The period of assessment undertaken in Spring 2010 covers the period July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2009.

No Annual Report is required from:
- Full-Time Members in their final year
- Full-Time Members who did not have a Full-Time Appointment for more than 3 months during the assessment period

The performance of each Probationary and Tenured Member will be evaluated in each of the areas of Teaching, Research and Service in which that Member has responsibilities, according to the weightings specified in the Normal Workload document for the Department of Mathematics. If there is a written agreement between the Member and the Employer for an Alternative Workload, Reduced Responsibility or any other type of arrangement, in accordance with the Collective Agreement, then the weightings specified in that agreement will be used.

Members holding a Full-Time appointment other than a Probationary or Tenured appointment will be evaluated according to the weightings specified in their Letter of Appointment, or in any subsequent agreement provided for within the Collective Agreement.

Part-Time Members will be evaluated only on the basis of Teaching, except where additional duties are specified in the Letter of Appointment, or agreed to in an appendix to the Letter of Appointment.

The evaluation of any Joint Appointees will be carried out by a Joint APE Committee as specified in Clause 6.6 of the Collective Agreement.

In assessing a Member's performance in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service Work, the Annual Performance Evaluation Committee will base its assessments on information supplied in

(a) an Annual Report submitted by the Member;

(b) any other documents in the Member's Official File that are relevant to an assessment of the Member's performance in the preceding three academic years.

Annual Reports must follow the format approved by the Joint Committee, and evaluations are to cover a three-year period. If a Member does not have three full academic years upon which to base an evaluation, then the available period will serve as a basis for evaluation.

In accordance with the Annual Performance Evaluation Article, the APE Committee may take into account the effectiveness with which the Member discharged his/her Academic Responsibilities as those Academic Responsibilities are documented in the Member’s Office
File and/or Annual Report. The Parties have agreed that should the APE Committee evaluate adversely the effectiveness with which the Member has discharged his/her Service Responsibilities, that fact is to be disclosed in the copy of the assessment of the Committee provided to the Member, and the reasons for that adverse evaluation shall be provided to the Member by the Dean upon request.

Employer-approved duties outside the Unit and approved in advance by the Chair, Dean and Member will be considered.

The criteria used to arrive at the assessments will include consideration of the following:

**Teaching:** Any honours or awards; classroom performance including student teaching evaluations, grade distributions, possible peer review; course and curriculum development; course coordination; reading courses; mentoring or supervision of undergraduate students, graduate students, or postdoctoral fellows.

**Research:** Any honours or awards; publications in refereed journals, conference proceedings, books etc.; monograph preparation; invited addresses; participation in journal editorial committees; citations; grant levels.

**Service:** Departmental and extra-departmental committee work within the University, and other administrative duties.

Each person on the Annual Performance Evaluation Committee will first make his or her assessment alone. The results of these assessments will be averaged and the Committee will meet to discuss them and arrive at a common assessment for each Member under consideration. The Members of the Annual Performance Evaluation Committee may not participate in the assessments of their own achievements.

The committee shall, for each of the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service work in which a Member has responsibilities, categorize the Member's performance as being one of:

(A) outstanding;
(B) very good;
(C) good;
(D) acceptable;
(E) below the acceptable level.

as indicated in Section 6.5 of the Collective Agreement, and following the specific criteria outlined in the appendices of this document.
Appendix I: Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching

As applicable, each Member shall be evaluated in Teaching according to the factors listed in this document and using the scheme below.

To be evaluated in categories (A)-(C), the Member must exhibit performance levels equivalent to one or more of the criteria listed to that category, and must in addition meet all criteria for category (D) below.

(A) Outstanding.

- The Member has received a Faculty, University or national teaching award.
- The Member has outstanding teaching evaluations.
- The Member has made fundamental contributions to curriculum design and course development.
- The Member exhibits an outstanding record with supervision of graduate students or postdoctoral fellows.

(B) Very Good.

