Subj: CIVILIAN FACULTY PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM

Ref: (a) 5 CFR, Part 430  
(b) Policy Regarding Appointment, Promotion, Salary, and Tenure of Office for Civilian Members of the Faculty  
(c) NAVPGSCOLINST 5400.2C

Encl: (1) Civilian Faculty Performance Appraisal Form  
(2) Performance Appraisal of Civilian Leaders  
(3) Civilian Faculty Performance Appraisal General Guidelines  
(4) Faculty Performance Appraisal Critical Elements  
(5) Additional Performance Appraisal Critical Elements  
(6) Faculty Mid-year Appraisal

1. Purpose. To establish the basic framework for the faculty performance appraisal program at the Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) in accordance with reference (a). This program is intended to supplement, but not replace, the pay, promotion, and tenure procedures of references (b) and (c). Forms for the appraisal are contained in enclosure (1).

2. Cancellation. NAVPGSCOLINST 12430.2F. This instruction has been revised and should be read in its entirety.

3. Scope. This instruction applies to all civilian faculty members of NPS including those assigned to the Defense Resources Management Institute (DRMI) and the Aviation Safety School.

4. Definition, Authorities and Responsibilities

   a. Civilian Faculty Performance Appraisal System. A system which provides for the identification of performance elements, establishment of performance standards, communication of standards and elements to individual faculty members, establishment of performance appraisal methods and procedures, and provision for the appropriate use of appraisal information in making personnel decisions.

   b. Performance. The level of accomplishment of assigned duties and responsibilities by a faculty member.

   c. Rating Standard. A component of a faculty member’s position which contributes towards accomplishing organizational goals and objectives, and which is of such importance that unsuccessful performance of the element would result in unsuccessful performance in the position.
d. Faculty Appraisal Review Official. The Provost manages the faculty performance appraisal system, including approving policies and procedures.

e. Close-out Appraisal. A close-out appraisal is one completed before the end of the normal annual performance appraisal period for a faculty member who has worked at least 90 days in the current appraisal period. For example, a close-out appraisal is required if the faculty member's rater is leaving the position or if a faculty member transfers to another government position. Appraisals will be considered in determining the annual rating of record; however, they will not be used as the annual rating of record.

f. Performance Standards. The expressed measure of the level of achievement for the performance elements of a position or groups of positions.

g. Performance Appraisal. Comparison, under an appraisal system, of performance of duties and responsibilities with the established performance standards.

h. Rater. The Department, Group Chair or Institute/Center Director is responsible for rating faculty members within their organization.* In the case of joint appointments, the rater is the Chair of the "home" Department/Group indicated in the joint appointment letter. The School Dean is responsible for rating the Department and Group Chairs with input from the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and the Dean of Research. The Dean of Research rates the Institute Directors. Associate Deans are rated by the Dean to whom they report. The Provost rates Deans, as well as the Associate Provosts and Assistant Provosts, and the Director of the Center for Executive Education (CEE). The Provost is rated by the President. “Home” Chairs rate faculty with joint appointments. The Home Chair should solicit input from the other Chair.

i. Reviewer. The School Dean is the reviewer for all faculty rated by one of his/her Chairs. The Provost acts as reviewer for all faculty rated by one of the Deans, and those rated by the Director of the CEE, and the Director of the School of Aviation Safety. The Dean of Research rates Institute and Center Directors. The Provost reviews those ratings. The President reviews all faculty rated by the Provost and serves as rater and reviewer for the Provost. The reviewer has the authority to change any rating made by a subordinate, but must provide written documentation for the rating.

* In the case of GSBPP, which has no Departments, the Provost will be the reviewer and the Dean of GSBPP is the rater. In the case of faculty in the Institutes, the Dean of Research is the Reviewer.
5. Procedures
   
a. Performance Standards.
      
