

# Faculty of Mathematics

## Guidelines for Faculty Performance Evaluation and Selective Salary Increases for 2025-26-27-28 Evaluation Period

### 1. PURPOSE

The primary purpose of performance reviews for faculty members is to identify particular accomplishments as well as areas of difficulty, and to promote discussion between individual faculty members and the Chair or Director concerning ways to structure and enhance future contributions. A review is also necessary for all regular faculty members on full-time, part-time ( $\geq 50\%$ ), reduced load, and joint appointments in order that well-informed decisions can be made regarding selective salary increments (*Ref: Memorandum of Agreement Article 13*). In some cases this will also include definite term research professors, if specified in their contract. Probationary appointments and definite term appointments will be evaluated annually; members holding permanent or tenured appointments will be evaluated every two years in odd-numbered years. In even-numbered years, members holding permanent or tenured appointments who have not previously been evaluated at the University of Waterloo may choose to be evaluated in their first year or take the average for their rank. This choice may be made independently for each of scholarship, teaching and service.

It is the responsibility of the Chairs/Director to assess the performance of each regular faculty member annually or biennially, to provide a written performance review and to be available to discuss it upon request. Performance reviews are especially important in helping new faculty members gauge their progress towards meeting the standards for reappointment and tenure/permanence. Annual performance reviews form part of the evidence in tenure, permanence and promotion considerations, together with reports from external referees and more extensive career reviews carried out by the Department/School Tenure, Permanence and Promotion Committee (D/STPPC).

Article 13 of the Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) states the principles for the determination of salaries and evaluation of faculty members. Specifically, section 13.5.1 (c) of the MoA requires that each Faculty has Performance Evaluation Guidelines (this document) setting out the evaluation criteria specific to that Faculty. These Faculty-specific guidelines are intended to supplement the principles documented in the Memorandum of Agreement. If there is a conflict between these Guidelines and the MoA and/or Policy 77, the provision in the MoA and/or Policy 77 shall take precedence. These guidelines are to be made available to all Members prior to the commencement of the calendar year(s) being evaluated.

### 2. AREAS OF REVIEW

A regular tenure stream faculty appointment involves three main responsibilities: to communicate the knowledge and nature of one's discipline through teaching, to advance the state of one's discipline through scholarship, and to contribute to the administrative functions that support these goals through effective service. The performance review will focus on recent activity in all three areas: teaching, scholarship, and service.

A regular teaching stream appointment will involve teaching and service as described above. In unusual cases, it may also include scholarship, depending upon the contract.

University teaching encompasses a wide range of activities. It takes many different forms (e.g., undergraduate and graduate courses, graduate seminars, online education, project and thesis supervision), has many different components (e.g., synchronous lectures and tutorials, asynchronous learning elements, setting and grading of assignments and examinations, interaction with students outside the classroom, curriculum development), and can occur in many different environments (e.g., large lecture theatres, small seminar rooms, off-campus short courses and workshops, clinics, laboratories, one-on-one supervision, virtual platforms).

For the purpose of performance evaluation, university teaching may include assigned development and delivery of material to pre- and post-university students, e.g., K-12 and lifelong learning. Research into the pedagogy of teaching and education may be considered teaching for the purposes of evaluation. Contribution to a wide range of teaching activity is considered valuable. Supervision of graduate and undergraduate students, as well as postdoctoral fellows, is evaluated in Teaching category for the Faculty of Mathematics.

*Scholarship* is broadly defined to include research articles in refereed journals, research monographs, textbooks, expository articles at all levels, conference papers, reports, reviews, patents, addresses to professional/learned societies, etc. Peer-reviewed research with respect to pedagogy and peer-reviewed research with respect to innovative teaching may be considered scholarship for the purposes of evaluation. The originality, quality, impact, and quantity of scholarly work are all considered in reviewing performance. The level of contract or grant support is not in itself to be used as a measure of scholarly achievement, although the peer evaluation system in grant selection committees is respected. Serving as referee for journals and granting councils is considered scholarship.

*Service* includes contributions through administrative appointments and committee membership at all levels with the University, direction of laboratories, organizational involvement in Groups, Centre and Institutes, outreach, and student advising. It also includes service to the discipline through granting council committees, editorial boards, conference organization, and working committees of professional societies.

