

Postdoc Progress Assessments and Annual Review:

Guidelines for Faculty and Postdoc HR Generalists

Revised 12/6/17

I. MANDATORY ACTIONS – required by Article 9 of the UC-UAW contract: **Individual Development Plans and Progress Assessments**

1. Provide Clear Goals and Expectations at the beginning of each appointment year

- a. PI may provide verbally
- b. Postdoc may request that goals and expectations be written
 - If so, the postdoc shall submit a written draft of the discussed goals and expectations to the supervisor for review.
 - The supervisor will provide the postdoc with the final goals and expectations upon which progress will be based.
 - If written, postdoc gets copy and original goes in personnel file

2. Provide Periodic Reviews

- a. Informal oral progress assessments
- b. Help the postdoc stay on track with expectations and avoid missteps and misunderstandings.
- c. Postdoc may request that the progress review be written
 - If so, the postdoc shall submit a written draft of the discussed goals and expectations to the supervisor for review
 - The supervisor will provide the postdoc with a written progress assessment. If written, postdoc gets copy and original goes in personnel file

3. Provide a Written Annual Review

- a. A comprehensive assessment of the postdoc's research progress and achievements, and of her/his professional development during the previous appointment year.
- b. Must be completed per each 12-month period
- c. Postdoc may want to complete a self-assessment form to prepare for Annual Review. Go to MyIDP to complete a self-assessment: myidp.sciencecareers.org
- d. Postdoc and PI must sign written review
 - Postdoc gets copy
 - Original goes in postdoc's personnel file
- e. May use the attached form

II. Individual Development Plans (IDP)

1. NIH IDP requirement announcement: grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-14-113.html

- a. NIH progress reports using the [Research Performance Progress Report](#) (RPPR) must include a report on the use of IDPs in Section B. Accomplishments, Question B.4. Actual IDPs should not be included. Instead, grantees will report on whether they use IDPs for all the graduate students and postdoctoral researchers included in Section D. list of Participants. The use of IDPs as well as the manner in which IDPs are used is expected to be determined by the awardee institution, but the RPPR will include a brief description of how and whether IDPs are

(continued)

used to help manage the career development of students and postdocs associated with that award. A similar response is required for all T, F, K, R25, R13, D43 and other awards or award components designed to provide training and professional development opportunities for graduate students and postdoctoral researchers.

- b. Should include research, professional development, and personal goals
- c. May refer to “core competencies” developed by the National Postdoctoral Association: www.nationalpostdoc.org/?CoreCompetencies
- d. If postdoc decides to create an IDP, the contract requires that their mentor help them
 - The UCSF and FASEB versions of the IDP and evaluation forms are available at: postdocs.ucsf.edu/idp

Note: The contents of the *Annual Review*, written progress assessments, and *IDPs* are not grievable. However, if a postdoc believes a *Review* or assessment contains factually incorrect statements, s/he may grieve the factual inaccuracies. If a postdoc disagrees with substantive aspects of the evaluation, s/he may file an addendum to their personnel file and/or discuss it with the Department Chair or Unit Director.

Caution Re Grievances: Records involving the progression of a postdoc’s grievance, such as the grievance form, step appeals and responses, and settlement documents, must be kept in a file separate from the postdoc’s personnel file.

Questions: Contact Christine Des Jarlais, Assistant Dean for Postdocs and Career Development at Christine.desjarlais@ucsf.edu.

UC-UAW Contract: ucnet.universityofcalifornia.edu/labor/bargaining-units/px/contract.html



University of California
San Francisco

form rev.
April 2011

Postdoctoral Scholar Annual Review

Postdoc's name: _____

Faculty mentor's name: _____

Today's date: _____

Department: _____

Date of first appointment as a postdoc with
current mentor: _____

Length of time you have supervised this
postdoc:

Period covered by this evaluation:
from: _____ to: _____

Years: _____ Months: _____

Rating

- exceptional*
- exceeds expectations*
- meets expectations*
- needs improvement*
- unacceptable*

Rate and comment on the postdoc's **overall work performance** for this evaluation period.

List any significant accomplishments in the past year (may include publications, presentations, new expertise acquired, milestones reached in research, etc.)

If there any areas needing improvement, what are they and how might they be addressed?

.....

Rating

- high potential*
- very good potential*
- average potential*
- somewhat low potential*
- very low potential*

Estimate the postdoc's potential for a successful independent career in the discipline.

.....

Provide a summary of expectations, goals, and activities for the coming year including performance objectives, specific projects, publications, training, etc. (Postdocs are strongly encouraged to create an "Individual Development Plan" to flesh out ongoing professional and personal objectives.)

.....

Postdoc Response If the postdoc wishes to do so, any comments concerning this evaluation may be indicated here. Additional pages may be attached.

.....

Postdoc Signature _____ **Date** _____

I have read and discussed this Annual Review with my PI/supervisor and I understand its contents. My signature indicates that I have reviewed this document, but it does not imply that I agree or disagree with the assessment of my performance given herein.

Mentor/Supervisor Signature _____ **Date** _____