

Draft Performance Evaluation Process (PEP) for the University Teaching (UT) Group

References:

- A. Career Progression Management Framework for University Teaching, 6 June 2014
- B. Treasury Board Salary Administration Plan for the University Teaching Group, 2008
- C. Agreement between the Treasury Board and the Canadian Military Colleges Faculty Association, Group: University Teaching, Expiry date: June 30, 2022
- D. Letter, UT Annual Evaluation in the Three Years prior to a Scheduled Retirement, dated 1 July 2007
- E. Letter to CMCFA, dated 27 June 2008

Aim

1. The aim of this document is to outline the process to conduct the evaluation of performance for the members of the University Teaching (UT) Group.

Authority

2. This is a management process. Performance assessment for the UT Group is outlined in the Career Progression Management Framework (CPMF) (see reference A). It is governed by the Treasury Board Salary Administration Plan for UTs (see reference B), which does not form part of the UT Collective Agreement (see Appendix A of reference C). In accordance with the UT Salary Administration Plan, the authority to conduct the performance assessment process is vested in the Principal. Given the financial implications of recommending increments, however, the authority to approve increments rests with the Commandants of the Military Colleges and Commander of the Canadian Defence Academy (CDA).

Confidentiality

3. The UT Salary Administration Plan stipulates that "Because the salary rate, under this plan, will reflect the assessed level of performance of an individual, care should be taken to preserve the confidentiality of an employee's salary rate."

Process

4. This is a process under the UT Salary Administration Plan. As articulated in reference B, the performance assessment process must be able to differentiate between the performance categories, which are described at reference B as Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Superior and Distinguished, and which correspond to 0, 1, 2, and 3 increments, respectively. The Distinguished Professor category applies only to UT-04s at the top of the pay scale (see reference B). The results of this assessment process are documented in the Faculty Assessment Report (FAR), which is completed in accordance with the CPMF (see reference A).
5. The UT Salary Administration Plan defines the review period as "the current academic year" and stipulates that "a maximum of 40 percent of the University Teaching Group faculty members may be appraised above the 'satisfactory' performance category in any one review period." This includes those retiring in accordance with reference D, which must be taken into consideration as part of the 40 percent

maximum. Furthermore, in accordance with the UT Collective Agreement, “[t]he Employer’s representative(s) who assess a UT’s performance must have been aware of the UT’s performance for at least one half (1/2) of the period for which the UT’s performance is evaluated.”

6. The UT Salary Administration Plan defines “merit/maturity increase” as “an increase in salary, based on the university teacher's assessed level of performance and years of experience, which results in an upward positioning in the range to a salary not exceeding the maximum rate.” Performance appraisals of satisfactory merit moving forward one step based on maturity (i.e. years of service). Performance appraisals of higher than satisfactory merit an increase of greater than one step in the pay scale or a performance award should the individual be at the penultimate or top of the pay scale.

Step 1: Establishment of Criteria (Beginning of the Review Period)

7. For the purposes of this document, Managers are limited to the following positions: Deans responsible for academic departments (hereafter referred to as “Line Deans”), the Academic Director at RMC Saint-Jean, and the Principal. For the purposes of this document, Supervisors are defined here as those who are not Managers and have one or more UTs reporting to them directly. They include Department Heads and Vice Principal Academic, as well as other supervisors, such as those at CDA. At the beginning of each academic year, Supervisors shall establish the criteria, principles and process by which a UT’s performance in the areas of teaching, research, service, and professional standing will be evaluated. Supervisors shall consult UTs in their department or equivalent unit in the preparation of these criteria. The criteria, principles, and process must be (a) consistent with the UT Collective Agreement and the UT Salary Administration Plan and (b) approved by the supervisor’s direct Manager (Line Dean/Academic Director/Principal). Supervisors who do not report to a Line Dean or Academic Director are required to discuss their criteria, principles and processes directly with the Principal, who, in this case, would be the appropriate Manager. The criteria, principles, and process established by the Supervisors shall not be unreasonably altered or denied approval.¹

Step 2: Preparing Year-End Evaluations Members of the UT Group

8. Before the end of each academic year and in preparation for the meeting of the Performance Evaluation Committee (commonly referred to as the “increments meeting”), members of the UT Group are responsible for providing their Supervisors with an accurate summary of all their contributions to teaching, research, service and professional standing over the review period. Note that these areas of assessment are identified in the FAR form as: “1. Effective teaching ability, 2. Professional standing; 3. Scholarly & creative activity; and 4. Service to the academic community & the College.”