(1) Not later than 30 days after the start of an appraisal cycle (or at the beginning of a new assignment or hiring of a faculty member), the rater will give the faculty member a copy of the Civilian Performance Appraisal form with the critical elements indicated thereon. Enclosures (3) through (5) provide guidance. To ensure mutual understanding of the rating and standards, a faculty member may request an oral discussion of the standards with his/her rater.

(2) The form will be signed by the rater, the rated faculty member, and the reviewer. Signature by the employee implies that the critical elements were received, but not necessarily that the faculty member agrees with them.

b. Performance Rating
   
(1) Critical Element. Raters will rate performance on each critical element at one of the two levels of performance listed in (3) below and provide written comment on those rated "unsuccessful."

(2) Summary Rating. The criteria provided in enclosure (6) will be used to assign that rating which best describes the employee's overall performance.

(3) Levels of Performance
   
M - "Meritorious" performance meets all expected performance and workload accomplishments. Work accomplishments are of high quality and the faculty member is contributing positively to the School's mission. (The "Meritorious" rating is equivalent to the "Fully Successful" rating used in other rating systems).

U - "Unsuccessful" work accomplishments are not satisfactory and the faculty member needs improvement to reach that level of performance. A plan of action to bring performance to an acceptable level is required.

Summary Rating
   
M - This rating will be assigned only when all critical elements have been rated "M".

U - This rating will be assigned if any critical element has been rated "U". Improvement in performance is needed.
c. Appraisals

(1) All faculty members will be appraised against established performance standards annually. General guidelines are provided in enclosure (3). Appraisal cycles begin on 1 May and end on 30 April. Completed faculty appraisal forms must be submitted to the Human Resources Office (HRO) within 30 days after the ending date of the appraisal cycle; thus, the rater must forward the rating to the reviewer within 15 days after the cycle's ending date. To receive a rating of record, a faculty member must have served for a minimum period of 90 days.

(2) Faculty normally will be rated on the two critical elements discussed in enclosure (4). (Deans, Associate Provosts, Assistant Provosts, Chairs, and Directors will be rated on both of the rating standards discussed in enclosure (4), as well as the additional administrative standards for element 1 that are listed in enclosure (5)).

(3) When rating non-tenure track faculty, check the "Workload Objectives" line of enclosure (1). Approval of the standards or objectives must be indicated on the appraisal form by the rater and reviewer. Workload objectives can be derived from the appraisal rating standards used for tenure track (TT) faculty where the non-tenure track (NTT) faculty responsibilities in teaching or research are similar to those for TT faculty. For example, NTT instructors may have workload objectives that mirror Element 1 – Internal Contributions, while NTT research faculty workload objectives mirror Element 2 – External Contributions. Where NTT faculty responsibilities are more administrative or non-academic in nature, workload objectives can be derived from Employee Performance Standards (Enclosure 7) or Supervisor Performance Standards (Enclosure 8). Workload objectives can also be tailored to match the specific set of responsibilities as individual job requirements may demand.

(4) The Provost and each Dean, Associate Provost, Assistant Provost, Chairman, or Director will be evaluated using those performance standards in enclosure (5) that the rater determines to be essential to accomplishing the position's requirements.

(5) A Progress Review of a faculty member performing at the unsuccessful level must be made by the rater close to the midpoint of the appraisal cycle (i.e., usually in early October). The rater is required to inform each faculty member rated "Unsuccessful" in writing at this time. A sample of the mid-year appraisal notification is included in enclosure (7). The rater must document by his/her signature each faculty member whose performance he/she considers to be "Unsuccessful."
The mid-year appraisal notification must be forwarded to the Division Dean* within 30 days after the midpoint of the rating period. Performance judged to be "Unsuccessful" must also be documented in writing, including improvement requirements, and delivered to the individual. (See Subsection (7) below for more information.)

(6) The rater will contact HRO when a faculty member is rated "Unsuccessful". The HRO will assist the rater in preparing written notification of performance deficiencies. A letter defining a formal opportunity to improve will be issued to any faculty member whose performance is at the "Unsuccessful" level. The letter will provide the level of performance the faculty must meet to fulfill the "Meritorious" standard. Any faculty member may request an oral discussion of his/her performance progress at any time during the rating cycle.

