

SECTION 6

FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES.....

6.1 Annual Evaluation Principles for Full-Time Faculty.....

6.2 Annual Evaluation Procedures.....

6.2.1 Role of the Department.....

6.2.2 Role of the Dean and the Provost

6.2.3 Appeals Process.....

6.3 Minimal Performance Criteria and Annual Evaluations.....

6.3.1 Evaluation Criteria

6.3.2 Teaching.....

6.3.3 Professional Activity.....

6.3.4 Service.....

6.4 Annual Evaluation Documents

6.4.1 The Faculty Annual Activities Report (FAAR)

6.4.2 The Curriculum Vitae

6.4.3 The Department Chair Evaluation Commentary

6.4.4 Annual Performance Review (APR).....

6.4.5 Special Assignments Performance Review (SAPR).....

6.5 Guidelines for Completing the FAAR

6.5.1 Teaching.....

6.5.2 Scholarly, Creative, Professional Activity.....

6.5.3 Service.....

6.6 The Schedule for Annual Evaluation.....

6.6.1 Principles.....

6.6.2 Dates

6.6.3 Late Documents

6.7 Faculty Salaries.....

6.8 Annual Salary Adjustments

6.8.1 Salary Adjustments Policy.....

6.8.2 Merit Pay Adjustment Process

6.8.3 Pay Dates
6.8.4 Salary Checks
6.8.5 Salary Advances.....
6.9 Addressing Unsatisfactory Performance.....
6.9.1 Unsatisfactory Performance Rating for Untenured Faculty.....
6.9.2 Unsatisfactory Performance Rating for Tenured Faculty
6.9.3 Unsatisfactory Performance Review.....
6.9.4 Action on Unsatisfactory Performance Review Recommendation
6.9.5 Commitment to Academic Freedom and Tenure.....
6.10 Evaluation of Adjunct Instructors.....

SECTION 6

FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES

6.1 ANNUAL EVALUATION PRINCIPLES FOR FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL

FACULTY. Annual evaluation of faculty has been mandated by the Board of Visitors. The evaluation system is required to be multi-sourced, to include peer review (unless this step is not part of the department’s process), rating each faculty member’s performance as to whether it meets, exceeds or does not meet expectations in the areas of teaching, professional activity, and service.

Meets expectations: the faculty member is effective, productive, and meets standards expected of all faculty. This rating represents the standard performance of UMW faculty. This rating should always be interpreted in a favorable light.

Exceeds expectations: exceptional performance; well above the effective level of expectations

Does not meet expectations: the faculty member fails to meet standards expected of all faculty.

Procedures outlined in §6.2-§6.9 apply to full-time instructional faculty. For evaluation of adjunct faculty, see §6.10

6.2 ANNUAL EVALUATION POLICY AND PROCEDURES

6.2.1 The Role of the Department The chair of each department will be responsible to ensure that a specific evaluation plan is approved by the department and the dean. The plan must evaluate the individual faculty member in the areas of teaching, professional activity, and service.

.1 Each departmental faculty member, including the chair, will make available to fellow department members for peer review the Faculty Annual Activities Report (FAAR, see Appendix A), syllabi for all courses taught in the evaluation period, and other materials designated by the department, but excluding data from student course evaluations (see §6.5.1.4).

These materials will help to ensure transparency of the review process and may be used for peer review if peer review is part of an approved department evaluation plan.

.2 In accordance with the approved department evaluation procedures the chair will write an annual performance review (APR) for each faculty member that includes a rating, as listed above in §6.1, determined according to the department's defined procedure. The APR should include individual ratings indicating evaluation levels for teaching, professional activity, and service, and assign an overall merit level of satisfactory or unsatisfactory. This rating shall be thoroughly justified in the commentary and ratings for the aforementioned areas. In each instance, a copy of the review shall be provided to, reviewed with, and signed by the faculty member prior to the chair's consultation with the dean. Any changes made to the performance ratings or merit level assigned to a faculty member by the dean in accordance with §6.2.2.2 will be identified and appended to the faculty member's APR.

