

UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO  
FACULTY OF ENVIRONMENT  
**SCHOOL OF PLANNING FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW GUIDELINES**  
**Created December 2011**

(Amended January, 2015<sup>i</sup>, January 2017, September, 2018<sup>ii</sup>, September 2020)

**Current Approval July 18th, 2022. Effective January 1, 2023 -December 2024**

## **PREAMBLE**

The following School of Planning (SOP) Faculty Performance Review Guidelines (Guidelines) are consistent with the Memorandum of Agreement, Policy 77 and the recommendations of the *Working Group on Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation* (WGFAPE) that were approved by the Faculty Relations Committee in June, 2010. The guidelines reflect the principles in the Faculty of Environment Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, which supplement Policy 77. The following Guidelines provide unit level detail in areas of teaching, research and service as stipulated in Faculty Performance Review Regulations and Procedures. The Guidelines are therefore to be interpreted in conjunction with Policy 77 and Faculty Performance Review Regulations and Procedures.

In cases where weights are changed part way through an evaluation window, the weights that shall be applied for the entire evaluation are those weights that were in place for the majority of the evaluation period. In cases where a change in weights occurred exactly at the midpoint of an evaluation period, the individual shall choose which of the weights that were in place are to be used for the evaluation.

Performance evaluations shall occur on an annual basis for Faculty Members (including Lecturers, Assistant, Associate and Full Professors) holding probationary or definite-term appointments, and on a biennial basis on odd numbered years for Faculty Members holding tenured or continuing appointments. The descriptions for performance expectations are provided on an annual basis (one year time frame). Those members reviewed biennially will provide two years of performance data and the quantity expectations for satisfactory performance described in this document are subsequently doubled.

## **CONTEXT**

The intent of these Guidelines is to provide a framework used to evaluate the academic performance of faculty. This performance can take place and be influenced by factors external to the University and School of Planning work environment. These Guidelines permit the flexibility to consider the following factors in performance evaluation, although it should be noted that these factors are not themselves criteria for evaluation:

- Professionalism and integrity in how we carry out our work and interact with others
- Collegiality and mutual respect
- Maintaining vibrant connections with the planning profession and other professional associations relevant to faculty members' research areas
- Community engagement
- Appreciation for the diversity of scholarship in planning, bridging the professional and academic realms
- Understanding and respect for the unique forms of knowledge and experiences held by

Indigenous and other racialized colleagues

- Beyond the professional expectations, we recognize the importance of:
  - Work-life balance
  - A supportive and respectful work environment
  - Stage of life and health considerations
  - Unforeseen and extenuating circumstances
  - Ensuring 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 \(https://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/merit\\_review-evaluation\\_du\\_merite/guidelines\\_recherche-lignes\\_directrices\\_recherche-eng.aspx\)](https://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/merit_review-evaluation_du_merite/guidelines_recherche-lignes_directrices_recherche-eng.aspx)

### **Performance Evaluation Committee (PEC)**

- Advisory to the Director, a PEC committee of four tenured SOP faculty members, will review, and in conjunction with the Director, approve annual performance evaluations.
- To increase the efficiency of the related tenure and promotion process, all the members of the PEC will also serve on the School Tenure and Promotion Committee (STPC)
- The four individuals will serve one-year terms, and be elected from the pool of tenured faculty, as per the STPC membership requirements outlined in Policy 77.

### **SCHOLARSHIP**

Based on the directive of Faculty Performance Review Regulations and Procedures, the following outlines the SOP policy on “the relative balance between innovative design and peer-reviewed publication, and expectations regarding the quantity and quality of scholarly output relative to experience and rank.”

The SOP holds a dual position as an academic unit and professional school. Therefore, consideration in evaluation will be given to a wide range of outputs that (a) disseminate scholarly activity to an academic and professional audience and also to society at large and (b) contribute to public policy development. In keeping with the mission of the University as a research-intensive academic institution, most emphasis is placed on i) refereed scholarly publications with ii) scholarly non-refereed publications and iii) other outputs assigned less weight respectively. Within this prioritization exists the opportunity to recognize scholarly activity disseminated in categories ii) and iii). The onus is on faculty members to provide explanation and evidence of the quality and significance of their contributions, regardless of the type of scholarly output.

In the spirit of mentorship, faculty are encouraged to work with students in ways that facilitate student authorship of publications but must remain cognizant to adhere to principles of contribution and recognition to ensure attribution of those, and only those, who have materially contributed (see Policy 73 -- Intellectual Property Rights). This applies to the contributions of supervisor(s), committee member(s) and students.