Supervisors

9. It is the responsibility of Supervisors to do the following:
- a. evaluate UTs within their Department or equivalent unit in the areas of teaching, research, service and professional standing over the review period;
 - b. rank all UTs within their department or equivalent unit;

¹ Examples of “unreasonable” exercise of managerial discretion include decisions that are arbitrary, discriminatory, or in bad faith.

- c. recommend ratings for all UTs within their department or equivalent unit, including recommendations for Distinguished Professor, in accordance with the guidance provided by the Principal in para. 16; and
- d. provide their ranking and recommended rating to their Manager at least two weeks prior to the increments meeting.

10. These evaluations shall be based on the summary of contributions provided by each UT and shall consider all contributions made to teaching, research, service and professional standing over the review period, including contributions outside of the department or discipline.² Supervisors who do not report to a Dean or Academic Director are required to provide their evaluations, including ranking and recommended rating, directly to the Principal.

Ranking Guiding Principles

11. The following guidelines are provided:

- a. The process is merit-based and, therefore, Supervisors must substantiate their evaluations, rankings, and recommended ratings to their Manager, clearly explaining how their evaluations, rankings, and recommended ratings meet the criteria, principles and process established at the beginning of the academic year. Supervisors' rankings will not be unreasonably altered.³
- b. The review period for assessment is defined in the Salary Administration Plan.
- c. In order to remain within the limitation of 40 percent for the UT Group, Supervisors and Managers will be provided with guidance by the Principal as to the number of superior ratings or higher that can be awarded at each stage of the process, taking into consideration the 40 percent limitation for the entire UT Group and the other considerations identified in para. 16. Supervisors assess relative merit only within their departments and disciplines; they would normally recommend a superior rating for at least 40% of the UTs in their department.
- d. Evaluation of UTs on leave:
 - i. *Sabbatical leave* - UTs on sabbatical are eligible to be appraised above satisfactory, in accordance with the UT Salary Administration Plan. Any acknowledgements of teaching, research, service or professional standing, such as publications and awards, that occur while the UT is on sabbatical leave will be taken into consideration and must be annotated in the FAR.

² This includes evaluations of those serving as Chair or Associate Chair of a graduate program under the Dean of Graduate Studies.

³ Examples of "unreasonable" exercise of managerial discretion include decisions that are arbitrary, discriminatory, or in bad faith.

- ii. *Maternity, parental, or medical leave* - UTs on leave with or without pay for maternity, parental or medical reasons are eligible to be appraised above satisfactory as long as the period of observation is sufficient (i.e. six months or more) to evaluate all aspects of teaching, research, service and professional standing (the criteria). It is incumbent upon the Supervisors and Managers to substantiate that the period of observation has been sufficient to evaluate all aspects of teaching, research, service and professional standing.
- iii. In the event that the period of observation is insufficient to fully assess a UT's performance in one or more of the required criteria, any acknowledgements of teaching, research, service or professional standing, such as publications and awards, that occur while the UT is on leave with or without pay for maternity, parental or medical reasons shall be carried forward and considered in the assessment period following their return from leave in which there is a sufficient period of observation to support a full assessment on teaching, research, service and professional standing.⁴

Example

- In academic year one (1), a UT is on leave for seven (7) months. This year would not yield a period of observation sufficient to evaluate all aspects of the criteria. However, a book happens to be published in that academic year.
 - In academic year two (2), the same UT is on leave for only five (5) months and therefore there is a sufficient period of observation to evaluate all of the criteria. The book that was published in academic year one (1) would be considered along with all other achievements in year two (2).
- e. Faculty members who have applied for promotion during the review period are eligible to be appraised above satisfactory.
 - f. As articulated at reference E, Term UTs are not eligible to be appraised above satisfactory.
 - g. UTs benefitting from the retirement Letter of Agreement (reference D) will not be included in the departmental ranking, as they have been removed from the guidance provided by the Principal under para. 16.
 - h. Supervisors will not be included in the departmental ranking, as they have been removed from the guidance provided by the Principal under para. 16.

⁴ This temporary modification remains in force until the conclusion of the 2022-2023 round of Collective Bargaining.