.3 When the University awards sabbatical or other leave to a person for a semester or a year, it recognizes the person's contribution to the institution. A faculty member on leave will automatically receive an overall rating of "Satisfactory." The faculty member may, however, elect to participate in the annual evaluation process for consideration of higher merit. In such cases, the person must complete the departmental requirements for peer review and include a report on progress made and accomplishments completed during the leave period. Participation of the person on sabbatical leave in the annual evaluation process does not replace the report requirements attached to the awarding of the sabbatical leave.

.4 In departments using a peer review process, the chair reviews all members of the department after the peer review process is concluded; therefore, the chair should not participate in the departmental peer review process as a peer. Department members will review their chair anonymously in the areas of teaching, professional activity, service, and administration on a separate form distributed from and collected by the dean. (See Appendix A, "Department Chair Evaluation Commentary" form.) The chair will provide each of the documents specified in §6.2.1.1, which department members will then consult for their evaluation of the chair.

.5 In order to provide formative feedback for faculty, departments will conduct a pre-promotion review for tenure-track faculty who will be applying for promotion or tenure, and for RTAs who will be applying for promotion. Procedures for this review will be developed by each department or college and approved by the dean. The procedure must include, but is not limited to, the following: The faculty member shall provide a pre-promotion credentials file, submitted at the beginning of the spring semester of their third year, which will include evidence of effective teaching, professional activity, and service. These materials shall be reviewed by a pre-promotion review committee, consisting of tenured faculty members, as defined by the department or college. The department or college shall provide formative written feedback to the candidate about whether the candidate is on track to be successfully

reviewed for promotion at the end of the probationary period, and send a copy of this review to the dean by March 1st.

.6 Different disciplines, departments, and colleges may have varying definitions of what constitutes professional activity. Individuals should familiarize themselves with these expectations.

6.2.2 The Role of the Dean and Provost

.1 The individual department plan, approved by the dean, offers the most accurate means for rating individual faculty members within the department. Except for rare instances, it is not the dean's responsibility to adjust the rankings within the department.

.2 The dean's primary function in the evaluation process is to ensure equitable scoring across departments and in rare circumstances within a department. When the dean determines that a department is out of line with the college norm, the dean will, in consultation with the chair, raise or lower the department's rating. Part of the dean's role is to ensure that individual faculty members are compared with their colleagues across campus to determine their merit level and that they are not penalized if they happen to be in a department with many outstanding colleagues. Should the chair disagree with the dean's recommendation, the provost will review the materials and rule in the case. In rare cases, should the dean determine an inequitable ranking within the department, the dean will discuss the matter with the chair. Should they fail to reach agreement, the matter will be presented to the provost, who will rule in the case.

.3 The dean will incorporate results from department chair evaluation commentaries submitted by department members in the writing of special assignment performance reviews (SAPR) for chairs and others with special assignments supervised by the dean (see also 6.4.5).

.4 If, as a result of actions described in §§6.2.2.1–3, an individual's rating is changed after the individual has signed the APR completed by the chair (§6.2.1.3), the dean will write to that individual, explaining the change.

6.2.3 Appeals Process

.1 Any faculty member may submit to the dean, with a copy to the chair, a letter of exception regarding any portion or all of the APR completed by the chair, and/or any portion or all of the dean's letter of explanation. The individual is entitled to a written reply from the dean. If dissatisfied with any portion or all of the written reply, the individual may submit a further letter of exception to the provost, with copies to the dean and chair. The individual is entitled to a written reply from the provost.

.2 Any chair or other person with a special assignment may submit to the Provost, with a copy to the dean, a letter of exception regarding any portion or all of the SAPR completed by the supervising administrator. The individual shall be entitled to a written reply from the provost. If any individual's APR or SAPR is not received by the stipulated deadline (see §6.6), the individual retains the right to file a letter of exception once the evaluation is

received. The deadline for submitting letters of exception in these cases will be set by the dean or provost as appropriate.

