

Administrative Faculty Evaluation General Guidelines

This document was composed from comments, questions, and ideas derived from a number of administrative faculty and from information discussed in past evaluation workshops. The information is intended to be used as a guide for administering the evaluation process. The policies and procedures that govern the evaluation process can be found in the Board of Regents Handbook as well as in the University Administrative Manual and University Bylaws.

Evaluation Overview

- The evaluation and merit process provides the means for improving and building a strong reputation for quality within each unit, department, college and university.
- The point of reference for faculty evaluations should be aligned with the strategic mission of the department. The issues of quantity and quality are relative to the department overall. For individuals serving in more than one department or program, the expectation of all agreed to areas of responsibility should be met.
- Individuals are expected to do good work. Merit is for a great work, not good work. Evaluations should reflect individual performance. Excellent performance makes us successful.
- Merit recognizes excellence in performance; it is not for equity or cost of living.
- The total dollar value of the merit pool is 2.5% of total eligible professional salaries. The salaries of deans, vice presidents, provost, and the president are not part of the merit pool. Any merit for these positions must come from other university sources.
- There is a direct connection between evaluation ratings and merit levels.
- Leaders in this university are challenged to make tough decisions and to discriminate among different levels of performance. When supervisors make difficult, but appropriate decisions, the president, provost and vice presidents will support these decisions.

Importance of Goal Statements / Individual Performance Objectives (IPOs)

- Each faculty member must have an annual goal statement clearly stating all areas of professional responsibility being undertaken by the faculty member for the coming year, including any cross-department or college responsibilities. It should include one's goals/objectives for the year, the goals and objectives to be accomplished for the year, evaluation criteria, needed resources and timeline. Goal statements reflect agreement about how one's efforts contribute to the mission of the department and how the performance will be measured.
- Goal statements are not a check list; e.g., a "laundry list" of activities. Connection between individual goals and department/college and university goals is essential.
- Achieving listed goals on the goal statement does not guarantee one will achieve meritorious performance; goals provide a baseline for measurement of overall performance.

- Supervisors should know in advance what activities each faculty member will undertake to advance the mission of the department as well as other units in which the faculty member participates.
- Everyone in the department or unit should contribute to the established programmatic goals of the department or unit. The strategic plan is designed to move the department ahead. Each faculty member must contribute. If faculty members do not contribute to the department/unit goals, they should not be rewarded.
- Goal statements should be changed when a faculty member's role in a department changes; e.g. a major change in role due to a major change in assignments, leave, and so forth. Goal statement changes need to be discussed early - as soon as a role change has occurred.
- Goal statements should provide flexibility in setting goals for each faculty member.
- New faculty must have goal statements developed within a reasonable time after they have been integrated into the department i.e. within three months, end of semester etc.

Evaluations

- Evaluations are a qualitative assessment of how well a faculty member has performed in carrying out the overall responsibilities of their job for the year with particular focus on the goals specified in the goal statement.
- Every faculty member should receive an evaluation regardless of whether he or she is merit eligible; e.g. those receiving a promotion during the year.
- There should be rigorous evaluations of each faculty member based on performance in the job of which he/she is assigned.
- Evaluations should differentiate among faculty based on performance. Measurable standards are necessary.
- Evaluation of faculty performance must be justified, fair, honest, and consistent. Evaluations should not be inflated.
- Evaluations (and merit recommendations) depend upon the professional judgment of supervisors, directors, AVPs and the VP, and must be able to defend their judgments.
- Only use the four ratings approved by the Board of Regents can be used for the evaluations; i.e. "Unsatisfactory", "Satisfactory", "Commendable", and "Excellent."
- A "Satisfactory" rating does not mean that one's performance is unacceptable. "Satisfactory" means that one has done their job at the expected level.
- Use the supervisor's narrative to support between the four categories of evaluation and among the merit levels within the "Commendable" and "Excellent" ratings.
- Faculty on professional development leave **are** merit eligible. They should be evaluated on the basis of their goal statement and what they accomplished during their leave.

