



POLICY TITLE: Administrative Faculty Evaluation Policy	POLICY NUMBER: HR 0018
RESPONSIBLE OFFICE: Human Resources	DATE ISSUED: 12/1/2025
PRIMARY CONTACT: Human Resources	EFFECTIVE DATE: 12/17/2025 LAST UPDATED: 10/2025
POLICY TYPE: HR	

I. POLICY PURPOSE

The purpose of the annual performance evaluation of the College of Southern Nevada (CSN) Administrative Faculty, as required by Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) policy, is to provide constructive and developmental feedback to the Administrative Faculty.

II. APPLIES TO

This policy applies to all Administrative Faculty as defined by Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 2, Subsection 1(d) of the Board of Regents (BOR) *Handbook*.

III. POLICY STATEMENT

The NSHE requires all Administrative Faculty to be evaluated in writing annually.

All Administrative Faculty shall be evaluated for the period beginning March 1 each year and end on the last day of February of the subsequent year (“Current Performance Year”).

IV. PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

Administrative Faculty shall be substantially involved in the development and implementation of evaluation methods. The Procedures for the annual evaluation of Administrative Faculty are contained within this policy.

Evaluation of Administrative Faculty at CSN shall be designed to ensure effective performance of professional responsibilities. The primary emphasis of Administrative Faculty evaluation shall be for developmental and constructive purposes.

V. EVALUATION STANDARDS

Evaluations shall be constructive so that they help the institution develop employees and encourage and assist those evaluated to provide excellent service.

Evaluations of Administrative Faculty will be conducted legally and ethically. Guidelines for personnel evaluation should be recorded in policy so that evaluations are consistent, equitable, and in accordance with pertinent laws and ethical codes. All evaluation outcomes will be held in confidence and only made available to the Administrative Faculty member, the evaluating supervisor, and appropriate administrators and as otherwise provided in NSHE Code, Chapter 5, Section 5.6.2.

Evaluations should address Administrative Faculty in a professional, considerate, and courteous manner so that their motivation, performance, and attitudes toward Administrative Faculty evaluations are enhanced.

The performance evaluations for Administrative Faculty shall use a rating of (i) Excellent, (ii) Commendable, (iii) Satisfactory, or (iv) Unsatisfactory. These ratings shall have the following meanings:

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| Excellent | Performance consistently exceeds position requirements and management expectations. Resourcefulness and depth of knowledge are of the highest quality. Assignments are accomplished in an exceptional manner with minimal direction and are characterized by outstanding achievements seldom accomplished within the agency/institution. |
| Commendable | Performance meets all or most and may occasionally exceed work objectives and management expectations. Employee demonstrates good knowledge of job duties, and assignments are accomplished effectively with normal Supervisory guidance. |

Satisfactory Performance meets most of work objectives and management expectations. Employee demonstrates an acceptable knowledge of job duties, and assignments are accomplished effectively with normal supervision Supervisory guidance.

Unsatisfactory Performance does not consistently meet management expectations. Requires more than normal guidance and direction. Improvement and/or development are necessary if the rater elects to continue the incumbent's employment.

Self-Evaluation: The Self-Evaluation is an opportunity for the employee to share what they have accomplished during the Evaluation Period. The Self-Evaluation shall be based on the following categories:

- Professional Responsibilities Accomplished
- Service on College or System Committees
- Membership in Professional or Service Organizations (*Optional*)
- Additional Training or Development Activities
- Community Services (*Optional*)

All Administrative Faculty should have a job description or a Professional Development Questionnaire (PDQ) description form on file. A PDQ is an important part of establishing job performance expectations and providing information about assigned duties and responsibilities. It is a roadmap to success.

The areas of evaluation and procedures for evaluation of Administrative Faculty shall be consistent with Board policies and established in the institutional bylaws.

No annual evaluation is required for any Administrative Faculty who has not worked at the college for a minimum of 90 calendar days in the Current Performance Year.

If an Administrative Faculty member disagrees with an evaluation, they may proceed with Reconsideration and a grievance, in addition to submitting a written rejoinder.

VI. PROCEDURE

1. Self-Evaluation (Part 1). Part 1 of the evaluation is the "Self Evaluation of Professional Performance" for the Current Performance Year containing a summary of activities performed based on the essential functions in their PDQ and job description during the Current Performance Year. The Self Evaluation will be

accompanied by their corresponding Management Objectives or Professional Growth Plan for the Current Evaluation Period.