.3 In a case where the dean has changed a faculty member's evaluation rating from what was submitted by the department chair, the faculty member may appeal by writing a letter of exception to the provost. The individual is entitled to a written reply from the provost.

.4 At the request of a faculty member, department chair, the dean, or the provost, the dean or provost shall schedule a conference with the parties to examine the causes of their differing judgments. The dean or provost shall summarize in writing the points discussed in the conference and outline the positions taken by the parties, including the dean and/or provost, with respect to those points. All parties shall sign and retain copies of the summary. Nothing in this provision shall preclude an individual's right to pursue appeal through the letter of exception provision (§§6.2.3.1–3).

6.3 MINIMAL PERFORMANCE CRITERIA AND ANNUAL EVALUATIONS. Widely (if not universally) within the academic profession, faculty performance is evaluated in three areas of endeavor: teaching, scholarly/creative/professional activity, and service. In all three areas, certain activities and performance levels are taken for granted within what all faculty recognize as basic and minimal professional responsibilities. These include, for example, support of the Honor Code (see Appendix B), adherence to the Statement on Community Values (see §1.3), punctuality in meeting one's assigned classes, faithfulness in keeping one's posted office hours, the provision of appropriate course syllabi, the prompt return to students of graded work, the reading and other preparation one must do to keep instruction current and vibrant, the maintenance of memberships in appropriate professional and disciplinary organizations and societies, the reading one must do and the conferences and workshops one must attend to maintain currency in one's profession or discipline, attendance at faculty meetings, and the willing acceptance of one's fair share of departmental chores.

6.3.1 Evaluation Criteria The assignment of annual evaluation ratings in each of the three areas of faculty assessment should be done in a manner that is as consistent and as objective as possible. Toward that goal the following descriptions of each level of achievement are intended to provide guidance for all faculty, chairs and administrators involved in the assessment process. The examples of the types of evidence of achievement provided here are not meant to be considered comprehensive and are not limited to the examples provided. It is also not expected that a particular performance rating requires that a faculty member accomplish all of the examples provided within each category, but rather show a set of achievements consistent with these descriptions.

6.3.2 Teaching

Meets expectations. Expected performance in teaching includes a clear record of effectiveness in the classroom, as evidenced by the following: acceptable scores and comments by students reported by the student course surveys; acceptable peer evaluations of teaching and/or course materials; consistently meeting all scheduled teaching obligations and holding office hours as expected by the University; updating course content as necessary to reflect current knowledge in the discipline; presenting course syllabi which conform to the expectations of instruction at UMW. Given the emphasis on excellence in teaching at the

University of Mary Washington, faculty must meet expectations in the category of teaching in order to achieve a satisfactory overall performance rating.

Exceeds expectations. This rating should be applied to a faculty member whose performance is determined to be well above the average level of expectations. Evidence of outstanding performance in teaching includes a clear record of success in the classroom, as well as additional teaching contributions which may include: a significant number of noteworthy positive scores and comments by students reported by the student course surveys; strong positive peer evaluations of teaching and/or course materials by departmental colleagues; involvement in new course development and/or teaching innovation; documented collaborative activity with colleagues in course design; contribution to interdisciplinary experiences for student learning; involvement and success in individual instruction or mentoring of students, as evidenced by student presentations or publications in departmental or campus venues; or assumption of additional, unusual, or particularly demanding teaching assignments.

Does not meet expectations. This rating implies that the faculty member is not meeting the minimum expected level of performance and that significant improvement is needed. Recommendations for improving performance should be discussed with the faculty member as part of the annual evaluation process. Evidence that performance in teaching needs improvement may include: a pattern of problematic scores and/or problematic comments by students reported by the student course surveys; peer evaluations of teaching and/or course materials that raise concerns about the quality of the course material or the strategies of instruction; a significant record of student complaints reported directly to the chair or dean; failure to meet assigned classes; failure to fulfill minimum performance criteria listed in 6.3 as they relate to teaching. This rating may also be assigned for failure to take steps for improvement in consultation with the chair as a consequence of a previous year's rating.

