Evaluating Faculty Members with Unique and/or Administrative Assignments  
Chair and Peer Committee Guidelines

Several COHS faculty members hold unique and/or administrative assignments. While they are faculty members in the truest sense, they are faculty members who do not fit the parameters of the usual evaluation processes. The guidelines presented here are to assist in evaluating out-of-the-ordinary faculty roles.

Faculty Members with Unique Assignments

If a faculty member has a unique or non-traditional assignment as documented in their letter of offer or in some other official short-time arrangement, it is important that the faculty evaluation criteria be adjusted to address the particulars of that assignment. If the faculty member has accomplishments in an area for which there is no expectation, those accomplishments should be acknowledged and credited to enhance the final evaluation.

Example: Currently faculty members have other expectations rather than research expectations (research, industry relations for example). Consequently, these faculty members should be evaluated on teaching, "other assignment," and service, but not on research. If these faculty members actually have accomplishments in research (papers, presentation, research funding), these items would be viewed as a type of bonus, adding to the final evaluation total. The faculty evaluation form should be revised in such a way that the faculty member’s actual assignment is reflected. At no time should a faculty member be penalized for lack of accomplishment in an area for which he/she is not appointed.

While not precisely holding a unique appointment, instructors are not evaluated on the same criteria as tenured or tenure-track faculty members. Instructors are employed to teach and usually have a much heavier teaching load than other faculty members. The department policy should reflect the expectation for any activity in addition to teaching. Some departments expect instructors to participate in service and others do not. These expectations, whatever they are, should be very clear to instructors. In a similar vein as above, instructors should be evaluated only on what they have been told is expected of them and rewarded for performance outside their expectations.

Faculty Members with Administrative Assignments

Some faculty members hold administrative appointments, with their time commitment varying from 25% to 75%. These roles include associate deans, department chairs, and perhaps a department-based assignment such as graduate advisor or assistant chair. In evaluating the remaining time, which is the faculty appointment, it is important to consider their available time to function in a faculty role. It is vital that everyone is clear on what is given up from the faculty role when a person takes an administrative assignment. This decision is negotiated between the department chair and the faculty administrator concerned.

Example: A half time administrator may elect to be evaluated on all three areas of faculty service, but with a reduced productivity expectation in each one. If one of the quality guidelines is number of courses taught or credit hours generated, then the faculty administrator should be expected to generate only half as much as a non-administrative faculty member for a similar rating. If one of the quality
standards is teaching evaluations, then the expectation on that standard for all faculty members would be equal. There would be no reduction in teaching quality expected, just the amount of teaching done. A faculty administrator might decide to forego one area of faculty service completely (often it is research). In such a case, the faculty administrator is held to the same productivity and quality standards as any other faculty member in the areas in which he/she is appointed, but there is no expectation in the area that is no longer in the appointment. As with any evaluation, achievement in areas for which there is no appointment/expectation should be included as an extra or an enhancement to the final evaluation.

_Evaluation Process_

When it is time to evaluate faculty members who hold unique and/or administrative assignments, it is important that the chair be aware of and utilize the adjusted evaluation procedures needed and that these adjustments are made very clear to the peer review committee. The chair will need to explain the pertinent differences in appointments and their implications for their evaluation deliberations. The committee will need to know if the differences in types of expectations for some faculty members such as development vs research appointments. They will also need to know if faculty/administrator will not be evaluated at all in one area (e.g., administrative time replaces research time) but have full expectations in the other areas, or if the faculty/administrator will be evaluated on the traditional categories (teaching, research, service) but at a productivity expectation level reduced by the percentage of their administrative appointment.

**Example:** If a faculty member has a development assignment and no research assignment, that faculty member should be evaluated on development but not research. If a faculty member holds a half-time administrative position, the evaluation of their productivity (as opposed to quality standards) should be reduced by half. If a full time faculty member is expected to teach two classes for a top rank, then a half-time administrator should be expected to teach only one. If the normal expectation is two papers per year, then the administrator should get an equal evaluation for one paper.

_Source of Evaluation_

Department chairs are not evaluated by peer committees. Their entire evaluation is done in the dean’s office with the faculty portion of their time rated based on their departmental policy. Associate/assistant deans have their faculty time evaluated by the department chair and peer review committee, with their administrative time evaluated by the Dean. Internal departmental administrators are evaluated in a similar fashion but with their administrative time evaluated by the chairperson and documented in the “Other” section of the annual review form.