

# 7.1 Performance Evaluations

---

The annual evaluation of faculty performance is critical to the professional development of individual faculty members. General guidelines and requirements for evaluations of various faculty are provided below:

- A. For academic faculty the evaluation focuses on performance during the evaluation period in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, as appropriate. The faculty performance evaluation is the primary source of information for employment decisions regarding compensation, promotion, tenure, appointment renewal and other performance-related employment actions. All annual evaluations will be submitted to the appropriate Dean for review and approval.
- B. For tenure-track assistant professors, a Preliminary Tenure Review, in accordance with Section 8.1.4, shall be conducted by the department promotion and tenure committee and the department head.
- C. For all tenure-track faculty, the department head's comments concerning the candidate's progress toward promotion and tenure shall be included on the candidate's annual evaluation form.
- D. Ranked research faculty (i.e., Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor) are required to complete the same faculty performance evaluation process as other academic faculty. The performance evaluation is the primary source for employment decisions regarding compensation and promotion. A research faculty member who has received less than 25% remuneration, has not published in the peer-reviewed literature with a Mines affiliation, has had no proposal submissions as principal investigator, or has not advised or co-advised any graduate students in an annual evaluation period should be (a) changed to Affiliate Faculty, or (b) terminated effective 30 days after evaluation. If the faculty member disagrees with the performance evaluation or decision, they may appeal the review/decision to the appropriate Dean. Remunerated research faculty positions that are not ranked (i.e., Research Associates, Research Support, and Postdoctoral Researchers) are evaluated in accordance with the process established by Mines Human Resources. All evaluations are to be reviewed by the next-level supervisor.
- E. For administrative and athletics faculty, annual evaluations shall be conducted in accordance with the process established through Mines Human Resources. All evaluations will be reviewed by the next level supervisor. Additionally, the appropriate Dean, Vice President or President may also be a reviewer.

## 7.1.1 General Outline of the Evaluation Process for Academic Faculty <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For library faculty, replace "Department Head" with "University Librarian" and omit references to Deans.

The following is a general outline of the academic faculty evaluation process at Mines. Complete details concerning the process, such as applicable time schedules and due dates, may be found in the *Academic Affairs Procedures Manual*, which is available on Mines' website.

### A. Goal Setting

1. During the spring semester of each year, the department head shall confer with department faculty to develop department goals. The department head will convey to and discuss with the Dean the departmental goals. The Dean will discuss proposed goals with the Provost.
2. The department head shall meet with each faculty member in a timely manner each calendar year to discuss individual goals and assignments for the upcoming evaluation period. At this meeting, the distribution of effort among the three evaluation categories (see Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2) shall be discussed to determine whether any change in this distribution is appropriate. In the case of research faculty who are supported over a multi-year period on continuing and new grants, the annual meeting should address the faculty member's goals for research directions and grant procurement in the upcoming year. The meeting should include the department head and research supervisor, if appropriate. This meeting is not required for research faculty having short-term or intermittent contract appointments such that year-to-year goal setting is unrealistic.
3. Goals and effort distribution should be placed in writing and can be revised with the mutual consent of the faculty member and the department head, and research supervisor as appropriate.

### B. Evaluation

1. At the end of the evaluation period, the faculty member shall complete a Faculty Data Report and submit it to the department head.
2. The department head shall review the Faculty Data Report and assemble student ratings, peer evaluations, external evaluations, and other appropriate data. Based on the Faculty Data Report and the assembled data, the department head shall conduct an evaluative analysis and a formative analysis using the Faculty Evaluation Form.
3. For the evaluative analysis, the department head shall assign only a performance rating of "exemplary," "exceeds expectations," "meets expectations," "needs improvement," or "unsatisfactory" for each of the applicable categories teaching, scholarship, and service.
4. The formative analysis shall consist of an overall performance rating and a narrative summary of the evaluation, including a summary of progress toward tenure (if applicable), a summary of progress toward promotion, and areas for improvement, as appropriate. In cases where performance of a tenured faculty member is deemed unsatisfactory, a Performance Improvement Plan is mandated as outlined in Section 7.3.
5. The Department Head shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the evaluation. Both shall sign the Faculty Evaluation form. The faculty member's signature acknowledges the discussion, but it does not necessarily indicate his or her agreement with the evaluation. The faculty member may also attach a rebuttal statement to the evaluation.
6. The Faculty Data Report and the Faculty Evaluation Form shall be submitted to Academic Affairs for review and acknowledgement by the Associate Provost. A signed copy shall be returned to the faculty member. If the Associate Provost has questions about the evaluation, it shall be returned to the department head for discussion and further review. The Associate Provost will alert the Provost to any especially noteworthy faculty evaluations during each evaluation cycle. The

Office of the Associate Provost shall annually provide the Provost with a report summarizing the faculty evaluation ratings from each department.

### C. Rating Concepts

The descriptions below are intended to convey general guidance regarding the characteristics of the various performance ratings defined in Section 7.1.1 B.

1. *Exemplary* - Performance that is consistently far above expectations, and clearly distinctive. This level of performance occurs rarely. Such "outstanding performance" often results in significant positive impact on community members, departments, or the university, and implies substantial contributions well beyond basic job responsibilities.
2. *Exceeds Expectations* - Performance that is consistently above expectations. It is representative of excellent work having substantial impact beyond the individual. Performance reflects contributions beyond basic job responsibilities.
3. *Meets Expectations* - Performance that represents satisfactory work. Faculty member's work is effective, reliable, and of good quality. The faculty member meets obligations and performance expectations.
4. *Needs Improvement* - The faculty member does not meet performance expectations in one or more of his/her basic job responsibilities. Improvement in performance is needed.
5. *Unsatisfactory* - Performance consistently fails to satisfy basic job responsibilities, and urgent efforts on the part of the faculty member are required to improve performance.

An overall ranking of unsatisfactory performance requires a faculty member to participate in the formal performance improvement process set forth in Section 7.3.

## 7.1.2 Effect of Extended Leave on Evaluation Goals

If an exempt employee has taken an extended period of leave, he or she may request that his or her evaluation goals be temporarily redefined to reflect a reasonable performance expectation for the affected evaluation period. When a request for amended evaluation goals is submitted, the employee and his or her supervisor shall attempt to negotiate appropriate evaluation goals for the affected evaluation period. If the employee and his or her supervisor cannot agree upon the need for, or the specific content of, amended evaluation goals, the appropriate vice president shall review the matter and make a final decision on the issue of amended evaluation goals.