



INSTRUCTIONS FOR CONDUCTING A FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION:

For New Jersey Medical School, Robert Wood Johnson Medical School (including CINJ and UBHC), Rutgers School of Dental Medicine, School of Nursing (excluding those faculty in the AAUP-AFT), School of Public Health and School of Health Professions.

For faculty in NJMS, RWJMS, SDM, SON and SPH, the evaluation will be completed online via this link https://rapid.rwjms.rutgers.edu/faculty_evals/. This link will be live on May 1. Only faculty in SHP should utilize the MS Word version of the form.

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 May 1 and ends July 15th of each year. **By no later than June 1, the faculty member must submit the following items to the Chair or other evaluator:**

- a. a completed Self-Evaluation form (with the "Self-Evaluation" option selected if using the MS Word version of the form) 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 on the Self-Evaluation form;
- b. an updated C.V.

Per the collective negotiations agreement with AAUP-BHSNJ: A negotiations unit member who does not submit these evaluations materials to the Chair by the first working day in June of each year shall not be eligible for a merit increase the following Fiscal Year 2022.

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

- a. selecting Faculty Evaluation by Evaluator option at the top of the form (if using the MS Word version of the form)
- b. recording the total FTE of the faculty member and their Education/Teaching (eFTE), Research and Scholarship (rFTE), Service (sFTE) and Clinical/Patient Care (cFTE) broken down by Contract Clinical and Productivity Based cFTE (if applicable, see guidelines here: <https://facultyaffairs.rbhs.rutgers.edu/wp-content/uploads/guidelinesfordefiningfte-cfte.pdf>). **The FTEs for the four 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.

- c. For clinical faculty in NJMS and RWJMS (including CINJ and UBHC) indicate the faculty specialty, the corresponding specialty, or alternative where no appropriate benchmark exists, based upon the publications listed in the evaluation form. Please note, these are entered in Section I for FY22 and in Section III for FY23.
 - d. enter comments describing the quality of the performance in each area of responsibility, based upon the criteria listed, the Faculty Self-Evaluation form submitted, the previously set goals and objectives, and of the overall performance. Where appropriate in the clinical section, indicate the actual WRVUs for FY22.
 - e. based on these written comments, assign a rating and select or enter 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;
 - f. 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. Where appropriate indicate the anticipated WRVUs for FY23.
3. evaluator gives the proposed evaluation to the faculty member in advance of the face-to-face (or virtual) review meeting between them, allowing sufficient time for the faculty member to reflect and respond.
 4. By July 15 of each year, 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 consultation may occur during the evaluation session itself or by exchange of documents. 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. 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. Be sure to consider and attach to the Faculty Performance Evaluation Form a copy of the goals and objectives for this evaluation period which were set 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.

Within each area of responsibility, consider the criteria detailed in the evaluation form, performance standards, including goals and objectives established last year.

Written comments reflecting the quality of the work performance should be provided in each section of the evaluation. These comments should specifically address productivity as reflected in the Faculty Data Form, and any goals and objectives for the area established in the previous year's evaluation. In addition, an evaluation for each area should be checked off 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 check 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@ca.rutgers.edu or 973-972-7595.