Although the official review period is one or two calendar years, it is desirable that the evaluation take place in the context of a somewhat longer viewpoint (2 years for teaching and service, and 4 years for research). Consecutive performance evaluations should not change dramatically owing to sabbatical leaves, number of teaching terms, or publication delays. Chairs/Directors must also pay particular attention to the provision of Section 13.5.4 of the MoA regarding evaluations for Members on leave.

#### Expectations related to presence on campus

The presence of our faculty members on campus matters to our students, their faculty colleagues and the staff who support them. Regular and frequent interactions among students, staff, and faculty are essential to maintaining the integrity of the University as a scholarly community for our students and each other, developing a healthy institutional culture, and ensuring the future success of the University of Waterloo. To meet these goals and effectively perform one's academic duties and obligations, regular faculty presence on our University campus is necessary.

Faculty presence on campus is also a key ingredient to ensure that the daily academic business of the university is carried out responsibly, ethically, and successfully, and that progress is made toward achieving the university's longer term academic goals and in meeting the public's expectations.

Occasional absence of faculty members from campus is anticipated due to the multiple and varied responsibilities of faculty members who contribute special expertise to professional, corporate, and public communities, thereby assisting in fulfilling the University's education, research, and service missions. However, extended absence of faculty members from campus can have negative effects on

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

~~students, fellow faculty members, their academic units, the Faculty and the University as a whole. For example, faculty members are expected to be available to students for interviews and consultations outside the classroom at reasonable times.~~

### 3. REVIEW PROCEDURE

#### Committee

Each Department or School with 15 or more members shall conduct their evaluations with a Departmental/School Performance Review Committee (D/SPRC), advisory to the Chair/Director. By December 1, the Members of the Department or School shall elect an advisory committee of no more than five Members to assist the Chair/Director with their responsibilities.

Faculty members appointed in the Dean's Office will be evaluated by an equivalent Performance Review Committee, advisory to the Dean. It is important that the Directors of each of the CEMC and the Mathematics Undergraduate Group contribute to the Performance

Review process. It is also important that the Performance Review Committee includes faculty representation from each of two constituencies. Given these considerations, the Dean will nominate, in consultation with these two constituencies through their Directors, a Performance Review Committee that includes representatives from these constituencies by December 1 in each calendar year for ratification by the faculty members in the Dean's office.

#### Activity Report

By early January, each faculty member under evaluation in that period will submit to the Chair/Director a completed Activity Report for the evaluation period, along with any other relevant documentation. Faculty members with probationary or definite term contracts shall provide documentation each year. Tenured and permanent faculty shall provide documentation every other year on odd-numbered years. For many, the completed Activity Report will be sufficient, but some may wish to include (or be asked by the Chair/Director to include) other material such as copies of publications, teaching materials, and letters of recommendation. Failure to submit a report will result in an overall rating of at most 0.5 as outlined in the MoA.

The Activity Report shall include the weights that the faculty member believes should be used for their Performance Review. This is to ensure that there is no discrepancy with the official record of the weights.

#### Review Procedures at Department/School level

Based on the Activity Report and any other relevant documentation, the Chair/Director, together with the Review Committee, will review each faculty members' contributions in teaching, scholarship, and service. They will prepare a written review for each faculty member, addressing each of the three areas.

#### Role of the Dean

The Chair/Director will inform the Dean of the proposed ratings and weightings for each of the three categories. The Dean will carefully review and, if necessary, modify the proposed ratings to ensure that fair and consistent standards and criteria are being employed cross the Faculty. The Dean may establish an advisory committee to assist with this review.

The Dean will evaluate the performance of the Chairs/Directors, Associate Deans, and Assistant Deans, and shall forward the proposed performance ratings in the three categories and overall to the VPA&P for approval. The VPA&P will inform the Dean and the Chairs/Directors or Associate/Assistant Deans in writing with reasons of any changes in the recommended ratings. The Dean may choose to consult with the Review Committee of the individual's home unit for input upon their scholarship, teaching and service.

#### Communication of Ratings

By the end of March, each faculty member under evaluation that year will receive a copy of their written performance and overall rating from the Chair/Director or Dean. If a faculty member's performance is considered to be less than satisfactory, the written review should carefully explain the reasons for the assessment, and give reasonable and explicit expectations and the details of any plans to enhance contributions. Each faculty member will be provided with the opportunity to discuss their performance review with their Chair/Director.

