ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS AND SALARY DETERMINATION
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. 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]

CONTENTS:
A. Annual Performance Evaluation and Salary Determination for Faculty Members
B. Performance Below 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 successive steps. The form to be used, “Annual Performance Evaluation Form 1: Evaluation of Faculty,” is appended to this section. Personnel on international assignment see FSH 3380 C. [rev. 7-03, 7-09, 7-14, ed. 7-10]

a. Forms Distributed. Supplies of the Annual Performance Evaluation Pilot Form is available below. The form may not be altered without following the appropriate governance process (see FSH 1460), to be used in the evaluation process are procured by deans and unit administrators. The immediate administrative officer is responsible for ensuring that each faculty member uses receives the proper form together with a copy of the supplementary instructions as provided by the Provost Office. [rev. 7-01]

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.

b. Performance levels for each criterion are described as follows: [ed. 7-10]
i. Exceptional Performance (5) is extraordinary performance well beyond that required relative to the position description.

ii. Above Expectations (4) represents performance that is better than expected relative to the position description. [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]

a) received a “1” rating the previous period but did not make the improvements required;

b) consistently violated one or more of the institution’s standards for meeting the expectations of the position; or

c) 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 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 period under review [rev. 7-09]
(4) Other materials necessary to document efforts and accomplishments for the period under review. [add. 7-01, ed. 7-10]

d. Evaluation of Faculty by Unit Administrators. Unit administrators evaluate their faculty members. 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 determined by comparing the faculty member’s performance to the position description. 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 in assessing the faculty member’s performance. 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 narratives for all faculty for the review period, he or she 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]
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. The unit administrator shall provide each faculty member with the opportunity to meet to discuss the unit administrator’s evaluation. (Suitable alternate arrangements are made for off-campus personnel.) The purpose of this meeting is to review and discuss the administrator’s evaluation and the self-evaluation, if any. The unit administrator explains his or her ratings and narrative providing a formative assessment on progress towards tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfaction 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 work to identify strategies to help the faculty member improve performance. The ratings 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 disagrees with the contents of the review, he/she shall be permitted to append a report to the unit administrator’s evaluation, detailing the nature of the dissent. A copy of the administrator’s final evaluation is 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]

- a narrative evaluation on progress towards tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfactory performance, [rev. 7-09]
- any evaluative comments provided by interdisciplinary/center administrators or from those administrators of faculty holding joint appointments, and [rev. 7-09]
- the evaluation form, [rev. 7-09]

If the unit fails to attach the narrative evaluation and evaluative comments, the college will return the materials to the unit. [add. 7-09, rev. 7-10]

If the faculty member files a dissent, the unit shall provide a copy to the dean. 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 of the faculty member by the unit administrator, no additional signature is required from the faculty member. [rev. 7-09, 7-10]

If there are any differences in any rating between the unit administrator and college dean, the dean shall attach a narrative stating the reasons for these differences, and a second and subsequent signature by the faculty member, acknowledging receipt of the dean’s evaluation and rating, is required. The college shall forward the original evaluation form and narrative to the Provost’s Office for permanent filing. If the college fails to attach the narrative, the provost will return the form to the college. A copy of the evaluation form is retained in the college office. If the faculty member disagrees with the Dean’s evaluation and the disagreement cannot be resolved at the college level, either party may choose to refer the matter to the University Ombuds (FSH 3820). 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. PERFORMANCE BELOW EXPECTATIONS OF NON-TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS. [add. 7-10]

B-1. If the unit administrator determines that a non-tenured faculty member is performing below expectations, the unit administrator should consider the variety of possible causes, 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 and Human Resources. [ed. 12-06, 7-09, 7-14, rev. 7-16]

B-2. 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 expectations (2 or lower) within one or more areas of responsibility, 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 the performance below expectations. At this meeting, the faculty member and the unit administrator will review the current Position Description and examine strategies that would permit the faculty member to improve his or her performance. [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-3. TWO CONSECUTIVE 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 will, 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 Dean of the College. The faculty member or the unit administrator may request that the University Ombuds attend the meeting. [ed. 12-06, rev. 7-09, 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 and to identify why the strategies did not result in the faculty member meeting expectations. The parties should re-examine strategies that would 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]

C-2. THREE CONSECUTIVE ANNUAL EVALUATION ASSESSMENTS OF BELOW EXPECTATIONS. In the event of three consecutive annual evaluations below expectations 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 six (6) members, appointed as follows:

(1) The Faculty member will submit to the unit administrator a list of the names of three faculty members from within the unit and three tenured faculty members from outside of the unit. The unit administrator will submit a similar list to the faculty member. From the list given to the faculty member, he/she 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. Timing of the Review. The review and recommendation(s) will 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 the faculty member and the unit.

The faculty member and chair will provide the following materials to the committee:

- Updated Curriculum Vitae of the faculty member
- Position Descriptions for the past four years
- Annual evaluation materials submitted by the faculty member for the past three years
- Annual Evaluations of the faculty member by the unit head and the Dean for the past three years
- Student and peer evaluations (if any) of teaching for the past four years
- A self-evaluation of teaching
- A self-assessment summary of what the faculty member has learned and achieved during the 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 faculty member, chair, and dean will receive the report and will have fifteen days from the report’s date to submit written responses to the review committee. The review committee will send the report and all responses to the provost.

e. Provost. The Provost will 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]

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/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).
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