2. Supervisor Evaluation (Part 2).

Administrative Faculty's Supervisor completes Part 2 of the evaluation: Supervisor's Evaluation of Professional Performance for the Current Evaluation Period. If needed, attach the employee's current job description to their evaluation. The Supervisor Evaluation of Professional Performance for the Evaluation Period, based on the essential functions in their PDQ and job description, consists of:

- Evaluation of the Employee's Overall Professional Performance:
- Evaluation of the Management Objectives or Professional Growth Plan; and
- Other Contributions to the College

In turn, the Supervisor gives the Administrative Faculty an overall performance rating of: (i) Excellent, (ii) Commendable, (iii) Satisfactory, or (iv) Unsatisfactory.

Administrative Faculty members receiving an overall rating of "Unsatisfactory" on their evaluation shall be provided with constructive feedback in the written evaluation for improving their performance. This constructive feedback must include a written plan for improvement, which must be specific and must be provided at the time of the first "Unsatisfactory" rating.

3. Management Objectives for the Upcoming Performance Year (Part 3).

Supervisors and Administrative Faculty should collaborate on Management Objectives or Professional Growth Plans for the Upcoming Year, but the Management Objectives or Professional Growth Plan for the Upcoming Year must be entered in the Administrative Faculty Evaluation Platform by the Supervisor. This area should also include professional development opportunities that enhance the Employee's skills, expertise, and professional network.

All goals for the Administrative Faculty should be written as S.M.A.R.T. goals to increase understanding of the expectations - Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, Time-Bound. Supervisors are encouraged to establish S.M.A.R.T. goal-oriented objectives, incorporate them into the performance evaluation, and review them with the employee:

- **Specific** – Define your goal in detail. Be clear and specific. Defined goals provide focus and lead to easier achievement.
- **Measurable** – Measurable goals can be tracked, allowing you to see progress toward specific outcomes. Consider using metrics.
- **Achievable** – Goals need to be genuine and realistic. Ensure the employee has the time, resources, and support needed to achieve the goal.

- **Relevant** – Choose goals that are high priority, well-timed, and have short and long-term impact. Consider how related factors may change.
- **Time-Based** – Setting deadlines helps employees prioritize tasks and stay motivated and focused.

VII. MERIT

If merit pay is available and applicable, review the [Merit Policy](#) for guidance.

VIII. ACTIONS AND TIMELINE

By April 15 or before, the Supervisor must meet with the Employee to:

- Review the Self Evaluation.
- Identify and review Management Objectives or Professional Growth Plan for the upcoming year.
- The Supervisor rates the evaluation and submits it to the Administrative Faculty. The Administrative Faculty can certify the evaluation by agreeing with the rating and submitting it to the Supervisor.
- If the Employee disagrees with the evaluation, the Employee may proceed with Reconsideration and a grievance, in addition to submitting a written rejoinder.
- In a System institution, which elects to establish grievance procedures, the institutional bylaws shall establish the procedures to be used in reviewing grievances, Reconsideration, and a written rejoinder.
- The procedure for submitting a grievance is outlined in CSN Bylaws, Section 3.2.2 B.

After the immediate Supervisor certifies, the evaluation is sent for review and finalization to the Second-Level Supervisor, Recommending Authority, and Vice President. Reviews and finalization of evaluations should be completed within 30 calendar days or less after immediate Supervisor approval.

Date	Action
March 1	Human Resources launches the evaluation period.

March 1 – 31	Administrative Faculty member reviews their PDQ and previous year’s goals and drafts Self-evaluation.
April 1	Administrative Faculty member submits Self-evaluation to their Supervisor.
April 1 – April 30	Supervisor completes the Employee’s evaluation and meets with the Employee to discuss the evaluation. Administrative Faculty member certifies the evaluation.
April 30	Supervisor certifies and submits the final evaluation to the Recommending Authority.
May 1 – 31	Recommending Authority and Vice President/President certify and finalize the evaluation.

IX. PERFORMANCE REVIEW APPEAL PROCESS

Administrative Faculty who disagree with the supervisor’s evaluation may submit a written rejoinder, and where authorized by the institution bylaws as provided for in Section 5.16 of the NSHE Code, request a peer evaluation.

