5. Performance Review of Faculty and Instructors

Overview
Details the requirements and process by which the performance of faculty members and instructors is monitored, judged and developed.

Scope
Applies to all faculty members and instructors except those in the College of Medicine and Health Sciences.

Objective
Provides indicators that assess levels of faculty/instructors performance and the extent to which this performance supports College and University Strategic Plans, generates a detailed report rating the faculty/instructor performance, outlining strengths and points of possible improvement in the faculty’s/instructor’s performance, gives direction for future planning, and identifies the resources needed to support faculty/instructor development.

Policy
1. The Faculty/instructor Performance Review is an evidence-based and peer-reviewed process that guides the professional development of faculty and instructors.

2. Faculty members and instructors are reviewed for their performance in teaching, scholarship and service, and their collegial conduct.

3. To fulfill the University’s Mission of becoming a world-class research-intensive University, scholarship assumes a vital role in the performance review of research focus faculty members, while teaching represents a major element in the evaluation of teaching focus faculty members and instructors.

4. The Performance Review informs decisions pertaining to promotion and renewal of appointments.

5. The review of the performance is based on a self-study report that is supported by evidence of achievements provided by the concerned member.
Procedures of Policy No. (5) - Performance Review of Faculty and Instructors

1. General

The Performance Review process is based on the academic values of collegiality, peer review, and collective critique. It requires the application of the academic skills of critical reasoning and impartial judgment based on available evidence.

2. Frequency of the Process

a) The performance is reviewed annually by the Department Chair and every other year by the Department Performance Review Committee and the Dean.

b) For a typical faculty member/instructor, the process will start in the first year of joining the University through the preparation of an 18-month work/activity plan starting from the date of initial appointment. The interim review will take place before the end of the first academic year. The self-evaluation report will be prepared by the end of March of the following academic year and the review process should be completed before the end of the second semester of that academic year.

c) If the concerned member successfully completes the probationary period, the same process will be repeated in the third and fourth years of appointment. Faculty members with rolling contracts will be subject to the same process.

3. Timeline

The following timeline should be considered in the planning and review of performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year one</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of faculty/instructor work plan</td>
<td>last week of August</td>
<td>mid-September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and approval of work plan</td>
<td>mid-September</td>
<td>mid-October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim review</td>
<td>last week of April</td>
<td>mid-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year two</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-study report on performance</td>
<td>mid-March (of the following Academic Year)</td>
<td>end of March (of the following Academic Year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental review committee report</td>
<td>April 1st</td>
<td>Third week of April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair review</td>
<td>Third week of April</td>
<td>end of April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report sent to individual faculty/instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td>end of April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual faculty/instructor response on report</td>
<td>May 1st</td>
<td>end of the first week of May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean's review and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>end of third week of May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Preparation of the Work Plan

a) At the beginning of the academic year, each College holds a workshop that focuses on the College strategic plan and discusses how Department plans dovetail with the College plan. The workshop sets the context for the faculty members’ and instructors’ planning and review process.

b) Each Department’s plan sets out directions and standards for faculty members and instructors in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. The balance of contributions will depend on individual circumstances, such as faculty designation (stream/focus), rank, and length of service. A Department Plan is established by the Department Chair in consultation with the faculty in the Department and should be considered a collegial activity and shared commitment.

c) The distribution of time of each faculty/instructor (evaluation weights) among teaching, research and university and community service, varies based on his/her designation and administrative duties.

d) Faculty members and instructors draft their goals for a period of 18 months in the context of the Department Plan and upload their work plan through the performance evaluation system. Goals should be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timed. They may contain short-term objectives that are steps towards the achievement of a longer-range goal. Dependencies, where the individual ‘depends’ on someone else or something to achieve a set goal, should be identified within the goal setting process.

e) The draft plan is reviewed, discussed and adjusted as needed by the Department Chair together with the concerned member. The distribution of time, that is, the relative weight of the activity) should be clearly stated in the plan and should be consistent with the designation (stream/focus) of the concerned member. If necessary, the work plan may be returned to the concerned member for adjustment. The Department Chair provides his or her comments on the submitted plan and the resources and development needs that have been identified by the concerned faculty member. Once agreed upon, the plan should be approved by the Department Chair and submitted to the performance evaluation system.

