

**PROMOTION & TENURE REVIEW AD HOC COMMITTEE
RECOMMENDATION**

SR-11-12-(02) 40 PTRAHC

Recommends approval of the attached, Marshall University Board of Governors, Policy No. AA-22, Annual Evaluation of Faculty, with new language indicated in bold and deleted language indicated with strikethrough.

RATIONALE:

To establish a policy for the annual evaluation of faculty as it applies to implementation, application and internal procedures for market equity and merit salary increases.

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR:

APPROVED BY THE
FACULTY SENATE: _____ DATE: _____

DISAPPROVED BY THE
FACULTY SENATE: _____ DATE: _____

UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT:

APPROVED: _____ DATE: _____

DISAPPROVED: _____ DATE: _____

COMMENTS: _____

MARSHALL UNIVERSITY BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Policy No. AA-22

ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY

1. General Information

1.1 Scope: Academic policy regarding the annual evaluation of faculty – the implementation, application and internal procedures for market equity, merit processes, and planning.

1.2 Authority: W. Va. Code §18B-1-6

1.3 Passage Date: March 8, 2006

1.4 Effective Date: Upon Passage

1.5 Controlling over: Marshall University

1.6 History: This section has been revised by the Faculty Evaluation and Compensation Committee as a result of changes to Series 9 dated January 10, 2004. (SR-04-05-(12) 69 FECAHC). **Revised by the Promotion & Tenure Review Ad Hoc Committee, mm/dd/yy, (SR-11-12-(02) 40 PTRAHC).**

2. Policy: The Evaluation Process

~~2.1 The evaluation process~~

~~2.1~~ ~~2.2~~ The evaluation calendar will run from January to December in order to compress the time between evaluation and awarding of promotion, **retention**, tenure and merit.

~~2.2~~ ~~2.3~~ Faculty in consultation with, and approval of, their **immediate supervisor chairs/deans** will file annual planning pages in January.

~~2.2.1~~ ~~2.3.1~~ Faculty will outline the roles in which they anticipate being evaluated. For example, in a particular year a faculty member may emphasize; teaching and advising ~~activities~~, professional development and university service. In another year the evaluation emphasis may shift to teaching and advising and scholarly and creative activity. **This is in accordance with The Greenbook, the employment agreement, and Marshall University's Faculty Workload Policy, AA-21.**

~~2.2.2~~ ~~2.3.2~~ ~~When the roles are determined if~~ Faculty members will attach a percentage at which they want the roles to be weighted in their evaluations. The role percentages must fall within the ranges established by academic units. For example, a college sets its range for teaching and advising at 25-75%. The faculty may elect to set 65% teaching and advising as their goal for activity in that role. Role percentages set by faculty must total 100%.

~~2.2.3~~ ~~2.3.3~~ Because the work of faculty in universities is fluid and varied from college to college, it is possible that under some special circumstances a faculty member may be able to negotiate evaluative criteria

outside of the ranges with the mutual agreement of the faculty member, the chair and the dean.

2.2.4 ~~2.3.4~~ If circumstances merit and with the mutual consent of **the** faculty members and ~~their~~ **his/her** **immediate** supervisors, **the** annual plans may be amended during the course of the evaluation year.

2.2.5 ~~2.3.5~~ Over a number of years faculty may need to vary their activities in all roles in order to meet **The** Greenbook **policy** and ~~contractual obligations~~ **employment agreements for retention, promotion, and tenure in accordance with Marshall University's Faculty Workload Policy, AA-21.** ~~That is, faculty may not repeatedly set teaching and advising at 90% and expect to meet promotion and tenure guidelines that require research and scholarly activity and service.~~

3 Appeals Ratings

~~3.1 In the event a faculty member and a chair are unable to negotiate a mutually acceptable annual planning page, the faculty member may appeal to the Dean, and then appeal, if necessary, to the Provost. A notice of the disagreement would go in the faculty file, and then the percentages would or would not be amended when the Dean's or Provost's decision is made.~~

3.1 ~~3.2~~ With the annual planning page in place, faculty activities in their designated roles (**Teaching and Advising, Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities, Service and Professional Development, Administration, and Librarianship**) are evaluated by appropriate sources and the results recorded. Methods of data collection may vary among the different academic units ~~on~~ **campus**, and ~~will~~ **may** require different techniques for the various roles ~~identified~~.