(7) Following a period of opportunity to improve, failure to raise performance to the "Meritorious" level within the prescribed time period will be used as the basis to propose proceedings to remove a faculty member.

(8) If there is to be a change in the critical elements under which a faculty member will be appraised, an interim appraisal will be made using the old standards, provided that the employee has completed a minimum of 90 days under the standards. (A new appraisal form will be signed by the faculty member and the rater before appraisal under the new standards begins.) A request for a change in the standards may be initiated by either the rater, the rated faculty member, or the reviewer, but such new standards must be approved in advance by both the rater and reviewer.

d. Rating Form and Procedures

(1) Enclosure (1) will be used to determine ratings for faculty members. The rater will consider the faculty member’s workload agreement and activity report when evaluating the faculty member’s performance. The rater will not discuss the proposed rating with the faculty member or communicate the rating of record until it has been approved and signed by the reviewer. After these signatures are obtained, the rater will present the appraisal to the faculty member.

(2) Appraisals of faculty members in supervisory positions that include a supervisory Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) objective will be forwarded to the Deputy EEO Officer for NAVPSCOLINST 12430.2G

* On to the Provost in the case of the GSBPP, or the Dean of Research in the case of the Institutes
review, when standards are being set and, again, when a rating of record is established, prior to submission to the reviewer.

(3) For each person covered by this system, the original completed appraisal form will be retained in the HRO for three calendar years; the rater will retain a copy and provide a copy to the faculty member.

e. Grievances. Faculty members may grieve the rating received, to the rater (and subsequently to the reviewer, if resolution is not reached). If the faculty member feels that appeal through this normal procedure has not been resolved satisfactorily, he/she may take the case to the Faculty Professional Practices Committee, which will investigate the case and prepare a report for the Provost.

f. Performance Appraisal Used as Basis for Personnel Decisions

(1) Administrative Pay Increases. Civilian faculty members can receive administrative pay increases (also referred to as "merit increases" or "steps") only if they otherwise qualify and their current performance is rated "Meritorious."

(2) Promotion/Tenure. The promotion and tenure process for civilian faculty is based on an extensive, thorough and thoughtful evaluation of the candidate's entire performance history in the areas of teaching, research and service. Annual performance ratings below "meritorious" can be expected to disqualify a candidate for promotion and tenure, and rulings of meritorious are necessary but not sufficient to promote or tenure a candidate.

//S//
DAVID A. SMARSH
Chief of Staff

Distribution:
http://intranet.nps.navy.mil/code00/Instructions/index2.html
CIVILIAN FACULTY PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

NAME ___________________________ ORGANIZATIONAL CODE___________
FACULTY TITLE (e.g., Assoc. Prof.) _________________________________________
RATING PERIOD BEGINNING_______________  ENDING_________________
RATING METHOD USED: Critical Elements ____________
(place an “X” in one)
Workload Objectives____________
(Usually used to appraise non-tenure-track faculty.)

PART I. CRITICAL ELEMENTS SET: (NPS-wide critical elements are attached. The standards apply to all tenure-track faculty. Workload objectives are used to appraise non-tenure-track faculty.)

FACULTY MEMBER’S SIGNATURE ______________________ DATE__________
(Note: My signature certifies that I have reviewed the rating standard or workload objectives, which are attached, and that I accept these standards or objectives.)

