I. POLICY

It is the policy of EVMS that all EVMS Department Chairs of the School of Medicine or the Vice President and Dean of the School of Health Professions, referred to as academic unit's administrative head, or their designees, annually evaluate all faculty members appointed within their departments or programs with the exception of those faculty members who are appointed with an "Adjunct" or "Visiting" title. Academic units shall make reasonable efforts to inform faculty of the promotion process, including tenure, and encourage participation in professional development activities aligned with their career goals.

II. PURPOSE

EVMS values excellence in teaching, clinical care, research/discovery and administration/ service. The institution believes that an ongoing performance management process supports these values by providing faculty with performance feedback in order to understand what is expected, how they are performing in each four domains as applicable to the faculty member, and what is required to achieve or sustain excellence for promotion or tenure. Specifically, annual reviews of faculty performance are intended to: 1) involved faculty members in the design and evaluation of objectives and goals of their academic programs and in the identification of the performance expectations central to their own personal and professional growth; 2) assess actual performance and accomplishments in the areas teaching, clinical care, research/discovery and administration/service; 3) promote the effectiveness of faculty members through an articulation of the types of contributions they might make to enhance EVMS; 4) provide a written record of faculty performance to support personnel decisions; 5) recognize the special talents, capabilities, and achievements of faculty members; 6) correct unsatisfactory ratings in one of more areas of responsibility through specific faculty improvement plans designed to correct the deficiencies in a timely manner; and 7) fulfill reappointment, promotion and post-tenure reviews (when appropriate) for faculty.

III. PROCEDURE

A. Review Process.

1. Notice. Faculty Affairs and Professional Development (FAPD) will notify all faculty, chairs and administrators via email in the spring of each year that the annual performance review process has begun with directions and a link to the evaluation form and activity report.

2. Faculty Submission. Each faculty member shall submit an annual evaluation form and any other materials that may be deemed relevant to the academic unit's administrative head of her/his past year's performance and her/his goals and priorities for subsequent year in a timely manner for review. Information provided on the annual evaluation form shall be based on the appropriate criteria for subsequent annual review, reappointment, promotion, and (as applicable) tenure and post-tenure review. In the area of teaching, student evaluation of faculty performance

and other expressions of teaching performance are required. Student evaluations of faculty should become available to the academic unit's administrative head from the Office of Medical Education, School of Medicine and School of Health Professions.

3. Review Meeting. The academic unit's administrative head, or designee, shall meet with each faculty to discuss progress toward meeting last year's goals in all domains aligned with the institution's mission areas and determine goals and priorities for the upcoming year in accordance with the faculty's percentage of effort directed toward teaching, clinical care, research/discovery and administration/service. Reasonable efforts shall be made to inform faculty of the promotion process and promotion guidelines, including tenure, and encourage participation in professional development activities aligned with their career goals. If faculty members are making exceptional contributions, they should be encouraged to apply for promotion consistent with guidelines time frame. As soon as possible thereafter, the academic unit administrative head or his/her designee shall prepare a written report of the evaluation that is acknowledged by both parties verifying that the evaluation was completed, and the feedback was read and discussed.

4. Alternate Reviewers and Multiple Appointments.

a. In the event that the academic unit's administrative head does not have routine contact or knowledge of the performance of a faculty member, she/he may select another individual within the academic unit as a designee (i.e., associate chair, division chief or program director) who is in a supervisory role and has knowledge of the individual faculty member's performance.

b. When the faculty member holds an appointment that involves an administrative assignment that involves more than 50% effort, the annual performance review shall be conducted by the supervising administrator with appropriate input from other units when appropriate. Decisions on academic advancement remains under the responsibility of the academic unit's administrative head.

c. When the faculty member holds multiple appointments involving administrative, professional, or other assignments, the annual performance review is conducted by the academic unit's administrative head, or designee, and shall address contributions under each of these assignments.

5. Failure or Denial to Submit. If the faculty member does not timely submit or denies to submit annual performance review information to the academic unit administrative head, or designee, the faculty member shall receive an overall unsatisfactory performance rating, which will initiate the Faculty Improvement Plan described below, unless the administrative head determines the good cause exists for an exception.

6. Review File. A copy of all signed annual evaluations shall be maintained with FAPD as part of the faculty member's academic file.

