



## APPENDIX A. CRITERIA FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW

December, 2001 (revised September 2020)

### 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 normally excludes scholarship, performance in this area will be regarded as contributory at the member's request.

In order to address a serious imbalance in the recognition given to excellence in research as compared to teaching in performance review, a minimum two to three merit increments will be reserved each performance review cycle for merit applications based upon teaching excellence (conditional, of course, upon the existence in any given year of applications that meet the relevant criteria.

## **2.1 TEACHING**

The evaluation of teaching is an important part of the performance review process. The Faculty of Arts is strongly committed to effective teaching and places a high value on faculty members continually striving to “strengthen the quality and impact of teaching and learning for all students” (University of Regina’s Strategic Plan 2015-2020). As such, effective teaching is expected of all academic staff members and demonstration of teaching effectiveness is a prerequisite for appointment renewal, career growth increments, and tenure and promotion.

In order to better evaluate members’ teaching we have developed the following set of descriptors (viz. items A through D) of what constitutes effective teaching. While their application may vary from one type of class to another, it is expected that teachers in the Faculty of Arts will include many of them in their teaching practice.

### **A. PREPARATION FOR EFFECTIVE SCHOLARLY TEACHING**

An effective teacher:

- thinks critically about and reflects on their teaching practices and works continuously to improve them
- is well-prepared for their classes
- keeps current with the developments in their field
- informs their teaching by relevant research.
- Regularly reviews the content and design of frequently scheduled courses

### **B. EFFECTIVE KNOWLEDGE COMMUNICATION**

An effective teacher:

- communicates enthusiasm for the subject and for the task of teaching
- provides conceptually clear and accessible explanation of course content
- actively engages students in the subject and in the classroom
- exhibits flexibility, adjusting well to unexpected questions or new and changing circumstances in the classroom
- recognizes that students have differing strengths and weaknesses. When students are having difficulty grasping new ideas, effective teachers adjust their teaching to accommodate and overcome these difficulties
- grades fairly and gives prompt, constructive, and substantial feedback
- uses class time efficiently to guide students to course learning objectives
- encourages interaction and cooperation among students.

### **C. POSITIVE LEARNING EXPERIENCES & OUTCOMES**

An effective teacher:

- inspires students to be independent learners
- prepares students to critically evaluate and, when appropriate, assimilate new information and ideas
- develops more sophisticated minds in order to generate higher-level thoughts and actions
- enables students to build on and transfer learning from previous courses and to move quickly into areas of new related content
- enables students to creatively and critically apply problem-solving skills to address unique questions
- structures the teaching/learning environment to enhance the learning process
- has ambitious but reasonable expectations of their students, and communicates these clearly.

### **D. MENTORSHIP & SUPERVISION**

An effective teacher:

- motivates students to fully comprehend important issues in their chosen subject(s) of study
- is approachable, both in the classroom and other appropriate settings (such as office hours)
- treats their students with respect
- guides students in developing independent and creative research projects
- fosters the professional development of their students.

Effective teaching for laboratory instructors includes:

- 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 labs and appointments with students
- fair treatment of and respect for students, and availability to them outside class time
- 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.

For the purposes of this section, the term “member” shall be taken to include all those in the Faculty ranks (Lecturer, Assistant Professor, and Professor), those in the Instructor ranks (Instructor I, II, and III) and Lab Instructor ranks (Lab Instructor I, II, and III); it does not include sessional instructors.

Members’ duties fall under the headings of teaching and related duties, service, and also, for those in the Faculty ranks, scholarship, research, and creative or equivalent professional activities. The following sections outline these duties in more detail.

### **2.1.1 TEACHING WORKLOAD EXPECTATIONS**

Every department or program has a normal teaching load, which it defines for itself subject to a proviso that it not fall below 4 courses and 6.0 per year on average, for faculty and instructor ranks respectively, without prior, written approval from the Dean (as per section 5.2 of the Policy Handbook). Heads, in consultation with faculty members, determine the allocation of members’ normal teaching load across the full academic year. If some of the department’s courses are considered more onerous than others, it is expected that the workload associated with teaching be distributed equitably among all members of the unit. Departments may also decide collectively to ask additional teaching of their members to support grad programs or other internal priorities, in which case this additional workload is also to be equitably distributed among all members in the unit.