#### Dispute resolution

A faculty member who disagrees with their performance evaluation should proceed first to the Chair/Director, and then, if no resolution has been reached, to the Dean of the Faculty for final disposition prior to the 15<sup>th</sup> of April. A Chair/Director, Associate Dean, and Assistant Deans who disagrees with their performance evaluations should proceed first to the Dean, and then, if not resolved, to the VPA&P for disposition.

#### 4. RATINGS and WEIGHTS

A faculty member's performance in each of teaching, scholarship, and service will be rated on a standard scale ranging from 0 to 2:

- 2.00 Outstanding
- 1.75 Excellent
- 1.50 Very Good
- 1.25 Good
- 1.00 Satisfactory
- 0.75 Needs Some Improvement
- 0.50 Needs Improvement
- 0.25 Needs Major Improvement
- 0.00 Unsatisfactory

Chairs and Performance Evaluation Committees should use the entire range of scores, as needed. The overall rating shall be computed as the weighted average of the individual ratings in teaching (t), scholarship (r) and service (s) for the period under review.

$$R = at + br + cs$$

Where a,b,c are non-negative weights adding to 1. For members on a biennial performance review cycle, the rating for non-review years shall be equal to the rating for the previous review year. Section 13.5.4(b) of the MoA explains how to handle the evaluation of newly appointed faculty members and faculty members who have been on leave during the evaluation period.

#### Weights

The weight for each area shall be specified in the member's letter of appointment. In the absence of specified weights for tenure stream positions the default weights shall be 40 percent for teaching, 40 percent for scholarship, and 20 percent for service; for teaching stream positions, the default weights shall be 80 percent for teaching and 20 percent for service.

Weightings and duties may be adjusted in a formal written agreement between the faculty member and the Chair/Director with the approval of the Dean. The weights shall be at least 20% in every category, except in the case of teaching stream appointments. Weight redistribution does not modify the performance quality standards expected in any of the three areas, though expectations for quantity will change. Some examples of non-standard weights used in the Faculty in Mathematics are:

- 60%R, 20%S, 20%T for individuals with special appointments or national awards that entail increased research expectations and reduced teaching loads (e.g., salary award holders such as Steacie and Killam Fellows, NSERC Industrial Research Chairs, CRCs etc.);

- 20%R, 60%S, 20%T for individuals with major administrative duties and reduced teaching loads (e.g., Chairs/Director and Associate Deans).
- 20%R, 20%S, 60%T for individuals who have negotiated increased teaching loads and reduced expectations in scholarship.
- In the case of appointments starting or ending partway through the evaluation period, the practice in the Math faculty is to use a weighted average to determine the weightings for the evaluation period. For example, if an individual had weights 40%R, 20%S, 40%T for the first six months of the two-year cycle, and had weights 20%R, 60%S, 20%T for the last 18 months of the two-year cycle, then you would use the weights 25%R, 50%S, 25%T. Here  $25\%R = 6/24 \times 40\%R + 18/24 \times 20\%R$ , etc.
- With mutual agreement of the faculty member and their unit head, and with approval of the Dean, weights may change for faculty members who are not evaluated, if there is a significant change in their circumstances.

5. PROPOSED SPECIFICATION FOR DEPARTMENTAL ADDENDA OF WHAT CONSTITUTES LESS-THAN-SATISFACTORY AND OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE General Standards for Assessing Less-than-Satisfactory and Outstanding Performance

The Faculty of Mathematics acknowledges the diversity of teaching, research, and service opportunities and experiences across our faculty. The following proposed language applies generally within the Faculty of Mathematics. The following language applies generally within the Faculty of Mathematics, unless modified in a departmental addendum.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.49"

Each Department/School is required to have an Addendum to their Faculty Performance Evaluation Guidelines setting out the performance expectations in the Department/School for scholarship, teaching and service (MoA Article 13.5.1b). Departmental Addenda are required 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. A rating of 2.0 ("Outstanding") in any category represents exceptional performance that clearly exceeds expectations for a faculty member at their rank and demonstrates leadership, impact, and distinction.