6.3.3 Professional Activity

Meets expectations. Evidence of effective performance in professional activity includes not only engaging in the work necessary to maintain currency in the profession or discipline, but also demonstrating contributions to the discipline and/or teaching profession through activities directed toward professional peers beyond the university. Evidence of such contributions may include the following: participation in regional, national or international conferences through presentations, panel organization or participation, or workshop participation; preparation, submission or revisions of texts for possible publication; participating in exhibitions or performances; applications for external grants or funding; winning internal grants; the extensive employment of a faculty member's professional expertise in the community (for instance, large-scale activities involving local schools or businesses); serving on the editorial board of a journal or as an officer in a professional organization; making efforts to obtain funding by preparing and submitting research proposals, or evidence of progression on a professional project. Documented contributions to professional organizations may also be considered in this category.

Exceeds expectations. This rating should be applied to a faculty member whose professional and scholarly contributions are determined to be well above the average level of expectations. Evidence of outstanding performance includes publication, performance, exhibition, or conference presentation in peer reviewed situations. Peer reviewed publications and

presentations are evidence that the quality and productivity of the activity is acceptable to a knowledgeable peer group. Serving as editor of a journal may be recognized in this category. Documented contributions to professional organizations may be considered in this category. Other criteria include obtaining external sources of funding that are peer reviewed.

Does not meet expectations. This rating implies that the faculty member is not meeting the minimum expected level of performance and that significant improvement is needed. Recommendations for improving performance should be discussed with the faculty member as part of the annual evaluation process. Performance in professional activity needs improvement when there is no discernible record of contribution to the faculty member's discipline and/or scholarship of teaching through activities directed toward professional peers beyond the university, for instance because such efforts have been unsuccessful or sporadic, or may have been directed too narrowly to colleagues on campus or to an audience not well connected to the faculty member's primary professional peers. Failure to fulfill minimum performance criteria listed in 6.3 as they relate to professional activity is also cause for this rating. This rating may also be assigned for failure to take steps for improvement in consultation with the chair as a consequence of a previous year's rating.

6.3.4 Service

Meets expectations: Evidence of effective service consists of meeting all one's advising responsibilities and serving on at least one committee at the department, college, or university level during the evaluation period and demonstrating responsible participation on that committee, or offering an explanation for the lack of activity. Sometimes committees have more work than at other times and sometimes a committee's agenda is not always within the committee's control. Furthermore, there are times when a faculty member is not assigned to a committee (or has recently completed a term on a major committee). However, expectations for service remain and a faculty member may demonstrate service through an accumulation of other activities such as participation in departmental hiring activities, special events for students (such as receptions for graduating majors, career panels, or recruiting activities for Showcase), or other activities that are limited in scope. Community outreach activities that rely on a faculty member's academic expertise and serve to connect the University with the community can be recognized in this category. Willingness to serve on a committee is a minimum requirement for this level of recognition. In the case of a minimal record of service a faculty member is expected to offer evidence of willingness to serve (for example, making oneself available for election to a major committee—even if the election is won by a competing candidate) or present a credible case for alternatives to established committees. Service to the profession may be included in this category, but it alone does not constitute evidence of effective service. Faculty members in their first year shall automatically be considered satisfactory in service.

Exceeds expectations. This rating should be applied to a faculty member whose service contributions have been determined to be well above the average level of expectations. Evidence of outstanding service includes such activities as serving in a leadership role on an active University or College committee and/or documentation of significant contributions to an active committee. In addition, serving on multiple committees, evidence of other leadership, innovation, or other significant service responsibilities may also be considered in this category.

Does not meet expectations: This rating implies that the faculty member is not meeting the minimum expected level of performance and that significant improvement is needed. Recommendations for improving performance should be discussed with the faculty member as part of the annual evaluation process. Service performance needs improvement when the record shows no or only slight department or university service when options for service were available, or when the faculty member fails to satisfactorily perform advising responsibilities. The previous service record should be taken into account, however, to ensure that the faculty member is not penalized after having completed a major committee assignment. Failure to fulfill minimum performance criteria listed in 6.3 as they relate to service is also cause for this rating. This rating may also be assigned for failure to take steps for improvement in consultation with the chair as a consequence of a previous year's rating.

