University of Idaho
2017-2018 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #11

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, October 31, 2017
Brink Hall Faculty-Staff Lounge & Zoom

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2017-18 Faculty Senate Meeting #10, October 24, 2017 (vote)

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.
   • Recording Class Sessions (Chermak)(FYI)

VI. Committee Reports.
   • Faculty Affairs (Ytreberg)(vote)
     o FS-18-010 – FSH 3320 – Annual Performance Evaluation Form
     o FS-18-011 – FSH 3320 – Annual Performance Evaluation Policy

VII. Special Orders.
   • 2017 Great Colleges to Work For Survey (Pietrzak)(FYI)

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Patrick Hrdlicka, Chair 2017-2018, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2017-2018 FS Meeting #10

Handouts
Present: Anderson (Miranda), Anderson (Mike), Arowojolu, Baird, Barbour (Twin Falls), Brandt (w/o vote), Brown, Bugingo, Cannon (Boise), Caplan, De Angelis, Ellison, Foster, Grieb, Hrdlicka, Jeffrey, McIntosh for Johnson (w/o vote), Kern (Coeur d’Alene), Leonor, Mahoney, Morrison, Nicotra, Panttaja, Seamon, Tibbals, Vella, Watson, Wiencek (w/o vote).

Absent: Johnson, Morgan, Zhao.

Guests: 9

Call to Order and Minutes: The chair called the meeting to order at 3:31. A motion (Seamon/Mahoney) to approve the minutes passed with three abstentions.

Chair’s Report:

- Faculty Senate nominations for the University-level Promotion Committee are due to Mary Stout (mstout@uidaho.edu) by October 27. Details regarding the nomination process and the nomination form are available in the documents supporting Senate meeting #9 on October 17, 2017.
- Annual benefits enrollment began October 16 and runs through November 7.
- Sabbatical applications are due by October 27.
- President Staben will give the State of the University address on November 10 at 2-3:30 pm, International Ballroom, Pitman Center.

The chair also explained that the normal order of the agenda was changed to move the Provost’s Report to the end of the meeting. This change was made to ensure that senate has time for to consider time-sensitive policy matters while still allowing discussion with the Provost about the restructuring of the university’s advising and retention programs.

FS-18-009- FSH 6880 - Campus Recreation. A motion (Foster/Morrison) was made to remove FSH 6880 regarding campus recreation from the Faculty-Staff Handbook (FSH). Brian Mahoney, a member of Senate and Associate Director of Campus Recreation presented the proposal. He explained that the current policy dates to before the building of the Student Recreation Center (SRC) and contained many irrelevant and out-of-date provisions. The staff at campus recreation believes the contents of the policy was largely informational and contained on the campus recreation website. They pointed out that every time information about services changes, both the website and the FSH provision must be updated.

Several senators stated that they did not believe the information in the policy was purely informational. They also found the recreation website difficult to navigate and unhelpful. The suggestion was made that information for faculty and staff regarding use of campus recreation facilities and participation in programs should be in one coherent and accessible place. A senator commented that the FSH has historically contained both policies and information. Concern was expressed that recreational opportunities for faculty and staff are an employment benefit that might be eliminated if not included in the FSH. The faculty secretary stated that including information in the FSH did not prevent the revision of policies regarding benefits. In addition, she pointed out that the FSH was sometimes inconsistent with current approaches such as in this case. She also gave background on the long-term effort to remove informational and procedural matters from the FSH to the Administrative Procedures Manual (APM). A senator pointed out that the money to fund the SRC came from a bond issue that was approved based on the representation that the proceeds would be used for campus recreation. If the campus recreation policy is removed from the FSH, he expressed concern that it would also remove accountability on the maintenance of campus recreation opportunities. The provost pointed out that the proceeds from the bond have already been spent for the purpose that was intended. Another senator added that there are
tight financial controls at UI that prevent funds from being spent for purposes for which they were not intended. Mahoney added that he has started providing comprehensive information about campus recreation to all new faculty and staff at the time they begin employment at the university.

A number of senators expressed support for the idea of moving FSH 6880 to the APM rather than eliminating it altogether. A motion (Grieb/Vella) to postpone the vote on eliminating FSH 6880 was made and passed unanimously.

University Curriculum Committee Report. Registrar Heather Chermak and Associate Registrar Dwaine Hubbard presented the report which involved three revisions to academic regulations in the catalog and changes to the final exam schedule. The chair asked the registrar to present each regulation separately.

FS-18-005: Regulation F: The registrar explained that the changes to Regulation F regarding incomplete grades was to simplify the language and update it according to current processes. There was no discussion of these revisions.

FS-18-006: Regulation J: Similarly, the revisions to regulation J regarding concurrent and subsequent baccalaureate degrees simplifies and updates the policy language. A senator asked whether the regulation should address how a student would return to the university to pursue a new major within the same degree. After some discussion, the registrar indicated that her office would consider how to address this issue. There was no further discussion of this revision.

FS-18-007: Regulation O: The registrar explained that the revisions to Regulation O extend the deadline for graduation applications from the last day of the semester before graduation to the 10th day of the semester in which the student will graduate. It was moved (Tibbals/Panttaja) that the proposed language be revised as follows:

**O-3. Application for Graduation.** Degree candidates must submit an Application for Graduation to their college. Students should submit applications no later than the semester in which they will be completing their degree requirements. If two degrees are to be received concurrently, separate applications must be filed with the dean(s) of the college(s) concerned. The graduation, binding and microfilming fees will be posted on the student’s account once the graduation application has been approved and processed (See Fees and Expenses). The deadline for filing Applications for Graduation without a late service charge is the 10th day of the semester in which the student will be graduating.

The motion to amend proposed Regulation O was approved. There was no further discussion on Regulation O.

The chair proceeded to a vote on all three regulations as amended. They passed unanimously.

The registrar next presented the revised final exam schedule coming as a seconded motion from UCC. She stated that the registrar’s office had considered several options for the exam schedule, including those offered by Senate in its discussion at Meeting #7 on October 3, 2017. The registrar proposes that fall 2018 exams begin at 8:00 am, that the break between exams be 15 minutes, and that exams for classes during the day end at 5:00 pm. Evening classes and rescheduled exams will begin after 5:00. The proposed schedule was approved unanimously with three abstentions.

FS-18-010 and FS-18-011: Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation Form and Policy. Marty Ytreberg presented revisions to FSH 3320 and the accompanying form, regarding annual performance evaluation
of faculty proposed by the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC). The chair explained that revisions to the form were approved by senate on a pilot basis in 2015-16, and a stop-gap revision to the policy was approved in 2016-17 to facilitate the pilot, and survey (by FAC) results were presented to senate end of 2017 semester which supported the narrative form. [Meeting #25, 2015-16, April 12 2016; Meeting #7, 2016-17, October 4, 2017;Meeting #27, 2016-17, May 9, 2017]. Ytreberg added that FAC has proposed some additional changes to the evaluation form as well as revisions to the policy to simplify it and bring it into line with the form.

Questions:

- A senator asked why the form uses the terminology “met or exceeded expectations” rather than simply “met expectations”? Ytreberg responded that members of FAC wanted to clarify that the “yes” evaluation would apply regardless of whether a faculty member met or exceeded expectations. Another senator commented that the “met or exceeded” language was appropriate to encourage high levels of performance.

- A senator asked how the changes in the policy will affect merit-based raises? Typically, the State Board of Education (SBOE) has required employees to “meet expectations” as a condition of receiving regular increases in employee compensation and has characterized these increases as “merit” increases. Ytreberg explained that if a faculty member receives an overall evaluation of “meets expectations”, the faculty member would be eligible for increased salary as part of the regular change in employee compensation. Chair Hrdlicka added that the concept of merit pay will change as the institution moves toward a market compensation approach. Under this approach, meeting expectations will not trigger merit pay. Rather merit pay will most likely be reserved for exceptional performance. The provost elaborated that the market salary forming the basis for each faculty member’s target salary will reflect cost of living increases. Merit increases will reflect performance above and beyond meeting expectations. The faculty secretary also clarified that language regarding salary was eliminated from FSH 3320 in 2009 when it was moved to FSH 3420.