5. Interim Review

The concerned faculty member/instructor submits an interim achievement report according to the schedule of the performance review process. Within the deadlines set by the Academic Affairs Calendar, the Department Chair calls for a formal interim review meeting with individual faculty and instructors to discuss progress towards achieving the goals per their work/activity plan. Goals set at the outset of the 18-month period might be revised as a consequence of the discussion. The Department Chair should give feedback to the concerned faculty member on the qualities of his/her contributions to date and provide quantitative assessment for the performance in teaching, research and service based on the progress made during the first year of the review cycle. The feedback should be constructive and motivational.
6. Self-Study

Each faculty member/instructor prepares and submits his/her self-study according to the schedule of the performance review process. The self-study should reflect his performance against the approved activity/work plan and address any adjustments made during the interim review process. It should explain the conditions that facilitated or prevented successful achievement of planned goals. It is the responsibility of each faculty member/instructor to ensure that the best available evidence related to his or her performance is submitted together with the self-study to the Department Chair by the deadline.

Failure to submit the work plan or achievement report (Self Study report) by a concerned member will lead to unsatisfactory evaluation.

7. Review Committee and Review Process

a) The Dean appoints the Review Committee at the Department or the College level in consultation with the Department Chair. Department Chairs are not normally members of the Committee. The Committee should include at least two faculty members from the Department. The third member of the Committee should be a Full Professor from the same or a different Department in the College. A Full Professor should chair the Committee. Nominated members should identify any potential conflict of interest with the faculty members or instructors being evaluated. In such cases, the Dean will decide if they should continue to serve on the Committee or to be replaced.

b) In small Departments/Colleges, the Review Committee may be formed at the College level.

c) The Review Committee will meet with the Department Chair to discuss the review process and the evaluation criteria. They should also review the weights that are assigned to teaching, research and service for each faculty member/instructor, to ensure consistency with their respective designation.

d) The review process and its outcomes are confidential between the Review Committee and the Department Chair. Members of the Review Committee are responsible for ensuring confidentiality, collegiality, impartiality and absence of external interference in the process.

e) The Review Committee will use the self-study and the available evidence to quantitatively rate the performance of the faculty member/instructor in the three areas and the overall performance, based on the established criteria. They will provide a rationale for their rating, elaborating on:

(i) the extent to which goals have been met;
(ii) Mitigating factors affecting faculty performance over the planned period.
(iii) support, resource and development needs; and
(iv) Suggestions for the forthcoming cycle of planning and review.

f) The Chair of the Review Committee is responsible for the fulfillment of evaluation based on the related policies. The Chair may ask the faculty member/instructor under review for additional evidence should this be needed to assess the extent to which a goal has been met. The Committee Chair will then report the overall performance of the concerned member as evaluated by the Committee.
g) Decisions are made by consensus or a majority vote. The Committee Chair finalizes the report and submits it through the performance evaluation system.

h) The Department Chair will determine if further consideration by the Review Committee is required, in which case the Department Chair will require the Committee to reconvene.

i) The Department Chair writes a response to the Review Committee’s report on the performance of each member in the three areas. The response should include, at minimum, quantitative performance evaluation, comment on the collegiality of the concerned member and give recommendations on goals and activities for the subsequent work plan.

j) The concerned member may write a response through the performance evaluation system within the specified period.

k) The Dean will review all submitted documents and rate the performance of the concerned member.

8. Department Chair Responsibility

a) The Department Chair will ensure effective communication with all faculty members and instructors about the process, requirements and deadlines for work/activity planning and review process. He/she should discuss, review and revise the plans as needed.

b) The Department Chair will ensure that the workload distribution and the relative weight of activities considered in the evaluation are consistent with the designation of the concerned member.

c) The Department Chair will conduct an interim review as set out in these Procedures and quantitatively assess the performance of the concerned member based on the reported achievements in the three areas.

d) The Department Chair should not influence the work of the Review Committee until he/she receives the evaluation report.

9. Role of the Dean

a) The Dean reviews all the evaluation reports based on the established criteria and the comments of the Review Committee, the Department Chair, and the faculty member/instructor’s response. The Dean provides the final performance evaluation.

b) The Dean has the final decision in all matters pertaining to the review process, including management of any grievances.

10. Grievance

Whenever a faculty member or an instructor has a grievance over the operation or outcomes of the planning and review process, he/she must provide a written statement directly to the Dean. The Dean will respond to such cases within ten working days of receiving the complaint.