6.4 ANNUAL EVALUATION DOCUMENTS For copies of forms used in this context, see Appendix A.

6.4.1 The Faculty Annual Activities Report (FAAR). A brief form to be filled out and filed with the department chair and dean each year by each faculty member. It lists, by category, the activities and accomplishments of the faculty member for the academic year just completed. It is used in annual performance evaluation, salary adjustment, and pre-tenure, promotion, and unsatisfactory performance review. Categories to be addressed and guidelines to complete the FAAR appear at §6.5.

6.4.2 The Curriculum Vitae. The formal academic resume of a faculty member, written in standard form (see Appendix A for example format) and updated with each evaluation.

6.4.3 Department Chair Evaluation Commentary. A form upon which a faculty member is asked each year to offer comment for the dean upon the effectiveness, as he or she sees it, of the department chair in the areas of teaching, professional activity, service, and administration.

6.4.4 Annual Performance Review (APR). A brief form executed for the record by the department chair (see §6.2.1.3). With reference to teaching, professional activity, and service and using the ratings of §6.1, it identifies aspects of the faculty member's performance that were exceptionally strong, as well as any aspects that fell short of expectations or should be improved. In the case of significant shortfall, the APR may also outline major objectives for a stated future period. The APR will provide a rating for each area of evaluation (teaching, professional activity, and service), as well as an overall rating (See 6.1 and 6.3).

6.4.5 Special Assignments Performance Review (SAPR). In the case of faculty members with special assignments (e.g., department chair, Director of the Speaking Intensive Program, etc.), the person with immediate supervisory responsibility for the special assignment should complete a performance evaluation that specifically speaks to the performance criteria detailed in the faculty member's original letter of appointment, and submit that evaluation to the faculty member's department chair for incorporation into the APR.

6.5 GUIDELINES FOR COMPLETING THE FAAR

6.5.1 Teaching

.1 List courses by semester, including summer session courses for faculty on twelvemonth contracts (faculty on nine-month contracts may include summer courses). List course number, course name, and enrollment (class size after drop-add period). Indicate, using the following abbreviations if you wish, whether any of these conditions holds:

N New—you are teaching the class for the first time

RM — Required for majors

U Updated — made current with recent work

GE — General education course

R Revised—some of the material and/ or method is new.

WI — Writing intensive course

SR Significantly Revised—most of the material and/or method is new.

SI — Speaking intensive course

In the above list, updated refers to the minimum expectation of faculty (integration into the course of the results of, “reading and other preparation one must do to keep instruction current and vibrant”—§6.3); significantly revised denotes a thorough course overhaul; revised should be used for courses changed, but neither merely updated nor thoroughly overhauled.

.2 If FAAR numbers differ from those reported to the dean by the Registrar or other record keeping office, include additional explanation. Identify funding source, if any, for undergraduate research projects.

.3 Among the items you may wish to address are course outcome objectives; academic standards and expectations of students; course rigor; grading practices; courses introduced, extensively revised, or approved for across-the-curriculum or General Education goal credit. Note whether project proposals for curriculum enrichment are funded.

.4 Departments differ in their procedures for the peer review aspect of the annual evaluation. When syllabi are provided as part of peer review, include syllabi for each different course taught (see §5.4.6 for syllabus information) or URLs for web-based courses and any other materials designated by your department. You may wish to include final examinations or their equivalent, representative handouts, additional evaluation tools, or other course materials. Although student course evaluation data must not be included among materials for peer review, you may if you wish provide to the chair (separately) contextual information relevant to the results of student evaluation (e.g., grade distributions, unusual circumstances affecting class performance or morale, and timing of the survey in relation to major assignments or the return of significant graded material).

