



Guidelines for 2018 Faculty Performance Evaluations

Supplemental Instructions:

- The current annual performance evaluation form can be found at the bottom of [FSH 3320](#). Only current forms will be accepted. Evaluations on older forms will be returned.
- Completed evaluations are due to the provost's office by **March 1, 2019**. Colleges will likely have earlier deadlines.
- The college shall forward all evaluation material at the unit and college level, including the dean's narrative and faculty responses, if any, for the faculty member's permanent personnel file in the Provost's office. This includes the following documentation required in FSH 3320-A-1-c:
 - Evaluation form with all signatures.
 - Current Curriculum Vitae.
 - Written detailed summary report of faculty activity for the period of the annual performance review that compares accomplishments to expectations in the Position Description for the review period. This report may be in the form of a self-evaluation using the annual evaluation form included in the policy.
 - Other materials necessary to document efforts and accomplishments for the review period.
- Forms must be submitted electronically by the college designee to the provided folder on the S drive: S:\Committees\Faculty-Evals. The provost's office no longer accepts paper forms.
- Forms must be named in the following way (with the employee's V#): **V00001234-PE-2018**

FAQ:

Who writes the initial narrative?

The initial narrative describing the performance of the faculty member can be developed by the faculty member, by the department/unit administrator, or collaboratively between the faculty member and the administrator. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the department chair/unit administrator to finalize the narrative for each responsibility area (teaching and advising, scholarly and creative activity, outreach and extension, and university service and leadership). In addition, they must provide a narrative of overall performance and comment on progress toward tenure, promotion and/or continued satisfactory performance.

Can you explain the joint appointment signature line versus the interdisciplinary check box?

If the faculty member has a true joint appointment it is the responsibility of the department chair/unit administrator to solicit input from the joint appointment supervisor and incorporate that into the evaluation form. The joint appointment supervisor must sign the evaluation form on the indicated line.

However, if the faculty member is engaged in an interdisciplinary unit and/or a center, there is no need to have an additional signature on the form. The department chair/unit administrator is responsible to solicit, discuss and consider evaluative comments from those interdisciplinary/center administrators listed in the faculty narrative. The box must be checked indicating that the feedback is attached.

How is the overall annual performance and the progress toward tenure, promotion, and/or satisfactory performance different?

The "overall" evaluation references the work done in the past year. It should summarize the evaluation of the four areas. The "progress" portion (bottom box of the form from FSH 3320) evaluates the trajectory of the faculty toward

tenure, promotion(s), and/or continuing employment. This narrative provides guidance to the faculty member in addressing strengths and/or areas for growth from the perspective of performance over time.

Note: It is possible that a faculty member will have a satisfactory annual evaluation but not be making overall progress towards promotion and/or tenure. Unit criteria for promotion and tenure standards should be referenced to provide guidance.

How do I account for collegiality? How do I document if someone is meeting their position description goals but is difficult to work with?

Collegiality can be considered part of Service and Leadership. Observations regarding collegiality may be addressed in the narrative for that section and the overall summary. Continued collegiality issues could result in referencing additional Faculty Staff Handbook policies: FSH1565 A-1, FSH3160 B-3, and 3170 A.

Administrators are also encouraged to consider how the collegiality issues negatively affect other aspects of the faculty member’s performance in any of the four responsibility areas (e.g. has a negative effect in the classroom, hurts their ability to do research with their team, hinders their outreach success, etc.).

If a faculty member does not meet expectations in one responsibility area, does that mean I have to mark that they don’t meet expectations overall?

The “overall” evaluation is not a weighted score relative to job responsibility percentages. It is a judgment the chair/unit administrator makes after assessing the accomplishments of the faculty member during the year under review. Examples of factors to consider may include the proportion of the time assigned for an area(s) relative to productivity, the essentiality of the area of concern, or the impact of the concern on future success.

Filling out the form:

**Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation¹
Includes Disclosure of Conflict⁹**

For Review of Period: January through December (year) Enter the correct review year (2018).

Faculty Name: **Provide full name** Employee V#: **Ensure correct v#**

Rank: **Rank during year of review**

Administrative Title (if applicable): **Leave blank unless the faculty member has an administrative appointment**

Unit(s): **Primary unit of the faculty member (first) and others, if the faculty member has more than one unit appointment and/or interdisciplinary appointments**

Responsibilities	PD % - Enter the percentage of effort from the PD	Narrative - For each area of responsibility, describe the basis for their evaluation of the faculty member’s performance in this area. These boxes can be initially filled out by either the faculty member or the unit administrator depending on the bylaws or practices of the unit.	Met or Exceeded Expectations	
			Yes	No
Teaching and Advising ²				
Scholarship and Creative Activities ³				
Outreach and Extension ⁴				

University Service and Leadership ⁵				
Overall faculty member met or exceeded the expectations defined in the position description	The narrative in this section is developed by the chair/unit administrator, summarizing the overall performance including strengths and weaknesses.			Mark one box to indicate the overall performance of the faculty member.

Commentary/recommendations on progress toward tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfactory performance.*

The narrative in this section is developed by the unit administrator. It should address the trajectory of the faculty member toward tenure, promotion(s), and/or continuing employment. This narrative provides guidance to the faculty member by addressing future expectations.

***Relationship to Promotion and Tenure Process.** The faculty annual performance evaluation is an administrative review. Annual evaluations are one component of the independent promotion and tenure process. See FSH 3520 and 3560 for details on the promotion and tenure process.

Forms without proper signatures will be returned.

Unit Administrator Signature Date

Add "NA" if the appointment is not a joint appointment.

Unit Administrator Signature (joint appointments [if applicable]) Date

Faculty Signature ⁶ Date

Dean Signature Date

Check appropriate box if comments are attached.

- Interdisciplinary/Center Administrator Comments Attached** (if applicable). The unit administrator is responsible to solicit, discuss and consider evaluative comments from those interdisciplinary/center administrators listed in the faculty narrative. **All solicited comments are to be attached to this form.⁷ Please attach the comments as a separate document and not as part of the above narrative.**

- Faculty Comments Attached** (optional). The faculty member is allowed to include comments that respond to the administrator's evaluation. **Please attach the comments as a separate document and not as part of the above narrative.**

- Dean's Comments Attached** (optional). If there is any significant difference in the commentary, recommendations, or evaluation overall between the department chair and college dean, **the dean shall include a narrative stating the reasons for these differences.** The form with attachments must be returned to the faculty member and an opportunity provided for the faculty member to respond.⁸ **Please attach the comments as a separate document and not as part of the above narrative.**

Disclosure of Conflicts⁹

Make sure one of the boxes are marked and both signatures are on this section. A conflict management plan must be attached if the faculty member discloses a conflict (2nd box).

- If you have a conflict to disclose then you also will need to complete Form FSH 6240A.
- If there is any change in your circumstance that may give rise to potential conflicts or eliminate potential conflicts previously disclosed, then you will need to complete Form FSH 6240A within 30 days of the change.
- Disclose outside employment for compensation of more than 20 hours/week by completing FORM 6240B

I **DO NOT** have any conflicts of interest, conflicts of commitment or apparent conflicts, according to FSH 6240, to report.

I **DO** have any conflicts of interest, conflicts of commitment or apparent conflicts, according to FSH 6240, to report.

I have submitted FSH 6240A and a plan to manage each conflict or apparent conflict to my unit administrator.

Faculty Signature

Date

Unit Administrator Signature

Date

Note: An evaluation of “not meeting expectations” in any responsibility area or in the overall evaluation triggers procedures outlined in FSH 3320-B.