This memo is intended to clarify procedures to ensure compliance with the NSHE Board of Regents Handbook (Code) and UNLV Bylaws for the CY 2017 annual evaluation period. The electronic evaluation form for academic faculty (i.e., the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report) is available on the Annual Evaluations website located at http://www.unlv.edu/provost/annual-evaluations. The website also provides additional helpful resources.

Who Should Be Evaluated?

According to the NSHE Code, faculty shall be evaluated in writing at least once annually. This includes tenure-track, tenured, and nontenure-track academic faculty, as well as administrative faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSHE CODE, TITLE 2, CHAPTER 5, SECTION 5.12</th>
<th>5.12.1 EVALUATIONS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty shall be evaluated in writing at least once annually by department chairs, supervisors or heads of administrative units. The performance evaluations of executive and supervisory faculty shall include consultation with the professional and classified staff of the administrative unit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How Should Faculty Be Evaluated?

Per NSHE Code, untenured faculty shall be evaluated on a 4-point scale of “Excellent,” “Commendable,” “Satisfactory,” and “Unsatisfactory.” As permitted by the Code, UNLV has adopted the practice of evaluating tenured faculty on a 2-point scale of “Satisfactory” and “Unsatisfactory.” Evaluations are to include a narrative on each established area of performance. At least every three years, the evaluation of untenured faculty must include a narrative that assesses progress toward tenure and promotion, prepared in consultation with the appropriate tenure and/or promotion review committee. Evaluations of instructional faculty shall include an assessment that accounts for teaching evaluations completed by their students.
All performance evaluations of untenured faculty shall include a rating of (i) “excellent,” (ii) “commendable,” (iii) “satisfactory,” or (iv) “unsatisfactory.” All performance evaluations of tenured faculty shall include a rating of (i) “excellent,” (ii) “commendable,” (iii) “satisfactory,” or (iv) “unsatisfactory” unless institutional bylaws require a rating of only (i) “satisfactory” or (ii) “unsatisfactory.” The areas of evaluation and procedures for evaluation of academic faculty and administrative faculty shall be established in Board policies and institutional bylaws. All performance evaluations shall include a narrative addressing each area of performance, and at least every three years a narrative addressing progress toward tenure and/or promotion, if applicable. The three year narrative progress assessment shall be prepared in consultation with the appropriate tenure review committee or promotion committee, if any. Evaluations of instructional faculty shall include an assessment incorporating teaching evaluations completed by their students.

**Progress Towards Tenure and Promotion**

Per UNLV Bylaws, Chapter 3, Section 8.3, as posted below, “...the department chair shall meet with the tenured faculty and thereafter incorporate in chair’s annual evaluation the sense of the tenured faculty on the progress of the candidate towards tenure and promotion.”

The department chair or supervisor shall write an annual evaluation and present it to the faculty member for review. For tenure track faculty, the department chair shall meet with the tenured faculty and thereafter incorporate in chair’s annual evaluation the sense of the tenured faculty on the progress of the candidate towards tenure and promotion. If the faculty member disagrees with the evaluation, then he or she (a) within thirty calendar days after notification, may submit a written response to the evaluation to be incorporated therewith, and (b) within fifteen calendar days after notification, may request in writing to the college dean or appropriate vice president the formation of a committee of peers to conduct a separate annual evaluation. Each college or unit shall establish in its Bylaws procedures for forming an elected peer review committee, and any operational guidelines deemed necessary. In the case of academic faculty, the elected peer review committee shall consist of tenured faculty members regardless of rank. The peer review committee shall be constituted within fifteen calendar days after receipt of a request for peer review. The committee's purpose shall be to file a report, which either recommends upholding the administrator's original evaluation or reversing that evaluation and recommending an alternative one. The committee shall complete its work no later than the end of B-contract period. Both the original evaluation and the recommendation of the peer review committee shall be forwarded to the appropriate dean and vice president or Executive Vice President and Provost and both evaluations shall be placed in the faculty member's master personnel file. The appropriate vice president or Executive Vice President and Provost shall make the final decision on the evaluation to be issued to the faculty member for the year. (B/R 6/08)
Faculty Annual Achievement Reports

Academic faculty members are asked to submit a self-report of yearly activities, called the Faculty Annual Achievement Report, to their chair, director, or other supervisor. The Faculty Annual Achievement Report can be completed using either Digital Measures, access to which is available via MyUNLV, or through an interactive PDF form available on the Annual Evaluations website. Digital Measures is now the preferred method of faculty activity reporting at UNLV. The system allows reports such as the Faculty Annual Achievement Report to be generated after requisite information is entered into the database.

Deans and department chairs/directors should give faculty members specific instructions on which method to use to generate the Faculty Annual Achievement Report, the content to provide, and deadlines for submission. Suggested timelines are posted on the Provost’s Annual Evaluations website.

Academic Faculty Annual Evaluations Process

The evaluation period is from January 1, 2017 through December 31, 2017.

1. All full-time academic faculty as of December 31, 2017 should have an evaluation completed. There is one evaluation form for all academic faculty. The form will update based on the “Tenure Status” (tenure-track, tenured, or nontenure-track) and “Present Rank” (I, II, III, or IV) selected.

2. Once completed, the evaluation should be electronically signed by the chair or evaluator to prevent any changes and then sent to the faculty member to be reviewed and signed. It is recommended that chairs-supervisors meet with each faculty member to review the evaluation, discuss the past year’s achievements, and formulate goals for the coming year.

3. Once the evaluation is returned to the chair, it should be saved in the department/unit folder on the X-Drive for the dean to access.

4. After the dean has reviewed and signed the evaluation, it should be saved in the college/school folder on the X-Drive for the Office of Faculty Affairs to access.

The deadline for deans’ offices to submit completed and signed annual evaluations of all academic faculty to the X-Drive is March 16, 2018.

Administrative Faculty Annual Evaluations

The evaluation process for administrative faculty is largely overseen by the Office of Human Resources, with involvement from the Office of Faculty Affairs only in specific instances concerning individuals who work a unit ultimately reporting to the Executive Vice President and Provost.

Satisfactory evaluations for administrative faculty should be forwarded directly from the relevant dean or vice provost to the Office of Human Resources, unless the administrative faculty member is a direct report to the dean or vice provost, in which case the Executive Vice President and Provost will be the reviewing official and final signatory. However, any and all unsatisfactory evaluations of administrative faculty should be forwarded to the Office of Faculty Affairs using the X-Drive (as in step five of the Academic Faculty Annual Evaluation Process).