- Teaching evaluations are well above departmental standard.
- The Member has made important contributions to curriculum and course development.
- The Member has a substantial record with respect to supervision, teaching, or evaluation of graduate students, or a substantial record of supervision of postdoctoral fellows.
- The Member sits on and effectively participates in provincial or national committees, or journal editorial boards devoted to Mathematics education.

(C) Good.

- Teaching evaluations are at the departmental standard.
- The Member has made some contribution to the updating and redesign of courses.
- The Member has made some contribution to the graduate program through supervision, teaching or evaluation of graduate students.
- The Member has successfully served as course co-ordinator for large multi-section courses.
- The Member has a record of teaching contributions, including reading courses, over and above his/her workload

(D) Acceptable.

The Member must teach all courses to which he or she has been assigned. The material covered should be in line with departmental expectations, especially where the course is a prerequisite for later offerings. The Member must satisfactorily complete all teaching-related duties that he or she has been assigned. Teaching evaluations should not be significantly below departmental standard.

(E) Below the acceptable level.

Failure to meet the criteria in (D) will result in an assessment of (E) for Teaching.
Appendix II: Criteria for the Evaluation of Research

As applicable, each Member shall be evaluated in Research according to the factors listed in this document and using the scheme below.

To be evaluated in categories (A)-(C), the Member must exhibit performance levels equivalent to one or more of the criteria listed to that category, and must in addition meet all criteria for category (D) below.

(A) Outstanding.
   - The Member has a consistent record of publication in highly respected monograph series, journals or refereed conference proceedings; the Member is regularly invited to give one hour conference talks or seminars at other universities; the Member has strong support from NSERC or other funding agencies, relative to the stage of the Member's career.
   - The Member has received a major research award or fellowship.

(B) Very Good.
   - The Member has a consistent record of publication in respected monograph series, journals or refereed conference proceedings; the Member makes presentations at conferences or at other universities; the Member has good support from NSERC or other funding agencies, relative to the stage of his or her career.
   - The Member serves his or her research community on a high level, e.g., scientific organization of conferences, membership in granting council committees, membership in professional society research committees, membership in journal editorial committees.

(C) Good.
   - The Member has a consistent record of publication in monograph series, journals or refereed conference proceedings; the Member maintains a grant from NSERC or other funding agencies.

(D) Acceptable.
   - The Member produces on average one publication per year in a refereed forum. Alternatively, a Member may provide evidence of equivalent progress in a larger project for consideration in the Annual Performance Evaluation, e.g., a contract for a monograph in progress, with an indication of milestones for the project and how they have been met.

(E) Below the acceptable level.

Failure to meet the criteria in (D) will result in an assessment of (E) for Research.
Appendix III: Criteria for the Evaluation of Service

As applicable, each Member shall be evaluated in Service according to the factors listed in this document and using the scheme below.

The most significant factors in Service work are committee or other administrative work in the Department of Mathematics, and in the University at large.

For the purposes of this assessment, Service in any one of the following areas will be equivalent to membership in one highly active committee:

- The Member takes a significant workload in the Department in an administrative area outside the committee structure, for example, serving as web master or computer system planning and maintenance.

- Membership and active participation in Senate, the Board of Governors, or UWOFA.

The evaluation of Service will be made relative to the Member's Workload weighting in Service. Every Member with a Normal Workload should serve on a minimum of three departmental committees or their equivalent. Members with an Alternative Workload should serve on a proportionate number of committees. This number of committees is referred to as the Member's minimum number below.

To be evaluated in categories (A)-(C), the Member must exhibit performance levels equivalent to one or more of the criteria listed to that category, and must in addition meet all criteria for category (D) below.

(A) Outstanding.

- Leadership effecting significant progress in the Member's minimum number of committees, all highly active.

- Membership and effective participation in more than the Member's minimum number of committees, all highly active.

- Effective service in a senior departmental post.

(B) Very Good.

- Membership and effective participation in the Member's minimum number of committees, all highly active.

(C) Good.

- Membership and effective participation in the Member's minimum number of committees, at least one highly active.

(D) Acceptable.
- Membership and effective participation in at least one committee.

(E) Below the acceptable level.

Failure to meet the criteria in (D) will result in an assessment of (E) for Service.