publishers (authored and edited); Chapters in books and monographs by recognized publishers; Special journal issues (as editor); Papers in conference proceedings (where this is the terminal publication) – the significance of the conference will be

considered; Other refereed publications with special significance, e.g., case studies, reports to government agencies or other groups.

Minor publications will include scholarly non-refereed publications as defined by the Faculty Performance Review Regulations and Procedures. Specifically this includes: Books and monographs (authored and edited) – those by recognized publishers will be given more emphasis; Articles in magazines and journals of criticism having substantial intellectual stature; Book chapters; Papers in conference proceedings; Presentations at academic and professional conferences – the significance of the conference and the nature of the presentation (e.g. an invited keynote presentation at a major international conference versus a presentation at a seminar); Applied publications and general agency reports that make a scholarly contribution; Book reviews; and Other publications.

In assessing the importance of individual outputs the following factors may be considered:

- The national or international stature of the publisher or journal and bibliometric factors (although these are not determinative)
- The contribution of the faculty member (where there are multiple contributors)
- The size and complexity of the contribution
- The stature of the conference (for presentations and proceedings)

The onus is on the faculty member to explain the significance of the research output, especially in non-peer reviewed venues.

Publications under preparation or in review may be evidence of academic activity, but are not evidence in themselves of satisfactory output.

For outputs prepared under contract or consulting arrangements to be considered in the evaluation of scholarship, the onus is on faculty members to demonstrate that these make a scholarly contribution. Proprietary reports, particularly those that are not publicly available will rarely be considered as making a scholarly contribution.

### ***Publication and Funding – Minimum Expectations for Satisfactory Performance***

Below are the minimum expectations per rank within a given year. As these are minimum annual expectations, this is not intended to indicate tenure or promotion expectations.

#### *Assistant Professor*

- Funding: Apply for or holding grant(s) and participation in funded research
- Publications: One major and one minor

#### *Associate Professor*

- Funding: Apply for or holding grant(s) as PI/co-applicant

- Publications: Two major. Or one major and two minor

*Full Professor*

- Funding: Apply for or holding successful grant(s) as PI/co-applicant
- Publications: Two major and one minor. Or one major and three minor

**Service**

All faculty members are expected to contribute to service within and outside the School and University. The following items are considered as part of service:

Evidence of good citizenship: attendance at meetings; participation in student recruitment and engagement activities; presence in the workplace; participation in events that promote Department, Faculty and University community, including participation in mental health training workshops.

Every member is expected to engage in internal service activities, such as participation in committees of the School, Faculty and/or University.

Every member is expected to engage in external service activities. External service includes service to professional and academic bodies. This may include activities such as conference reviewer, journal reviewer, journal editorial board member, conference executive member, funding application reviewer and participation in administration/management of professional and academic societies. External service also includes engagement with, and participation in, government, organizations, businesses, and community groups. For external commitments – priority will be given to service that meets goals of SEED. The onus is on the faculty member to demonstrate relevance.

Where consulting activities result in scholarship, they should be reported as scholarship in the Faculty Activity Report. Consulting activities that do not result in scholarship are not considered service, but should be reported in Section 5 of the Faculty Activity Report in accordance with University Policy 49.