



INSTRUCTIONS FOR CONDUCTING A FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION –

NJEA Program Directors:

UPDATED: March 2026

For NJEA Program Director faculty the evaluation will be completed online via this link https://rapid.rwjms.rutgers.edu/faculty_evals/.

1. Performance evaluations will evaluate the faculty member's performance since the date of their last faculty performance evaluation and shall set expectations for the coming academic year. The evaluation process begins April 1 and ends July 15th of each year. **By no later than May 1, the faculty member must submit the following items to the Chair or other evaluator:**

- a. A completed Self-Evaluation reporting information about their activities during the evaluation period and indicating how goals and objectives previously set for the period have been achieved (if additional quantitative measures are applicable for the faculty member, those data should be attached separately or included in the additional space provided on the form). Section III: Goals and Objectives for Next Evaluation Period must also be completed.
- b. An updated C.V. (please note that the C.V. document name cannot contain any special characters such as: . , _ ; : !).

2. After submission to the Chair or other evaluator, the Evaluator completes Faculty Performance Evaluation:

- a. **NJEA Program Directors** record their total FTE including Education/Teaching (eFTE), Research and Scholarship (rFTE), Service (sFTE), Clinical/Patient Care (cFTE), and Program Administration (aFTE). (if applicable, see guidelines here: <https://facultyaffairs.rbhs.rutgers.edu/wp-content/uploads/guidelinesfordefiningfte-cfte.pdf>). **The FTEs for the areas of responsibility must add up to the total FTE of the faculty member.** If a faculty member does not have responsibilities in a particular mission area, the FTE recorded for that activity will be 0 and that area will not be evaluated. Faculty administrators and designated evaluators are responsible for the review and confirmation of all current and proposed Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) distributions, including both productivity and contract clinical effort (cFTE). By acknowledging the pop-up prompt, evaluators are confirming they have carefully reviewed and both portions of the cFTE are accurate and up to date.
- b. Enter comments describing the quality of the performance in each area of responsibility, based upon the criteria listed, the Faculty Self-Evaluation submitted, the previously set goals and objectives, and of the overall performance.
- c. Based on these written comments, assign a rating and select the number on the evaluation (5. Exceptional, 4. Exceeds Expectations, 3. Meets Expectations (*Satisfactory*), 2. Needs Improvement, and 1. Unsatisfactory) to each area of responsibility, for Professionalism, and to the overall evaluation.
- d. In consultation with the faculty member, establish and record FTEs for each area of responsibility and goals and objectives for each of these mission areas for the next fiscal year.

3. The Faculty Performance Evaluation must be submitted to the faculty member ahead of the meeting between the evaluator and the faculty member, giving them time to review.
4. By July 15 the evaluator meets with the faculty member to discuss the proposed evaluation and weightings of areas of responsibility and goals and objectives for the next fiscal year. In addition to establishing the goals and objectives themselves, it is important to give some indication as to how fulfillment of those goals and objectives will be measured. **(Note that the weights assigned should reflect the importance of the area of responsibility within the totality of the individual's duties and responsibilities, not the relative time commitment to that area of responsibility.)** Establishment of goals and objectives and consultation with the faculty member regarding those goals and objectives are very important aspects of the evaluation and are **not** optional. The initial proposal of goals and objectives most frequently is developed by the faculty member rather than by the evaluator. However, the evaluator has the responsibility of establishing the final statement of the goals and objectives following the consultation process and adding these to the evaluation.
 - a. **This meeting is required, not optional.** It is important to use this meeting to review faculty development issues pertaining to the individual faculty member. For example, for junior faculty members it is essential to discuss progress toward promotion, steps that should be taken to qualify for promotion, additional credentials/training that would be useful for career advancement, and other related matters. An optional section is provided on the Faculty Performance Evaluation Form for long-term goals, particularly those relating to career development issues for junior faculty.
 - b. If appropriate, the evaluator may amend the evaluation following the meeting with the faculty member.
 - c. The faculty member must sign the evaluation, which indicates only that they have reviewed the evaluation. The faculty member may submit a written response to the evaluation.
6. Electronic copies of the final evaluation go to the faculty member, the evaluator, and to the personnel file in the Dean's Office.

General Guidelines:

The evaluation of faculty performance is one of the most important functions of department chairs, division directors and other evaluators. When done properly, the performance evaluation process should be an effective means of improving performance, motivating faculty members to reach higher levels of achievement, communicating expectations, and dealing with performance-related problems. It is incumbent upon evaluators to be both fair and constructive.

Productivity, quality of the overall performance, and the achievement of the previous year's goals and objectives should be considered specifically. Within each area of responsibility, consider the criteria detailed in the evaluation form, performance standards, including goals and objectives established last year.

Evaluations must contain sufficient written commentary to explain the assigned ratings, especially if there is an unsatisfactory rating or if improvement is needed.

Written comments reflecting the quality of the work performance should be provided in each section of the evaluation. These comments should specifically address productivity and any goals and objectives for the area

established in the previous year's evaluation. In addition, an evaluation for each area should be selected in the space provided.

Level 5 - Exceptional: Demonstrates exceptional performance, sustains excellence and optimizes results in their endeavors. This represents the highest level of performance, as evidenced by the extraordinary impact on the achievement of the mission. The faculty member is an inspirational leader and is considered a role model by University leadership, peers, and students. Continually contributes materially to the University efforts that address or accomplish important organizational goals, consistently achieves expectations at the highest level of quality possible, and consistently handles challenges and exceeds targets.

Level 4 – Exceeds Expectations: Demonstrates a very high level of performance beyond that required for successful performance in the position and scope of responsibilities. Is a proven, highly effective leader who builds trust and instills confidence in University leadership, peers, and students. Consistently exceeds established performance expectations, timelines, or targets, as applicable.

Level 3 – Meets Expectations/Satisfactory: Demonstrates the high level of performance expected and actions and leadership contribute positively toward the achievement of strategic goals and meaningful results. Is an effective, solid, and dependable leader who delivers high-quality results based on measures of quality, quantity, efficiency, and/or effectiveness within agreed upon timeliness. Meets challenging performance expectations established for the position.

Level 2 – Needs Improvement: Contributions are below satisfactory and may not appreciably advance the organization towards achievement of its goals and objectives. While the faculty member marginally meets the lower range of established performance expectations, timelines and targets, there are occasional lapses that impair operations and/or cause concern from management. While showing basic ability to accomplish work through others, the faculty member may demonstrate limited ability to inspire subordinates to give their best efforts or to marshal those efforts effectively to address problems characteristic of the organization and its work.

Level 1 – Unsatisfactory: Demonstrates performance deficiencies that detract from mission goals and objectives often in repeated instances. The faculty member generally is viewed as ineffectual by leadership, peers, or students. Does not meet established performance expectations/timelines/targets and fails to produce - or produces unacceptable – work products, services or outcomes.

Write a description of the overall evaluation and select the appropriate overall evaluation rating in the space provided. (See the definitions of evaluation terminology provided above.)

Please note, a rating of unsatisfactory in a single important area of responsibility may be sufficient justification for an overall rating of unsatisfactory. Similarly, an extraordinary accomplishment in a single area of responsibility may be sufficient justification for an overall rating of exemplary. In addition, a rating of Unsatisfactory in any one or more of the four mission areas under the category of Professionalism will result in a rating of Unsatisfactory for Professionalism.

Questions concerning the Faculty Performance Evaluation process should be directed to
rbhsfacultyaffairs@rbhs.rutgers.edu or 973-972-7595.