

French Department Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines for 2017 and 2018

Approved at the November 18, 2016 departmental meeting.

THE FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATING SCALE

0	Unsatisfactory
0.25	Less than satisfactory; needs improvement
0.5	Less than satisfactory; needs improvement
0.75	Less than satisfactory; needs improvement
1.0	Satisfactory
1.25	Good
1.5	Very Good
1.75	Excellent
2.0	Outstanding

Typical formula for professors:

Research: 40%
Teaching: 40%
Service: 20%

Formula for lecturers:

Teaching: 80%
Service: 20%

At the departmental level, the view is that there is nothing inherently problematic in a probationary-term faculty member's having scores that initially fall at the lower end of the departmental or faculty distribution. Such scores may simply represent a nascent research program, lack of experience as an instructor, or initial adaptation to the service aspects of a professorial career. In these cases, what matters is that scores are not so low as to be objectively problematic (Unsatisfactory; Needs Improvement) and that they generally improve over the period of one's probationary term.

Overall scores that plateau in the Satisfactory-Good range over several years may be seen as marginal progress toward tenure; the interpretation of such scores will come down to specifics in the sub-scores and to the details of the faculty member's vita over that time period.

The Department will vote every spring as to how performance evaluations will be conducted – either by chair alone or by a committee of tenured department members who will advise the Chair.

Documentation is to be provided that gives evidence of the activity/achievement being claimed. The Department of French Studies usually requires all course evaluations, offprints of articles, letters of commendation etc. to be submitted with the Activity Report.

In any of the categories, to receive a score of 2.0 the contribution must be truly outstanding in terms of its impact or amount of effort required, or it must mark an extremely high level of accomplishment, or it must demonstrate ability much beyond the departmental norm.

Recent output and impending output can rightly influence an appraisal.

The expectation for each faculty member is that they will perform well in the categories below.

1. APPRAISAL OF TEACHING

For Professors, the standard teaching load in the Department is currently four courses per academic year. For Lecturers, the standard teaching load is currently eight courses per academic year.

The following factors will be taken into account when evaluating a department member's teaching:

- Quantitative information, such as: number of courses taught; number of students taught; scores on course evaluations; number of theses/dissertations supervised; number of grad defense committees served on.
- Qualitative information, such as: new or repeat course; degree of innovation or inventive teaching practices; course observations by others; training of graduate students; involvement in student success; awards; curriculum development.

2. APPRAISAL OF RESEARCH

The assessment of research quality and intensity is particularly open to case-specific considerations. The key measure of research activity is published or presented original research output. But other measures are also relevant, including: evidence of research impact; winning research grants and research awards, especially Tri-Council and other external awards (foundations, government agencies, etc.); and organizing conferences and academic institutes that advance research and promote the research reputation of the Department. Equal consideration will be given to digital resources (web sites, databases, programs, etc.) when the dossier provides evidence that such work represents original and substantial scholarship. Types of assessment may include formal peer review, citation metrics, and public impact. Other evidence of activity and standing as a scholar includes supervision of student research, invitations to present "keynote" addresses, election to and awards received from professional and disciplinary societies, service as a referee for journals, e-journals, and granting councils, and membership on government or professional committees. (Policy 77)

The following factors will be taken into account when evaluating a department member's research:

Quantitative information, such as paper or on-line publications: number of books, chapters, articles, presentations, book reviews, reference articles, public press articles; number of edited volumes or special journal issues; number of presentations, workshops; research grants.

Qualitative information, such as: review process of the publication/press; demonstrated impact of the member's work (e.g. reviews, proven usage of a website, database or other digital materials); invited or refereed conference presentations; awards.

Please note: Single or co-authorship is assessed according to the practices of discipline involved; published work that straddles the assessment period (e.g. date of acceptance -> date of publication) should be noted, and it can count towards both assessment periods, but in only one assessment period

should it ever be considered outstanding; Work in progress is required for non-tenured members; tenured members may provide information on work in progress if they wish in order to demonstrate the ongoing nature of their activities or to provide context for future achievements.

Probationary faculty should ensure the maintenance of quantifiable research output over the short term, even if longer-term and larger-scale research projects are also under way.

3. APPRAISAL OF SERVICE

It should be taken as a faculty member's duty to find ways of contributing service-wise to the Department. Departmental affairs moreover require the existence of a range of committees. Some of these are standing committees, some are periodically and predictably reconstituted, and some are ad hoc committees intended to deal with specific issues.

Service in these committees too can be a substantial contribution, depending on the number of issues that fall to the committee in a given year.

This can be considered Open-Door service: the contribution that faculty members make to the Department by being present during regular office hours; by being readily available for consultation with students and other faculty members. Absenteeism, a reduced departmental presence, or chronic tardiness or disorganization in the completion of administrative tasks all lead to some burdens falling disproportionately upon those faculty who are in their offices, available, and responsive. They also create additional work for departmental administrators and support staff. Problematic performance in these aspects of Service is likely to be reflected in one's annual appraisal.

The Department and the University recognize and encourage service at the Faculty level, at University level and to the wider discipline, board membership in academic societies; community outreach; and academic mentorship not amounting to teaching. Some service activities, such as chairing a curriculum committee or editing a professional society journal, may also provide indirect evidence for scholarship and teaching.

"Citizenship" has not been expressly stated as a category, but it is understood that department members are expected to contribute positively to the life of the department, the faculty, the university, and the discipline.

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

- Memorandum of Agreement between FAUW and UW.
- Policy 77: Tenure and Promotion.
- Review of the Faculty Performance Evaluation Process and its recommendations as revised by the Faculty Relations Committee. The Review will be available at: <https://uwaterloo.ca/provost/memos-reports>.
- Faculty of Arts Guidelines for the Faculty Performance Evaluation: <https://uwaterloo.ca/arts/information-faculty-and-staff/faculty-arts-internal-documents>.