FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS: FACULTY DEVELOPMENT and EVALUATION

Aligning UTHSCSA School of Medicine Faculty Development, Mentoring and Productivity Planning with the Annual Faculty Evaluation

Refers to: Annual Faculty Evaluation Format.

Why is faculty development vital to the SOM?

Through effective faculty development and mentoring programs, the SOM becomes a vital force through which faculty members can reach their fullest potential personally and professionally, thus contributing to the Department, the SOM and UTHSCSA in turn achieving their fullest potential.

Why integrate faculty development with other faculty processes?

Optimal faculty development relies on having structure, details and reminders that build and insure strong bi-directional connections and communication among the institutional plans, policies, procedures, processes and programs through which academic faculty life is valued, namely the following:

- Appointment offer letter
- Faculty member’s own goals
- Division/department/school/institution (contextual) goals
- Departmental XYZ compensation plan
- Mentoring and advising (formal and informal)
- Faculty development
- Faculty recognition
- Faculty promotion/tenure processes and criteria (PTAC)
- Formal faculty evaluation (annual and other)

Historically, when these processes have operated partially or entirely independently, they have contributed to lower rates of faculty satisfaction and faculty retention, plus lower faculty (department/center or institutional) productivity, achievement, advancement, recognition and renown.

What UTHSCSA HOP policies cover faculty development and evaluation?

The UTHSCSA Handbook of Operating Procedures Policy 3.2.4 Evaluation of Faculty Members at http://www.uthscsa.edu/hop2000/3.2.4.pdf states in part:

As a result of the policy established by the Board of Regents, the Health Science Center has subscribed to and implemented a written personnel evaluation program for all faculty employees. The faculty will be evaluated annually. The evaluation will provide information to administrators and faculty that will enhance faculty development.
Each individual must be judged in the context of those responsibilities assigned by the Chair. There must be an appropriate division of time and labor, as well as opportunity, to accomplish the academic goals necessary for achieving departmental objectives. It may be difficult for a given faculty member to attain excellence in research, teaching, and service (e.g., patient care, supportive services, administration) when the candidate’s departmental assignments exclude time for one or more of these activities. Therefore, the degree of responsibility assigned to an individual is a consideration for the determination of rank.

This SOM Annual Faculty Development, Productivity & Evaluation approach aims to assist in fulfilling HOP policy by providing an organizational structure for these activities while insuring effective communication and alignment among the related entities and processes.

Additionally, HOP 3.4.1 states that each faculty member through Year 5 of appointment should discuss and consider whether the current appointment track is the ‘best fit’ for them. Changing tracks is generally allowed to occur once, and must be conducted during year 3-5.

Additional reviews that can be conducted in an overlapping or simultaneous fashion to minimize duplication of effort:

- **Tenure track Mid-probationary review**: (HOP 3.7.4) is a formal review occurring in the fifth year of the 9-year tenure track probationary period.
- **Annual post-tenure review**: (BOR instituted 5/2012; UTHSCSA HOP addition still pending.)
- **Comprehensive (6-year) post-tenure review**: BOR 2/2012; UTHSCSA HOP update in effect. (HOP 3.7.5)
- **Administrative review** when holding an administrative title in addition to faculty title: (HOP 3.9.1)

**Does the Annual Evaluation (Format) of Faculty Development, Mentoring and Productivity mean there are additional meetings and forms to complete?**

No! The Annual Evaluation of Faculty Development, Mentoring and Productivity FORMAT is:

1. A **template** for adaptation and concept application in whole or part on the department, center or other hierarchical ‘unit’ level.
2. **NOT** an additional process or form for submission outside the department.
3. Meant to inform and move the various faculty development, mentoring, incentive and evaluation systems toward building synchronized, integrated quality systems and eliminating identified gaps and ‘silos’ that render them ineffective, particularly when these processes operate independently from one another.
4. One way to document when **formal faculty development and the annual evaluation discussion occurred** and what specific agreement was reached between the individual faculty member and the primary evaluating supervisor, such as a Division Chief or Center Director, regarding:
a. faculty role, responsibilities and measurable goals that align the career pathway with appointment context and track, XYZ compensation plan, mentoring, faculty development, and UTHSCSA promotion/tenure criteria.
b. the specific, contextually aligned and measurable goals that were established.
c. the analysis and evaluation of faculty productivity outcomes relative to each goal mutually established for that year.
d. the review being multipurpose by also serving as the annual faculty evaluation, and to the extent possible, fulfilling other evaluation processes.

