

## Report of FRC Working Group on Faculty Performance

The following recommendations are supported by (i) a survey of faculty performance assessment practices and (ii) analyses of merit scores across campus (all units and Faculties). These analyses included quantitative pair comparisons of merit score histograms for teaching, research and service, as well as historical trends (2020-2025) of the mean and median of the overall rating (R) by rank, unit and Faculty. Presentation of the results to FRC have been made on June 26, 2025, September 4, 2025, September 18, 2025, November 13, 2025. Representative results are included in the Appendix.

The data show that while overall R scores do not increase over time during the period investigated, the scores are generally inflated. Merit scores representing “less than satisfactory” performance (<1.0) in research, teaching or service are hardly observed, while merit scores representing “more than excellent” performance (2.0) are often observed with unreasonably high frequency. In general, merit score distributions are highly skewed to the low end. Merit score differences between faculties are more significant than differences across time, and differences between ranks are even more significant. Pair comparisons show significant differences between units in the same faculty that are difficult to explain.

All the above observations are indicative of faculty performance evaluation practices lacking clarity on how **the full spectrum of the FPR scores available (MOA Article 13.5.3) is to be interpreted and applied** - as is also suggested by the results of the survey of unit heads conducted by this FRC Working Group.

### **Recommendation 1:**

Each Department is required to have an Addendum to their Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines setting out the performance expectations in the Department for scholarship, teaching and service (MoA Article 13.5.1b).

**It is recommended that Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines explicitly require Departmental Addenda to clearly specify what constitutes less-than-satisfactory (a rating less than 1.0) and outstanding (a rating of 2.0) performances in each of scholarship, teaching and service.**

The revised addenda should be submitted to the Dean by October 15, 2026, in accordance with the MOA13.5.1.b.

### **Recommendation 2:**

Nine of the 26 departments/schools that responded to the survey conducted by the FRC Working Group on Faculty Performance indicated they differentiated between “research active” and “non-research active” tenure-stream faculty. Definitions of “research active” typically included holding research grants and supervising at least a specified number of graduate students, although variability in definitions existed. In some departments, research-active faculty have reduced teaching loads. However, the normal contractual weighting for research for tenure-stream faculty is not zero (and typically is 40%), such that faculty members are contractually obligated to be research-active.

**It is recommended to discontinue the use of the terms “research active” and “non-research active” for tenure-stream faculty. In addition to Article 13.5.3 of the MoA, a faculty member’s research activity should be assessed in accordance with Faculty Guidelines and Departmental Addenda that make no reference to these terms.**

### **Recommendation 3:**

Adoption of the above two recommendations is expected to result in (i) reduction of the average merit score to 1.5 or less in each of research, teaching and service, (ii) reduction of the skewness of merit score histograms, and (iii) reduction of unwarranted variability (e.g., between ranks).

**It is recommended that analysis of merit score data along the lines informing this report be carried out on a biennial basis to quantitatively assess the effect of Recommendations 1 and 2.**

# Appendix