Peer Review Process

A peer review consists of a committee that reviews the evaluation and makes a recommendation to the appropriate vice president to either uphold or make changes to the original evaluation rating. Although the following outlines the general peer review process, it should be noted that individual units or departments may have established bylaws that deviate from this process. The entire peer review process should remain confidential and only be discussed with persons who are not party to the proceedings.

The employee has 15 calendar days from when the evaluation was issued to request a review. This review must be submitted in writing to the appropriate vice president. If the employee does not report to a college dean or vice president, they must address their request for a peer review committee directly to the president. Once the president has appointed a designee, the request should be addressed to the designee.

Committee Composition

The peer review committee will consist of three non-academic faculty members including the chair of the committee. The chair is responsible for submitting the final report to the vice president, or president designee.

After the peer evaluation file has been created, the committee will begin the peer review process. The review may include written materials submitted by the supervisor and the employee. The supervisor and higher levels of review may also use the peer evaluation file in addition to other sources. The review may also include interviews with the supervisor and the employee. The parties are interviewed separately and are only interviewed for information regarding the appeal. At its discretion, the committee may request interviews with other personnel. However, interviews are limited to persons who have direct bearing or knowledge of the evaluation or intimate knowledge of the employee's work. Character interviews are not allowed. The committee should complete the review no later than the end of the A-contract period (e.g., fiscal year).

The report is comprehensive and is normally no more than two to three pages. It includes the following:

Introduction

This section contains:

- The employee's position
- The employee's issues with the evaluation
- The resolution requested by the employee
- A brief summary of the department evaluation points of contention

Committee Findings

This section details the committee's findings of evidence which are the basis for the committee's recommendation.

Committee Conclusion

The committee must avoid conclusions based on hearsay evidence or emotional displays. The report must state and explain ratings it believes should be amended.

Vice President Review and Selection

The original evaluation and the recommendation of the peer review committee will be forwarded to the appropriate vice president. Both evaluations will be placed in the employee's permanent personnel file. The vice president will make the final decision about the evaluation. The decision must be presented in writing and addressed to the employee's supervisor. The employee will receive a copy of the vice president decision. A copy will also be placed in the employee's permanent personnel file.

1. The supervisor's official evaluation and the faculty member's rejoinder and/or peer evaluation will be retained in the faculty member's personnel file along with other recommendations from a review process. If a peer evaluation, or any other review process result in a recommendation that the initial evaluation be changed, that

recommendation shall be forwarded to the President or designee of the institution, who, at his or her discretion, may change the faculty member's evaluation by means of an addendum attached to the front of the evaluation stating how the evaluation is being changed and the reasons for the change. If the President or designee does not change the evaluation, the reasons shall also be stated by means of an addendum attached to the front of the evaluation. The President or designee shall sign the addendum and provide a copy to the Administrative Faculty member.

2. If the annual performance evaluations provided for in Title 2, Chapter 5, Section 5.12 of the NSHE Code results in an Administrative Faculty member receiving an overall unsatisfactory rating, the employees receiving any rating of unsatisfactory on their evaluation must be provided with constructive feedback in the written evaluation for improving job performance, including a written plan for improvement and timeframe which must be specific and must be provided at the time of the first "unsatisfactory" rating.

X. AUTHORITY AND CROSS-REFERENCE LINKS NSHE CODE

Title 2, Chapter 5, Section 5.12, NSHE Code

Title 2, Chapter 5, Section 5.16, NSHE Code

Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 2, NSHE BOR *Handbook* Title 4,

Chapter 3, Section 4, NSHE BOR *Handbook* CSN Bylaws,

Chapter 2, Section 2.4.2

CSN Bylaws, Chapter 3, Section 3.2.2 b.

XII. Disclaimer

The President has the discretion to suspend or rescind all or any part of this policy or related procedure(s). The President shall notify appropriate CSN personnel, including the Administrative Code Officer and shared governance groups of the suspension or rescission.

Questions about this policy should be referred to the Recommending Authority.

This policy was signed and went into December 17, 2025.

