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POLICY STATEMENT

Faculty Evaluation Procedures:

A. Written Performance Expectations

Each unit will develop written performance expectations (for contract renewal, tenure, promotion, and sabbatical leave) of all unit faculty as appropriate to various ranks. These expectations should be specific to the disciplinary focus of the unit but compatible with the performance expectations of all faculty as expressed in the Faculty Handbook and of the college/school in which the unit is housed.

B. Faculty Activity Reports and Faculty Activity Plans

Annually, by October 1, each faculty member will prepare a Faculty Activity Plan (FAP) for the next calendar year and by February 1 submit the Faculty Activity Report for the preceding calendar year. These documents should address how the faculty member’s activities and achievements comply with the general expectations of the unit, college/school, and the university. The Faculty Activity Plans and Faculty Activity Reports will be reviewed by the unit head and the dean of the college (or by a designee of the dean) for consistency with unit and college expectations and be made available to the unit faculty members.

C. Student Course Evaluations

Normally, student evaluations of each course are completed each semester.

D. Peer Evaluations
See the process identified in Board of Trustees’ Policies BOT 4.2.3 through 4.2.10.

E. Collegiality

1. Faculty members are expected to refrain from engaging in non-collegial behavior towards each other that will threaten or harm the productive environment critical for the progress and success of the unit and the university community. The functions of teaching/professional effectiveness, scholarship/creative activities, and service should be free from "incivility, misuse of authority, intimidation, humiliation, retaliation, and infringement upon personal and academic freedoms". (Source: Senior Leadership Team policy SLT 3.3)

2. Collegiality should be understood in professional, not personal, terms, as it relates to the performance of a faculty member’s duties. Collegiality does not refer to one's view of another’s social skills or position on controversial issues, which should not be part of the faculty evaluation process. Nor does collegiality require a display of enthusiasm, dedication, or "fit" within the unit.

3. Collegiality is not a fourth, separate evaluation criterion at Grand Valley. Only the three criteria specified in the General Personnel Policies (i.e., teaching/professional effectiveness, scholarly/creative activities, and service) are appropriately part of the evaluation process; however, non-collegial behavior can be relevant as a qualitative standard applied to those three criteria during a personnel action and may result in a negative outcome. (When non-collegial behavior affects the unit's ability to function productively, it should be brought up under the service evaluation criterion.)

4. Non-collegiality is normally a pattern of behavior. Verified and documented allegations of "repeated and unreasonable activity, or a severe non-collegial act" (Source SLT 3.3), will be considered evidence of non-collegial behavior in the context of personnel actions. Concerns about non-collegial behavior must be communicated in writing to the faculty member by the unit head before they can be brought up in a personnel action.

5. Academic misconduct, illegal activity, violations of GVSU’s discrimination policy, or violations of academic integrity are a separate matter and should be addressed through proper disciplinary procedures.

See also the Collegiality Policy Statement in the President’s Cabinet Policies [SLT 3.3]

F. Contract Renewals, Promotion and Tenure Decisions

The process for personnel evaluations for contract renewals, promotion, and tenure decisions is outlined in the Board of Trustees' Policies BOT 4.2.9.

See also the Faculty Personnel Actions Workbook.
The unit head or designee(s) refers to the member or members designated by the unit to carry out the personnel review process, as specified in the Board of Trustees’ Policies BOT 4.2.10.

Evaluation Principles. The evaluation process is designed to create an open, uniform, and equitable procedure for the review of faculty by their peers. The central principle of this process is to have an informed, candid, and open, job-related discussion of the candidate in a unit meeting followed by a unit vote and written recommendation. This is accomplished by the following steps given in outline form (specific details for each step are in the relevant sections):

1. The submission by the unit head and the candidate to the unit of materials necessary for the action under consideration, including relevant Faculty Activity Plans and Faculty Activity Reports.

2. An agenda for a unit meeting based on the candidate’s review materials and unit regular faculty's input after review of the candidate’s materials. This input should address both the candidate’s achievements and the writer’s concerns as to how the candidate has addressed the criteria for review.

3. A unit meeting where the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate are discussed followed by a unit vote on the personnel action. The first motion for a vote on the personnel action under consideration is for the action (for renewal, for promotion, or for tenure).

4. A unit recommendation prepared after the unit meeting based on the discussion and written comments. This recommendation is submitted to the dean.

5. A review of the unit action by a College/Library Personnel Committee whose role is to:
   a. ascertain whether the unit has followed the procedures for contract renewal, etc.
   b. ascertain whether the unit has adequately discussed all the issues raised by the regular faculty of the unit about the candidate under discussion.
   c. determine whether substantive issues require the Committee to contradict the unit’s recommendation.
   d. in the absence of a valid vote by the unit, to make a recommendation based on its own judgment.

**Evaluation Procedure Flow Chart.**
A Flow Chart of the evaluation procedure is available on the Office of the Provost website.
POLICY STATEMENT

Faculty Salary Adjustment Program

Each year the Faculty Salary and Budget Committee (FSBC) recommends to the University Academic Senate (UAS) how funds, as available for faculty salary increases, are to be administered. The document wherein the resulting salary increase process is described is titled the Faculty Salary Adjustment Program. It is distributed to teaching members of the faculty during the initial stages of the process, usually by the end of the winter semester/term.

The pool of available funds each year is characterized as a percent of current faculty base salaries, i.e., X.X% in the "generic" copy.