6.5.2 Scholarly, Creative, and Professional Activity

.1 List the year’s activities and accomplishments, annotating the list with comments about the nature and quality of each activity. For scholarly publications (books, monographs, articles,

or reviews), give complete bibliographic citations, and note whether refereed, invited, or contributed. Note patents applied for or granted. Note whether exhibitions were juried. Note whether public performances were reviewed. Note whether presentations (conference papers, lectures, addresses, talks, etc. before audiences of professional peers, including local colleagues) were refereed, invited, or contributed. Note whether project proposals (either for University faculty development grants, or for external funding) for research in the discipline or for professional development were funded. For all work in progress, summarize any progress made during the period of evaluation. Teaching development may include participation in professional activities arranged by the Writing or Speaking Intensive Programs, University Teaching Center, NEH summer seminars and institutes, etc., and may include helping professional colleagues to develop new dimensions of teaching competence. List active affiliation with a laboratory or performing group, and indicate whether external to the University; and active involvement (not membership) in professional societies, associations, or boards, e.g., journal editing, conference organization, offices held (note responsibilities). List also responsibilities as a referee, reader, or peer reviewer for publishers, journals, funding organizations, or conferences; participation on editorial boards; duties as an external evaluator or assessor for other colleges and universities. Consulting activity that has clear and relevant professional dimensions may be listed as well (if remunerated, see §5.6.2 and attach report). Although conventions and definitions differ somewhat by discipline, the following list is meant to cover common situations.

- refereed/juried: subjected to peer review, typically anonymous
- invited (describing completed work): solicited for publication or presentation; (describing work in progress) promised for a specific publication or occasion
- contributed: accepted on the basis of a proposal or abstract
- forthcoming: definite date for appearance set
- accepted: editor or organizer has approved for publication or presentation
- accepted subject to revision: will be approved for publication or presentation if specified changes are made
- returned for revision and resubmission: rejected in current form with suggestions for changes and an invitation to resubmit
- under editorial review, or submitted: currently in the hands of an editor or organizer
- work in progress: in preparation

.2 Criteria of quality differ by discipline, but some of the following might be used in annotations: an organization or meeting's scope (local, regional, national, international); reviews and citations; a journal's circulation, rejection rates, ranking; and awards.

.3 Depending on your department's procedures for peer review, append preprints or offprints, reviews, proposals, reports, theatre programs, art show announcements, or other documentation of activities listed above.

6.5.3 Service

.1 University List all university-wide committees on which you actively participated this year and any office held or special committee project effected under your leadership.

.2 College List standing, ad hoc, advisory, and college-wide committees on which you actively participated this year and any office held or special committee project effected under your leadership; club sponsorships and the documentable level of your involvement; first-year student academic advising; BLS portfolio assessment; etc.

.3 Department List academic and career advising responsibilities; participation in Preview, Showcase, Family Weekend; support of student activities; special tasks or assignments.

.4 Community List talks, presentations, high school visits, written contributions, etc., that feature your affiliation with the University and/or require your disciplinary expertise.

6.6 THE SCHEDULE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION

6.6.1 Principles. Under no circumstances will faculty members be required or encouraged to submit materials or perform other evaluation-related activities outside their designated contract period.

6.6.2 Dates. The Provost's Office shall publish a list of deadlines for the academic year that covers all aspects of the annual faculty evaluation. The list will observe appropriate periods of time for assembling materials, writing and evaluating reports, scheduling conferences, making appeals, etc., in an approximation of the sample calendar. Dates should be adjusted to working days; the full calendar applies only if every step is appealed. The Provost's Office will distribute a specific calendar of dates to be followed in a particular academic year. This calendar is provided to serve as a guide for where the dates generally fall.