Members are generally expected to teach their normal teaching load each year. Temporary departures from this pattern (e.g. teaching one extra course in one year, so as to be able to teach one class less in another) can be arranged between the member and the department head, but members seeking longer-term departures should first receive prior written approval from the Dean

### **2.1.2 SERVICE WORKLOAD EXPECTATIONS**

The functioning of a university requires a certain amount of administrative work. Faculty members are expected to do their fair share of such work. This variously includes attendance, when possible, at meetings of the bodies of which the individual faculty person is a member (e.g. one’s Department, Faculty, University Council, or Faculty Association), participation in those bodies’ decision-making processes, and contributions to the work of committees established by these bodies. Faculty members may also contribute to the administrative work of the university by serving in a specific administrative role, such as Department Head or Program Coordinator.

Faculty members are also expected to contribute to broader communities outside the University. This may include national or international academic bodies (e.g. board positions for “learned societies”, editorial positions, conference organization, program review for other universities). It may also include organizations outside academe, as long as the contributions in question utilize members’ general or specialized academic expertise and bring good repute to the University. Examples include non-paid consulting work with professional organizations, invited public lectures (e.g. for religious groups), media commentary, and assistance to community organizations. Contributions to community organizations that do not make use of the member’s

scholarly expertise (e.g. coaching soccer), although meritorious in their own right, will not normally be considered to satisfy the requirement for public service. If they so choose, however, faculty members are free to make a case for why their specific efforts should indeed be considered relevant for this purpose.

In assessing faculty members' service work, attention will be paid, not just to the number of different forms of contribution, but also to the amount of work each contribution requires (e.g. being a Department Head will generally require more of a time commitment than being a member of the Executive of Council). Faculty members will not even be considered for promotion to Full Professor unless they have participated substantially, for at least a few years, in the work of some Faculty or University-level committee, or regularly offered good public service of the kinds just described. Full Professors will normally be expected to take on some of the more time-consuming leadership roles within university administration. If they wish to be excused from this general rule, they will need the prior written agreement of the Dean.

### **2.1.3 SCHOLARSHIP WORKLOAD EXPECTATIONS**

The Faculty does not require, either in its annual performance reviews or in applications for tenure and promotion, any pre-determined quantity of scholarly output. It asks only that members consistently do good-quality work and that, whatever their particular scholarly style, peers can see the fruits of their labour and know that reasonable progress is being made. The Faculty recognizes that assessments of quality and reasonable progress depend on the judicious but necessarily subjective opinion of peers. If members are uncertain whether their current rate of progress will be considered reasonable, they should seek advice from their head and/or the Dean.

### **2.1.4 BALANCE BETWEEN DUTIES**

Members will be expected to make contributions in all of the areas that apply to their category and rank. Although members may choose to place more emphasis on one or another of these areas for some period of time, it will normally be expected that this will be roughly compensated for by focusing on the neglected areas at other times (e.g. professors may place relatively little emphasis on their scholarship during heavy teaching terms, but might devote more time to their scholarship during the summer months). Members who want to alter substantially the overall allocation of their responsibilities should apply to the Dean for prior approval.

Academic work does not lend itself readily to strict time-based accounting. In part, this is because job performance is assessed with regard to outcomes (e.g. effective teaching, or productive scholarship) rather than to the number of hours devoted to the work. Furthermore, not all hours devoted to one's duties are equally productive. Nevertheless, some general guidelines can be provided for balancing members' various duties.

When faculty members are teaching courses they are expected to make this their first priority. Scholarship and service duties must take a back seat to the member's duty to provide good-quality instruction, and timely assistance and feedback, to their students. Furthermore, in all ranks members will be expected to place more emphasis on their teaching duties than on their service duties.

Newly-arrived members are welcome to participate fully in the life of the university, and accepting service roles may benefit them by providing an improved understanding of the workings of the University. Nevertheless, members who are as yet untenured or in term positions are urged not to take on heavy responsibilities in service internal or external to the university, if this will detract significantly from their teaching and research duties. Such members are responsible for exercising good judgment in this regard, and, if in doubt, for seeking guidance from their head or dean. In addition, more senior members of the Faculty should beware of making excessive requests for service contributions from new members. Members will generally not be expected to devote more than eight hours a week to their service responsibilities.

