

**Performance Evaluation Plan
College of Health and Human Services**

The primary purposes of the Performance Evaluation Plan (also referred to as the Plan) are to: (1) improve performance, and (2) assess performance as part of the annual review process. As such, the Plan is both formative and summative in nature. Objectives (which the faculty member, Chair of the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee and School Director, have mutually agreed upon) provide the foundation and direction for annual faculty development and performance enhancement. They also serve as criteria for annual performance evaluation. The outcomes expected provide evidence of faculty achievement in meeting these objectives. Although the plan is oriented toward the individual faculty member, the process provides an opportunity to coordinate or integrate faculty objectives with the mission, goals, and priorities of the University, College, and School, as well as with respective promotion and tenure documents. The end result is a system designed to meet individual and collective needs.

I. The formative goals of the Performance Evaluation Plan are to:

- A. Assist faculty members to identify and target objectives for professional growth.
- B. Assist faculty members to identify and obtain the resources needed to accomplish objectives.
- C. Assist faculty members to identify professional objectives that will move them in a positive direction toward promotion and/or tenure.
- D. Recognize and support individual differences and preferences among faculty members in terms of their unique abilities to contribute through teaching, scholarly endeavors, and service.
- E. Provide feedback to faculty members about methods, behaviors, and outcomes that can enhance performance.

II. The summative goals of the Performance Evaluation Plan are to:

- A. Clarify role expectations of faculty members (i.e., teaching, scholarly endeavors, and service) to assure that each fully understands how performance will be reviewed on an annual basis.
- B. Review faculty performance based on mutually agreed upon objectives, action plans, and outcomes.
- C. Provide a basis of mutual understanding for annual review and salary adjustments that reflect the strengths and unique contributions of each faculty member.

III. The expectations of faculty are to:

- A. Annually prepare a Performance Evaluation Plan that addresses teaching, scholarship endeavors, and service. Objectives, action plans, needed resources, and outcomes expected should be stated for each area.
- B. Develop specific and measurable objectives in conjunction with action plans that describe how they will be met. The number of specific objectives in each category should be based upon the annual needs of the School and with consideration of individuals' professional growth strategies.
- C. Provide documentation to support the achievement of specific objectives. Include a brief summary statement (no more than 1 page) describing the accomplishment of the objectives in terms of University, College, School, or professional goals. A rationale for incomplete objectives should also be provided.

IV. The expectations of the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee are to:

- A. Act as a resource to faculty members in developing objectives that demonstrate

progress in teaching, scholarly endeavors, and service.

- B. Evaluate proposed objectives with respect to School and College promotion and tenure documents. Make recommendations to School Director through the Chair of the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- C. Assess the individual's annual performance in terms of objective accomplishment and/or progress toward promotion and tenure. Make recommendations to School Director through the Chair of the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee.

V. The expectations of School Directors are to:

- A. Assure that the work of the School is completed with an equitable distribution of tasks across faculty members over the annual evaluation period.
- B. Act as a resource to faculty members in developing objectives that demonstrate progress in teaching, scholarly endeavors, and service.
- C. Consider requested resources necessary to accomplish faculty objectives.
- D. Assess the individual's annual performance in terms of objective accomplishment with respect to the mission, goals, and priorities of the University, College, and School, as well as, if applicable, progress toward promotion and tenure.