XII. SIGNATURES

RECOMMENDED BY:

Vartouhi Asharian 03/03/2026
[Vartouhi Asharian \(Mar 3, 2026 09:15:52 PST\)](#)

Administrative Faculty Assembly Chair *Date*

Tracy Sherman 03/03/2026
[Tracy Sherman \(Mar 3, 2026 15:09:19 PST\)](#)

Faculty Senate Chair *Date*

India Barton 03/03/2026
[India Barton \(Mar 3, 2026 11:04:26 PST\)](#)

Chief Human Resources Officer *Date*

Reviewed for Legal Sufficiency:

R 03/03/2026
[Tina Russom \(Mar 3, 2026 18:51:17 PST\)](#)

General Counsel *Date*

Approved by:

Stacy Klippenstein 03/04/2026

President, College of Southern Nevada *Date*

XII. ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT A: Version History

ATTACHMENT A: HISTORY

VERSION 1:

10/3/2025 – Presented to Faculty Senate

11/7/2025 – Approved by Faculty Senate (T. Sherman)

12/1/2025 – Sent out for signature (V. Asherian, I. Barton, Legal, Klippenstein)

Admin Evaluation Policy For Signature

Final Audit Report

2026-03-04

Created:	2026-01-28
By:	Tracy Sherman (tracy.sherman@csn.edu)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAA85dP1M831kwE22JOJdrjoLC9_wD7YNm

"Admin Evaluation Policy For Signature" History

-  Document created by Tracy Sherman (tracy.sherman@csn.edu)
2026-01-28 - 0:31:51 AM GMT- IP address: 131.216.24.107
-  Document emailed to vartouhi.asherian@csn.edu for signature
2026-01-28 - 0:35:10 AM GMT
-  Email viewed by vartouhi.asherian@csn.edu
2026-01-28 - 0:54:08 AM GMT- IP address: 70.170.195.32
-  Email viewed by vartouhi.asherian@csn.edu
2026-03-03 - 7:47:10 AM GMT- IP address: 146.75.146.0
-  Signer vartouhi.asherian@csn.edu entered name at signing as Vartouhi Asharian
2026-03-03 - 5:15:50 PM GMT- IP address: 70.170.195.32
-  Document e-signed by Vartouhi Asharian (vartouhi.asherian@csn.edu)
Signature Date: 2026-03-03 - 5:15:52 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 70.170.195.32
-  Document emailed to india.barton@csn.edu for signature
2026-03-03 - 5:15:54 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by india.barton@csn.edu
2026-03-03 - 7:02:02 PM GMT- IP address: 104.47.58.254
-  Signer india.barton@csn.edu entered name at signing as India Barton
2026-03-03 - 7:04:24 PM GMT- IP address: 131.216.24.110
-  Document e-signed by India Barton (india.barton@csn.edu)
Signature Date: 2026-03-03 - 7:04:26 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 131.216.24.110
-  Document emailed to Tracy Sherman (tracy.sherman@csn.edu) for signature
2026-03-03 - 7:04:28 PM GMT

 Email viewed by Tracy Sherman (tracy.sherman@csn.edu)

2026-03-03 - 11:08:41 PM GMT- IP address: 131.216.24.110

 Document e-signed by Tracy Sherman (tracy.sherman@csn.edu)

Signature Date: 2026-03-03 - 11:09:19 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 131.216.24.110

 Document emailed to tina.russom@csn.edu for signature

2026-03-03 - 11:09:21 PM GMT

 Email viewed by tina.russom@csn.edu

2026-03-04 - 2:50:20 AM GMT- IP address: 104.47.58.254

 Signer tina.russom@csn.edu entered name at signing as Tina Russom

2026-03-04 - 2:51:15 AM GMT- IP address: 70.170.151.4

 Document e-signed by Tina Russom (tina.russom@csn.edu)

Signature Date: 2026-03-04 - 2:51:17 AM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 70.170.151.4

 Document emailed to Stacy Klippenstein (stacy.klippenstein@csn.edu) for signature

2026-03-04 - 2:51:20 AM GMT

 Email viewed by Stacy Klippenstein (stacy.klippenstein@csn.edu)

2026-03-04 - 3:31:00 PM GMT- IP address: 104.47.58.254

 Document e-signed by Stacy Klippenstein (stacy.klippenstein@csn.edu)

Signature Date: 2026-03-04 - 3:34:20 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 131.216.24.110

 Agreement completed.

2026-03-04 - 3:34:20 PM GMT