



UNIVERSITY OF REGINA
FACULTY ASSOCIATION

Academic Staff - Performance Review

Individual Preparation for Review

- Read and be familiar with the *Academic Collective Agreement, 2014-2017*, particularly Articles 3, 16.1 - 16.3, 17.1 - 17.22, and 18.1 - 18.7.
- Read the Criteria Document of your Faculty or of the University Library (see Articles 17.10, 17.11, and 5.11 concerning procedures for developing and revising this document). You can request an electronic copy of your criteria document from your dean.
- Ask yourself whether you are prepared to be honest and fair, undertake your role “seriously and with integrity,” base your recommendation or decision on “appropriate evaluation of the material,” and ensure that any statements are “fair commentary, and are based on appropriate evaluation of the material.” If you cannot assure yourself of these, you should not be involved in peer review. (Quotes from Article 17.1 of the Collective Agreement).
- When reviewing members of your own Department, those you know well, or those that you may personally dislike, take special care to be fair and honest. Think of how you would like the person you are reviewing to assess your performance.
- Make sure that you do not discriminate “on the basis of any prohibited grounds set forth in *the Saskatchewan Human Rights Code and The Saskatchewan Employment Act Part III, Division 1*.”
- Give prior thought to whether or not you might be in conflict of interest in any case to be reviewed. Be prepared to step aside when reviewing those cases where you may be in conflict of interest. See CAUT *What Is Fair?* Section 2.
- Be prepared to devote considerable time to reading, understanding, and assessing all the evidence.

Review Committee Guidelines

- Formation of the Review Committee. See Article 17.13 of the Collective Agreement and applicable language in your criteria document.
- Develop a set of rules, guidelines, and procedures for the Review Committee to follow. These should be established by the members of the Committee. These may be the rules from the previous year’s Committee, in which case you should review these and you may wish to amend them.
- The Dean (as defined by the Definitions section of the CBA) may be present as an observer only (Article 17.13). Remember that this is a committee of peers and the members of the

Committee make recommendations. The Committee should not bargain or negotiate with the Dean, or allow the Dean to establish Committee rules or influence recommendations of the Committee.

- If the Committee requires more information from an individual being reviewed, ask the Dean to request that the individual provide this.
- If there are verbal submissions by the initial reviewer, the Committee must decide if such submissions are fair and appropriate commentary based upon appropriate evaluation of the material submitted. If they are not, they must be excluded from consideration; if they are, they must be put in writing and provided to the member being reviewed who must be given the opportunity to respond. (Article 17.13, 2nd paragraph)
- The deliberations of the Committee are a part of a collegial process. This means spending time carefully discussing and assessing the performance of each individual being reviewed. Do not jump to conclusions but carefully read, discuss, and evaluate the evidence, and make recommendations based on the evidence.

Evidence to Consider – See Articles 17.4, 17.9 and 17.18

- U. of R. - URFA Academic Collective Agreement, 2014-2017, Article 17.4.
- Criteria Document of your Faculty or the University Library. Make sure the Committee is using the proper Criteria Document, from the year being reviewed.
- Annual Information Form(s) for the individual being reviewed. One form for the calendar year currently under review in the case of single year reviews, and three forms for each year of the period under review in the case of three year reviews.
- Performance Review Form(s) for the individual being reviewed. Ensure this has been completed in accordance with Article 17.12. Note that the individual being reviewed must have had an opportunity to (i) view the recommendation of the initial reviewer, (ii) discuss the recommendation with the recommending officer, (iii) add written material to the form, and (iv) sign the form indicating that the member has read the document.
- Letters of reference, if appropriate. See Article 17.9 and the Criteria Document for appropriate use. Make sure that the specific procedures of Article 17.9 have been followed if these letters are used.
- Current curriculum vitae.
- Student course evaluations. See Articles 17.4.6 and 17.18 and your Faculty Criteria Document. The procedures for using these vary from faculty to faculty. Remember that the use of these is to obtain “fair and reasonable assessments of the quality of teaching.” Data are to be aggregated and summarized and shall exclude any anonymous remarks (Article 17.18). Student evaluations are only part of evidence for evaluating teaching; evidence from course outlines, assignments, evaluations by peers, etc. should be considered in the review process.
- Any other information in the member’s official file, or information submitted by the individual. This may include a teaching dossier, articles, books, art works, etc. See Articles 17.4.4 and 17.4.5.

- Consider and base your decision on all the evidence. Do not selectively choose, pick, and consider evidence. Having considered the evidence in the light of the established criteria of the academic unit, the Review Committee is to make written recommendations on the Performance Review Form.
- Avoid and ignore rumor, hearsay, personal bias, personal friendship, and personal dislike. Some statements that should not be heard or considered in the review process are:
 - ◆ “Professor X is a difficult person to work with.”
 - ◆ “In our Faculty we all know that Ms. Y is not a very good teacher.”
 - ◆ “My children go to the same school as Dr. G’s children, and I get along very well with him and his wife. We’ve had them over to dinner and they are excellent people.”
- Other factors: Nature, extent, and location of duties. See Article 17.10. For Librarians, take note of Articles 16.1.2, 16.2 and 17.10. For Instructors take note of Articles 16.1.3, 16.2 and 17.10.
- Evidence must be available to be assessed. If work resulting from consulting activities, political activities and appointments, etc. is available to be assessed, then it can be considered, but if there is no means of assessing these, must be careful in considering how these are to be evaluated.
- It is the responsibility of the member being reviewed to provide all the relevant information. See Article 17.4.
- Anonymous evidence must not be considered.
- Evidence outside that provided for in Article 17 should not be considered.
- Read Section 5, pp. 16-20, of *What Is Fair?* For guidelines concerning fairness and consistency.

Review Period and Time Lines

- To December 31, of the current year under review. Article 17.5.
- Evidence from the time of the last review is to be considered. See Articles 17.2, 17.3, and 17.5.
- In the case of merit, the period since initial appointment or since the last merit received. See Articles 17.5 and 18.3.
- In case of tenure or promotion, review of a member’s entire career, including activities prior to coming to the University of Regina. Article 17.5.
- Timeliness. **Should the Dean delay in forming the Review Committee, call meetings of the Committee, or communicating the decisions of the Committee, members are asked to contact the Faculty Association. Article 5.1 of the Collective Agreement states that “planning shall be undertaken in the spirit of collegiality and with open communication.”**

Types of Recommendations

- Recommendations concern increments, merit, promotions, renewal of tenure-track appointments, and tenure. See Article 18.1 and the Faculty Criteria Document for procedures.
- The Committee's recommendations are to be written (Article 17.13). This may simply be of a form such as "grant increment," "recommend promotion," or "deny merit." In the case of negative recommendation, **written reasons should be provided.** Comments should be **concise, clear, and to the point, and make reference to the evidence and the criteria.** A long, rambling comment may be misinterpreted or misused by the Dean, or by the individual being reviewed. A concise comment is less likely to cause problems later than is a long comment.
- Read Section 7, pp. 22-24, of *What is Fair?* "Reasons for the decision" for guidelines in documenting rationale.
- Where the recommendations or decisions are negative, reviewers should provide reasons and make suggestions about how performance can be improved. See Articles 17.13, 17.20 and 17.21.
- Avoid making unfair or improper comments. Where the individual being reviewed or the Dean considers the comments to be biased, unfair, or improper, Article 17.15 has provisions for reconsidering and changing comments.

University of Regina Faculty Association
November/December 2018