12. The completed evaluation and the summary of contributions for each UT recommended for a rating above “satisfactory” must be provided to the Managers two weeks in advance of the increments meeting. It is important for Supervisors to discuss their ranking and recommended ratings with Managers in advance of the increments meeting with a goal of resolving differences prior to the Performance Evaluation Committee (PEC) meeting.⁵ These discussions enable the Managers to understand the evaluations and ranking at the increments meeting. Supervisors who do not report to a Dean are required to provide their evaluations directly to the Academic Director at RMC Saint-Jean or the Principal, as appropriate.

Managers (Line Deans/Academic Directors/Principal)

13. Managers are responsible for discussing with Supervisors the evaluations and rankings provided by the Supervisors, including recommendations for Distinguished Professor. Managers will confirm that files clearly demonstrate the assessment of the files in accordance with the SAP and that the criteria, principles, and processes established at the start of the review period have been applied. These discussions may result in agreed upon adjustments to the ranking. Managers will not advance any files until they have been substantiated in accordance with the SAP and the established criteria, principles, and process. Managers are also responsible for evaluating the UTs who report directly to them. As described in para. 16, Department Heads are not included in the guidance on the number of files to be brought forward. Managers will present the Supervisors’ rankings to the PEC for approval.

14. In order to remain within the limitation of 40 percent for the UT Group, the Dean/Academic Director will be provided with guidance by the Principal as to the number of superior ratings or higher that can be awarded at each stage of the process, taking into consideration the 40 percent limitation for the entire UT Group and the other considerations identified in para. 16.

Principal

15. It is the responsibility of the Principal, in consultation and with concurrence of the Commandant RMC or Commandant RMC Saint-Jean, as appropriate, to evaluate the performance of Vice-Principals and Deans.

16. The Principal is obligated to ensure that, in accordance with the UT Salary Administration Plan, no more than 40 percent of the UT Group is appraised above the satisfactory category in any one review period. Accordingly, for each review period and in advance of the increments meeting, the Principal will provide Managers with guidance as to the number of superior ratings or higher that can be awarded at each stage of the process. The available increments at each stage of the process are calculated through application of the following terms. These numbers will be shared with the CMCFA for information and sensitivity analysis at least two (2) weeks before the Principal’s guidance is provided.

- a. Nd = the number of indeterminate UTs who worked in a given department/unit during the review period. This number will be determined by the Principal.

⁵ This includes evaluations for those serving as Chair or Associate Chair of a graduate program under the Dean of Graduate Studies.

- b. N_f = the number of indeterminate UTs who worked in a given faculty or equivalent unit during the review period. This number will be determined by the Principal.
- c. T = the total number of indeterminate and term UTs who worked during the review period. This number will be determined by the Principal.
- d. S_2 = the total number of superior ratings or higher that can be awarded during stage 2 of the process. This number will be determined by the Principal. The actual value will normally vary from year to year for reasons including the number of term hires, the number of indeterminate faculty, the number of retirements, and the number of Supervisors and Managers.
- e. S_{2d} = the number of superior ratings or higher that can be awarded in each department or unit during stage 2 ($S_{2d} = N_d \times S_2/T$). This number will be determined by the Principal and will be communicated to Supervisors and Managers at the beginning of the process. S_{2d} will obviously vary with the number of UTs in each department/unit.⁶
- f. S_3 = the total number of superior ratings or higher that can be awarded during stage 3 of the process. This number will be the sum of all S_{3f} at the Colleges.
- g. S_{3f} = the number of superior ratings or higher that can be awarded in each Faculty or equivalent unit during stage 3 of the process. This number will be determined by the Principal. It should be clear that, because of rounding, the number of superior ratings or higher awarded at stage 2 in a given Faculty may be lower than $N_f \times S_2/T$. This difference is S_{3f} . It may vary by faculty.
- h. S_4 = the total number of superior ratings or higher that can be awarded during stage 4 of the process. This number will be determined by the Principal.
- i. X = the number of superior ratings or higher that can be awarded to current Supervisors, current Managers, and those UTs benefitting from the "retirement agreement". This number is determined by the Principal. It is clear that $40\% \times T = S_2 + S_3 + S_4 + X$.

Step 3: Performance Evaluation Committee (PEC)

17. The PEC is composed of the Managers (Line Deans, Academic Director, and the Principal). The Principal is the Chair of the Committee and ensures the increments meeting is held annually. It is the responsibility of the PEC to distinguish between those faculty members who will receive one increment and those who will receive more than one increment.

