This memo describes a clarification of the memo from FRC issued on October 9, 2020. That memo provided details about how the implementation of the option for faculty members to opt out of the performance review process for 2020 in light of the COVID-19 pandemic will be implemented. A revised, clean version of the October 9 memo is attached here for the reader’s convenience.

The procedures described in the earlier memo are not implementable as worded, given the way the system for calculating merit increases is implemented.

The original memo states (in point 8) that for faculty members receiving scores for both 2019 and 2020, “the weighted sum will be calculated for each year” and “the overall average for 2019-20 will be the mean of these two weighted sums.” However, what is required is instead:

For each area of teaching, research, and service, the weighting and average score must be calculated, with the average score rounded to the nearest increment of 0.25. The weighted sum of the results will be the faculty member’s overall score for 2019-2020 for the purposes of calculating merit.

This requires a corresponding adjustment to point 9:

When reporting final individual and overall ratings to the member (MOA 13.5.8.), the Chair will record which areas of activity, if any, were not evaluated in 2020, and in any area where they differ will indicate the yearly scores for 2019 and 2020.

If we consider the example of Professor X from the October 9 memo, the table below illustrates the difference the difference between the two processes. Given the amendments above the correct calculations for the example are displayed on the third row of the table below, while the calculation described in the original memo is in black in the two rightmost columns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Teaching (Wt) Scr</th>
<th>Research (Wt) Scr</th>
<th>Service (Wt) Scr</th>
<th>Annual score</th>
<th>2019-20 score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>(0.2) 1.25</td>
<td>(0.2) 1.5</td>
<td>(0.6) 2.0</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>(0.4) 1.50</td>
<td>(0.4) 1.5</td>
<td>(0.2) 2.0</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20 Averages* (i.e. 1.375 rounded up)</td>
<td>(0.3) 1.50</td>
<td>(0.3) 1.5</td>
<td>(0.4) 2.0</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Faculty members, University of Waterloo
    Faculty Deans
    Department Chairs and Directors of Schools

From: Faculty Relations Committee

Date: October 9, 2020, revised November 9, 2020

NB: revised sections 8, 9; revised D(c) subsumes previous D(d)

Subject: Faculty Performance Reviews for 2020

This memo follows up from the memo jointly issued on August 31, 2020.

On August 31, a memo was circulated by the Vice-President Academic & Provost and the President of the Faculty Association on behalf of the Faculty Relations Committee. The memo announced that in light of the fallout from the COVID pandemic and for 2020 only, faculty members would have the option to choose a regular performance review process or to opt out, in which case their performance review scores would be determined using a process modeled on MOA section 13.5.4(b). That MOA section describes how to handle evaluations in some other circumstances where normal evaluation is not possible for a faculty member.

The memo also promised that precise details would be communicated in due course. This memo provides those details.

1. All faculty members will submit activity reports as normally scheduled, including a report of activities in all three categories for 2020. For areas of activity faculty members choose not to have evaluated, they may submit an abbreviated account (e.g., a list of courses taught for teaching, a list of committees served on for service, etc.)

2. Faculty members scheduled to have biennial reviews for 2019 and 2020 will have their 2019 performance reviewed as usual
   a. For faculty members newly appointed or on paid or unpaid leave in 2019, their scores will be determined according to the MOA section 13.5.4

3. For the 2020 performance review, faculty members:
   a. Can choose to be evaluated in none, some, or all of teaching, scholarship and service, as specified in their appointments
   b. Will indicate areas that they do not wish to be evaluated on by stating “No Performance Evaluation for 2020” at the top of the relevant section(s) of their activity report
   c. In cases where Student Course Perception survey results are not released before the deadline for activity reports, faculty members may change their decision with regard to the evaluation of teaching. To do so, they must inform their Chair/Director of the change within three days of being informed that SCP results are available on Evaluate

4. The decision to not be evaluated will be without prejudice, i.e., will not be taken as evidence, either positive or negative, about the faculty member’s performance in that area in 2020