3.2 ~~3.3~~ Regardless of the data collection **method** ~~used~~, the end results of **the** evaluation must be converted to a four-point scale, if not collected as such originally, that reflects the quality of performance and ~~that~~ corresponds to the following labels and ~~corresponding~~ definitions.

3.2.1 ~~3.3.1~~ 4 = Exemplary: ~~3.3.1.1~~ This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, consistently exceeded the ~~institution's~~ **college/school/library's** standards of professional performance. Individuals receiving this rating stand as exemplars of the highest levels of professional academic performance within the ~~institution~~ **college/school/library**, making significant contributions to their department, college, academic field and society.

3.2.2 ~~3.3.2~~ 3 = Professional: ~~3.3.2.1~~ This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, consistently met the ~~institution's~~ **college/school/library's** standards of professional performance. The individuals receiving this rating constitute ~~these good and~~ valued professionals on whom the continued successful achievement of the ~~institution's~~ **college/school/library's** mission, goals and objectives depends.

3.2.3 ~~3.3.3~~ 2 = Needs Improvement: ~~3.3.3.1~~ This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, did not consistently meet the ~~institution's~~ **college/school/library's** standards of professional performance. This rating must be given with: 1) specific feedback as to which standards of professional performance were not met, 2) suggestions for improvements, and 3) a written commitment to assist the individual in accessing resources required for improvements. Improvements in performance **are** ~~is~~ required within the next evaluation period (provided suggestions for improvement were made and necessary resources for improvements were provided.)

3.2.4 ~~3.3.4~~ 1 = Unacceptable: ~~3.3.4.1~~ This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, did not meet the institution's college/school/library's standards of professional performance. This rating represents performance that is not acceptable and/or is inconsistent with the conditions for continued employment with the institution. Failure to meet these standards in any one of the three following ways will result in a rating of "Unacceptable."

Note: Delete the following headings, 3.3.4.1.1, 3.3.4.1.2, and 3.3.4.1.3. Reformat the three paragraphs with bullets, as illustrated.

- Received a needs improvement rating **during** the previous rating period but did not make the improvements required.
- Consistently violated one or more of the institution's college/school/library's standards of professional performance.
- Violated one or more of the standards of conduct as specified in **The Greenbook faculty handbook**. (Arreola, P.A. (2000). *Developing a comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System 2/e*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Co., Inc.)

~~3.3.4.1.3.1 Existing processes. Some colleges/schools have implemented well-developed evaluation criteria and methods. Those academic units may continue to use those systems as long as they include:~~

~~3.3.4.1.3.1.1 an annual plan,~~

~~3.3.4.1.3.1.2 an annual review, and~~

~~3.3.4.1.3.1.3 an end result reported on the university-wide scale of 4=exemplary, 3=professional, 2=needs improvement and 1=unacceptable.~~

~~3.3.4.1.3.1.4 If no evaluation process is in place, or if the existing process cannot be adapted to the four point criteria a data gathering method will have to be devised.~~

3.3 ~~3.4~~ At the end of the **calendar** year, (~~December~~) the ratings in each role will be collapsed into an Overall Composite Rating (OCR) with the individual's role ratings being weighted according to the role percentages agreed upon in the annual plan.

3.3.1 ~~3.4.1~~ Schools/colleges/libraries may use the OCR as a consideration in promotion if they wish. ~~and~~ **T**he rating can be used to track performance over time, to isolate problems and to guide faculty in areas that may need improvement.