RATER’S SIGNATURE___________________________ DATE________________
(Usually a Chair)

REVIEWER’S SIGNATURE________________________ DATE________________

PART II. RATINGS AND SIGNATURES:

RATING (“M”, “U”, or “N/A”)

CRITICAL ELEMENTS
INTERNAL CONTRIBUTION ________    _______
EXTERNAL CONTRIBUTION ________    _______
SUMMARY RATING                     ________         _______

SIGNATURES:
RATER(Chair or)_________________________ DATE _______________
(Institute Director)

REVIEWER (Dean or)______________________ DATE _______________
(Equivalent)

FACULTY MEMBER__________________________ DATE _______________

Encl (1)
NAVPGSCOLINST 12430.2G

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL OF CIVILIAN LEADERS

7
NAME______________________ ORGANIZATIONAL CODE________________

POSITION TITLE_________________________________________________

RATING PERIOD BEGINNING_______________ ENDING__________________

PART I. CRITICAL ELEMENTS SET: (The critical elements are attached.)

FACULTY MEMBER’S SIGNATURE____________________ DATE_____________
(Note: My signature certifies that I have reviewed the critical elements, which are attached, and that I accept these standards.)

RATER’S SIGNATURE_____________________________ DATE_____________
(Note: My signature certifies that I have informed the faculty member being rated that the attached critical elements will be used to rate him/her.)

REVIEWER’S SIGNATURE__________________________ DATE_____________

PART II. RATINGS AND SIGNATURES:

RATING (“M”, “U”, or “N/A”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITICAL ELEMENTS</th>
<th>BY RATER</th>
<th>BY REVIEWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERNAL CONTRIBUTION</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTERNAL CONTRIBUTION</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY RATING</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SIGNATURES:

RATER(Chair or)_________________________ DATE _______________
(Institute Director)

REVIEWER (Dean or)______________________ DATE _______________
(Equivalent)

FACULTY MEMBER__________________________ DATE _______________

DEEOO __________________________________ DATE________________
(Chair, Dean, Director, Assist. Or Assoc. Provost)

Encl (2)

NAVPGSCOLINST 12430.2G
CIVILIAN FACULTY PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL GENERAL GUIDELINES

The following performance appraisal guidelines apply to all civilian faculty. The civilian faculty consists of tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty of all ranks. Tenure-track faculty are evaluated "...on two criteria, internal contributions to the institution, and external contributions that demonstrably enhance NPS's reputation in either the academic community, Department of Navy (DoN)/Department of Defense (DoD); or both" (Marto Report). Variations in application of the guidelines when evaluating various types of faculty are expected, specifically:

1. Evaluation of non-tenure-track faculty who are hired for specific tasks will be based on their degree of success in performing those tasks. The "Workload Objectives" line on the Appraisal form (enclosure 1) should be checked.

2. This system does not apply to temporary faculty who are intermittent employees such as temporary Chairs/Professors, reemployed annuitants, and faculty who are on temporary duty from a non-Department of the Navy institution.

3. As stated in the Marto Report*, "NPS needs a mix of talents which crosses traditional academic disciplines as well as subspecialty areas of direct relevance to the Navy and Marine Corps. To foster this mix requires a flexible reward system which recognizes that a variety of activities are important to the mission of the institution, while also requiring that certain absolute standards be met." Thus, it is expected that the distribution of activities will vary from individual to individual. In order to foster the needed broad range of faculty capabilities and interests, ratings will be weighted in accordance with the faculty workload agreement. Tenure-track faculty professors are expected to make significant contributions both internally and externally.

4. Individual faculty may be appraised using either the elements listed in enclosure (4) or by assessing the level to which they have completed their workload agreements. In either case, they are rated on both their internal and external contributions.

5. Deans, Chairs, and other faculty who have significant personnel management and hiring responsibilities are also rated on a specific EEO element.

* The Marto Report is available from the Provost’s office.
Faculty are expected to support fully the internal programs of the school. This is done through a wide range of activities such as classroom instruction, thesis advising, committee service, laboratory development, administrative service, etc. The following standards are not meant to be all-inclusive, but to indicate the typical levels of performance associated with the ratings.

**MERITORIOUS** performance includes such factors as:

- Instructional duties are carried out in competent/superior manner with students adequately prepared for subsequent courses or work. Currency on DoD and professional areas is maintained.

- Participation in NPS administrative service, councils, committees, etc., is given willingly and carried out professionally, resulting in positive contributions to the school's programs.