- A senator asked whether the narrative boxes on the annual evaluation form would have character limits? Ytreberg explained that in the Word document the table with boxes did not have limits and would grow in size as they were filled.

- This senator also asked what the difference was between the narrative overall evaluation and the commentary on continuing progress toward promotion and tenure? Ytreberg responded that FAC intended the overall narrative to differ from the continued progress narrative. He pointed out that the performance evaluation relates to a single year of performance, measures the faculty member’s performance against the annual position description, and is retrospective in nature. In contrast, review for promotion and tenure examines the cumulative performance of the faculty member. The narrative in the continuing progress box on the performance evaluation is intended to be more comprehensive and forward-looking in nature. He pointed out that a faculty member could meet expectations in a particular year, but may not be making adequate progress toward tenure or promotion because of prior unsuccessful year(s) or because the faculty member’s future plans may not satisfy expectations.

- Several senators expressed concern that the presence of the continuing progress box on the annual evaluation form might give the annual evaluation too big a role in the promotion and tenure process. Ytreberg and the faculty secretary commented that the annual evaluation process is an administrative process that informs the tenure and promotion process whereas the tenure and promotion process is a faculty-driven process. The faculty secretary pointed out that the commentary on the annual evaluation form helps ensure that the administrative evaluation process and the faculty-driven promotion and tenure process are connected. Ytreberg suggested that questions concerning how the overall performance and continuing progress narratives
should be completed and the role they would have in tenure and promotion are training issues for unit administrators and deans. This process should be seen as a warning system and a way to open up dialog with the unit administrator to address problem areas so the faculty member can succeed.

- Another senator suggested reversing the order of the box for overall performance and progress toward promotion and tenure. Ytreberg responded that the intent was to include the four responsibility areas and the overall performance all in one table and then to include a forward looking comment on progress which could also cover whatever period of time the administrator feels is important, thinking into the future.

- A senator followed up asking whether the role of annual evaluations in tenure and promotion is clearly delineated in the tenure and promotion policy? Ytreberg and the faculty secretary both responded that they believed the tenure and promotion policy was clear in describing that annual evaluations are only one category of evidence in the tenure or promotion packet.

- A senator asked whether, if the policy is adopted, the form would be required or whether it could be modified by an administrator or faculty member? Ytreberg responded that the form would be required and could not be modified.

- A senator asked whether FAC had considered the impact of adopting what was essentially a pass/fail rating? Ytreberg responded that the SBOE requires that the university adopt a standard to determine whether employees receive annual change in employee compensation. Another senator commented that the narrative would help ensure that evaluations are not pass/fail.

- Regarding the policy changes, a senator asked Ytreberg to comment on the fact that the revision proposes a single process for both tenured/tenure-track and non-tenured faculty. Ytreberg responded that the only difference between the existing policy regarding these two groups of faculty and the proposal is whether a review committee was created if the faculty member did not meet expectations. FAC concluded that both tenured and non-tenured faculty could benefit from mentoring and from review of their performance.

Provost’s Report. The provost began by commenting on the ironic timeliness of the Common Read presentation on the evening before on the book Mistakes Were Made But Not By Me. He reflected that his announcement of the management realignment in advising was released too abruptly and without enough direct conversation and collaboration. He stressed his commitment to the institution and expressed his regrets that the announcement has caused confusion and has upset a number of employees. He voiced regret for not having had better communication with advising staff and associate deans, which could have minimized the upset. Nonetheless, he believes that the need of the university to address enrollment and retention required decisiveness. He pointed out that while overall enrollment has increased, aspects of the university’s enrollment statistics are not encouraging. He stressed that we must change our current practices to move the institution forward and increase our resources. The provost emphasized the difficulty of the current fiscal environment and pointed out that our sister institution in Washington has just announced a $30 million budget cut -- $10 million during each of the next three years. He stressed that his intent is that this not happen here at UI. If we do not take decisive action now, we may find ourselves in the same situation.

The provost emphasized that his goal is to implement best practices for retention. To do so, we must have a more coordinated recruitment and retention program. He does not intend for the changes to disrupt successful efforts. In that regard, he specifically mentioned the ambassador program in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and the high touch advising approach of the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences. Instead, he would like to put in place a structure that will allow these successful programs to be implemented across the institution. He stressed that we must pay attention to our overall success rather than focusing on individual gains in colleges and units that are made without a corresponding
overall gain for the institution. His vision is that we implement an advising system that enables us to communicate and implement best practices across all the colleges. He believes that we can increase retention to the high 80% or even to 90%.

Finally, the provost stressed that the SBOE is moving to outcomes based funding for higher education. This means that SBOE will be allocating funds based on graduation rates, not on enrollment. The board is concerned about whether the different state institutions are implementing best practices for advising.

A senator thanked the provost for moving the university toward centralized advising. He expressed the view that polls of students have historically been critical of advising at the university and that the current ASUI leadership ran for election on a platform seeking centralized advising. Another senator thanked the provost for clarifying the current changes. She expressed concern that the role of faculty in the advising changes was unclear. She pointed out that in some colleges faculty are deeply involved in advising. The role of these faculty advisors, described in the roll out memo as “mentors”, is unclear. The provost responded that working out these relationships will be part of our implementation of the new process. He expressed his strong conviction that the current changes are not intended to reduce the role of faculty in advising. He suggested that faculty can be included in training and support that will be offered to advisors. Moreover, he emphasized that research on student success at college indicates that one of the most important factors is the development of strong relationships with faculty. He also commented that advising is central to the faculty’s responsibility to direct how the curriculum is carried out. There are many potential models for how faculty carry out that role. In the end, a professional staffing team will augment and support faculty. The provost stressed the theme that the university must provide better and more consistent support to professional advisors and must foster collaborative relationships with faculty to meet the differing needs of each academic program. Implementation of best practices will take time.

A senator suggested that the university should undertake a cost benefit analysis to determine whether further investment in advising is warranted compared to other types of investments.

A senator asked whether the university plans to conduct searches for the new management positions that have opened in advising. He explained that an assistant dean with a clinical faculty position had been told that his position would be eliminated and that he would need to apply for a staff position. The provost indicated that these were not new positions but rather reflected reorganization of current positions. He stated that advisors were being invited to express interest in the re-organized positions. Formal searches would not be conducted as these positions simply reflect a re-assignment of responsibilities.

The chair commented that much of the anxiety exists because faculty members knew nothing of the reorganization in advance. From their perspective, the changes seemed hasty and possibly ill conceived. He suggested that in order to relieve anxiety and stem some of the confusion around the change, the provost should sponsor an open forum to present a coherent vision about the advising changes. The provost affirmed that he intends to do so and suggested that senate leadership identify some time after the current advising period ends, but before fall break for such a forum. He also noted that he was working on a memo that would go out in the next day or so to address and recognize the upset this caused.

The time for the meeting having expired, a motion to adjourn (Morrison/Bugingo) was made and the meeting was adjourned at 5:11.

Respectfully Submitted,

Liz Brandt, Faculty Secretary &
Secretary to the Faculty Senate
VETERANS APPRECIATION DINNER

Presented by:
University of Idaho and
Moscow Chamber of Commerce

Keynote Speaker:
Colonel Glen R. Downing Commander
Air Force ROTC Detachment 905

Please join us in honoring the veterans in our community.

Saturday, November 11, 2017

University of Idaho
Bruce M. Pitman Center – International Ballroom

Doors open at 5:30 p.m.
Program and dinner begin at 6:00 p.m.
Veterans (plus one guest) are FREE
Each additional guest and non-veterans - $10

RSVP to https://uiveteransdinner.eventbrite.com by Wednesday, November 8, 2017. For more information please call 208-885-6365.
Recording Class Sessions

A faculty member who records a session of a course section they are teaching is creating a student educational record if students are recorded. The faculty member is responsible for knowing how to store and utilize this student record appropriately according to the rules and policies of the University of Idaho and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

A course section can be recorded and used by students participating in that particular course section or sections that meet together via video conferencing. If a faculty member wishes to record their lecture(s) and make them available to those students in that section(s) you can do so without violating FERPA, assuming the recording is available in a secure environment. Students do not have the right to anonymity under FERPA within their own classes.