### **Outlets**

The following describes the types of outlets for knowledge dissemination:

i) Refereed scholarly publication as defined in Faculty Performance Review Regulations and Procedures:

“Articles in journals – where journals with international or national stature will receive more emphasis than those in local or regional journals; Books and monographs by recognized publishers; Chapters (including appropriate editorial writing) in edited books or monographs by recognized publishers; Papers in conference proceedings; the significance of the conference will be considered; Other refereed publications with special significance, e.g., reports to government agencies or other groups.”

Faculty members focusing on design can also make a case that their design outputs of scholarly significance be counted as equivalent to refereed scholarly publications by evidence of an external review process conducted by expert(s) in a relevant field. As per Faculty Performance Review Regulations and Procedures:

“...greater importance will be given to design in the form of the following: exhibitions of national or international stature; design work, art, planning, computer programs, patents, and related innovative work of national or international stature; national or international awards for design, planning, buildings, etc.; films, film scripts and comparable work of a national or international stature.”

ii) Scholarly non-refereed publication as defined in Faculty Performance Review Regulations and Procedures:

“Books and monographs; those by recognized publishers will be given more emphasis; Articles in magazines or journals of criticism having substantial intellectual stature; Chapters (including appropriate editorial writing); those by recognized publishers will be given more emphasis; Papers in conference proceedings; the significance of the conference will be considered; Presentations at academic and professional conferences; the significance of the conference will be taken into account, as will 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 scholarly contributions; Book reviews; Other publications (e.g., maps or atlases).”

Faculty members focusing on design can make a case regarding the scholarly significance of their non-refereed design outputs. As per Faculty Performance Review Regulations and Procedures:

“Somewhat less importance will be assigned to design scholarship in the form of the following: exhibitions of regional stature; design work, art, planning, computer programs, patents and related innovative work judged of special significance regional awards for design, planning, building, etc.; films, film scripts and comparable work of regional stature.”

iii) Other outputs relevant to planning.

- Contract research that draws on and enhances the faculty member’s research activity and/or involves graduate students
- Articles in the media written by the faculty member that summarize or draw heavily on their scholarly activity. The size of the audience, national/international profile of the

media outlet and/or the share of a specific target population reached by the media coverage are taken into consideration to determine inclusion of an article in evaluation.

- Multimedia used to disseminate research findings from scholarly activity to a broader audience. The size of the audience reached is considered to determine inclusion.
- Development of computer software and programs considered of importance to the planning profession
- Invited presentations drawing on the faculty members' research activity to a political body such as a city council or planning board
- Testimony before a tribunal where the presentation or testimony is directly informed by the faculty member's own research activity

## **Quality**

The goal of scholarly activity and output is ultimately to have positive impacts on society, measured in a number of ways. In the academic realm, quality is partly evaluated through traditional metrics of outlet stature and citation indexes. It is recognized that citation indices vary in levels of sophistication; at a minimum, information should be included as to the number of non-self citations and the significance of the outlet where the work is being cited. Faculty members may explain the quality of their work in terms of the significance of the outlets specific to their field of expertise. Quality of their scholarship can also be measured in terms of its influence on policy development, decision-making or shaping values and beliefs in society at large. Faculty members bear responsibility for establishing the quality of their scholarship.

## **Funding**

Faculty members are expected to secure research funding for the support of their research program and related activities including research travel, conference attendance, research equipment, research computing, graduate student support, hiring research-related co-op students and to cover other research related expenses.

Faculty member involvement in Tri-Council and similar competitively secured and funded projects can take a number of forms: Principal investigator, team leader, co-investigator, group member, collaborator and advisory role. Faculty members may also take the role of consultant to government agencies, NGOs, charitable foundations or private sector interests.

## **Expectations**

The following outlines normal expectations for satisfactory performance regarding funding and the quantity of output by rank for the standard evaluation period of one year. As per Policy 77, the expectations for tenure and promotion require Faculty members to exceed satisfactory, particularly in terms of scholarship and teaching. Evaluation takes into account annual variations in publishing and securing funding that arise due to the nature of academic work by considering faculty members' performance over a two-year timeframe. Faculty members meeting the expectations stated below are assigned a performance evaluation of 1 on the 0-2 evaluation-scale used in the Faculty of Environment (EV). To receive scores above 1, faculty members must exceed these standards in one or more areas. The determination of exact score is a combination of reference to stated expectations in policy, as well as comparison within the SOP, and broader EV faculty complement.

