APPENDIX A. CRITERIA FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW

December, 2001 (revised September 2013)

1 PREAMBLE

This Criteria Document addresses the requirement in the Collective Agreement that the Dean of each Faculty must maintain “established criteria and procedures” to guide performance review. Such criteria “shall be reviewed from time to time by the Dean through consultation in committee with the members of the Faculty” (Article 17.11).

Teaching, scholarship, and service constitute the raison d'être of the University, and therefore of the Faculty of Arts. The Faculty of Arts affirms its commitment to the pursuit of excellence in the execution of these responsibilities.

Because it is committed to the principles of academic freedom, the Faculty further affirms that disciplinary boundaries shall not be used to discriminate against those who pursue scholarly work outside the traditional fields of research in their Departments or programs. While we recognize that individual scholars have collegial responsibilities, the Faculty affirms that it is not appropriate for those involved in peer review to choose areas of research and scholarly activity for members either explicitly or by implication in the assessment of a member's performance.

Effectively applied, performance review is formative. Its purpose is not only to inform career decisions, but to enable those reviewed to develop their skills and move forward professionally. Performance review thus guides career progress through the ranks, and motivates all academic members to pursue excellence in their assigned duties.

Standards of performance should be applied in a manner that recognizes differing expectations for the ranks, differences from discipline to discipline, different patterns of activity at various career stages, and differing annual workloads and assignments.

While the diverse teaching and research cultures of the Faculty of Arts preclude the articulation of precise Faculty-wide criteria of performance, the following principles, and the provisions of the Collective Agreement, will guide performance review and advise the Dean on all recommendations regarding the award of increments, promotions, and tenure.

Documents required in the performance review process are specified in the Collective Agreement, Article 17.4. Members being reviewed are required to provide a current curriculum vitae.

2 CRITERIA FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The Collective Agreement specifies that the duties of a faculty member shall normally include:

- teaching and related duties (hereinafter “teaching”)
- scholarship, research, or equivalent professional duties (hereinafter “scholarship”)
- participation in collegial governance (hereinafter “administrative duties” and/or public service).

The performance review of those in faculty ranks (Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor) focuses on assigned duties in these areas. Though the evaluation of Instructors focuses on teaching and related duties, performance in one or more of the other areas will be regarded as contributory at the member's request.

2.1 TEACHING

In the Faculty of Arts, teaching includes selecting, preparing, and presenting course materials for lectures, seminars, labs, and tutorials; supervision of students; availability to students for consultation; and assessment of student performance.
The Faculty aspires to be regarded highly for its teaching, and expects from members a high standard of performance in this area of responsibility. Fine teaching can take many forms, but the following activities and qualities are central:

- thorough, current knowledge of the subject, and enthusiasm for it;
- clear, appropriate presentation of course material;
- the encouragement of independent and creative thinking in students;
- prompt and regular attendance at classes and appointments with students;
- fair treatment of and respect for students, and availability to them outside class time.

Good teaching for laboratory instructors includes all of the above but also:

- technical skill and facility appropriate to the teaching assignment
- the coordination of their teaching activities with those of faculty so that students can follow a coherent pattern of development within and between courses

2.2 TEACHING EVALUATION

The evaluation and assessment of teaching are important parts of the performance review process. The aims of the assessment and evaluation of teaching performance are:

- to encourage and recognize superior performance in teaching;
- to assist members to improve teaching;
- to assist in the performance review process.

Information used to evaluate teaching includes some or all of:

- evidence of effective supervision of graduate and honours students, and membership on thesis and project committees;
- evidence of using the results of one’s scholarship and research in teaching;
- evidence of applying knowledge gained from professional activities to teaching;
- student evaluations of teaching;
- evaluations conducted by Department Heads or peers;
- copies of relevant teaching materials such as syllabi, examinations, and the like;
- evidence of the development of new resources including those in electronic form;
- evidence of the development of new courses or new approaches to teaching;
- evidence of keeping course content current;
- evidence of steps taken to improve teaching and other material an academic staff member may wish to submit.