Faculty who wish to record lectures for use in later semesters must take steps to comply with FERPA. You can comply with FERPA by recording the course in such a way that the students’ identity in the course is never revealed. For example, avoid recording student faces, and recording only the instructor and material being shared.

Storing student information in an unapproved manner is prohibited. Never save a recording to your personal device. Recordings should be stored in a secure place identified by ITS, (Share Drive, other approved secure drives).
POLICY COVER SHEET

(See Faculty Staff Handbook 1460 for instructions at UI policy website: www.webs.uidaho.edu/uipolicy)

[Faculty/Staff Handbook [FSH] □ Addition ☑ Revision* □ Deletion* □ Emergency

Minor Amendment

Chapter & Title: FSH 3320 – Annual Evaluation

All policies must be reviewed, approved and returned by a policy sponsor, with a cover sheet attached to apm@uidaho.edu or fsh@uidaho.edu respectively.

*Note: If revision/deletion request original document from apm@uidaho.edu or fsh@uidaho.edu, all changes must be made using “track changes.”

Originator(s): Marty Ytreberg Oct 16, 2017
(Please see FSH 1460 C)

Telephone & Email: 208-885-6908 ytreberg@uidaho.edu

Policy Sponsor: (If different than originator.)

Reviewed by General Counsel ___Yes __X__No Name & Date: ________

I. Policy/Procedure Statement: Briefly explain the purpose/reason of proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion to the Faculty/Staff Handbook or the Administrative Procedures Manual. Remove pilot form language. Remove all references to the numerical score and clarify the narrative evaluation process. Clarify the consequences of not meeting expectations for multiple years.

II. Fiscal Impact: What fiscal impact, if any, will this addition, revision, or deletion have?
None

III. Related Policies/Procedures: Describe other policies or procedures existing that are related or similar to this proposed change.
None

IV. Effective Date: This policy shall be effective on July 1, or January 1, whichever arrives first after final approval (see FSH 1460 D) unless otherwise specified in the policy.

If not a minor amendment forward to: _____________

Track # ____________
Date Rec.: ____________

Policy Coordinator Appr. & Date: [Office Use Only]

FSH Appr. FC FS-18-012 GFM Pres./Prov. ____________
[Office Use Only]

APM F&A Appr. : [Office Use Only]

APM F&A Appr. : [Office Use Only]

Track # ____________
Date Rec.: ____________
Posted: t-sheet ____________ h/c _________
web ____________
Register: [Office Use Only]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>PD %</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Met or Exceeded Expectations</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship and Creative Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach and Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Service and Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall faculty member met or exceeded the expectations defined in the position description</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*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.
Faculty member is making progress on the goals defined in the position description, and contributes positively to life and learning at the University of Idaho.

Faculty member is not meeting University of Idaho performance expectations.

Unit Administrator Signature  Date

Unit Administrator (joint appointments [if applicable])  Date

Faculty Signature  Date

Dean Signature  Date

☐ 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

☐ Faculty Comments Attached (optional). The faculty member is allowed to include comments that respond to the administrator’s evaluation.

☐ 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 for a second signature.8

Second Faculty Signature (if applicable)  Date

Disclosure of Conflicts9

- 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

1 Faculty Staff Handbook section 3320
2 Faculty Staff Handbook section 1565 C-1
3 Faculty Staff Handbook section 1565 C-2
4 Faculty Staff Handbook section 1565 C-3
5 Faculty Staff Handbook section 1565 C-4, 1420E
6 “At the conclusion of the review process, each faculty member shall sign the evaluation form indicating that she/he has had the opportunity to read the evaluation report and to discuss it with the unit administrator.” FSH 3320 A1 e,4
7 Faculty Staff Handbook section 3050 B-2, 3320 A-1 d, 3520 E-1, G-3, G-4c, and 3560 C,E-2d
8 If there is a disagreement, see Faculty Staff Handbook section 3320 A-1 e
9 Faculty Staff Handbook section 6240
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>PD %</th>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Met or Exceeded Expectations Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship and Creative Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach and Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Service and Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall faculty member met or exceeded the expectations defined in the position description

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

---

*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.
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

Faculty Comments Attached (optional). The faculty member is allowed to include comments that respond to the administrator’s evaluation.8

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.9

Disclosure of Conflicts9

- 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 Senate 2017-18 - Meeting #11 - October 31, 2017 - Page 14

1 Faculty Staff Handbook section 3320
2 Faculty Staff Handbook section 1565 C-1
3 Faculty Staff Handbook section 1565 C-2
4 Faculty Staff Handbook section 1565 C-3
5 Faculty Staff Handbook section 1565 C-4, 1420E
6 “At the conclusion of the review process, each faculty member shall sign the evaluation form indicating that she/he has had the opportunity to read the evaluation report and to discuss it with the unit administrator.” FSH 3320 A1 e
7 Faculty Staff Handbook section 3050 B-2, 3320 A-1 d, 3520 E-1, G-3, G-4c, and 3560 C,E-2d
8 If there is a disagreement, see Faculty Staff Handbook section 3320 A-1 i
9 Faculty Staff Handbook section 6240
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS AND SALARY DETERMINATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS

PREAMBLE: This section contains those policies and their attendant procedures for those periodic reviews of performance that affect faculty members and academic administrators. Policies concerning performance evaluation were part of the original 1979 Handbook, but were completely rewritten in July 2002 and further refined in 2003. In July 2007 Form 1 underwent substantial revisions to address enforcement and accountability issues in the UI promotion and tenure process as well as align the form with the Strategic Action Plan. In January 2008 Form 1 was again revised to include a Disclosure of Conflicts statement to comply with FSH 6240. In 2009 this section was again revised to reflect recent changes to the faculty position description and evaluation forms to better integrate faculty interdisciplinary activities. In July 2010 B was added and FSH 1420 E-6 was incorporated into D to consolidate the evaluation process into one policy. In July 2014 changes were incorporated to ensure all faculty go through a review by their peers. In January 2017 a temporary fix to this policy was put in place to allow for a pilot narrative evaluation process for 2016 and ensure that existing policy would apply. Further information may be obtained from the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448. [ed. 7-03, rev. 7-07, 1-08, 7-09, 7-10, 7-14, 1-17]

CONTENTS:
A. Annual Performance Evaluation and Salary Determination for Faculty Members
B. Faculty Performance Below that does not Meet Expectations of Non-tenured Faculty Members
C. Performance Below Expectations of Tenured Faculty Members
D. Performance Evaluation of Academic Administrators
E. Sequence of Evaluation of Faculty Members and Administrators.

A. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND SALARY DETERMINATION FOR FACULTY MEMBERS.