5. A mentoring effectiveness tool that can be used to document:
   i. that the Development and Productivity Plan details are shared with mentoring.
   ii. which specific goal(s) will be targeted in formal mentoring.
   iii. the quality/quantity of faculty mentoring
   iv. how mentoring is valued by department/center and in faculty advancement.
   v. mutual participation or consideration of mentor and protégé in each other’s annual evaluation processes.

6. One way to document the actual annual Faculty Evaluation process and outcomes, so that the:
   a. Division/Department/Center can demonstrate accountability
   b. Evaluations can be a valued consideration in determining individual faculty member recognition, retention and career advancement.

Who is accountable for what in the Annual Faculty Evaluation process?

• Each Department/ Center or other administrative entity is responsible for conducting the annual faculty evaluation process in a timely fashion prior to the end of each fiscal year, allowing time for integration of the review processes with the faculty development and mentoring processes, and for each supervisory level of faculty in the chain of authority through the Department Chair to document accountability in these processes prior to their own evaluation.

• The leadership of each academic home department is accountable for implementing and sustaining an effective early-career and new faculty mentoring system that serves that specific department.

• Demonstrated implementation and outcomes of faculty development as well as faculty mentoring programs will serve as benchmarks in the Chair/Director’s annual evaluation of supervisory faculty members.

• Demonstrated implementation and outcomes of faculty development as well as faculty mentoring programs will serve as benchmarks in the SOM Dean’s evaluation of Department Chairs and Center or Institute Directors.
• Departments/ Centers are responsible for maintaining the record of results from each of that unit’s faculty member’s formal Annual Faculty Evaluation, and for having a record of or access to a current CV for each faculty member. Any faculty member may have more than one evaluator when the role assignment and activities of that faculty member cross multiple domains.

What about the annual reviews of ‘other’ types of faculty appointments?

Reviews should be concise and reasonable in serving the Department/ Center’s needs while fulfilling HOP policy.

• Adjunct faculty: Performance review process devised by department must be operational to document basis for any requested promotion in rank. Keep it simple. Record faculty member’s expected/assigned duties (See appointment form.) Ask faculty to record their contributions, and if they desire reappointment - an annual process. Review and document performance meets departmental quantity and quality standards.

• Adjoint faculty: Performance review process devised and conducted by department to meet departmental performance standards. Anticipate needs of adjoint-appointing institution to coordinate sharing report(s) when needed.

• Other faculty (emeritus; visiting; etc.): As needed.

What are the steps in the Annual Faculty Evaluation process?

See the Annual Faculty Evaluation Format comprised of Sections I – VII, listed:

I. Faculty Information
II. Mentoring
III. Exceptional Accomplishments
IV. Evaluation of Productivity & Goal Achievement
V. Confirmation of Track
VI. New SMART Goals for the Upcoming Fiscal Year
VII. Additional Comments and Signatures of Agreement

STEP 1: Prepare goals for the upcoming fiscal year (FY): The faculty member in discussion with the primary supervisor (evaluator), and in alignment with the department’s/unit’s expectations, completes Section VI New SMART Goals for the Upcoming Fiscal Year. Except in the case of an initial faculty appointment when goal-setting occurs soon after appointment, STEP 1. goal preparation occurs as part of the prior FY’s Annual Faculty Evaluation. These Section VI. goals serve to focus faculty activity and mentoring throughout the upcoming FY and form the basis for that FY-end Annual Faculty Evaluation where at that time they are the goals evaluated in Section IV. Evaluation of Productivity & Goal Achievement.