6.6.2.1 Sample Annual Faculty Evaluation Calendar for Nine Month Faculty

Nine-Month Faculty — Annual Faculty Evaluation Action Period/deadline

FAARs, , and special assignment performance reviews submitted to chairs/supervisors (§§6.2 – 6.5) May 15

peer review materials (§§6.2.1.1–2) available for examination by peer reviewers May 15– August 31

(optional) annotations of course evaluation results submitted to chairs (§§6.5.1.4) August 31

department chair evaluation commentaries (§6.2.1.6) submitted to dean September 7

peer reviews if required (§6.2.1.2) submitted to chairs September 7

Chair-faculty conferences/negotiation as specified in departmental plan starting September 8

all departmental materials (§6.2.1.3) submitted to dean; September 13

APRs (with evaluation level) and FAARS are be given to the dean even if they are not yet signed by the faculty Member

Chair-dean conferences/negotiation (§§6.2.2.2–4); Sept. 18–October 17

all APRs must be signed by faculty members prior to the chair-dean conference

letters of exception (§6.2.3.1 - 3) submitted to dean and provost, respectively October 25
written resolutions completed (§6.2.3.1-3) November 8

6.6.2.2 Sample Annual Faculty Evaluation Calendar For Twelve-Month Contracts
(Beginning in 2017-18, there is no longer a separate 12-month contract evaluation schedule.)

6.6.3 Late Documents. Evaluation documents not submitted, or not received, or received late, should be brought to the attention of the relevant party or parties immediately and steps taken urgently to correct the omission. In particular, within five working days of the submission of all departmental materials to the dean, the dean shall send written notice of any missing APR to the faculty member and chair involved, advising that the omission be corrected immediately.

6.7 FACULTY SALARIES. Annual salary adjustments for continuing faculty do not occur at the beginning of the contract year. Because of the timing of salary adjustment appropriations by the Virginia General Assembly, salaries for continuing faculty are approved each November by the Board of Visitors and the new salary is in effect over the period December 1 through the following November 30, unless some singular event (e.g., resignation, promotion) intervenes. Salary letters are distributed to continuing full-time instructional faculty annually in late November or early December. These letters are for information only and need not be signed or returned to the Human Resources Office.

6.8 ANNUAL SALARY ADJUSTMENTS

6.8.1 Salary Adjustment Policy. To fund faculty salary adjustments, the University uses money appropriated by the General Assembly. These state funds are allocated annually by the Board of Visitors, as follows:

- .1 The portion of funds needed for promotions, cost of living adjustments, and for the correction of salary inequities is allocated first.
- .2 The remaining salary adjustment pool, if any, is divided among all faculty who have received an overall rating of “satisfactory” for the previous evaluation period as merit pay.

6.8.2 Merit Pay Adjustment Process. All full-time, continuing faculty members are subject to annual performance review (§6.1) and on the basis of that review will be recommended for salary increments as outlined above. Merit pay will not be awarded to any faculty member with an overall rating of “unsatisfactory” for the previous evaluation period.

6.8.3 Pay Dates. The first pay date for the academic year is September 1. Salary is paid in twenty-four equal paychecks over a twelve-month period. Pay dates are the first and the sixteenth of each month. When a holiday falls on the first or the sixteenth of the month, the payday is the immediately preceding workday.

6.8.4 Salary Checks. It is required that checks be electronically direct-deposited to a bank account identified by the faculty member. Faculty members who plan to terminate

employment at the end of an academic year must leave a forwarding address at the Payroll Office so that payroll checks can be mailed. Applicable federal and state taxes are deducted.

6.8.5 Salary Advances. The University does not, under any circumstances, pay salary advances to faculty members.

6.9 ADDRESSING UNSATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE

Should any faculty member receive a rating of “does not meet expectations” (failure to meet minimum performance expectations) in any one of the three areas (teaching, professional activity, service) on the annual performance evaluation (described in §§6.3), the evaluator (the department chair, with the concurrence of the dean, or the dean, if the latter is overruling a satisfactory recommendation from the chair) will notify the faculty member in writing of the rating and of the factors on which it is based. The faculty member and department chair will agree on a plan to improve the faculty member’s performance in that area. The faculty member may appeal the evaluation to the provost. Should the faculty member receive a rating of “does not meet expectations” in any one area for two years in a row, or an overall rating of unsatisfactory that is not overturned on appeal by the provost, it will have the following consequences:

6.9.1 Unsatisfactory Performance Rating for Untenured Faculty. The faculty member will receive no merit increase in salary for the subsequent year. One or more overall unsatisfactory performance ratings may result in non-renewal of the faculty member’s contract.