A-1. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION. Annual evaluation of the performance of each member of the faculty is primarily the responsibility of the faculty member and her/his unit administrator. Each unit will develop criteria in its bylaws for third-year and periodic review of its faculty (FSH 1520 II Section 1). The committee for all reviews will be defined in unit bylaws and will include tenure-track faculty (see FSH 3560 E-2 c). The materials listed in FSH 3560 E-2 a and b are critical and used by review committees when considering progress towards promotion (FSH 3560) and/or tenure (FSH 3520). The provost is responsible for preparing supplementary instructions each year, including the schedule for completion of the annual performance evaluation process. Personnel on international assignment see FSH 3380 C. [rev. 7-03, 7-09, 7-14, ed. 7-10, 1-17]

a. Forms Distributed. The Annual Performance Evaluation Pilot Form is available below. The form may not be altered without following the appropriate governance process (see FSH 1460). The unit administrator is responsible for ensuring that each faculty member uses the proper form together with a copy of the supplementary instructions as provided by the Provost Office. [rev. 7-01, 1-17]

Approach during Pilot Study: While the pilot narrative Annual Performance Evaluation form is being used, the specific references to performance and ratings found in this section are not in effect. Checking the “not meeting expectations box” on the pilot form triggers section B-1 for non-tenured faculty and section C for tenured faculty. The evaluator must document the areas of concern that warrant checking the “not meeting expectations” box in the narrative review. If there are areas of concern that warrant attention, but do not rise to the level of “not meeting expectations” these too should be documented in the written narrative. [add. 1-17]
b. Performance expectations levels for each criterion are described below. The narrative in the evaluation form shall provide evidence to support the evaluations as follows: [ed. 7-10]

i. Exceptional Performance that Meets or Exceeds Expectations (5) is the satisfactory extraordinary performance during the review period of a faculty member well beyond that required relative to the position description.

ii. Performance that does not Meet Above Expectations (4) denotes represents performance during the review period that is less better than expected of a faculty member relative to the position description and means improvement is necessary. An evaluation of not meeting expectations in one or more responsibility areas triggers procedures outlined in FSH 3320 B below. [ed. 7-09, 7-10]

iii. Meets Expectations (3) is the performance expected of a faculty member relative to the position description.

iv. Below Expectations (2) denotes performance that is less than expected of a faculty member relative to the position description and means improvement is necessary. A rating of below expectations in one or more criteria triggers procedures outlined in 3320 B or C. [rev. 7-09, 7-10]

v. Unacceptable Performance (1) is performance that is not acceptable relative to the position description and/or is inconsistent with the conditions for continued employment with the institution. Failure to meet these standards in any of the following ways will result in a rating of unacceptable performance: [rev. 7-09]

- received a “1” rating the previous period but did not make the improvements required;
- consistently violated one or more of the institution’s standards for meeting the expectations of the position; or
- violated one or more standards of conduct as specified in the Faculty-Staff Handbook.

c. Annual Report of Efforts and Accomplishments by Faculty Member. Each faculty member shall provide his or her unit administrator with the following materials in preparation for use in the annual performance evaluation:

(1) Current Curriculum Vitae
(2) UI Faculty Position Description for Annual Performance Review
(3) 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 this policy. [rev. 7-09]
(4) Other materials necessary to document efforts and accomplishments for the review period. [add. 7-01, ed. 7-10]

d. Evaluation of Faculty by Unit Administrators. Unit administrators evaluate their faculty members in their unit. The performance of each faculty member during the review period is judged on the basis of the position description(s) in effect during that period. In the case of a faculty member holding joint appointments and/or involved in interdisciplinary activities, as described in the position description, in two or more academic or administrative units, it is the responsibility of the administrator in the faculty member’s primary academic discipline to solicit and consider relevant information on job performance from other administrators with responsibility for the faculty member’s work. [See also 3080 E-3.] [rev. 7-09, ed. 7-10]

Ratings are Whether a faculty member’s performance meets expectations is determined by comparing the faculty member’s performance to the position description for the review period. The results of the student evaluation of teaching are carefully weighed and used as a factor in this evaluation. For each area of responsibility, the unit administrator shall describe the basis for her/his evaluation of the faculty member’s performance. In the ratings and narrative are entered as indicated on the form. The annual evaluation score for a faculty member in Form 1 relates to the faculty member’s performance evaluation.
relative to his/her position description. The overall unit average is provided to the faculty member upon request so that each faculty member can gauge his/her performance relative to other faculty members within the unit. After the unit administrator has completed ratings and the narrative evaluation for all faculty for the review period, the unit administrator shall provide the following items to each reviewed individual as they become available: \[rev. 7-03, 7-09\]

1. A copy of the individual’s annual evaluation form and narrative \[rev. 7-09\]
2. If requested, comparative information to help assess performance evaluation and numerical ratings, including, but not limited to: \[rev. 7-09\]
   a. Frequency distribution for overall ratings for the unit
   b. Frequency distribution for overall ratings for the college \[rev. 7-97, ren. and rev. 7-01\]

The unit administrator shall also include comments and recommendations for the faculty member’s progress toward tenure, promotion or continued satisfactory performance in the appropriate place on the annual evaluation form.

e. Self-Evaluation and Conference. Each faculty member is given an opportunity to use the evaluation form (FSH 3320 Form 1) to make an evaluation of his or her own performance. It is strongly recommended that the unit administrator meet with each faculty member. The unit administrator shall provide each faculty member with the opportunity to meet to discuss the unit administrator’s evaluation. (Suitable alternate arrangements shall be made for off-campus personnel.) The purpose of this meeting is to review and discuss the administrator’s evaluation and the faculty member’s detailed report of activities self-evaluation, if any. The unit administrator should explain the his or her ratings and narrative providing a formative assessment on progress towards tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfactory performance related to the faculty member’s performance during the year and any revisions in professional goals and objectives for the coming year. The faculty member and the unit administrator should work to identify strategies to help the faculty member improve performance. The ratings narrative evaluation may be modified as a result of the discussion. At the conclusion of the review process, each faculty member shall sign the evaluation form indicating that she/he has had the opportunity to read the evaluation report and to discuss it with the unit administrator. If the faculty member wishes to respond to the unit administrator’s evaluation, the unit administrator shall be permitted to append a report response to the unit administrator’s evaluation, detailing the nature of the dissent. A copy of the administrator’s final evaluation shall be given to the faculty member. \[ren. and rev. 7-01, rev. 7-09, ed. 7-10\]

f. College-Level Action. Copies of the performance evaluation materials forwarded by the unit administrator to the appropriate dean(s), for evaluation at the college(s) level, shall include: \[rev. 7-09\]

1. The narrative evaluation form with the complete narrative and the including comments and recommendations on progress towards tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfactory performance, and \[rev. 7-09\]
2. Any evaluative comments provided by interdisciplinary/center administrators or from those administrators of faculty holding joint appointments provided pursuant to subsection A-1. d., above, and \[rev. 7-09\]
3. The evaluation form, \[rev. 7-09\]

g. If the unit administrator fails to include attach the the required narrative and comments regarding whether the faculty member met expectations and comments/recommendations on the faculty member’s progress toward tenure, promotion or continued satisfactory performance, evaluation and evaluative comments, the college shall return the materials to the unit administrator. \[add. 7-09, rev. 7-10\]

h. If the faculty member has attached a report response to the evaluation file a dissenting from the unit administrator’s evaluation, the unit report response shall be provided a copy to the dean with the annual evaluation form. The dean shall arrange a meeting with the unit administrator and the faculty member to attempt to resolve the relevant issues. The dean enters an evaluation in the space provided on the evaluation form. A copy of that form is given to the faculty member and the original is forwarded to the Provost’s Office for permanent filing [see FSH 1470 and APM 65.02]. A copy of the evaluation form is retained in the college
office. If the dean concurs with the overall evaluation and rating of the faculty member by the unit administrator, no additional signature is required from the faculty member. [rev. 7-09, 7-10]

i. If there are any differences in any rating between the unit administrator and college dean disagrees with the unit administrator’s evaluation, the dean shall attach a narrative stating the reasons for the disagreement. A copy of the dean’s narrative shall be provided to the faculty member. The faculty member may respond to the dean’s evaluation before the evaluation is forwarded to the provost. The faculty member, unit administrator, and dean are encouraged to resolve the disagreement before forwarding the evaluation to the provost. If the matter remains unresolved at the college level, the provost shall be notified of the disagreement. [ren. and rev. 7-01, rev. 12-06, 7-09, 7-10]

A-2. SALARY DETERMINATION. This process is carried out at the departmental and higher levels of academic administration. [see FSH 3420.][rev. 7-09]

B. FACULTY PERFORMANCE THAT DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS OF NON-TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS. [add. 7-10]

