General Policy

1. It is the policy of this University and the College of Health Professions that all faculty will be evaluated annually. The evaluation period covers the preceding calendar year, and must be completed by March 1.

2. Annual faculty evaluation are to provide for self-development; to identify, reinforce, and share the strengths of faculty; to extend opportunities for continuous professional development; and to provide for identifying and strengthening the role of faculty members within their academic units.

3. This annual evaluation of continuing faculty is the responsibility of faculty governance, a duty shared by the chairs/directors and personnel committees.

4. In order to receive an award for merit, a faculty member must meet the minimal criteria in all three areas of teaching, scholarly/creative, and service, and exceed the criteria in at least one area, as outlined in the individual’s academic unit evaluation system. Academic unit evaluation systems and expectations may differ, but must meet the minimal levels of expectations.

5. Each academic unit is responsible for developing a policy and procedure statement document which identifies the criteria and procedures for recommending merit adjustments. The academic unit PPS must be approved by the dean and the Provost.

PURPOSE

1. The purpose of this policy and procedure statement is to define the College of Health Professions’ minimal expectations of faculty for annual evaluation and the criteria for eligibility for merit raises and identify the process by which eligibility for raises will be determined.

2. This policy is consistent with and supportive of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedure Statement 7.10.

DEFINITIONS

1. A merit raise shall be defined as additional salary to be awarded to faculty whose performance was clearly exceptional during the designated merit evaluation period.

2. Eligible Faculty: All continuing percentage-contract faculty are eligible for merit raises awarded through this process, with the exception of doctoral and graduate assistants, chairs/directors, deans, and a few specially assigned faculty identified annually by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

3. Time Period will be from January 1 of each year through December 31 of the same year. All materials and documentation submitted for consideration must have been completed in this time period.
PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1. The deadline for submission is established by the dean. The chair/director will inform all eligible faculty of the academic unit’s deadline for submission of materials. Each individual faculty member is responsible for completing and submitting all required materials to the chair/director by the established deadline.

2. The chair/director will insure that each eligible faculty member has a copy of the College and academic unit’s criteria.

3. The chair/director will make all materials submitted on each eligible faculty member available for review by the academic unit’s personnel committee.

1. The personnel committee will review eligible faculty member on their teaching, scholarly/creative, and service, as appropriate to the faculty’s assigned duties. The chair/director will hold a meeting at which time the personnel committee will make recommendations for merit awards.

2. Merit awards should be based on meritorious performance for the identified evaluation period, normally three years. The rolling multi-year period allows faculty who have stellar accomplishments in one or two years, but fewer in the other(s), to qualify for an averaged degree of merit.

3. Before making final merit recommendations, the chair/director shall be required to indicate to each faculty member, without necessarily mentioning a specific amount or percentage of increase, whether the chair/director intends to recommend that faculty member for merit and the approximate level of merit determined for that faculty member (e.g., high, medium, low).

4. After receiving the chair/director’s preliminary recommendations, faculty who believe their accomplishments have been overlooked or undervalued may, within five working days, request a meeting with the chair/director. At this meeting, the chair/director shall explain the reasons for the level of merit or for denying merit, and the faculty member may ask the chair/director to reconsider the preliminary decision on the basis of accomplishments or achievements that may have been initially overlooked or undervalued. After considering the accomplishments of all faculty who requested a review of their activities, the chair/director will proceed to make final merit recommendations to the dean.

8. Chairs/directors may, but are not required to, inform their faculty of the final merit award for all faculty members in the department/school.
9. After the dean has had an opportunity to review all materials and recommendations, the dean will confer with the chair/director on merit recommendations to be allocated. The dean may accept, reject or modify the recommendations of the chair/director.

10. The dean will reserve a maximum of 10% of the available funds to award at the dean’s discretion.

11. The dean will make recommendation to the Provost.

12. Faculty will be given an opportunity to review their respective evaluations and to add their own comments prior to the materials being placed in their personnel files.

**APPEALS**

1. Faculty who are dissatisfied with the chair/director’s final merit recommendation may appeal to the college dean and shall be afforded an opportunity to meet with the dean to offer information in support of their appeal. If the dean upholds the chair/director’s recommendation, he or she shall be required to explain why to the appealing faculty member. The college dean’s decision is final.

2. All merit recommendations, including those resulting from an appeal, must be finalized and merit awards made during the current merit cycle. No merit increase resulting from an appeal shall be withheld until the next merit cycle.

3. A summary of all appeals submitted to the dean using (Attachment A), however they are resolved, must be maintained on file in the dean’s office. Subsequent appeals regarding performance evaluation and merit recommendations may be made through the faculty grievance process, VPAA PPS 8.08.
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