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8.2 Evaluation Rating Terms.

8.2.1 Annual evaluations for faculty members who are candidates eligible for tenure, regardless of rank, shall include ratings across a four-point scale, comprised of excellent, commendable, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory, in the areas of teaching, and research, scholarship, creative or entrepreneurial activity, and service, or other duties if the assigned workload includes such; and an overall rating across the same four-point scale. In annual evaluations, and with reference to the UNLV Bylaws, Chapter III, Section 8.1, the evaluee must be given an “unsatisfactory” rating if performance falls below minimum standards.

8.2.2 Annual evaluation for tenured faculty and all faculty in ranks 0 and 1 shall include an overall rating of either satisfactory or unsatisfactory, as set forth in the NSHE Code, based upon the assigned workload.

8.3.3 Separate from annual evaluations, progress toward tenure and/or promotion shall be assessed every three years, as applicable. This shall be a narrative appraisal prepared in consultation with the appropriate faculty based on the standards and procedures of the unit. Progress assessments may consider annual evaluations but annual evaluations may not be supplanted by these assessments.

8.3.4 Department chairs may negotiate individual role statements with faculty within the parameters of unit workload policies, evaluation, and tenure and promotion standards. Such role statements shall be referenced in annual evaluation, progress evaluations, and attached to tenure and promotion dossiers.

ARGUMENTS FOR:

1. Clarifies the four-point ratings scale for tenure-track faculty and defines areas to be evaluated.
2. Codifies the two-point ratings scale, as permitted by the NSHE Code, for ranks 0, 1 and tenured faculty.
3. Describes the three-year progress assessments mandated by the NSHE Code.
4. Allows negotiation of evaluation standards through role statements, as applicable, for expanded research engagement, extra teaching responsibilities, heightened service, etc.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST:

1. Does not allow department or college discretion to use four-point scale for all faculty.
2. The Code language regarding three-year progress assessments is ambiguous.
3. A satisfactory annual evaluation could be in direct contradiction to conclusions of a three-year assessment and frustrate both associate professors and their supervisors.
4. An unsatisfactory three-year assessment of progress to promotion may drive faculty members whose strengths involve other than high-level research to leave UNLV.
5. Role statements may not be given full consideration in tenure or promotion evaluation.