7. Use of Review. The appropriate Dean of each school as well as the appropriate committees shall have access to the annual performance reports for subsequent annual review, reappointment, promotion, and, if applicable, tenure decisions. Annual performance reviews completed in the last three years, may be considered on the promotion and tenure process, but such evaluations are not determinative on promotion and tenure decisions. Satisfactory ratings in the annual performance reviews do not necessarily indicate successful progress toward promotion and tenure. Progress toward promotion and tenure requires scholarly accomplishment over a period of years in the broader range of faculty responsibilities, and includes evaluation by external referees, which is not part of the annual review process. Criteria and decisions regarding promotion and tenure are detailed in the applicable policies.

B. Unsatisfactory Ratings of Non-Tenure and Tenure Track Faculty.

1. Overall Unsatisfactory Rating. In the event a faculty member receives an overall annual performance review rating as unsatisfactory, the faculty member's immediate supervisor shall work with the faculty member to develop an individualized Faculty Improvement Plan (FIP). The FIP should be created within 30 days after the completion of the annual performance review. It should take into consideration the reasons for under performance by the faculty member including professionalism issues that interfere with the faculty member's performance; lack of knowledge/skills to perform assigned tasks and willful or deliberate neglect of roles, responsibilities or tasks, and include specific benchmarks to enhance faculty's performance over the next academic year period, or may choose to initiate other actions in accordance with institutional policy.

2. Faculty Improvement Plan. The objective of the Faculty Improvement Plan (FIP) is to resume the faculty member's place as a fully contributing member of the faculty. The faculty member must take responsibility for meeting to develop the FIP and submitting any necessary materials in a timely manner, and for following the FIP once it is developed.

a. FIP aims to address a) two or more areas of performance rated as unsatisfactory; b) one area of performance rated as unsatisfactory, depending on the emphasis assigned to that area or the extent of the deficiency; c) the faculty member's failure to provide annual performance review information on time to their academic unit's administrative head (or designee); d) the faculty's member denial to submit annual performance review information on time to their academic unit's administrative head (or designee); e) ratings of needs improvement in more than one area of performance before they become sufficiently serious to impair the faculty member's overall performance.

b. FIP will generally:
   i. Describe specific deficiencies;
   ii. Provide a list of clear and reasonable outcomes needed to correct deficiencies;
   iii. Describe the process to be followed to achieve outcomes;

iv. Provide the timeline for accomplishing the process, including frequent reviews and feedback;
v. Describe benchmarks and expectations;
vi. Describe the criteria to be used in evaluating progress in the FIP.

c. The academic unit's administrative head (or designee) develops the plan in collaboration with the faculty member and the appropriate department/unit committee, when available.

d. The plan has a maximum of one-year duration, has clear and attainable objectives for the faculty member and includes appropriate interim monitoring and feedback. When appropriate, the plan includes a commitment of departmental or institutional resources (i.e., mentoring, faculty development).

e. The plan may also include a reallocation of the faculty member's workload distribution in accord with the department workload standards and is signed by the faculty member, the academic unit's administrative head (or designee) and the Dean of the appropriate School.

3. Expected Outcomes of the Faculty Improvement Plan. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate improvement in the deficient area to a level that meets expectations within one year. If the faculty member fails to demonstrate reasonable progress relative to the benchmarks and performance goals, dismissal for cause or non-renewal of contract may be initiated, and if initiated will proceed in accordance with the applicable policies.

4. Refusal to Participate. If the faculty member refuses to participate in the development of the Faculty Improvement Plan, an unsatisfactory rating will be assigned to the faculty, which will initiate other actions in accordance with institutional policy.

C. Appeals of Annual Performance Review Ratings.

Faculty members have the right to appeal their overall annual performance review when: 1) there are errors of fact that may impact the rating; or 2) the facts may be correct, but there is disagreement about the supervisor's judgment of the rating by providing additional information to the next administrative level, ordinarily to the academic unit's administrative head. If the disagreement cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of the faculty member, then the faculty member may appeal their reviews with the Dean of the appropriate School through the office of FAPD. Such appeals must be made in writing within 30 days from the date of the written annual performance review and must state with specificity: 1) the findings to be appealed; 2) the points of disagreement; 3) the facts in support of the appeal; and 4) the corrective action sought. The document should not exceed three pages in length.

The administrator reviewing the appeal will consider the facts in support of the appeal and develop any additional facts deemed necessary. The decision on the appeal, which represents the final evaluation, will be completed in writing within 30 days, with copies provided to the faculty member, the administrative head involved in the annual performance review and the office of FAPD.