- The provost does not make decisions on individual evaluations. This is the role of the supervisor, director, AVP or VP.
- The provost expects deans and VPs to correct those evaluations that they consider to be inaccurate reflections of a faculty member's performance. If there are a substantial number of these in a given department, the dean/VP is advised to take this into account in his or her evaluation of the supervisor.
- When the VP/AVP/Director agrees with the supervisor's evaluation of a faculty member, they should indicate his or her agreement by signing the evaluation. If they disagree, they should provide an explanation to the supervisor.
- Faculty members who disagree with their evaluations may request a peer review through the faculty senate office within 15 days of receiving the evaluation.
- For individuals serving in more than one department or program, the supervisor of the department/unit the faculty member holds the largest percentage of FTE should complete the evaluation and consult with the other supervisor to get input on the faculty member's performance.

Roles in the evaluation and merit process

- The Provost's role is to ensure that equivalent standards for merit recommendations are used across the university and to approve requests for extraordinary merit.
- The VP's role is to ensure that standards are consistently applied across the division, and to recommend extraordinary merit for those truly deserving such recognition.
- The AVP should work with directors to set reasonable, consistent, standards for evaluation and merit recommendations.
- The supervisor completes the evaluation. They must ensure that the goals of all faculty are in alignment with the strategic plan of the department. The supervisor is to ensure that faculty understand the evaluation process. They must establish, in coordination with their faculty, appropriate goal statements and evaluate faculty fairly using criteria consistently applied to all faculty.

Merit

- Each division/college should have a rational and known process for allocating merit which complies with the standards articulated in the NSHE Code.
- There must be fairness and consistency in the allocation of merit within each division/college.
- Merit is not to be used for equity or cost-of-living.
- Faculty hired after September 1st of the evaluation year are not eligible for merit, but must be evaluated.
- Faculty on professional development leave are merit eligible.
- Faculty receiving a "Commendable" rating will be eligible for one (1) or two (2) steps of merit; those receiving an "Excellent" rating will be eligible for three (3) or four (4) steps. An extraordinary merit recommendation will earn six (6) merit steps (1.5 times the dollar value of four merit steps).

- The dollar value of the merit steps will be determined after the evaluations have been completed by dividing the total amount of dollars available for merit by the total number of merit steps.
- Completion of goals described on the goal statement does not automatically determine receipt of merit. Merit is based on the overall performance and quality of the work performed by the faculty member.
- Differential merit recommendations must be justified based on the evaluation and differential performance within the categories.
- Merit awards can be grieved under NSHE Code, Title 2, Chapter 5, Section 5.2.3 and 5.2.4 provides for the process and timelines for reconsideration from an adverse decision regarding promotion, salary or tenure. For complete details of the process refer to the Code. The Code basically states that a faculty member who has been denied appointment with tenure, a salary increase, promotion or reappointment to employment may, within 15 calendar days after notification of such denial, provide a written request to the department chair, supervisor, or dean who rendered the negative decision asking for a statement in writing of the reasons for the denial. The response must be received by the faculty member within 15 calendar days after the appropriate administrator receives the written request for reasons.
- Reconsideration of an evaluation can be requested under Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 4.5 of the NSHE: Academic and administrative faculty who disagree with the supervisor's evaluation may submit a written rejoinder and/or request a peer evaluation as provided in the institution's bylaws. The supervisor's official evaluation and the faculty member's rejoinder and/or peer evaluation will be retained in the faculty member's personnel file.

General comments regarding the evaluation process

- Mid-year evaluation discussions are helpful to both the faculty member and the supervisor. The activity will ensure understanding of the goals and expectations set forth and give an opportunity to assess progress.
- The evaluation process provides an opportunity for identifying and establishing goals for individual professional development and training.
- Supervisors should begin the evaluation in January; make it an integral part of the daily work throughout the year. Don't wait until December to begin the actual evaluation process. Faculty should review their goal statements regularly.
- Departments may gather information from various individuals when completing faculty evaluations, i.e., peers, colleagues, customers, subordinates etc., just as long as the process is consistently applied to all faculty members in the department/unit.