- Course syllabi are followed and relevance to the needs of the curricula are made clear to the students.

- Thesis students receive sufficient and timely guidance.

- Supplementary materials and oral illustrations of military applications of course content are used.

- Course materials are prepared in a timely manner and adhere to the aims of the curricula and prerequisite structure.

- Significant attention is paid to the student learning process: identifying and aiding students in distress, making sufficient time available outside of classroom hours, developing and using good diagnostic exams and learning tools, stimulating student interest, etc.

- New courses and/or course materials are prepared, having application to curricular needs.

- Informative course journals and research summaries are submitted in a timely manner.

- Other faculty are guided and motivated in specialty areas.
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• The Student Opinion Form (SOF) program is used effectively to evaluate instruction. Faculty are informed of and counseled concerning their instructional performance.

• A fully accredited academic program is maintained (if applicable).

• An effective annual resource plan is developed, allocated resources are efficiently utilized to best support the mission of the School, and managerial controls on all resources are in place and utilized. Faculty and staff assignments adequately support instruction, within available resources.

• Effective communication that promotes support for NPS instruction and research programs is maintained with the sponsors of these programs.

• EEO policies, principles, and programs are actively supported.

Performance in any or all of these areas may be substantially above these levels.

UNSUCCESSFUL performance includes such factors as:

• The individual is intellectually dishonest.

• The individual is disrespectful of students, staff or colleagues.

• The individual discriminates against or harasses colleagues.

• When speaking or acting as a private person, creates the impression he/she is speaking for their Department/School of NPS.

• There is little or no contribution to NPS goals. There is inattention to NPS priorities and administrative requirements. Programs do not adequately support NPS curricula.

• Inadequate attention is paid to the instruction program as evidenced by substandard performance not being detected nor dealt with, available faculty not utilized effectively; curricular needs are not taken into account, etc.

• Instructional material is inaccurate, incomplete, not current, or significantly different from course syllabus.
Thesis topics are not developed and made available to students.

Thesis students often encounter difficulties in accomplishing goals due to erroneous information from advisor or lack of advisor availability.

Examination and grading practices are unfair.

Course journals are not submitted or are not adequate and informative.

Performance causes loss of student learning opportunities.

There is an absence of illustrations of applications of course content to military activities, when such applications exist.

Participation in administrative or committee activities is lacking or attendant responsibilities or duties are not discharged (e.g., by repeated failure to attend meetings, failure to file appropriate reports, etc.).

Administration of government resources violates federal regulations governing fraud, waste, and abuse.

ELEMENT 2 - EXTERNAL IMPACT

Faculty are expected to carry on activities, which have external visibility and are of sufficient quality and creativity to enhance the reputations of themselves and the School. External contributions are not confined to research and can be made through all faculty activities.

MERITORIOUS performance includes such factors as:

- New instructional materials and techniques are developed in cooperation with other academic institutions or DoD organizations.

- Sessions at national and international conferences are organized or chaired.

- Research proposals that address the discipline’s leading edge are prepared and often result in internal or external funding.

NAVPGSCOLINST 12430.2G
• Scholarly output results in student theses, NPS technical reports, patents, software packages, books or monographs, classified literature, etc. Results are often published in the scientific and technical literature.

• Scholarly activity is sufficiently high to maintain thesis supervision and classroom instruction at the leading edge of his/her field.

• Reports and theses are clearly and effectively written and free from technical errors.

• Scholarly activity in areas relevant to military organizations and operations, are performed.

• Services as a referee of professional or DoD publications are performed.

Performance in any or all of these areas may be substantially above these levels.

UNSUCCESSFUL performance includes such factors as:

• The individual’s personal conduct brings discredit to NPS.

• Work is lacking in technical detail or contains serious technical errors.

□ Scholarly activity is out of date or addresses topics that have no significance for NPS programs or military significance.

□ Scholarly activity results are not of sufficient significance to be published in open or classified literature.