The Faculty recognizes that members in the professorial ranks may each have their own scholarly styles. There are consequently no specific expectations about how many hours are to be spent in scholarly activities, which hours these are to be, nor where these hours are to be spent. Scholarly work should be done at times that do not conflict with the needs of providing good-quality teaching in the member's assigned courses, or with the member's service commitments. Faculty members can decide how much of their remaining time they choose to

devote to their scholarly activities, provided that the resulting scholarly output is sufficient so that their peers can judge that the member is making reasonable progress in this area. If members are uncertain whether their current rate of progress will be considered reasonable, they should seek advice from their head and/or the Dean.

## **2.2 THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

Recognizing that effective teaching is a core requirement in the Faculty of Arts, it is incumbent upon faculty members to demonstrate that their teaching is effective. This is an integral part of performance review and may be accomplished in a variety of ways. For this purpose, faculty members can draw upon student evaluations, peer evaluation, and self-review. In assessing student evaluations, it is recognized that teaching subject matter that challenges students' own perspectives and underlying understandings of the world is not always appreciated in the short term. The aims of the assessment and the evaluation of teaching performance are to encourage and recognize effective teaching and assist members to improve their teaching.

## **2.3 DESIGN AND APPROVAL OF EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS**

All faculty involved in teaching are required by the *Collective Agreement* to use some combination of evaluation instruments. It is the responsibility of departments to develop, adopt and periodically review appropriate evaluation instruments. These instruments need to be documented at the faculty level under the purview of the Dean. The Dean's Office will monitor and keep a record of the departmental evaluation policies and instruments. Faculty members may conduct their own informal or complementary evaluations in addition to those developed by the department. The Faculty provides a variety of evaluation instruments that departments may choose to use (student course evaluation, peer evaluation and/or teaching dossier).

### **2.3.1 STUDENT COURSE EVALUATION/STUDENT RATINGS OF INSTRUCTION**

Student evaluations must be developed and approved by departments, and administered each semester for all courses. However, it is the member's choice whether these evaluations are used in Performance Review. The student evaluations may address the following criteria.<sup>1</sup>

- the clarity of the instructor's expectations of learning
- the instructor's ability to communicate the course content effectively
- the instructor's ability to inspire interest in the subject
- the fairness of the instructor's assessment of learning (exams, essays, tests, etc.)
- the instructor's concern for the students' learning
- the overall quality of the instructor's teaching.

Evaluations must assure the confidentiality of responses and be obtained at the end of the term in the absence of the instructor.

Student evaluation instruments will be approved by the Department. Departments will provide the Dean and the Performance Review Committee with copies of their student evaluation forms. Original records of student evaluation belong to the faculty member. Copies of the aggregated and summarized data from a student course evaluation shall reside in the Department. In compliance with Article 17.4.6 of the *Collective Agreement* members who choose to use student evaluations for their performance review will append copies of the aggregated and summarized data to the Annual Information Form.

### **2.3.2 PEER EVALUATION**

Peer evaluations can be carried out by faculty members from their own department, members from other departments, their department head, the Centre for Teaching and Learning or some combination of these. These evaluations may include: classroom observation, review of course material, student focus groups, and evaluation of methods of delivery.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gravestock, Pamela and Emily Gregor-Greenleaf. (2008). *Student Course Evaluations: Research, Models and Trends*. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 23.

### **2.3.3 SELF REVIEW**

Faculty members may provide a short evaluation (a maximum of two pages, single-spaced) in which they offer an assessment of their own strengths and weaknesses as a teacher and identify the strategies they have implemented, or plan to implement, to improve or maintain their teaching effectiveness over time. Properly executed, such evaluations will speak for themselves and make it obvious that the faculty member invests considerable time and energy in their teaching. Documents of this kind can build from exercises that the faculty member undertakes throughout the year, such as keeping a log, recording themselves in the classroom, or inviting direct student feedback through questionnaires or interviews. Faculty members may supplement the evaluation with appendices, as required to support claims made in the evaluation proper.

## **2.4 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; successful external grants; submission or invited reviews of provincial, national, or international grant applications; invited reviews of 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, with the following exception. It is recognized that the publication timeline is no longer within the member's control once a work has been accepted and is in press. For this reason, work that has been completed and accepted but has not yet been disseminated may be considered for review upon explicit request by the member in a cover letter accompanying the Annual Information Form. The member must provide evidence that the work has been accepted and is now in press (e.g. an acceptance letter), in addition to providing a copy of the work in its final form (e.g. page proofs, if they are already available). It is the member's responsibility to complete each year's Annual Information Form in a way that ensures a given work 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.