Goal-setting process: Both short-term (6-month - 1-year) and long-term (2 - 5 year) goals are set and each is constructed as a SMART Goal, i.e. Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time-bound. Delineating goal boundaries improves the likelihood of goal accomplishment. Having written specific goals in a signed Annual Faculty Evaluation demonstrates mutual
agreement was reached between the individual faculty member and their supervisor. A maximum of three goals should be set in each short- or long-term area relevant to the faculty member’s career development; however, not all areas are applicable to every faculty career. Align goal-setting with the Department’s XYZ Compensation Plan & the UTHSCSA PTAC Criteria Checklist. Overall career goals may also be written.

**STEP 2: Prepare for the FY-end Annual Faculty Evaluation:** In the last quarter of the FY as the FY-end Annual Faculty Evaluation approaches, each faculty member completes Sections I - III regarding the FY review period, conducts a thoughtful self-evaluation related to Sections IV. and V., then prepares Section VI. to the extent possible.

- **Section I. Faculty Information:** List name, rank, track, etc.
- **Section II. Mentoring: Protégé** lists the (assigned) primary mentor. May list other mentors/ing relevant to the evaluation time period. Was feedback about the mentor submitted? Will this mentoring dyad continue? Which specific SMART goals were targeted? Key strength of this relationship? **Mentor** lists assigned ‘formal’ protégé and may list other protégés. Used CQI strategies? Which specific goals targeted? Gave feedback in annual evaluation? Mentoring dyad will continue?
- **Section III. Exceptional Accomplishments:** List any exceptional accomplishments since the last Annual Faculty Evaluation.

**STEP 3: Conduct the FY-end Annual Faculty Evaluation:** The primary supervisor (evaluator) reviews the individual faculty member’s current CV and Sections I. – III. of the Annual Faculty Evaluation Format prior to completing Sections IV. – VI. together with the individual faculty member. A faculty member’s ‘assigned’ mentor should have some mechanism to contribute to that evaluation process.

Based on the previously established Section VI. New SMART Goals for the Upcoming Fiscal Year, the faculty member should have conducted their own assessment of their past year’s productivity and goal achievement, including conducting a thoughtful SWOT-analysis to identify what they perceive as their Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats as well as the potential impact on each goal’s outcome.

Then, the supervisor (evaluator) and the faculty member discuss Sections II. – V. together before they work together to develop the details of Section VI. New SMART Goals for the next year. Mentoring is evaluated using the unit’s specific process, but may be combined with the Annual Evaluation. Exceptional accomplishments since the last evaluation deserve recognition. Confirmation of track assignment is an important part of every faculty member’s annual evaluation, particularly during Years 3-5 (Section V.)

Each previously set Section VI. goal has now become the basis for Section IV. Evaluation of Productivity/Goal Achievement. A thoughtful SWOT-analysis will help identify unanticipated factors that facilitated goal achievement as well as challenges and barriers that arose in each goal area. This exercise will determine which evaluation rating will be assigned each goal as well as the SWOT-strategy for developing the new FY goals in Section VI. New SMART Goals for the
Upcoming Fiscal Year. For example, if the faculty member is deserving of recognition for teaching excellence, SWOT strategizing of that faculty member’s goals might include earning the nomination for an upcoming teaching award(s).

Rate each goal achievement by assigning one of the following RATINGS to evaluate each area of strength and related achievement: Exceeds expectations; Meets expectations; Fails to meet expectations; Unsatisfactory. These ratings are HOP 3.7.5-defined as follows:

- **Exceeds Expectations (EE)** – Performance exceeds supervisor’s/departmental expectations for goal achievement;
- **Meets Expectations (ME)** – Performance meets expectations;
- **Fails to Meet Expectations (F)** – Performance is below expectations, but improvement can be made and is expected;
- **Unsatisfactory (U)** – Performance is not acceptable and significant corrective action is necessary.

This is the same rating system the UT System has mandated for Post-Tenure Evaluations, so using this broader application has potential for more closely associating several of the mandated evaluation systems with each other.

Section VII. Additional Comments and Signatures of Agreement. Signatures document the discussion and agreement reached regarding the faculty member’s past FY accomplishments and upcoming FY goals and strategies. More detail could be added as best serves departmental and other evaluation needs.