The evaluation of laboratory instructors in particular shall be based at a minimum on the following information:

- list of labs/courses taught with enrolments and contact hours with students;
- supervisory and coaching time outside of normally scheduled course/laboratory time;
- syllabuses, tests, examinations, manuals, and other materials distributed to students;
- demonstrational videos or electronic teaching tools developed;
- the development of new labs/courses;
• student course/instructor evaluations;
• for those in term or probationary positions, evaluations by department heads and/or peer assessments by tenured members of the department.

The evaluation of laboratory instruction in particular may also include:

• for tenured members of the department, peer evaluations or evaluations by department heads;
• self-evaluation accompanied by whatever material the laboratory instructor wishes to attach;
• evidence of steps taken to improve teaching;
• letters from students and alumni which have not been solicited by the laboratory instructor;
• a teaching dossier containing any of the above materials.

2.3 SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship is part of the duties of faculty members.

The following is a partial list of examples of the outcomes of scholarship: refereed journal publications; articles in periodicals; books; monographs; bibliographic studies; translations; edited works; manuals; conference papers; invited reviews of grant applications, manuscripts, and books; novels; plays; poems; stories; public performances; participation in symposia and conferences; reviews of software, programs, and databases; policy studies; documentaries; maps; and reports.

In assessing the outcomes of the scholarship of its members, the emphasis will be upon quality as manifested in its importance, originality, sophistication, erudition, workmanship, reliability or other scholarly virtues. Members are encouraged to aim for clarity and accessibility in their work. Members must also demonstrate a substantial investment in scholarship as evidenced by their making regular and ample time for it and using that time effectively and to good purpose.

Since evaluation by peers, or others as appropriate, is an integral aspect of scholarship, members need to publish or otherwise disseminate their work in ways that allow for a rigorous evaluation of its quality. (Hereinafter the term "dissemination" shall be used to refer to publication and all its professional equivalents.) Members’ own participation in peer review processes shall also be recognized as a valued aspect of scholarship.

The Faculty strongly affirms the value of scholarship that addresses audiences wider than small groups of specialists. Such work does not replace more traditional scholarship, but rather supplements and enriches it by interpreting its meaning and significance for non-specialists. Where the quality of such ‘accessible scholarship’ is high as defined by the terms in paragraph two above, it should be evaluated as comparable to peer-reviewed scholarship.

The Performance Review Committee will consider only work disseminated during the period under review. Work that has been completed and accepted but has not yet been disseminated for reasons beyond the control of the member, may be considered upon request by the member. It is each member’s responsibility to report work in a way that ensures a given performance is not counted more than once.

Members engaged in long-term projects may request assessment of their scholarship at appropriate intervals. Similarly, the evaluation process should take into account the time required to secure funding from external sources.

2.4 ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES

Because the Faculty of Arts is committed to a collegial and consultative mode of governance, it is incumbent on every faculty member to participate in the administrative work of the institution.

In the Faculty of Arts this typically involves committee work at one or more of the Department, Faculty and University levels. For those in the pre-tenure phase of their careers, expectations are modest. As members gain tenure and progress through the ranks, administrative expectations increase.

In the review of administrative contributions, an effort will be made to assess quality and not just quantity.
2.4.1 DEPARTMENT HEADS

In the Faculty of Arts, initial evaluation of Department Heads is done by the Associate Dean (Research and Graduate). These evaluations are then referred to an elected subcommittee of Dean’s Executive and a recommendation is made to the Dean with regard to career progress, merit, or promotion.

2.5 PUBLIC SERVICE

The Faculty takes seriously its commitment to the community. It therefore encourages a variety of contributions to the public good flowing from members’ expertise and interests. In the review of public service activities, the contribution of the faculty member’s professional expertise, and the quality of the contributions will be considered.

3 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

Those applying for promotion shall make written application to the Dean no later than 30 November. All supporting documentation, including copies of material to be sent to referees, is due in the Office of the Dean by that date.

3.1 TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

To be considered for promotion from Lecturer to the rank of Assistant Professor, the candidate must normally have completed a PhD (or equivalent), and must present a record of successful teaching at all assigned levels and clear evidence of the initiation of a substantive research program. Members are not expected to have made significant contributions to administration or public service, but their contributions in this regard will be valued in performance review.

