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, 7-14, 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, 7-14, 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 at least 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]

A-2. 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 FSH 3560 for details on the promotion and tenure process.

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 is it 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: [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 beyond that stated in FSH 3900 B-2, absent a specific written multi-year contract. The process set forth in FSH 3320 B does not require the University to renew a non-tenured faculty contract. The process set forth in FSH 3320 B shall not be required for a non-tenured faculty member who has been given notice of non-renewal.

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

**C-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]

C-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 C-2 through C-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]

C-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]

C-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.

D. 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).