Questions about the process should be directed to the unit head. Suggestions for the improvement of the process should be communicated to the college’s representative on the Faculty Salary and Budget Committee as early as possible during the Fall Semester. The Committee considers revisions each year.

The Board of Trustees approves annually an increase in funds available for salary increments.

1. Fund Allocation.

a. Fifteen percent of the total increment funds available are retained by the Provost for special salary adjustments. All of these funds will be expended for these purposes.

b. Eighty-five percent of the total increment funds available are allocated to the appointing officers. The current appointing officers are:

Dean of the Seidman College of Business

Dean of the College of Community and Public Service

Dean of the College of Education
Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Dean of the Padnos College of Engineering and Computing
Dean of the College of Health Professions
Dean of the Kirkhof College of Nursing
Dean of the Brooks College of Interdisciplinary Studies
Dean of the University Libraries

2. **Range of Salary Adjustments**

Recommendations for individual salary adjustments to the Provost must fall within the following ranges. These ranges are based on performance over the past academic year.

a. Less than satisfactory performance: 0 to 55%.

b. Satisfactory performance: 70% to 100%.

c. Exemplary performance: 105+%.

In addition, the Appointing Officer may also make a request for a special salary adjustment (see 3.c below) to the Provost. Adjustment by the Provost can result in individual salary increment percentages, based on the total increment funds, being higher for certain individuals.

3. **Guidelines for Increments**

a. Appointing officers are required to recommend salary adjustments to the Provost. The appointing officer will consider the summary of peer evaluations as the most important factor in determining the recommendation for salary adjustment.

b. The Provost will consider individual salary adjustment problems that cannot be resolved within an appointing officer’s allocation. Appointing officers must prepare written justification to support such requests.

c. The funds retained by the Provost (15% of total increment funds) are intended to address outstanding performance, extraordinary circumstances, and market conditions. These are allocated based on written requests from appointing officers for salary adjustments that cannot be resolved by the appointing officer’s allocation and cases identified by the Provost that require special adjustment. In making these adjustments, the Provost should consider salary compression as an important factor. Promotional increments are not included in these funds.
4. **Evaluation Criteria.** Evaluation criteria for faculty performance reviews are specified in the Board of Trustees' Policies **BOT 4.2.9.**

5. **Unit Peer Evaluation**

Peer evaluation is part of the salary adjustment process.

a. Every member of a unit will be given the opportunity to evaluate colleagues based on the evaluation criteria unless a two-thirds majority of the faculty vote each year to waive that option. This decision must be communicated in writing to the appointing officer.

b. The unit head will collect relevant Faculty Activity Plans, Faculty Activity Reports, and current vitae not later than February 1. The faculty member is responsible for submitting these materials in a timely manner to permit peer evaluation to take place.

c. The unit head is responsible for distribution of these materials corresponding to the evaluation criteria in a timely manner to enable peer evaluation to take place.

d. The unit head will summarize peer evaluations and forward such summary to the appointing officer. However, unit faculty peer evaluations of the unit head will be sent directly to the appointing officer.

e. If peer evaluation does not take place, the unit head will evaluate each faculty member against the evaluation criteria and transmit a recommendation to the appointing officer.

6. **Communication with faculty**

a. **Written Performance Summary/Meeting with Faculty Members**

   By the end of the winter semester/term, each faculty member will receive a written performance summary from the unit head that includes:

   i. The unit head’s summary of peer evaluations (or the unit head’s recommendations if peer evaluation is not done).

   ii. A discussion of the faculty member’s performance in teaching (or professional effectiveness for librarians), scholarship, service, and the significant focus commitment from the Faculty Activity Plan.

   iii. A discussion of any departmental concerns regarding contract renewal, tenure, or promotion for untenured faculty.

   iv. Faculty members will normally be informed of their annual performance category by the end of the winter semester/term.

After the written performance summary has been completed, the unit head will also hold
a meeting with each faculty member to discuss performance during the past year. This meeting will occur ordinarily before the end of the winter semester/term.

b. Justification Required

i. For tenured faculty members, written justification is not required for recommendations within the satisfactory range. However, appointing officers must prepare a written justification to the Provost to accompany salary adjustment recommendations in the ranges for "less than satisfactory performance", "exemplary performance," and "special salary adjustments." A copy of the justification for these adjustments needs to be provided to each affected faculty member ordinarily by the end of the winter semester/term.

ii. For tenure-track faculty members who are untenured, written justification is required for recommendations in all ranges. Appointing officers must provide a written justification to the Provost to accompany all salary adjustment recommendations, a copy of which needs to be provided to each faculty member ordinarily by the end of the winter semester/term.

c. Annual Salary Letter

i. The annual salary letter will communicate both the percent and actual dollar amount of the salary adjustment, including a breakdown by category of adjustment (merit, promotional increment, and special salary adjustments, market adjustment). This letter will be mailed to faculty when the actual dollar amounts are known.

ii. The annual salary letter will also communicate both the percent and actual dollar amount of the total faculty salary adjustment as compared to the previous year.

7. Appeals.

Faculty who disagree with the salary adjustment may appeal using pertinent supporting material according to the procedure specified in the Board of Trustees' Policies BOT 4.2.18.

8. Promotional increments.

As provided in the Board of Trustees' Policies BOT 4.2.20, faculty who are promoted will receive, in addition to their regular salary increase, the indicated promotion increment or no less than the minimum of the salary range of the new rank if the combination of the regular increase and the promotion increment fall below the minimum.

Promotion to:

Assistant Professor $1,000
Associate Professor  $5,000
Full Professor       $6,500