6.9.2 Unsatisfactory Performance Rating for Tenured Faculty. The faculty member will receive no merit increase in salary for the subsequent year. Upon the receipt of one unsatisfactory performance rating, the faculty member will be invited to submit to the dean a development plan which addresses the shortcomings identified in the performance evaluation, sets forth specific goals for performance improvement, and suggests ways and means of achieving those goals. The plan (and any other modifications to it) becomes part of the documentation in subsequent annual performance evaluation(s) until the faculty member’s performance is rated as satisfactory. The dean may authorize special resources called for in the plan, in support of a return to satisfactory performance. In any event, the plan is advisory in nature, not prescriptive; it is the performance of the faculty member that is always the basis for subsequent evaluation, not the plan itself or its execution. In drawing up and pursuing his or her development plan, a tenured faculty member is entitled to the assistance of an advisory panel, which shall consist of the dean (who convenes the panel), the department chair, and one or two tenured faculty peers chosen by the faculty member. The faculty member may continue to seek the advice of the panel until a satisfactory rating is achieved or until unsatisfactory performance review (§6.9.3) is mandated.

6.9.3 Unsatisfactory Performance Review. Should a tenured faculty member receive an overall unsatisfactory rating in the subsequent two years, or two such ratings in the subsequent three-year period, he or she will participate in unsatisfactory performance review. Unsatisfactory performance review consists of an in-depth examination of the teaching, professional activity, and service record of the faculty member over the last five years, conducted by the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the faculty member’s college. The faculty member submits to the committee a performance review credentials file for those

years, the contents and organization of which address the three areas (teaching, professional activity, service), with emphasis on the area(s) found unsatisfactory in previous performance evaluations. Included in the file is the written performance evaluation documentation for the five years and any documentation regarding development plans (see §6.9.2) undertaken during that period. Following a careful review of the materials, the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the faculty member's college shall report its findings in writing to the President, along with one of these recommendations:

- no additional sanction (meets basic responsibilities and minimal performance expectations as set forth in §6.3);
- sanction other than dismissal for cause; and
- dismissal for cause (professional incompetence or lack of teaching effectiveness) -- see also §4 of the Handbook.

6.9.4. Action Taken on Unsatisfactory Performance Review Recommendations. The President will then make the final decision concerning what action, if any, is to be taken. If the President's decision is no additional sanction, the process ends. (Should the faculty member receive a subsequent performance rating of unsatisfactory, that rating would be counted as the first of three before that faculty member would again undergo Unsatisfactory Performance Review.) If the President's decision is discharge for cause, the case shall be dealt with according to the provisions specified in §4.3.

6.9.5 Commitment to Academic Freedom and Tenure. Nothing in this policy on unsatisfactory performance review is to diminish the commitment of the University to academic freedom and tenure, as set forth respectively in Appendix C and §§5.1 and 5.4.4 of this Faculty Handbook, nor does this policy limit, constrain, or supersede the provisions of §4.3 with respect to discharge for cause.

6.10 EVALUATION OF ADJUNCT INSTRUCTORS. The department chair will evaluate, in writing, the teaching of adjunct faculty after every odd-numbered semester of teaching (not necessarily successive), beginning with the first. The basis for these evaluations will be established by the department chair and the faculty member at the time of the latter's initial appointment. Evaluation materials will include: student course evaluations, which will be completed every semester by students in courses taught by adjunct faculty; course materials prepared by the faculty member; and the chair's own observations. Once completed, the faculty member will receive a copy of the evaluation and have the opportunity to accept it or write a letter of exception regarding it. The evaluation, and any letter of exception, will become a part of department's files and the faculty member's University Personnel File maintained in the Office of the Provost. Adjunct faculty must receive at least a "meets expectations" rating in evaluations to continue employment at the University.