3.2 TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

To be considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, members must provide evidence of teaching effectiveness at all assigned levels, good-quality scholarship, dissemination of their work in peer-reviewed outlets or their professional equivalents, substantial investment in scholarship over their academic career, and substantive peer or public responses to their scholarship. A record of administrative contributions (at least some of them outside their own Department or Program) and public service must also be present.

3.3 TO FULL PROFESSOR

To be considered for promotion to the rank of Professor, members must demonstrate a record of teaching excellence at all assigned levels and widespread recognition by peers of a significant body of scholarship that has been disseminated in peer-reviewed outlets or their professional equivalents and is of very high quality. Recognition is defined as the extent to which other scholars or the public generally have found the scholarship worthy of mention and made use of it themselves or otherwise demonstrated that they deem it authoritative. Members must also provide evidence of substantial investment in scholarship over their academic career, meaningful participation in the collegial governance of the institution (at the levels of Department or Program, Faculty, and University), and service to the public.

As set out in the Collective Agreement, letters of reference, including three from referees proposed by the member and up to a further three solicited by the Dean, will be used in the evaluation process. Members shall submit contact information for referees, together with copies of materials to be sent to them, to the Office of the Dean by no later than 30 November, on the understanding that the Dean will choose the materials to be sent to each referee. Faculty members who want to work with the Dean to choose the materials that will be sent to each referee must by 31 October provide the Dean’s Office with the names of their three referees and the works to be reviewed. In the latter case, at the member’s request, materials made available to the Dean before November 30, and time-permitting in December, will be included in the package of materials sent to referees.

Materials forwarded to referees will include: those materials submitted by the member for evaluation by referees; a copy of the Faculty’s Criteria Document; and a letter from the Dean to the referee requesting the reference and providing a date by which it is required.

3.4 TO LABORATORY INSTRUCTOR II

For promotion from Laboratory Instructor I to Laboratory Instructor II, the individual must have demonstrated proficiency and expertise in the areas of laboratory instruction and other appropriate instructional duties; laboratory
development and related professional activity; and administration and maintenance. As the instructor's primary responsibility is to develop and maintain a high standard of laboratory instruction, good teaching will be essential for promotion.

3.5 TO LABORATORY INSTRUCTOR III
Promotion from laboratory instructor II to laboratory instructor III will require demonstrated excellence in laboratory instruction and other appropriate instructional duties as well as laboratory development and related professional activity. Strong contributions in the areas of administration and maintenance, and public service will be seen as contributing factors.

3.6 GRANTING OF TENURE
The Collective Agreement states:

“Academic staff members with appointments in the faculty, librarian, instructor, or laboratory-instructor categories shall be granted an appointment with tenure when there is evidence of consistent performance that has met the standards for their category and rank of appointment through the probationary period (including, in the case of faculty members and librarians, professional growth and development demonstrated by contributions to their discipline and to the University) and where there is promise of future contributions that will enhance the academic reputation of the University.”

To be granted tenure, a member must provide evidence of teaching effectiveness at all assigned levels. With the exception of Instructors, members must also provide evidence of good-quality scholarship, dissemination of their work in peer-reviewed outlets or their professional equivalents, and substantial investment in scholarship over their academic career. Administrative and public service are considered as contributory.

Procedures for obtaining external references will be the same as those described in the section of promotion to full professor.

In the specific case of laboratory instructors, appointments with tenure will be granted only to those individuals who have maintained good teaching and competence with the equipment associated with their teaching responsibilities, demonstrated growth in all areas of service in which they have been assigned duties, and shown promise of continued growth in these areas. Normally, tenure will not be granted unless they also hold a degree or diploma appropriate to their area of expertise.

Normally, tenure will not be granted if conditions specified at the time of a tenure-track appointment have not been fulfilled.

4 SALARY INCREMENTS

4.1 CAREER GROWTH INCREMENT (CGI)
A CGI will be awarded annually (subject to the ceilings specified in the Collective Agreement) in recognition of members meeting the standards for teaching, scholarship, and service appropriate to their rank, level, and assigned duties as outlined above.