B-1. If the unit administrator determines that a non-tenured faculty member is not meeting expectations, the unit administrator should consider the reasons for and explanations of the performancethat no possibility of causing, other than inadequate effort on the faculty member’s part, that might be responsible for the performance. (see FSH 3190) [ed. 7-09, rev. 7-10]

The unit administrator, in consultation with the faculty member, should address the possible causes of the problem, should suggest appropriate resources and encourage the employee to seek such help. Faculty members and unit administrators may obtain referral information and advice from the University Ombuds, Human Resources, or the Provost’s Office. [ed. 12-06, 7-09, 7-14, rev. 7-16]

C-1B-2. ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF BELOW EXPECTATIONSPROVOST INVOLVEMENT. In the event of an overall evaluation of “does not meet expectations” where the faculty member’s performance is so far below expectations that it is not acceptable in relation to the position description, score of 1, the provost may, in consultation with the dean and unit administrator, determine that further review of the faculty member’s performance is required pursuant to . This review will be conducted in accordance with the procedures prescribed in FSH 3320 B-5 belowC-2. [ren. and ed. 7-09, rev. 7-16]

B-32. FIRST ANNUAL OCCURRENCE.

a. In the event that a non-tenured faculty member receives an annual evaluation concluding that he or she has performed below has not met expectations overall or (2 or lower) within one or more areas of responsibility, the unit administrator shall, at the same time he or she delivers the performance evaluation, offer to meet with the faculty member to identify the reasons for the performance below expectations. At this meeting, the faculty member and the unit administrator shall review the faculty member’s Position Description and examine strategies that would permit the faculty member to improve his or her performance. A mentoring committee shall
be formed upon the request of either the faculty member or the unit administrator. The committee shall be composed of two or more faculty members agreed upon by the unit administrator and faculty member. [rev. 7-09, 7-10]

b. In the event that a non-tenured faculty member receives an annual evaluation concluding that he or she has performed below expectations (2 or below) in the overall score, the unit administrator will, at the same time he or she delivers the performance evaluation, offer to meet with the faculty member to identify the reasons for evaluating the performance as below expectations. At this meeting, the unit administrator will appoint a mentoring committee by selecting three individuals from a list of five faculty members nominated by the faculty member, or if the faculty member makes no nominations, will appoint three faculty members of her/his choosing. The mentoring committee’s purpose is to help the faculty member improve performance. The members of the committee need not be drawn from the same unit as the faculty member. The faculty member or unit administrator may request that the University Ombuds attend meetings of the mentoring committee and faculty member. [ed. 12-06, rev. 7-09, 7-10]

B-43. TWO SECOND CONSECUTIVE TWO OCCURRENCES WITHIN THREE YEARS ANNUAL ASSESSMENTS OF BELOW EXPECTATIONS. In the event of two consecutive annual evaluations concluding that the non-tenured faculty member has performed below expectations overall or within one or more areas of responsibility (2 or lower), the unit administrator shall, at the same time he or she delivers the performance evaluation, arrange a meeting of the faculty member, the unit administrator and, in the unit administrator’s discretion, the college dean. The faculty member or the unit administrator may request that the University Ombuds attend the meeting. [ed. 12-06, rev. 7-10]

The intent of the meeting is to review:

a. the current position description and revise it if necessary to address the issues identified during the discussion. [ed. 7-09]

b. the strategies implemented in the previous year(s) and to identify why the strategies did not result in the faculty member meeting expectations. The parties should re-examine strategies that would support improved performance by permit the faculty member to improve his or her performance. [ed. 7-09]

C. PERFORMANCE BELOW EXPECTATIONS OF TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS. Tenured faculty will follow the same process as described in B-1 through B-3 above. In addition, to identify and address specific problems early on, a tenured faculty member may be subject to a review as described in C-1 and C-2 below. The purpose of C-1 and C-2 is to assist the faculty member with getting back on track. [add. 7-16]

C-1.- ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF BELOW EXPECTATIONS. In the event of an overall score of 1, the provost may determine that further review of the faculty member’s performance is required. This review will be conducted in accordance with the procedures prescribed in 3320 C-2. [ren. and ed. 7-09, rev. 7-16]

BC-52. THREE OCCURRENCES WITHIN FIVE YEARS CONSECUTIVE ANNUAL EVALUATION ASSESSMENTS OF BELOW EXPECTATIONS. In the event of three consecutive annual evaluations of “does not meet below expectations”, overall or within a five-year period, either overall or within one or more areas of responsibility, or a pattern of below expectations evaluations over five years (a summary score of 2 or lower), the dean shall initiate a formal peer review. [rev. 7-09, ren. 7-10]

a. Composition of the Review Committee. The Review Committee will consist of at least four (4) members, appointed as follows:

(1) The faculty member may submit to the unit administrator a list of the names of three faculty members from within the unit and at least one three tenured faculty members from outside of the unit. If the faculty member is tenured or on the tenure track, faculty on the committee should be tenured faculty unless no tenured faculty are available. The unit administrator shall appoint the committee, including at least two names from the faculty member’s list. The faculty member will select one person from inside of the unit and one from
outside the unit. From the list given to the unit administrator, he/she will select one person from inside of
the unit and one from outside the unit.
(2) The committee members will select as chair another faculty member from within the unit.
(3) The Ombuds or his/her designee shall be an ex officio member of the committee. [ed. 12-06]

b. **Report and Timing of the Review.** The committee report includes the review and possible
recommendation(s), and shall be completed within sixty days of the annual evaluation.

c. **The Review.** The purpose of the review is to assess the level of performance of the faculty member, and the
unit administrator’s evaluation of that performance. To that end, the committee shall assess the reasonableness
of the previous evaluations, and the appropriateness of the development plans, as well as any material
submitted by strategies put in place to assist the faculty member and the unit.

The faculty member and chair shall will provide the following materials for the review period under review to the committee:
1) Updated Curriculum Vitae of the faculty member,
2) Position Descriptions, for the past four years
3) Annual evaluation materials submitted by the faculty member, for the past three years
4) Annual Evaluations of the faculty member by the unit administrator and the Dean, for the past three years
5) Student and peer evaluations (if any) of teaching, for the past four years
6) A summary of the strategies put in place to assist the faculty member,
7) A self-assessment summary of each area of the faculty member’s responsibility and what the faculty
member has learned and achieved during the review period under review, past four (4) years,
including contributions to the department, university, state, nation, and field (about 2 pages).

The faculty member may submit any additional information he or she desires, and the committee may request
additional materials as it deems necessary.

d. **Responses to Committee Report.** The committee chair shall submit the report to the faculty member, unit
chair, and dean. Each recipient shall have fifteen days from the report’s date to submit written responses to the review committee. The review committee shall send the report and all responses to the provost.

e. **Provost.** The provost shall be responsible for determining the appropriate resolution, which may include: [rev. 7-09]
1) continuing the status quo;
2) mentoring to address area(s) of concern;
3) termination for cause;
4) consideration of other recommended resolution(s). [1-4 add. 7-09]

B-6. **Non-Tenured Faculty.** Pursuant to Regent’s policy, non-tenured faculty do not have an expectation of
contract renewal, absent a specific written multi-year contract. The process set forth in Section B does not require
the University to renew a non-tenured faculty contract. The process set forth in Section B shall not be required for
a non-tenured faculty member who has been given notice of non-renewal.

B-7. **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.