## **2.5 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.

### **2.5.1 DEPARTMENT HEADS**

In the Faculty of Arts, initial evaluation of Department Heads, for both sabbatical applications and performance review, 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 sabbaticals, career progress, merit, or promotion.

### **2.6 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 AND TENURE**

Those applying for promotion or tenure shall make written application to the Dean no later than 30 September. All supporting documentation, including copies of material to be sent to referees, is due in the Office of the Dean by 31 October.

Normally criteria for tenure and promotion include evidence of performance in teaching, research and service. Members who wish to be considered for tenure and promotion based more on either teaching or research shall provide more documentation in their preferred area. Tenured and tenure-track members, though they may place emphasis on one area of their career performance in a given review period, are expected to maintain a well-rounded academic profile, and to fulfill all of the duties corresponding to their appointment category and rank.

Sections 3.1 to 3.3 and 3.6 describe the normal path to promotion and tenure, in which faculty members are expected to provide evidence of good performance in all three areas of performance: teaching, research and service. For granting of tenure or promotion to Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor members must indicate in their written application to the Dean if they intend to place more weight upon their teaching or their research and less upon the other areas. Members are encouraged to consult with their Department Head and the Dean in advance of making a formal decision.

### **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*, members applying for promotion to full professor must supply the names and contact info of at least three referees by no later than 30 September. Members have two options. One is to come up on their own with a list of three referees, and leave it to the Dean to choose the other three. In this case, the member's full package of materials will be sent out to the referees. The other is to work together with the Dean to agree upon a list of at least six referees, and upon the subsets of completed works that will be sent out to each of the referees. The materials proper, per the *Collective Agreement*, need to be provided by 31 October at the latest. But members are advised to submit them earlier if possible, to maximize the chances of securing a full set of six referees.

Materials forwarded to referees will include: those materials submitted by the member for evaluation by referees; a current CV; a copy of the Faculty's *Criteria Document*, relevant sections from the *Collective Agreement* (i.e. Articles 16, 17, and 18), 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 INCREMENTS

An increment 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 an increment is not granted, the Dean will provide the member with an explanation that will include suggestions for improving performance.

### 4.2 MERIT

In evaluating applications for merit, the PRC will consider relevant only accomplishments since the last merit or for the previous three years, whichever period is shorter..

A merit 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.

Merits 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 if there is also evidence of strong contributions in teaching and/ or scholarship, but not necessarily in the same period as the bulk of the administrative work.

### 4.3 CAREER PLANNING

Members who hold the rank of Full Professor, Instructor III, or Laboratory/Clinical Instructor III may meet with the Dean once every three years for career planning rather than use the regular performance review process. Members who choose this option will meet with the Dean in the same year that their normal review cycle would have taken place.

Members making use of the career-planning process are expected to provide the Dean with an up-to-date curriculum vitae, a draft career plan, and any career plan agreed upon at the previous such meeting. Career plans should be a maximum five (5) pages in length (2-3 pages is preferred) and are due in the Dean's Office by January 31<sup>st</sup>. Copies of all documents relating to career planning will be kept in the Dean's Office; the documents will not be sent to Human Resources to become part of the member's official file.

Meetings will be coordinated by the Dean's Office and will occur between the months of February and May.

A performance review may still be requested by either the Dean or the member. The request must be made in writing. The deadline for the Dean to make a request is 1 July; the deadline for a member to make a request is 30 September.

## 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 above) *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;
  - 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 their last merit increase, or for the previous three years, whichever period is shorter.. Heads should supply the member's curricula vitae and a written rationale outlining how the criteria for merit have been met to the PRC. The maximum length for the written rationale is two (2) pages.
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.

- When carrying out its work, the Committee will set aside, as though they did not exist, any periods during which the member was on an approved leave, unless doing so would work to the member's disadvantage.
- 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.
- Since it is incumbent upon members to provide sufficient evidence of having met the relevant criteria, whenever they have not done so, the Committee shall conclude that the criteria in question were not met and proceed accordingly.
- 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 17.14 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.