3.3.2 ~~3.4.2~~ Documentation of evaluations, completed ratings, **matrices** ~~matrixes~~ and OCR calculations are the responsibility of **the** individual faculty members, with verification by the ~~chairs or deans~~ **immediate supervisor**.

4 Existing Processes

4.1 Some colleges/schools/libraries have implemented well-developed evaluation criteria and methods. Those academic units may continue to use those systems as long as they include:

- An annual plan
- An annual review

- An end result reported on the university-wide scale of 4=exemplary, 3=professional, 2=needs improvement, and 1=unacceptable

4.2 If no evaluation process is in place, or if the existing process cannot be adapted to the four-point criteria, a data gathering method must be devised at the department or at the college/school/library level.

4 The Market Equity Process

~~4.1 The typical method for determining market equity salary increases is as follows:~~

~~4.2 Step 1~~

~~4.2.1 Marshall's designated peer institutions' average salaries by rank and discipline are extrapolated using (1) American Association of University Professors (AAUP) data for average salaries by institution and rank and (2) Colleges and University Personnel Association (CUPA) data for average salaries by rank and discipline.~~

~~4.3 Step 2~~

~~4.3.1 The market salaries from step 1 are multiplied by the approved experience factors to determine an experience-adjusted market salary (or target salary) for each faculty member.~~

~~4.4 Step 3~~

~~4.4.1 Market equity salary increases are a portion of the gap between faculty members' existing salaries and their target salaries. Each faculty member's current salary is multiplied by a calculated percentage to yield an equity salary for that individual. The "calculated percentage" is the same for all faculty. It is set such that the total cost of raising all faculty salaries up to their respective equity salaries equals the funds available for that purpose.~~

~~4.4.2 All faculty with salaries below their equity salary will receive an increase to raise their salary up to their equity salary. They may also be eligible for merit increases if they meet merit qualifications.~~

~~4.5 Faculty with salaries above their equity salary do not receive an increase for market equity. They may be eligible for merit increases if they meet merit qualifications.~~

5 The Merit Process

5.1 The OCR calculated in the evaluation process will be used to determine merit raises.

5.2 OCRs will translate to the following values for purposes of merit raises.

Note: Delete the following headings, 5.2.1, 5.2.2, 5.2.3, and 5.2.4. Reformat the paragraphs with bullets, as illustrated.

- 3.51 – 4.00 = Exemplary
- 2.51 – 3.50 = Professional
- 1.51 – 2.50 = Needs Improvement
- 1.00 – 1.50 = Unacceptable

5.3 All faculty members in a college/school/library who are rated 2.51 or above are eligible for merit raises. Values in the thousandths place that fall at 0.005 and above are rounded up and values below

that are rounded down. For example 2.755 rounds up to 2.76, while 2.7649 rounds down to 2.76.

5.4 Merit money will be distributed to each college/school/library in proportion to the number of full-time, tenure, **clinical track** and tenure-track **faculty** and continuing appointments. The OCR for all faculty who qualify for merit in a unit will be summed, ~~e~~**Each person with a** qualifying rating will be **eligible for a raise**. ~~divided by that sum, and, then, multiplied by the raise pool available in the unit.~~ Merit raises will be added to base salaries. **It is up to each college/school/library to determine how the OCR is used for calculating raises within their units.**

5.5 ~~Years without merit raises~~ 5.5.1 In the absence of ~~university~~ **institution**-wide merit raises, the next available merit raises will be based on faculty ratings that include all years without merit raises. In the years that merit monies are not available, averages of OCR's for the consecutive years without merit raises will determine merit distribution within academic units. This applies only to times in which the university, as a whole, does not receive merit funding, **and** not to years in which individual faculty members may be denied merit increases.

