**EVALUATION SHEET**

**REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, TENURE,**

**AND EXTENDED TERM RECOMMENDATION**

CANDIDATE

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

Name Present Rank and Title

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

College or Administrative Unit Department

**EVALUATION SHEET**

**INSTRUCTIONS**

**(1) DEPARTMENT HEAD**

On a separate sheet (or set of sheets), the department head should attach an objective review of the candidate’s performance in activities summarized above. The evaluation should be a focused assessment of the candidate’s performance in relation to academic criteria, including strengths, weaknesses, and convergence with department goals.

**(2) DEAN OR ADMINISTRATOR**

On a separate sheet (or set of sheets), the dean should attach an objective review of the candidate’s performance in activities summarized above. The evaluation should be a focused assessment of the candidate’s performance in relation to academic criteria, including strengths, weaknesses, and convergence with college goals.

1. **CANDIDATE’S SIGNATURES**

The candidate should sign the sheet after reviewing the department head’s evaluation *and* after reviewing the dean’s or administrator’s evaluation. These signatures indicate only that the candidate has read the evaluations.

Administrator’s recommendation:

Tenure Track

Reappoint, review next year (Head)

Reappoint, review next year (Dean)

Reappoint, Skip 1 year (only possible in years 2 and 4 year review, skip year 3 or 5) (Head)

Reappoint, Skip 1 year (only possible in years 2 and 4 year review, skip year 3 or 5) (Dean)

Grant tenure (Head)

Grant tenure (Dean)

Promote (Head)

Promote (Dean)

Do Not Promote (Head)

Do Not Promote (Dean)

New Rank (if granted):

Terminate (Head)

Terminate (Dean)

Extended Term

Reappoint, review next year (Head)

Reappoint, review next year (Dean)

Reappoint, Skip 1 year (only possible in years 2 and 4 year review, skip year 3 or 5) (Head)

Reappoint, Skip 1 year (only possible in years 2 and 4 year review, skip year 3 or 5) (Dean)

Grant extended term

Grant extended term

Promote (Head)

Promote (Dean)

Do Not Promote (Head)

Do Not Promote (Dean)

New Rank (if granted):

Terminate (Head)

Terminate (Dean)

\*Ratings on next page

CANDIDATE NAME: DEPARTMENT:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

**RATINGS**

The department head should insert percentages in the job description column. Place an ‘x’ in the box that best reflects performance. **DO NOT** use + or – in ranking. Use narrative to address qualitative characteristics of performance.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance**  **categories** | **Percentage of effort from job description** | | **Does Not Meet**  **Expectations** | | **Performing Below Expectations** | | **Meets Expectations** | | **Exceeds Expectations** | | **Exceptional** | | **Insufficient**  **Information** | |
|  |  |  | **H** | **D** | **H** | **D** | **H** | **D** | **H** | **D** | **H** | **D** | **H** | **D** |
| Teaching |  | UG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advising |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research, Creative Activity, or Professional Development |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooperative Extension |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administration |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (Explain) |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall Evaluation |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Department head’s signature Date

\*Candidate’s signature (after reviewing the head’s decision) Date

Dean’s or administrator’s signature Date

\*Candidate’s signature (after reviewing the dean’s or administrator’s comments) Date

\*This signature indicates that the candidate has reviewed the evaluation. It does not indicate agreement or disagreement with the evaluation.

Rating Legend:

1. not meeting expectations (performance was unsatisfactory; needs substantial improvement)

2. below expectations (performance did not consistently meet expectations; needs further development and improvement)

3. meets expectations (performance consistently meets expectations)

4. exceeds expectations (quality of work is consistently very good; performance frequently exceeds job expectations)

5. exceptional (exceptionally high quality of work; far exceeds job expectations – both in consistency and quality)