

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS
SCHOOL OF ALLIED HEALTH SCIENCES

POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION

POLICY: Faculty are evaluated on an annual basis by the appropriate department chair.

RATIONALE: The department, school and university bylaws require evaluation of faculty on an annual basis.

PROCEDURE

1. Each faculty member is responsible for submitting an Annual Work Report to the Department Chair for the purpose of evaluation before the end of the 2nd week of the Spring semester.
 - The Annual Work Report should contain sufficient information such that the quality of the faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarship, and service can be evaluated. The main categories of the Annual Work Report that are evaluated are provided at the end of this document.
2. The Department Chair prepares a written Annual Evaluation and presents it to the faculty member for his/her review no later than the end of the 5th week of the Spring semester.
 - a. The Department Chair must use the ranking system set forth by the university to evaluate faculty performance.
 - The Annual Evaluation of tenured faculty will consist of an overall ranking of Excellent, Commendable, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory.
 - The Annual Evaluation of tenure-track faculty will consist of a ranking of Excellent, Commendable, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory in each core area (i.e., Teaching, Scholarship, Service) as well as for Overall Progress Towards Tenure.
 - The following descriptors are associated with each rank level:
 - Excellent: Possessing outstanding quality; extraordinary; superior.
 - Commendable: Worthy of high praise but not Excellent.
 - Satisfactory: Fulfills job duties; adequate.
 - Unsatisfactory: Not satisfactory; does not fulfill job duties adequately.
 - The Department Chair bases his/her evaluation largely on the information presented in the Annual Work Report in the context of evaluating the faculty member's performance of his/her duties and responsibilities to the department, school, university, and professional communities. In addition to reviewing the Annual Work Report to determine rankings, a chair may also consider information submitted by a Program Director (where

appropriate), information related to collegiality, or other information not directly included in the Annual Work Report but pertinent to the evaluation of a faculty member's performance.

- Evaluations involve both objective and subjective components. The Department Chair must use good judgment and complete the evaluations without personal bias. If the Department Chair is unsure of his/her ability to do so, he/she should seek assistance from the Associate Dean or Dean of the School of Allied Health Sciences.
 - The written Annual Evaluation is a summary of the faculty member's performance over the past year. As such, it is impossible to reference all materials submitted as part of the Annual Report within the written evaluation. Rather, the Department Chair is expected to summarize the data while considering all information available as rankings are determined.
3. If a faculty member disagrees with the evaluation, he/she can 1) submit a response to the evaluation within 30 calendar days of receiving the written evaluation and 2) within 15 calendar days request a peer-evaluation as per UNLV bylaws. If a faculty member submits a response to the annual evaluation, that response is forwarded to the Dean with the written annual evaluation.

MAIN CATEGORY	INFORMATION that may be considered
Opening statement	
Teaching/job ability and effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courses Taught Over Evaluation Period • Student Advising (Academic or Career) Responsibilities • Teaching Awards and Recognition • Membership on Graduate-Degree Candidates' Committees • Other evidence of effective job performance • Teaching Reassignment and/or Other Teaching Assignment
Research, Creative Accomplishments and Scholarship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and/or Scholarly Publications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Articles in refereed journals ○ Books or monographs ○ Book chapters or parts of books ○ Books edited ○ Book reviews and other published reviews ○ Articles published in non-refereed journals ○ Articles in refereed conference proceedings ○ Presentations at professional meetings—Refereed ○ Presentations at professional meetings—Invited ○ Prefaces, introductions, catalogue statements, edited pieces, etc. ○ Research reports to sponsor ○ Translations ○ Transliterations ○ Abstracts ○ Manuscripts accepted for publication ○ Manuscripts submitted for publication ○ Manuscripts in progress • Other Scholarly or Creative Accomplishments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Research or Creative Awards and Recognitions ○ List of honors or awards for scholarship or professional activity ○ Significant innovations with respect to library collections, services, or methods ○ Other evidence of research or creative accomplishments as appropriate (e.g. patents, new product development, new art forms, new computer software developed, citation index analysis, etc.) ○ Research Grants and Contracts ○ Research Reassignment
Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System • University • School • Department / Program • Professional and learned societies • Governmental agencies • Business and industry • Public and private organizations • Service grants, awards and recognition • Description of outreach or other activities in which there was significant use of the candidate's expertise (e.g., consulting, speaking engagements, services to government agencies, professional and industrial associations, etc.) • Service Reassignment