□ Proposals are incomplete or of poor quality.

□ Contractual obligations are not fulfilled.

□ Work has negligible impact on the outside community.
NPS faculty members who have significant administrative responsibilities, which are expected to occupy a majority of their time, will be rated primarily on their administrative internal contributions. Additional internal standards for administrative faculty are included below. In addition, administrative faculty are expected to provide planning for NPS programs, and support and guidance for the instruction and research programs, which is distinct from their individual participation in these activities. The following standards apply to those administrative activities, although all standards may not apply to each administrator.

ELEMENT 1 - ADDITIONAL INTERNAL CONTRIBUTIONS (ADMINISTRATIVE)\(^\ast\)

MERITORIOUS performance includes such factors as:

- Planning is effective and improves the quality of management practices, operating procedures, and program performance. Planning and budgeting documents are specific, internally consistent, clearly expressed, timely, and provide sufficient information for decision-making.

- The person is a good leader, establishes and maintains sound working relationships, and shows good judgment in dealing with faculty and staff, even in difficult situations. The views of assigned faculty and staff are considered before making decisions and opportunities are provided for them to play a substantive role in the accomplishment of the organization's objectives.

- The ability to get the job done well, despite constraints and to handle difficult and unanticipated problems is consistently demonstrated. Improved ways of performing various tasks and streamlining procedures are devised and encouraged. Work is performed independently, with minimum supervision and the response to assigned action items is generally timely.

- Adequate guidance and training are supplied to assigned personnel.

NAVPGSCOLINST 12430.2G

\(^\ast\) These are to be considered along with the contributions listed for Element 1 in Encl (4).
• Coordination with the staff and with the support functions of the School to improve NPS operations.

• Adequate safety training and equipment for employees are determined and provided. Documentation of required safety programs is maintained.

Performance in any or all of these elements may be substantially above these levels.

UNSUCCESSFUL performance includes such factors as:

• Resources are allocated to nonproductive individuals and programs.

• Adequate resources are not provided for new faculty and emerging high priority programs.

• Required routine administrative paperwork is not submitted in a timely or accurate manner (e.g., textbook requests, Faculty Activity Reports, sole source justifications, etc.).

• Management of assigned personnel is inadequate, so that a degradation of work performance is apparent.

• Interactions with staff and with support functions cause disruption and degrade the ability of others to discharge their responsibilities.

• Unsafe work practices are engaged in or permitted. Work practices do not conform to command safety regulations. Safety programs are not adequately documented.

ELEMENT 2 - EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

Faculty that have the authority to hire, direct, assign, promote, reward, transfer, furlough, layoff, recall, suspend, discipline, or remove employees are required to support and implement the goals of the EEO Program.

MERITORIOUS performance requires participation in the achievement of EEO goals and objectives (e.g., informs, briefs, and ensures that subordinate staff are properly trained on EEO goals/objectives and sexual harassment guidelines, demonstrates personal support of the same). Participates and encourages staff participation in EEO special emphasis events (workload permitting). Stops discriminatory behavior and sexual harassment in subordinate workforce, assists in resolving discrimination.
complaints. Analyzes subordinate workforce, develops plans, and achieves goals to improve workforce EEO balance. Performance in any or all of these areas may be substantially above these levels.

UNSUCCESSFUL performance includes evidence of a lack of support of EEO goals and objectives although opportunities were available. Failure to act to stop known discriminatory behavior in the subordinate workforce. EEO investigation supports a finding of discrimination. Support of EEO is limited to passively informing staff of EEO goals, but not permitting them to participate in EEO events unless mandated by higher authority.
The following written notification will be given to each faculty member who is performing at an unsatisfactory level.

Name ________________________ Department/School__________________
Year ______
Your performance to this time in the year is:

Unsatisfactory

If you wish, you may schedule an appointment with me to discuss your evaluation.

Chair’s/Director’s/Dean’s Signature: __________________________

Date: _____________

Encl (6)