It is the member’s responsibility to provide appropriate documentation of her or his contribution. In addition to the teaching materials noted in section 2.2 above, this documentation may include:

- publications (include offprints);
- list of conference presentations;
- details of grants and contracts or equivalents;
- details of applications for external funding;
- details of equivalent professional activity;
- research plan.
If a CGI is not granted, the Dean will provide the member with an explanation that will include suggestions for improving performance.

4.2 MERIT INCREMENT

In evaluating applications for merit increments, only accomplishments since the last merit increment or, if the member has never received a merit increment, since initial appointment will be considered relevant.

A merit increment may be granted to members who, given their rank and level as well as consistently good performance in all areas, clearly exhibit exceptional service in one or more of the areas of assigned duty during their review cycle, or who have presented evidence of sustained well-above average performance in two or more areas of assigned duty.

Merit increments based on scholarship or teaching will be considered only if the member demonstrates commitment to administrative duties and public service. Outstanding performance in administrative duties (e.g., dedicated and imaginative leadership as a Department Head) or public service activities may form the basis for a merit increment if there is also evidence of strong contributions in teaching and scholarship, but not necessarily in the same period as the bulk of the administrative work.

APPENDICES

The following supplemental appendices do not form part of the Criteria for Performance Review document. They are included for the information of members and for ease of reference.

APPENDIX A1. GUIDELINES FOR MEMBERS

These guidelines are intended to help members prepare the materials sent forward to the Performance Review Committee (PRC) so that a fair and complete assessment of their performance can be made. Recommendations are made on the basis of an assessment of all the material provided. The PRC can ask that more material be provided to it, and has access to information in the member’s official file.

1. Ensure that citations of published work are detailed and complete, and include specific page references. Offprints or copies of work published during the period under consideration should accompany the file. In listing published work, place the most recent publications first. Distinguish clearly between refereed and non-refereed publications. If word count is important (for example, in the case of a detailed book review of essay length), mention it. These points become especially important when special consideration (a merit increment or promotion) is sought.

2. Remember that the amount of material the Performance Review Committee must read and annotate each year is very large. If members choose to submit teaching dossiers, the dossiers should be carefully organized and clearly labelled. Section 2.2 of the Criteria for Performance Review document outlines some of the materials that should be included in teaching dossiers; other relevant material is welcome. In preparing a dossier, remember that judicious selection and careful organization is preferable to submitting reams of material.

3. In Departments in which they are used, student evaluations of teaching should be included in the teaching dossier. If evaluation summaries are included, make clear who (department support staff, students, oneself) has prepared them. Ensure that original forms are organized and readily available should the PRC wish to see them. Especially when requesting special consideration, members should consider commenting on evaluations in a covering letter or memo, pointing out strengths and addressing concerns noted by students. Bear in mind that student evaluations of teaching are assessed in the broad context of a member’s teaching throughout the period under review.

4. It is required that members provide an up-to-date and complete (see point 1) curriculum vitae for each performance review.

5. When members make application for a merit increment a letter must be included, stating clearly the grounds on which the application is to be judged. Specific reference to the requirements set out in section 4.2 of the Criteria for Performance Review document is essential.

6. Instructors are reviewed on the basis of assigned duties, which under the Collective Agreement (17.10) are defined as “teaching and teaching-related duties.” The onus is on the individual Instructor to explain how activities in the period
under review, as, for example, scholarship or administrative work, contribute to the performance of teaching and related duties. The PRC is receptive to such explanations.

APPENDIX A2. GUIDELINES FOR DEPARTMENT HEADS

The present guidelines are not meant to be an exhaustive listing of all the factors to be kept in mind by Department Heads in the evaluation of performance. Their main function is to guide Department Heads to make a fair and complete assessment of academic performance.

1. For the purpose of assessing performance, the relevant review periods are:
   - yearly for those in the pre-tenure career phase;
   - every three years for tenured members not subject to a career evaluation;
   - since the last merit increment (or initial appointment) for those being considered for a merit increment;
   - the full span of the career for those being considered for promotion or tenure.

2. Department Heads’ recommendations should be clearly based on the information available for the period under review. Heads should ensure that members have supplied all pertinent information for the period under review, especially in applications for merit and promotion.