VI. Process for the Performance Evaluation Plan:

- A. The time-line for the PEP process will be determined by the needs of each school but shall be consistent with any time-lines established by the University Faculty Handbook.
- B. Schools can choose to combine the annual review and the goal-setting processes in any manner as long as the February 1 deadline is met.
- C. The goal-setting process should include:
 - a. Each faculty member will submit a new Performance Evaluation Plan to be implemented in the next calendar year. The Plan is sent to the School Director and the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee.
 - b. The School Director and the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee will review the new Plan focusing on the objectives, the requested resources, and the expected outcomes.
 - c. The Chair of the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee will forward committee recommendations and suggestions to the School Director.
 - d. A formal agreement and approval of the Plan for the next calendar year will be obtained, as evidenced by signatures of the faculty member, Chair of the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the School Director. The specific mechanism used to obtain this agreement or consensus is at the discretion of the individual School.
 - e. Once all parties sign the Plan, it becomes part of the School's planning framework and is available for reference by the faculty.
 - f. If faculty members choose to retain objectives that are not valued by the University, College, or School, or do not enhance professional growth, then faculty should understand that these conditions will negatively affect their annual evaluation.
- D. The annual review process should include:
 - a. Each faculty member will submit the documentation and outcomes to support the prior year's Performance Evaluation Plan. Submission is to the School Director and the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee.
 - b. The suggested rating scale for the annual review process is:
 - 0 – failed to meet objective
 - 1 – partially met objective
 - 2 – met objective
 - 3 – exceeded objective

This rating scale is an example for each School to consider. If a different scale better suits the needs of the School, then that scale should be used.

- c. The School Director, in consultation with the Chair of the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee, will have assigned all ratings.
- d. Objective attainment and ratings will be used as the basis for the determination of annual merit salary increases.
- e. A performance review session will be held that will include the faculty member, the Chair of the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the School Director. Objectives from the prior year will be compared with the submitted documentation and outcomes.

VII. Revision of a faculty member's Performance Evaluation Plan:

- A. If a faculty member finds that it is necessary to revise his/her Plan based on unforeseen changes or opportunities in teaching, scholarly endeavors, and service, changes may be implemented if all of the following guidelines are met:
 2. The change(s) should be of equal or greater value when compared to the existing objective(s) which it is replacing.
 3. The School Director, in consultation with the Chair of the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee, must approve any change in the Plan.
 4. A written addendum must be added to the Plan containing a rationale for change(s) and an outline of the objective(s) in the Plan format.

Examples of changes may include, but are not limited to, unforeseen grant opportunities, collaborative research projects, unforeseen program needs, and significant service commitments.

- B. The Plan should not be revised to simply reduce the number of objectives originally specified except for unpredictable or extraordinary circumstances (for example, if a faculty member develops serious health problems). In these unusual situations, the Plan can be renegotiated to accommodate the individual faculty member.

VIII. Arbitration of Performance Evaluation Plan:

In the event that a personality conflict or an issue of trust arises, faculty members have the right to have their plans reviewed by the Dean of the College of Health and Human Services or a representative of the Dean's office. In the case that a review is requested, the Dean or the representative of the Dean's office will serve as an arbitrator. The review will result in a written decision distributed to the faculty member, School Director, and Chair of the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee about actions to be taken.

IX. Review, and possible revision, of the Performance Evaluation Plan document:

- A. This document will be reviewed and/or revised in a time interval that is consistent with the College's Promotion and Tenure document which is on a five year cycle, although spaced apart so that the revisions do not occur in the same year. The first review of this document will occur in academic year 2007-2008, with subsequent reviews occurring every five years. It will be reviewed and/or revised by an Ad Hoc Performance Evaluation Plan Committee consisting of two representatives (one tenured and one probationary faculty member) from each School within the College of Health and Human Services. A representative of the Dean's office will also be a participating member on this committee. Any changes must be approved by a majority of those Group I faculty voting.
- B. The School Director, in consultation with the Chair of the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee, are to establish their School-specific procedures for goal setting and the annual review process. Schools may choose to use the PEP process as previously described in this document or their own annual goal-setting and review process. Whichever process is used, the procedures are to be in writing and distributed to the

AP0005: Performance Evaluation Plan Form

faculty. Schools are to review and/or revise their procedures at least every five years, ideally the year after the College document is reviewed.

Form AP0005, Performance Evaluation Plan Form, is available at the following URL:

<http://www.hhs.ohiou.edu/html/AP0005.doc>

Original plan, with minor changes, approved by majority of faculty voting 5/10/02 with implementation date of Fall 2003-04. The PEP I Review Committee presented changes on May 16, 2008.

Revised plan approved by majority of faculty voting in June 2008, with implementation date of Fall 2008-09.