Faculty Annual Evaluation Process Policy

Following the Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP 3.2.4), all CSA faculty will be evaluated annually in writing by the department chair and when appropriate, the center/institute director. Non-tenure track faculty reporting to senior faculty mentors (e.g. Instructors/Research and Assistant Professors/Research) will be evaluated by the immediate supervisor and the evaluation, signed by the mentor and the mentee, will then be submitted to the department chair for final review and signature.

Process for Faculty Reporting to a Senior Faculty Member

1. Forms for providing information to the supervisor should be distributed and collected in the same timeframe as the departmental process (allowing at least two weeks to complete). Special circumstances may warrant an extension of the deadline and should be immediately brought to the supervisor’s attention for consideration.

2. Failure to turn in the requested information to the supervisor in the stated timeframe will lead to an automatic unsatisfactory performance evaluation unless documented extenuating circumstances justify failure to comply (e.g. medical emergency with incapacitation).

3. The supervisor may use the department form or create his/her own. If creating his/her own form:
   a. The form should provide space for the responding faculty member to delineate accomplishments and activities undertaken during the year being reviewed (e.g. published manuscripts, grants submitted and outcomes, presentations at meetings, awards, participation in departmental activities, etc.).
   b. The form should also provide space for the responding faculty member to convey concerns and suggestions about his/her laboratory, the department, and the institution.
   c. The supervisor will review the submitted material, prepare a written evaluation and discuss the evaluation with the nontenure-track faculty member. The evaluation will be based on expectations consistent with his/her rank, offer letter (if appropriate), prior performance evaluations, etc. Performance expectations for the upcoming year should be provided in writing. The established ranking system (HOP 3.7.5) will be used where one of the following rankings will indicate performance in each of the performance areas: exceeds expectations, meets expectations, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory. The evaluated faculty member will have the opportunity to respond to incorrect information and discuss ratings they believe are not appropriate. Such information should be brought to the supervisor’s attention within two weeks.
   d. After the supervisor reaches a final decision on ratings and corrected information, the evaluated faculty member has the option to sign the form. The supervisor must sign the evaluation and forward it to the department chair for review and signature.
e. A copy of the evaluation will be maintained in department files and one given to each the supervisor and the evaluated faculty member.

4. If the supervisor fails to perform and submit the evaluation to the department chair according to the department timeframe, he/she will receive an unsatisfactory rating for Service and Administration on his/her own evaluation.

**Process for Faculty Reporting Directly to the Department Chair**

1. Progress and Accomplishment forms will be distributed to evaluate performance in a given calendar year. Faculty will be notified as to when the form should be returned (allowing at least two weeks to complete). Special circumstances may warrant an extension of the deadline and should be immediately brought to the chair's attention for consideration.

2. Failure to turn in the requested information to the chair in the requested timeframe will lead to an automatic unsatisfactory performance evaluation unless documented extenuating circumstances justify failure to comply (e.g. medical emergency with incapacitation) or an extension was requested and approved.

3. The Chair will prepare a written evaluation based on records maintained by the department, mentoring faculty/committees, and information provided by the faculty member. The evaluation is based on expectations consistent with the individual's rank (HOP 3.6.3 and 3.6.4, Departmental Pay Plan, his/her offer letter (if appropriate), performance expectations from the prior year, etc). The established ranking system (HOP 3.7.5) will be used where one of the following rankings will indicate performance in each of the performance areas: exceeds expectations, meets expectations, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory. Evaluation of how expectations were met/not met and expectations for the upcoming year will be included.

4. The written evaluation will be distributed to the individual faculty members and each will be invited to request correction of specified information they can demonstrate is inaccurate and/or the opportunity to discuss any aspect of the evaluation.

5. If corrections/changes are made by the chair, the revised evaluation is then signed by the chair and given to the faculty member with the option of signing or not. One copy is kept for departmental records and one is retained by the faculty member.

**Certification to the School of Medicine Dean**

The chair certifies in writing to the School of Medicine Dean, that all faculty evaluations were performed.
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