5. Whether or not they opt to be evaluated, faculty members will receive 2020 scores for all areas specified in their appointments (so that merit increases can be calculated in the normal way). In order to remain consistent with the provisions of the Memorandum of Agreement, the scores in each area must be an increment of 0.25
6. For faculty members who opt not to be evaluated in an area (teaching, scholarship, or service), scores will be calculated as follows:
   a. For faculty members with performance reviews for the three previous years (in which they were not on leave), their score will be the average of the scores for that area in those previous three years, rounded to the nearest increment of 0.25.
   b. For faculty members with only two previous years of performance reviews (for years in which they were not on leave), their score will be the average of the scores for that area in those two previous years, rounded to the nearest increment of 0.25.
   c. For faculty members with only one previous year of performance review (for a year they were not on leave), their score will be the higher of that year’s score in that area and the average score in that area for faculty members of the same rank in their Faculty in 2018, rounded to the nearest increment of 0.25.
   d. For faculty members with no previous performance reviews (for a year in which they were not on leave), their score in that area will be the average score for faculty members of the same rank in that area in their Faculty in 2018, rounded to the nearest increment of 0.25.

7. Faculties will provide the relevant 2018 average scores to Performance Review Committees for each rank/area combination. If the Faculty has not maintained a distinction between 2017 and 2018 scores in its records, the two-year average will be provided.

8. Overall scores are to be calculated taking account of the relevant individual weightings of faculty performance in teaching, scholarship and service, which may change between years as described in 13.5.5. b) and c). For each area of teaching, research, and service, the weighting and average score must be calculated, with the average score rounded to the nearest increment of 0.25. The weighted sum of the results will be the faculty member’s overall score for 2019-2020 for the purposes of calculating merit.

9. When reporting final individual and overall ratings to the faculty member (MOA 13.5.8.), the Chair/Director will record which areas of activity, if any, were not evaluated in 2020, and in any area where they differ will indicate the yearly scores for 2019 and 2020.

10. As always, faculty members should feel free to discuss any aspect of the performance review process with their Chairs/Directors.

**Calculating scores: Illustrative examples:**

A. Continuing Lecturer Y has been at Waterloo for many years, and has not been on leave at any point in 2017-19. They decide not to be evaluated in teaching for 2020. For 2017-18, they received a score of 1.75 for teaching, but the department did not further break down that score into 2017 and 2018. For 2019 they received a score of 1.25 for teaching. Their score in teaching for 2020 is calculated as \((1.75 + 1.75 + 1.25)/3 = 1.58\), and recorded as 1.50.

B. If the situation is otherwise the same, but Y’s 2019 teaching score is 1.5, their score would be \((1.75+1.75+1.50)/3 = 1.67\), which rounds to 1.75, which will be their 2020 teaching score.

C. Associate Professor Z in Faculty F is being reviewed for the first time, and will receive a review for 2019 but has opted not to be reviewed in research in 2020. Their score for research in 2019 is 1.75. If the average research score for Associate Professors in Faculty F in 2018 was 1.50, then Z’s score for Research in 2020 is the greater of 1.75 and 1.50, i.e. 1.75.

D. In 2019, Professor X was in a heavy service role and so adjusted weightings to 20/20/60 for T/R/S. In 2020 they reverted to their normal 40/40/20. Prof. X opts to be evaluated for 2020 in research and service, but not in teaching.
a. Professor X is evaluated in teaching for 2019 only. Suppose the Performance Review Committee assigns a score of 1.25. If X’s 2017-18 teaching score was 1.75, X’s 2020 teaching score is (1.75 + 1.75 +1.25)/3 = 1.58 which, rounded to the nearest increment of 0.25 is 1.50. Thus 1.50 is X’s 2020 teaching score.

b. Suppose the Performance Review Committee assigns X scores of 1.5 for research and 2.0 for service for the 2019-20 period.

c. Prof. X’s 2019 weightings are 20% teaching, 20% research and 60% service, so their average weightings for 2019-20 are 30% in teaching, 30% in research, and 40% in service. The average score in teaching is (1.25 + 1.50)/2 = 1.375, which rounds to 1.50 as the nearest increment of 0.25. The average score for research is obviously 1.5, and for service is 2.0.

Their overall score for 2019-20 will be 0.3(1.5) + 0.3(1.5) + 0.4(2.0) = 1.70

Please note: this email has been published on our new Employee Communications website for your future reference.