D. **PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS.** [ed. 7-09, ren. 7-10]
D-1. EVALUATION BY FACULTY MEMBERS. Opportunity is provided for an annual performance evaluation of college deans, assistant and associate deans, and administrators of academic departments and other intracollege units by the faculty members of the respective units. The provost sends each faculty member an appropriate number of copies of the form, “Annual Faculty Evaluation of Academic Administrators” [form 2 appended to this section] to be used for evaluation of the unit or center administrator, one to be used for evaluation of the dean, and one to be used for evaluation of each assistant or associate dean in the college. [ren. & ed. 7-10, 10-10]

D-2. EVALUATION OF UNIT AND CENTER ADMINISTRATORS AND ASSISTANT AND ASSOCIATE DEANS. The review and evaluation of unit and center administrators, and assistant and associate deans, require consideration of their responsibilities as faculty members and as administrators as defined by percentage allocations in the Annual Position Description. All administrators are entitled to a review and evaluation of their performance as faculty members. Further, all administrators are entitled to a review of their performance as administrators. (Forms to be used in the evaluation of administrators are found in Form 1 and 2. [rev. 7-99, ed. 3-07, rev. & ren. 7-10 (incorporated 1420 E-6 into this entire section D-2 through D-4)]

1. Evaluation as a Faculty Member.

   a. Annual Evaluation. The annual evaluation of an administrator’s performance as a faculty member shall be conducted by the dean of the college in accordance with the provisions of FSH 3320 A above.

   b. Third Year Review. If the administrator is untenured, there shall be a third-year review in accordance with the procedures outlined in FSH 3520 G-4.

2. Evaluation as an Administrator.

   a. Annual Evaluation. The dean shall conduct an annual evaluation of each administrator’s performance in accordance with the responsibilities specified in FSH 1420 E-1 and in the Annual Position Description. The dean and administrator will negotiate the administrator’s Annual Position Description on the basis of the unit’s needs, and make it available to the faculty for annual evaluation purposes. The administrator will present his or her annual goals for the unit at the beginning of the review year and report on his/her effectiveness in meeting last year’s goals. Annual goals should be based on the unit action plan, needs of the unit, and discussion with the dean. The dean will make a conscientious effort to solicit input from unit faculty through evaluation form 2. [rev. 7-99, ed. 6-09, 10-10]

   Unit faculty must send completed copies of form 2 directly to the dean. The dean furnishes the administrator a summary of the faculty evaluations in such a way that the confidentiality of individual evaluations is preserved. The dean may arrange a conference with the administrator to discuss the summary. After these steps have been completed, the dean shall destroy the individual faculty members’ evaluations and shall file the written summary in the dean’s office. The dean then submits a summary of conclusions and recommendations resulting from the review to the provost, who in turn makes his or her review and forwards recommendations to the president. The dean will then provide feedback to faculty who have submitted form 2, as appropriate. [ed. 10-10]

D-3. EVALUATION OF DEANS. The provost shall conduct an annual evaluation of each dean’s performance in accordance with the dean’s responsibilities specified in FSH 1420 D-2 and in the Annual Position Description. The provost and dean will negotiate the Annual Position Description for the dean on the basis of the college’s needs and make it available to the faculty for annual evaluation purposes. The dean will present his or her annual goals for the college at the beginning of the review year and report on his or her effectiveness in meeting last year’s goals. Annual goals should be based on the college’s action plan, needs of the college, and discussion with the provost. The provost will make a conscientious effort to solicit input from college faculty through evaluation form 2. [ed. 10-10]
College faculty will send completed copies of form 2 directly to the provost. The provost will summarize the faculty responses and share that summary with the dean. In preparing and conveying that summary, the provost has the responsibility to ensure that faculty comments are confidential. This includes, but is not limited to, avoiding the use of any phrases that can identify the faculty member making the comments. The provost may arrange a conference with the dean to discuss the summary. After these steps have been completed, the provost shall destroy individual faculty members’ evaluations and file the written summary in the Office of Academic Affairs. The provost must then submit a summary of conclusions and recommendations resulting from the review to the president. The provost will then provide feedback to faculty who have submitted form 2, as appropriate. [ed. 10-10]

D-4. PERIODIC REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATORS. Each administrator is formally reviewed at least six months before the end of each appointment term, or, if there is not a fixed appointment term, at least every five years. The Provost appoints an ad hoc review committee to include faculty, department chairs, and experienced administrators of other units. The periodic review will be conducted at the request of the Provost and Executive Vice President and in accordance with the mechanisms of formal review, which must provide for the following:

1. Opportunity for the dean, center administrator, or unit administrator to prepare a report/porfolio summarizing his or her administrative achievements for the period, including annual reviews; [rev. and ren. 7-99]

2. Opportunity for all faculty and staff of the college/unit to participate in the review;

3. Solicitation of input by the committee from appropriate constituencies of the college/unit. Confidentiality of all individual evaluations will be ensured; [add. 7-99]

4. Preparation by the review committee of a written report summarizing the findings and recommendations of the review, which will be forwarded to the Provost and the dean/center or unit administrator; [ed. and ren. 7-99]

5. The provost will submit the written report along with any additional comments and recommendations to the president and provide appropriate feedback to the administrator. [rev. and ren. 7-99]

a. Additional Review. The provost and/or college dean may initiate a review at any time he or she determines a review is needed. The dean shall submit to the provost a summary of conclusions and recommendations resulting from this additional review. If the review is conducted by the provost, he or she shall submit a summary of conclusions and recommendations to the president.

The faculty of the unit may also initiate, by majority vote, a formal review (as outlined above) of the unit administrator. The tenured faculty of a college may also initiate, by majority vote, a formal review (as outlined above) of the college dean.

E. SEQUENCE OF EVALUATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS AND ADMINISTRATORS. The provost prepares the schedule for completion of steps in the performance evaluation and salary determination process each year. The schedule will ensure that faculty members’ evaluations of unit or center administrators and assistant and associate deans have been received by the dean before the administrators’ recommendations on salary, promotion, and tenure are made known to the faculty and, similarly, that faculty members’ evaluations of deans have been received by the provost before the deans’ recommendations on salary, promotion, and tenure are made known to the faculty. Likewise, the summaries of faculty evaluations of unit or center administrators, assistant and associate deans, and deans will be communicated to the persons evaluated after their recommendations on faculty salary, promotion, and tenure have been transmitted to the provost. [ren. & rev. 7-10]
*NOTE: In October of 2010 it was determined that elimination of Form 2A was possible with minor edits to Form 1 (addition of reference FSH 1420 E to box 4). As such, Form 1 may be used in lieu of Form 2A by administrators, if desired. Given this change, form 2B becomes Form 2 (see the UI Policy website for redline versions or contact the Faculty Secretary's Office or Provost's Office for further clarification).
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS
AND
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

PREAMBLE: This section contains those policies and their attendant procedures for those periodic reviews of performance that affect faculty members and academic administrators. Policies concerning performance evaluation were part of the original 1979 Handbook, but were completely rewritten in July 2002 and further refined in 2003. In July 2007 Form 1 underwent substantial revisions to address enforcement and accountability issues in the UI promotion and tenure process as well as align the form with the Strategic Action Plan. In January 2008 Form 1 was again revised to include a Disclosure of Conflicts statement to comply with FSH 6240. In 2009 this section was again revised to reflect recent changes to the faculty position description and evaluation forms to better integrate faculty interdisciplinary activities. In July 2010 B was added and FSH 1420 E-6 was incorporated into D to consolidate the evaluation process into one policy. In July 2014 changes were incorporated to ensure all faculty go through a review by their peers. In January 2017 a temporary fix to this policy was put in place to allow for a pilot narrative evaluation process for 2016 and ensure that existing policy would apply. Further information may be obtained from the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448. [ed. 7-03, rev. 7-07, 1-08, 7-09, 7-10, 1-17]

CONTENTS:
A. Annual Performance Evaluation for Faculty Members
B. Faculty Performance that does not Meet Expectations
C. Performance Evaluation of Academic Administrators
D. Sequence of Evaluation of Faculty Members and Administrators.

A. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FOR FACULTY MEMBERS.