3. In assessments of performance, single-word assessments such as “satisfactory” or “outstanding” are not helpful to the PRC. Several sentences pointing to concrete evidence are, by contrast, most helpful.

4. Recommendations shall bear directly on the performance of the member concerned. In formulating recommendations, Heads shall not use wording that can be interpreted in any way as a comment concerning someone other than the member under review.

5. Recommendations shall not take the form of trade-offs. There shall, for example, be no recommendation that if denied a promotion, a member should receive a merit increment. Either one, both, or neither should be recommended.

6. Department Heads should bear in mind that they can recommend a merit increment for a member who has not applied for one. If this is done, the recommendation is based on the member’s performance since the last merit increase, or, if the member has not been awarded merit, since initial appointment. Heads should therefore ensure that the necessary materials, including publications, performances, teaching evaluations, and all other pertinent documents for the period to be considered, are assembled and presented to the PRC.

7. When writing in support of – or in opposition to – a merit increment for a member, Heads should be sure to address directly the grounds on which that application is being made. Specific reference to the requirements set out in section 4.2 of the Criteria for Performance Review document is essential, and will help the PRC in its deliberations.

8. It is always useful for Heads to comment on the quality of journals in which the member’s work appears, and to situate specific pieces within the member’s broader research program. Because the PRC does not have representation from every Department, it depends to a great degree on the disciplinary knowledge and contextualization supplied by Heads.

APPENDIX A3. GUIDELINES FOR THE FACULTY’S PERFORMANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The primary tasks of the Performance Review Committee (PRC) are:

- To review the performance assessments and recommendations concerning members on the basis of the information provided to the PRC, and
- To advise the Dean of Arts with respect to the recommendations by stating its own views and recommendations in writing.
In order to carry out these tasks, the Committee:

- Will review all the material provided by the members under review on their Annual Information Forms and the assessments and recommendations contained in the Performance Review Forms. If the PRC requests more information, the member will be informed of all such requests and responses.

- May solicit comments from Heads in order to clarify the recommendations made by them on the Performance Review Forms, but will not accept new material evidence. If the Head responds in writing the member must be given an opportunity to see and respond to these additional comments.

- May review material contained in a member’s official file that is pertinent to the period under review.

- May, on particular occasions, invite to appear before the Committee the member whose performance is being reviewed, for the purpose of clarification of material under consideration.

In carrying out its function:

- The Committee will maintain strict confidentiality with regard to its reviews.

- If a member of the Committee has been involved in a prior stage of the review process for any person under review by the Committee, that member will declare this involvement and will recuse herself or himself from the Committee’s vote concerning the recommendation for that person.

- If any Committee members (or their partners or family members) are applying for merit, promotion to associate professor, or promotion to full professor, they will recuse themselves from all committee discussions pertaining to the corresponding recognition. So for instance a committee member who has applied for promotion to full professor will not attend any of the meetings at which applications for promotion to full professor are being discussed. Alternate members, if available, will be asked to attend any meetings for which the committee’s membership has been temporarily reduced on this account.

- The Committee will be guided in its deliberations by the Collective Agreement and by the Criteria for Performance Review document of the Faculty of Arts.

- The Committee will not consider any information not stated or alluded to in the annual Faculty Information Forms or Performance Review Forms, or not contained in the official file, for the period under review.

- After the Committee has reviewed relevant material, Heads may be called in to meet the Committee for the purpose of clarifying their recommendations. No new material evidence will be considered in this process of clarification.

- The Committee, including the Chair, will vote on each recommendation to be made to the Dean. The vote will be recorded as yes or no in all cases, other than recusals as provided for above.

- In addition to providing the Dean with the results of its recorded vote, the Committee may provide an account of the reasons for its recommendation, as well as a written advice to the member being reviewed.

- The recommendation and any written statement made by the Committee will be entered on the member’s Performance Review Form and thus will be available for perusal by the member as outlined in Article 17.16 of the Collective Agreement.

After completing the review, the Committee may make recommendations to the Dean about matters relevant to the review. It may also propose changes to the Criteria for Performance Review document, and its appendices.