5.6 **Each year, 5% will be reserved from the money set aside from the merit pool for special consideration by the Provost to address salary inequities. Faculty members who believe they have a salary inequity are to complete the Salary Inequity Form located on the Faculty Senate webpage and submit it to the Provost who will direct it to the Faculty Personnel committee for review and recommendation to the Provost. Any unused monies will go back into the merit pool.**

6 ~~System Review~~

6.1 ~~The faculty evaluation and compensation process should be reviewed periodically to ensure reliability in reflecting faculty performance and fairness in awarding merit increases. Faculty Senate will convene an ad hoc evaluation and compensation review committee to examine the process and recommend any needed alterations or revisions. The first review should be completed by the end of 2006, recommends should be submitted by the summer of 2007 and revisions implemented in 2008. Additional reviews will occur as requested by recommendation of the Faculty Senate.~~

6 7 Possible Categories and Activities of the Faculty Role

6.1 7.1 ~~Following is a “menu” of possible faculty roles, components of those roles and specific activities that can be observed and measured for evaluation purposes. The percentages in parentheses were generated after soliciting input from faculty regarding the types of work they perform, consolidating the data and establishing floor and ceiling ranges based on their responses. Departments and colleges/schools/libraries will establish parameters anywhere within these **following** ranges, and faculty will negotiate goals within the department and college/school/library bounds. Workload **percentages** and evaluation percentages do not necessarily have to be the same.~~

7.2 ~~Faculty may select appropriate activities from the suggested lists, and they may add, with approval of their supervisors, activities not listed.~~

7.3 Overview of ranges **for roles and activities are as follows:**

Note: Format the following as bullets.

- **Teaching and Advising (25-90%)**

- **Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities (5-70%)**
- **Service and Professional Development (5-50%)**
 - + **Professional Development (0-20%)**
 - + **University Service (5-50%)**
 - + **Professional Service (0-25%)**
 - + **Community Service Discipline Specific (0-25%)**
 - + **Community Service Non-Discipline Specific (0-5%)**

The totality of community service cannot exceed 25%
- **Administration (0-50%)**
- **Librarianship (0-70%)**

~~7.3.1 Administration 0%–50%~~

~~7.3.2 Professional Development and Recognition 0%–20%~~

~~7.3.3 Scholarship and Creative Work 5%–70%~~

~~7.3.4 Librarianship 0%–70%~~

~~7.3.5 Teaching 25%–90%~~

~~7.3.6 Service~~

~~7.3.7 University Service 5%–50%~~

~~7.3.8 Professional Service 0%–25%~~

~~7.3.9 Community Service Discipline specific 0%–25%~~

~~7.3.10 Community Service Non-Discipline specific 0%–5%~~

~~7.3.11 The combination of 7.3.9 and 7.3.10 cannot exceed 25%~~

Note: Delete 8 Administration: (0-50%) and accompanying sections 8.1 through 8.1.1.2.4

Note: Delete 9 Professional Development and Recognition (0-20%) and accompanying sections 9.1 through 9.1.1.1.10

Note: Delete 10 Scholarship and Creative Work (5-70%) and accompanying sections 10.1 through 10.1.1.1.8.3

Note: Delete 11 Librarianship (0-70%) and accompanying sections 11.1 through 11.2.1.1.2.12

Note: Delete 12 Teaching (25-90%) and accompanying sections 12.1 through 12.1.1.2.16

Note: Delete 13 Service and accompanying sections 13.1 through 13.1.1

Note: Delete 14 University Service (5-50%) and accompanying sections 14.1 through 14.4.1.1.1

Note: Delete 15 Professional Service (0-25%) and accompanying sections 15.1 through 15.1.1.1

Note: Delete 16 Community Service Discipline specific (0-25%) and accompanying sections 16.1 through 16.1.1.1

Note: Delete 17 Community Service Non-Discipline specific (0-5%) and accompanying sections 17.1 through 17.1.1.1

Note: Delete 18 “The Combination of 16 and 17 Above Cannot Exceed 25%”