A-1. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION. Annual evaluation of the performance of each member of the faculty is primarily the responsibility of the faculty member and unit administrator. The provost is responsible for preparing supplementary instructions each year, including the schedule for completion of the annual performance evaluation. Personnel on international assignment see FSH 3380 C. [rev. 7-03, 7-09, 7-10, ed. 7-10, 1-17]

a. Forms. The Annual Performance Evaluation Form is available below. The form may not be altered without following the appropriate governance process (see FSH 1460). The unit administrator is responsible for ensuring that each faculty member uses the proper form together with the supplementary instructions as provided by the Provost Office. [rev. 7-01, 1-17]

b. Performance expectations are described below. The narrative in the evaluation form shall provide evidence to support the evaluation. [ed. 7-10]

i. Performance that Meets or Exceeds Expectations is the satisfactory performance during the review period of a faculty member relative to the position description.

ii. Performance that does not Meet Expectations denotes performance during the review period that is less than expected of a faculty member relative to the position description and means improvement is necessary. An evaluation of not meeting expectations in one or more responsibility areas triggers procedures outlined in FSH 3320 B below.

c. Annual Report of Efforts and Accomplishments by Faculty Member. Each faculty member shall provide his or her unit administrator with the following materials in preparation for the annual performance evaluation:

(1) Current Curriculum Vitae
(2) UI Faculty Position Description for Annual Performance Review
(3) 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 this policy. [rev. 7-09]

(4) Other materials necessary to document efforts and accomplishments for the review period. [add. 7-01, ed. 7-10]

d. Evaluation of Faculty by Unit Administrators. Unit administrators evaluate the faculty members in their unit. The performance of each faculty member during the review period is judged on the basis of the position description(s) in effect during that period. In the case of a faculty member holding joint appointments and/or involved in interdisciplinary activities, as described in the position description, in two or more academic or administrative units, it is the responsibility of the administrator in the faculty member’s primary academic discipline to solicit and consider relevant information on job performance from other administrators with responsibility for the faculty member’s work. [See also 3080 E-3.] [rev. 7-09, ed. 7-10]

Whether a faculty member’s performance meets expectations is determined by comparing the faculty member’s performance to the position description for the review period. For each area of responsibility, the unit administrator shall describe the basis for her/his evaluation of the faculty member’s performance in the narrative on the form. After the unit administrator has completed the narrative evaluation for all faculty for the review period, the unit administrator shall provide the following items to each reviewed individual as they become available: [rev. 7-03, 7-09]

1) a copy of the individual’s annual evaluation form [rev. 7-09]

2) if requested, comparative information to help assess performance evaluation

The unit administrator shall also include comments and recommendations for the faculty member’s progress toward tenure, promotion or continued satisfactory performance in the appropriate place on the annual evaluation form.

e. Conference. It is strongly recommended that the unit administrator meet with each faculty member. The unit administrator shall provide each faculty member with the opportunity to meet to discuss the unit administrator’s evaluation. (Suitable alternate arrangements shall be made for off-campus personnel.) The purpose of this meeting is to review and discuss the administrator’s evaluation and the faculty member’s detailed report of activities. The unit administrator should explain the narrative providing a formative assessment on progress towards tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfactory performance. The faculty member and the unit administrator should work to identify strategies to help the faculty member improve performance. The evaluation may be modified as a result of the discussion. At the conclusion of the review process, each faculty member shall sign the evaluation form indicating that she/he has had the opportunity to read the evaluation report and to discuss it with the unit administrator. If the faculty member wishes to respond to the contents of the review, he/she shall be permitted to append a response to the unit administrator’s evaluation. A copy of the administrator’s final evaluation shall be given to the faculty member. [ren. and rev. 7-01, rev. 7-09, ed. 7-10]

f. College-Level Action. Copies of the performance evaluation materials forwarded by the unit administrator to the appropriate dean(s), for evaluation at the college(s) level, shall include: [rev. 7-09]

1) the evaluation form with the complete narrative and the comments and recommendations on progress towards tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfactory performance, and [rev. 7-09]

2) any comments provided by interdisciplinary/center administrators or from those administrators of faculty holding joint appointments provided pursuant to subsection A-1. d., above. [rev. 7-09]

g. If the unit administrator fails to include the required narrative and comments/recommendations the college shall return the materials to the unit administrator. [add. 7-09, rev. 7-10]

h. If the faculty member has attached a response to the evaluation, the response shall be provided to the dean with the annual evaluation form. The dean shall arrange a meeting with the unit administrator and the faculty member to attempt to resolve the relevant issues.
i. If the college dean disagrees with the unit administrator’s evaluation, the dean shall attach a narrative stating the reasons for the disagreement. A copy of the dean’s narrative shall be provided to the faculty member. The faculty member may respond to the dean’s evaluation before the evaluation is forwarded to the provost. The faculty member, unit administrator, and dean are encouraged to resolve the disagreement before forwarding the evaluation to the provost. If the matter remains unresolved at the college level, the provost shall be notified of the disagreement.

j. The college shall forward all evaluation material at the unit and college level, including the dean’s narrative and faculty responses, if any, to the provost for permanent filing. [ren. and rev. 7-01, rev. 12-06, 7-09, 7-10]

B. FACULTY PERFORMANCE THAT DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS. [add. 7-10]

B-1. If the unit administrator determines that a faculty member is not meeting expectations, the unit administrator should consider the reasons for and explanations of the performance (see FSH 3190) [ed. 7-09, rev. 7-10]

The unit administrator, in consultation with the faculty member, should address the possible causes of the problem, should suggest appropriate resources and encourage the employee to seek such help. Faculty members and unit administrators may obtain referral information and advice from the Ombuds, Human Resources, or the Provost’s Office. [ed. 12-06, 7-09, 7-14, rev. 7-16]

B-2. PROVOST INVOLVEMENT. In the event of an overall evaluation of “does not meet expectations” where the faculty member’s performance is so far below expectations that it is not acceptable in relation to the position description, the provost may, in consultation with the dean and unit administrator, determine that further review of the faculty member’s performance is required pursuant to FSH 3320 B-5 below. [ren. and ed. 7-09, rev. 7-16]

B-3. FIRST OCCURRENCE. In the event that a faculty member has not met expectations overall or within one or more areas of responsibility, the unit administrator shall offer to meet with the faculty member. At this meeting, the faculty member and the unit administrator shall review the faculty member’s Position Description and examine strategies that would permit the faculty member to improve performance. A mentoring committee shall be formed upon the request of either the faculty member or the unit administrator. The committee shall be composed of two or more faculty members agreed upon by the unit administrator and faculty member. [rev. 7-09, 7-10]

B-4. TWO OCCURRENCES WITHIN THREE YEARS. In the event of two annual evaluations within three years concluding that the faculty member has not met expectations overall or within one or more areas of responsibility the unit administrator shall arrange a meeting of the faculty member, the unit administrator and the college dean [ed. 12-06, rev. 7-10]

The intent of the meeting is to review:

a. the current position description and revise it if necessary to address the issues identified during the discussion. [ed. 7-09]

b. the strategies implemented in the previous year(s) and to identify why the strategies did not result in the faculty member meeting expectations. The parties should re-examine strategies that would support improved performance by the faculty member. [ed. 7-09]

B-5. THREE OCCURRENCES WITHIN FIVE YEARS. In the event of three annual evaluations of “does not meet expectations” within a five-year period, either overall or within one or more areas of responsibility, the dean shall initiate a formal peer review. [rev. 7-09, ren. 7-10]

a. Composition of the Review Committee. The Review Committee shall consist of at least four (4) members, appointed as follows:

(1) The faculty member may submit to the unit administrator a list of the names of three faculty members from within the unit and at least one faculty member from outside of the unit. If the faculty member is
tenured or on the tenure track, faculty on the committee should be tenured faculty unless no tenured faculty are available. The unit administrator shall appoint the committee, including at least two names from the faculty member’s list.

(2) The committee members shall select a chair.

b. Report and Timing. The committee report includes the review and possible recommendation(s), and shall be completed within sixty days of the annual evaluation.

c. The Review. The purpose of the review is to assess the level of performance of the faculty member, the reasonableness of the previous evaluations, and the appropriateness of the strategies put in place to assist the faculty member.