In teaching, a rating of 2.0 reflects performance that is exemplary and transformative. This may be evidenced by major instructional innovation; sustained excellence in teaching as demonstrated through peer review and student feedback; leadership in curriculum development or pedagogical practice; or recognition through significant internal or external teaching awards. Outstanding teaching contributes meaningfully to student learning, mentorship, and the advancement of learning at Waterloo or beyond.

In scholarship and research, outstanding performance is assessed using indicators appropriate to the discipline and career stage. This may include a sustained record of high-quality, peer-reviewed publications; the awarding of highly competitive and prestigious research grants; impactful knowledge mobilization or technology transfer; internationally recognized exhibitions or design work; or receipt of prestigious scholarly awards. Outstanding scholarship demonstrates clear impact, leadership, and recognition by the faculty member's scholarly community.

In service, a rating of 2.0 reflects an extraordinary commitment of time, expertise, and leadership to the Department, Faculty, University, profession, and/or broader community.

Outstanding service results in a substantive and positive impact, such as leading major initiatives, contributing significantly to governance or accreditation activities, advancing equity, diversity, and inclusion, or providing exceptional professional or public service that enhances the reputation and effectiveness of the academic unit or the University. A rating below 1.0 ("Less than Satisfactory") represents performance that does not meet reasonable expectations over the assessment period.

Indications of less than satisfactory performance would typically manifest as persistent concerns that either span a number of key indicators or represent a deep issue in one key area.

In teaching, less than satisfactory performance may be indicated by persistent concerns regarding course delivery, preparedness, or engagement, and by teaching outcomes, such as student course perception surveys or peer assessments that are significantly below Faculty or disciplinary norms, without evidence of meaningful improvement or responsiveness to feedback.

In scholarship and research, a rating below 1.0 may be appropriate when scholarly output or impact falls significantly below the norms of the discipline and career stage, and when there is insufficient evidence of an active and sustained research or scholarly program. In service, less than satisfactory is characterized by a lack of engagement with the academic unit, or a consistent failure to contribute to departmental, Faculty, or University service responsibilities as expected of a faculty member.

Those responsible for conducting performance assessments (Chairs/Directors and the Dean) are expected to make judicious and appropriate use of the full range of scores. Where performance in a given area is clearly less than satisfactory, the assignment of a score below 1.0 is warranted. Similarly, ratings of 2.0 should be reserved for truly exceptional contributions that go well beyond normal expectations.

Formatted: Font: 11.5 pt

#### 5-6. SALARY INCREASES

A pool of funds for selective salary increases is provided to the Faculty in accordance with Memorandum of Agreement Article 13.3.2. A faculty member's selective salary increase depends both on their annual performance rating (actual R) and on the position of their salary relative to the threshold T1 and T2 for their rank. The selective increases are described in detail in MoA Section 13.1.

Additionally, the MoA allows for adjustments for salary anomalies and for Outstanding Performance Awards, both of these are described in section 13.3.3(d,e) of the MoA.

#### 7. APPROVALS AND DOCUMENTATION

Formatted: Not Expanded by / Condensed by

This document will be circulated annually to members of the Faculty of Mathematics. The guidelines will be used to evaluate performance over the course of the next calendar year(s). It shall be reviewed and updated no less than once every five years with any changes approved by a majority vote of the Faculty Council by October 15<sup>th</sup> in the year before the evaluation calendar year to which the changes would apply.

For internal members, documents related to the performance evaluation process, including this guideline document, are available in the Annual Performance folder on the Faculty of Mathematics SharePoint site. Documents related to the performance Evaluation process, including this guideline document, are available at Annual Performance (sharepoint.com)

▲

▲

**Formatted:** Font: 11.5 pt, Condensed by 0.1 pt

**Formatted:** Not Expanded by / Condensed by

6-

~~This document will be circulated annually to members of the Faculty of Mathematics. The guidelines will be used to evaluate performance over the course of the next calendar year(s). It shall be reviewed and updated no less than once every five years with any changes approved by a majority vote of the Faculty Council by October 15<sup>th</sup> in the year before the evaluation calendar year to which the changes would apply.~~

~~Documents related to the performance Evaluation process, including this guideline document, are available at Annual Performance (sharepoint.com)~~