- 7 Teaching and Advising (25-90%):** Per Marshall University's Faculty Workload Policy of 2006 (AA-21), "*8.1 Teaching includes a wide variety of activities, including responsibility for "standard" on-campus 3- or 4-credit courses (which vary in their time demands for many important reasons), travel to teach off campus courses, teaching labs, advising students, supervising independent studies, field work and internships, course development, supervision of student research or capstone work, serving as chair or committee member for theses and dissertations, integrating technology and other innovative strategies into educational efforts, etc.*" For additional examples, refer to Marshall University's Faculty Promotion Policy (AA-26, Section 2.4.1.)
- 8 Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities (5-70%):** Per Marshall University's Faculty Workload Policy of 2006 (AA-21), "*9.1 Scholarly activity in the academic community frequently focuses on work such as refereed journal articles, books and book chapters, refereed conference presentations, and research grants. However, we recognize that a wide range of activities may be included in this section. For example, in the arts, creative activities can be very different than the scholarship listed above, and within professional schools and programs still other types of contributions may be highly valued.*" For additional examples, refer to Marshall University's Faculty Promotion Policy (AA-26, Section 2.4.2.)
- 9 Service and Professional Development (5-50%):** Per Marshall University's Faculty Workload Policy of 2006 (AA-21), "*10.1 University service includes activities in support of program, department/division, college and university governance that are not directly tied to teaching or research. Typically these include service on committees at all levels of the institution, as well as special assignments or projects within any level of the institution.*" Furthermore, professional development is expected to maintain currency in one's field and enhance the content expertise, research/creative work, or teaching abilities of the faculty member. For additional examples refer to Marshall University's Faculty Promotion Policy (AA-26, Section 2.4.3.)
- 10 Administration (0-50%):** Per Marshall University's Faculty Workload Policy of 2006 (AA-21), "*11.1 This category does not refer to the work of people with contracts designating them as administrators (e.g. deans, Vice Presidents, etc); rather, this is intended for faculty members who have significant portions of their work time devoted to administrative roles. These would include department/division chairs, directors of university centers, directors of clinics and other training centers, program coordinators, and other roles within departments, colleges and the university for which a faculty member is responsible for overseeing people and/or programs, for collecting data and submitting reports, and/or completing other administrative tasks designated for that role.*"
- 11 Librarianship (0-70%):** Academic librarianship is the professional practice of acquiring, organizing, preserving, and making accessible the information resources that are required to fulfill the teaching, learning, and research mission of the university. Activities may include reference service, liaison for academic departments, circulation services, cataloging and classifying materials, maintaining archives, preserving special collections, teaching library instruction courses and presenting at conferences.
- 13** In the event a faculty member and the immediate supervisor are unable to negotiate a mutually acceptable annual planning page or evaluation, the faculty member may appeal to the Dean, and then appeal, if necessary, to the Provost. A notice of the disagreement will be placed in the faculty file, and then the planning page and/or the evaluation will or will not be

amended when the Dean's or Provost's decision is made. A copy of the Dean's/Provost's decision will also be included in the faculty file.

- 14 The University President or designate annually report to the Faculty Senate, no later than its March meeting, the following information by institution and by academic unit:**
 - Explanation of how the salary increase pool was determined by the Institutional Board of Governors.**
 - Total amount of dollars distributed for faculty promotions**
 - Total amount of merit dollars distributed.**
 - Total amount of 5% reserve distributed and how much, if any, was returned to next year's merit pool.**
 - Percentage of the university's operating budget dedicated to all salaries and all benefits; broken down by administration, faculty, and staff.**
- 15 A notice of merit and/or equity raise will be sent to each faculty member by the University President; the letter will explain how the raise was calculated.**
- 16 At a minimum of every four years, the Faculty Senate will convene an ad hoc evaluation and compensation review committee to examine the process and recommend any needed alterations or revisions.**