The faculty member and the unit administrator shall provide the following materials for the review period to the committee:

1) Updated Curriculum Vitae of the faculty member,
2) Position Descriptions,
3) Annual evaluation materials submitted by the faculty member,
4) Annual Evaluations of the faculty member by the unit administrator and the dean,
5) Student and peer evaluations (if any) of teaching,
6) A summary of the strategies put in place to assist the faculty member,
7) A self-assessment summary of each area of the faculty member’s responsibility and what the faculty member has learned and achieved during the review period, including contributions to the department, university, state, nation, and field (about 2 pages).

The faculty member may submit any additional information he or she desires, and the committee may request additional materials as it deems necessary.

d. Responses to Committee Report. The committee chair shall submit the report to the faculty member, unit administrator, and dean. Each recipient shall have fifteen days from the report’s date to submit written responses to the review committee. The committee chair shall send the report and all responses to the provost.

e. Provost. The provost shall be responsible for determining the appropriate resolution, which may include:

1) continuing the status quo;
2) mentoring to address area(s) of concern;
3) termination for cause;
4) consideration of other recommended resolution(s). [1-4 add. 7-09]

B-6. Non-Tenured Faculty. Pursuant to Regent’s policy, non-tenured faculty do not have an expectation of contract renewal, absent a specific written multi-year contract. The process set forth in Section B does not require the University to renew a non-tenured faculty contract. The process set forth in Section B shall not be required for a non-tenured faculty member who has been given notice of non-renewal.

B-7. 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.

D. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS. [ed. 7-09, ren. 7-10]

D-1. EVALUATION BY FACULTY MEMBERS. Opportunity is provided for an annual performance evaluation of college deans, assistant and associate deans, and administrators of academic departments and other intracollege units by the faculty members of the respective units. The provost sends each faculty member an appropriate number of copies of the form, “Annual Faculty Evaluation of Academic Administrators” [form 2 appended to this section] to be used for evaluation of the unit or center administrator, one to be used for evaluation
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D-2. EVALUATION OF UNIT AND CENTER ADMINISTRATORS AND ASSISTANT AND ASSOCIATE DEANS. The review and evaluation of unit and center administrators, and assistant and associate deans, require consideration of their responsibilities as faculty members and as administrators as defined by percentage allocations in the Annual Position Description. All administrators are entitled to a review and evaluation of their performance as faculty members. Further, all administrators are entitled to a review of their performance as administrators. (Forms to be used in the evaluation of administrators are found in Form 1 and 2. [rev. 7-99, ed. 3-07, rev. & ren. 7-10 (incorporated 1420 E-6 into this entire section D-2 through D-4])

1. Evaluation as a Faculty Member.
   a. Annual Evaluation. The annual evaluation of an administrator’s performance as a faculty member shall be conducted by the dean of the college in accordance with the provisions of FSH 3320 A above.
   b. Third Year Review. If the administrator is untenured, there shall be a third-year review in accordance with the procedures outlined in FSH 3520 G-4.

2. Evaluation as an Administrator.
   a. Annual Evaluation. The dean shall conduct an annual evaluation of each administrator’s performance in accordance with the responsibilities specified in FSH 1420 E-1 and in the Annual Position Description. The dean and administrator will negotiate the administrator’s Annual Position Description on the basis of the unit’s needs, and make it available to the faculty for annual evaluation purposes. The administrator will present his or her annual goals for the unit at the beginning of the review year and report on his/her effectiveness in meeting last year’s goals. Annual goals should be based on the unit action plan, needs of the unit, and discussion with the dean. The dean will make a conscientious effort to solicit input from unit faculty through evaluation form 2. [rev. 7-99, ed. 6-09, 10-10]

   Unit faculty must send completed copies of form 2 directly to the dean. The dean furnishes the administrator a summary of the faculty evaluations in such a way that the confidentiality of individual evaluations is preserved. The dean may arrange a conference with the administrator to discuss the summary. After these steps have been completed, the dean shall destroy the individual faculty members’ evaluations and shall file the written summary in the dean’s office. The dean then submits a summary of conclusions and recommendations resulting from the review to the provost, who in turn makes his or her review and forwards recommendations to the president. The dean will then provide feedback to faculty who have submitted form 2, as appropriate. [ed. 10-10]

D-3. EVALUATION OF DEANS. The provost shall conduct an annual evaluation of each dean's performance in accordance with the dean’s responsibilities specified in FSH 1420 D-2 and in the Annual Position Description. The provost and dean will negotiate the Annual Position Description for the dean on the basis of the college’s needs and make it available to the faculty for annual evaluation purposes. The dean will present his or her annual goals for the college at the beginning of the review year and report on his or her effectiveness in meeting last year’s goals. Annual goals should be based on the college’s action plan, needs of the college, and discussion with the provost. The provost will make a conscientious effort to solicit input from college faculty through evaluation form 2. [ed. 10-10]

College faculty will send completed copies of form 2 directly to the provost. The provost will summarize the faculty responses and share that summary with the dean. In preparing and conveying that summary, the provost has the responsibility to ensure that faculty comments are confidential. This includes, but is not limited to, avoiding the use of any phrases that can identify the faculty member making the comments. The provost may arrange a conference with the dean to discuss the summary. After these steps have been completed, the provost...
shall destroy individual faculty members’ evaluations and file the written summary in the Office of Academic Affairs. The provost must then submit a summary of conclusions and recommendations resulting from the review to the president. The provost will then provide feedback to faculty who have submitted form 2, as appropriate. [ed. 10-10]

D-4. PERIODIC REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATORS. Each administrator is formally reviewed at least six months before the end of each appointment term, or, if there is not a fixed appointment term, at least every five years. The Provost appoints an ad hoc review committee to include faculty, department chairs, and experienced administrators of other units. The periodic review will be conducted at the request of the Provost and Executive Vice President and in accordance with the mechanisms of formal review, which must provide for the following:

1. Opportunity for the dean, center administrator, or unit administrator to prepare a report/portfolio summarizing his or her administrative achievements for the period, including annual reviews; [rev. and ren. 7-99]

2. Opportunity for all faculty and staff of the college/unit to participate in the review;

3. Solicitation of input by the committee from appropriate constituencies of the college/unit. Confidentiality of all individual evaluations will be ensured; [add. 7-99]

4. Preparation by the review committee of a written report summarizing the findings and recommendations of the review, which will be forwarded to the Provost and the dean/center or unit administrator; [ed. and ren. 7-99]

5. The provost will submit the written report along with any additional comments and recommendations to the president and provide appropriate feedback to the administrator. [rev. and ren. 7-99]

a. Additional Review. The provost and/or college dean may initiate a review at any time he or she determines a review is needed. The dean shall submit to the provost a summary of conclusions and recommendations resulting from this additional review. If the review is conducted by the provost, he or she shall submit a summary of conclusions and recommendations to the president.

The faculty of the unit may also initiate, by majority vote, a formal review (as outlined above) of the unit administrator. The tenured faculty of a college may also initiate, by majority vote, a formal review (as outlined above) of the college dean.

E. SEQUENCE OF EVALUATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS AND ADMINISTRATORS. The provost prepares the schedule for completion of steps in the performance evaluation and salary determination process each year. The schedule will ensure that faculty members’ evaluations of unit or center administrators and assistant and associate deans have been received by the dean before the administrators’ recommendations on salary, promotion, and tenure are made known to the faculty and, similarly, that faculty members’ evaluations of deans have been received by the provost before the deans’ recommendations on salary, promotion, and tenure are made known to the faculty. Likewise, the summaries of faculty evaluations of unit or center administrators, assistant and associate deans, and deans will be communicated to the persons evaluated after their recommendations on faculty salary, promotion, and tenure have been transmitted to the provost. [ren. & rev. 7-10]

(Forms on next few pages)

*NOTE: In October of 2010 it was determined that elimination of Form 2A was possible with minor edits to Form 1 (addition of reference FSH 1420 E to box 4). As such, Form 1 may be used in lieu of Form 2A by administrators, if desired. Given this change, form 2B becomes Form 2 (see the UI Policy website for redline versions or contact the Faculty Secretary's Office or Provost's Office for further clarification).