18. The PEC shall be provided with the following information in advance of the increments review meeting:

- a. the criteria, principles, and process established at the beginning of the review period;
- b. the Supervisor's ranking;
- c. the Supervisor's evaluations of each UT recommended for a "superior" rating or above;
- d. each UT's summary of contributions; and

⁶ In the Department of Politics & Economics, S_{2d} will be calculated on the basis of N_d for the entire department.

- e. the Manager's ranking and rationale for that ranking only if it is different from that of the Supervisor.

19. The awarding of superior ratings or higher by the PEC at the increments meeting follows four stages:

Stage 1 - Resolution of Disagreements over Supervisor Ranking:

20. The rankings provided by Supervisors shall not be unreasonably altered or denied approval by Managers. Should the Manager and the Supervisor disagree on the ranking, the Supervisor and Manager will be given the opportunity to make representation directly to the PEC. The Manager will inform the Supervisor in writing of this opportunity at least one week prior to the PEC meeting.⁷ This feedback will explain how the assessment conflicts with the provisions in the SAP; the criteria, principles, or processes established at the start of the review period; or fairness and equity.

21. The PEC will hear the recommendations made by the Supervisors to validate
- a. that there is a complete evaluation in accordance with the provisions in the SAP and the criteria, principles, and processes established at the start of the review period, and
 - b. that the recommendations are in accordance with the guidance provided by the Principal in para. 16.

22. The PEC, less any Manager involved in the disagreement, will, after reviewing the above information, decide on the ranking to be used in the remainder of the process. The Principal (or Academic Director of RMC Saint-Jean in case the Principal is the Manager) will vote only in the case of a tie.

Stage 2

23. Using the ranking determined in stage 1, in stage 2, Managers will present the S2d names recommended for a superior rating or higher for each department/unit, one department/unit at a time⁸. Comparisons shall not be made between departments/units at this time. It should be noted that those names recommended for a superior rating or higher in stage 2 represent those faculty members who have clearly demonstrated superior performance during the review period.

⁷ When making representation to the committee, the Supervisor may choose to present that representation in writing or in person; whether to make the presentation in the presence of the Manager; and whether to be present for the Manager's presentation. In some instances, the Manager may be the Principal. The Manager and Supervisor will not be present when the committee makes its determination.

⁸ For consistency with the Faculty of Arts Reorganization Implementing Instruction of 6 June 2018, at Stage 2, the Manager for the Department of Politics & Economics will present the Stage 2 names recommended for a superior rating or higher for Politics separately from the Stage 2 names recommended for a superior rating or higher for Economics. Each discipline will receive at least the number of superior ratings or higher that results when the formula for S2d is applied to the respective discipline.

Stage 3

24. Stage 2 may result in additional increments available within the Faculty or equivalent unit, due to rounding. Each Manager will therefore present additional recommendations for their Faculty/unit in stage 3, ensuring not to exceed the number of files per Faculty/unit in accordance with the guidance provided by the Principal (S3f see para 16).

Stage 4

25. The PEC will then proceed with examining additional files in Stage 4. The double increments awarded in Stage 4 are those remaining after the maximum number of increments have been awarded at Stages 2 and 3 and after accounting for the X double increments. The Principal or Academic Director RMC Saint-Jean (as appropriate) will present any files for those individuals who are part of an academic department/unit that, because of its small size and rounding, S2d for that department/unit was not equal to or greater than one (1). Each recommendation brought forward for consideration must be substantiated in terms of teaching, research, service and professional standing.

Step 4: Approval

26. At the completion of the increments meeting, the Principal brings forward the results to the Commandant RMC/ Commander CDA for approval and must substantiate the results in terms of teaching, research, service and professional standing. For UTs at RMC Saint-Jean, the Academic Director RMC Saint-Jean will bring the results for approval to the Commandant RMC Saint-Jean.

Step 5: Communication

27. Once approved by the Commandants/ Commander CDA, individual results of the increments meeting are forwarded to the Pay Centre for each member of the UT Group highlighting the performance assessment and corresponding increment result. Each member of the UT Group, their Supervisor and Manager receive a copy of this document. In addition, Managers will give feedback to the Supervisors so that they can inform members of their Departments/Equivalent Unit. The appropriate Manager normally sends a personal letter to those who achieved a superior rating, and the Principal normally sends a personal letter to those who achieve a distinguished rating. The Principal will send a courtesy copy of the letter to the appropriate Manager.

Recourse

28. The recourse mechanism for this process is the grievance process as outlined in the UT Collective Agreement (reference C).