Scores of 2 are normally reserved for faculty members attaining levels of performance that evidently demonstrate national/international leadership in their area of research and a record of funded research and publication at the level of other high performers in their field of study. Although tenure decisions are determined outside of the annual performance evaluation process, these evaluations play an important role and untenured faculty normally should aim to attain evaluations of 1.25 or higher to demonstrate performance that would merit submission of a tenure application. Associate Professors should regularly attain performance evaluations of 1.5 and higher to demonstrate performance that would merit submission of application to rank of Professor.

#### *Assistant Professor (output per year)*

##### Funding

- Evidence of application for external research funding
- Participation in at least one funded research project

##### Outputs

- 1 refereed scholarly publication and 1 output from category ii) and/or iii)
- Or 3 outputs from category ii) and/or iii)

#### *Associate Professor*

##### Funding

- Continuing evidence of application for external research funding
- Continuing participation in funded research projects
- May produce a successful research grant application as principal investigator or co-investigator

##### Outputs

- 1 refereed scholarly publication and 2 outputs from either category ii) and/or iii) above
- Or 4 outputs from either category ii) and/or iii) above
- ~~At least one of the above with a student or post-doctoral fellow as co-author~~

#### *Professor*

##### Funding

- Continuing evidence of application for external research funding
- Continuing participation in a leading role in funded research projects
- ~~Successful research grant application as principal investigator~~

##### Outputs

- 2 refereed scholarly publications (one as first author) and 2 outputs from either category ii) and/or iii) above
- Or 1 refereed scholarly publications (one as first author) and 4 outputs from either category ii) and/or iii) above
- ~~At least one of the above with a student or post-doctoral fellow as co-author~~

## **TEACHING**

Faculty members are expected to teach a normal course load of four half-credit courses per year (regular term courses at UW), with the opportunity to teach three in alternating years, maintaining a prioritization of teaching core graduate and undergraduate courses. The Performance Evaluation Committee may apply formulas to balance the credit given to such factors as class size, core versus elective, graduate versus undergraduate, number of contact hours or other factors.

### **Student Supervision**

All faculty members are expected to contribute to the supervision of undergraduate and graduate students completing senior honours essays and MAES, MES and MA thesis. The level of supervisory activity can be influenced by student demand, however, it is important that all faculty are engaged in graduate supervision. The normal supervision load for the Associate Professor level is three incoming students per year. Pre-tenured faculty members are expected to supervise fewer students and increase their numbers as they approach tenure. Those qualified for PhD supervision are expected to also take one or more incoming PhD students per year as their funding permits. Tenured faculty members, and those approaching tenure, are expected to serve as committee members and examiners for at least five students per year.

### **Quality of Teaching**

Maintaining high standards for quality of teaching is of central importance. Teaching quality shall be determined from a variety of sources as stipulated by Policy 77 and the ENV Performance Review regulations. The PEC will consider evidence of quality teaching such as, but not limited to, peer-reviews of teaching, student course perceptions, participation in teaching workshops and other efforts to develop teaching skills and improve student learning, and a commitment to keeping course materials up-to-date. The quality of graduate supervision may be assessed on the basis of student time to graduation, success in scholarship applications, publication of research and offers of employment. It is recognized that these metrics are imperfect, and that time to completion, scholarship success, and offers of employment in particular are often outside the supervisor's control. There are therefore also opportunities to explain the quality of teaching and supervision beyond the use of specific metrics. The PEC may take into account such factors as the size of the class, level of the class, type of class (core versus elective) and number of contact hours to evaluate teaching; and consider other specific contextual information on graduate supervision (including but not limited to contact hours, meeting frequency, professional development opportunities, or potential extenuating circumstances). It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide such detail.

## **SERVICE**

As part of their contribution to service, all faculty members are expected to:

- Take part in the functioning and life of the School as outlined in Faculty Performance Review Regulations and Procedures
- Take part in "internal service" at the unit and faculty/institution level
- Within the School, be an engaged committee member of at least 2 regular, or 2 ad hoc tasks/committees, per year (or less depending on other faculty/institutional commitments)

- Serve on at least one university or faculty level committee per evaluation period
- Be involved in the community as appropriate for their field of study and expertise such as serving as journal referees and editors and serving municipal committees, professional organizations
- New faculty members are expected to have fewer service commitments but increase their participation as they approach tenure
- Service commitments will vary with faculty members' assignment of formal administrative responsibilities

---

<sup>i</sup> Note: The amendment concerns the structure and creation of the Performance Evaluation Committee and was approved at the January 23<sup>rd</sup> 2015 School meeting.

<sup>ii</sup> Note: Amendments concern the approved Fall 2016 changes to UW MOA section 13 concerning performance evaluation and were approved at the Jan.13<sup>th</sup>, 2017.