

# Faculty Evaluation Procedures

## FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES

SG 3.07

**Date of Last Update:**

May 13, 2024

**Approved By:**

- University Academic Senate / Provost

**Responsible Office:**

Provost Office

## 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 Workload Reports and Faculty Workload Plans**

Annually, by **October 1**, each faculty member will prepare a Faculty Workload Plan (FWP) for the next calendar year and by **February 1** submit the Faculty Workload 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 Workload Plans and Faculty Workload 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**

1. Normally, student evaluations of each course are completed each semester.
2. The faculty member may request that unfairly prejudicial comments be redacted. This

request is made in writing to the Unit Head. The decision to approve/disapprove the request will be made by the Unit Head, or a standing or ad hoc committee in the unit. This provision is intended to cover offensive, racist, sexist, homophobic, and other personal comments, and is not intended to exclude from the file negative comments directly related to the teaching of the course. A department decision not to remove specific comments may be appealed to the Dean of the College.

#### **D. Peer Evaluations**

See the process identified in Board of Trustees' Policies [BOT 4.2.3 through 4.2.10](#).

#### **E. Unintentional Biases**

1. GVSU works to institute policies and processes into assessment procedures that mitigate the potential for bias based on identity, including, but not limited to age, color, disability, height, weight, familial status, marital status, national origin, political affiliation, race, religion, sex/gender (including gender identity and expression), sexual orientation, veteran or active-duty military status. Nonetheless,

Grand Valley recognizes that there remain unintentional biases that can potentially affect assessment of student and faculty at this institution.

2. In continuing to work to make the institution more inclusive, equitable, and welcoming for all, faculty members are encouraged to reflect on and temper biases in assessment and in all other evaluative processes.

#### **F. 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](#)]

#### **G. 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 Workload Plans and Faculty Workload 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](#).

---

## **FACULTY SALARY ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM**

SG 3.08

#### **Date of Last Update:**

September 12, 2024

#### **Approved By:**

- University Academic Senate / Provost

#### **Responsible Office:**

Provost Office

## **POLICY STATEMENT**

### **Faculty Salary Adjustment Program**

Each year the Faculty Salary and Budget Committee (FSBC) recommends to the University Academic Senate (UAS) how funds should be made available for faculty salary increases. The salary increase process is described in a Faculty Salary Adjustment Program Document which is distributed to faculty members each year.

Questions about the process should be directed to the unit head. Suggestions for improving the process should be communicated to the college's representative on the Faculty Salary and Budget Committee.

## **Fund Allocation**

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

There are three separate funds that support the Faculty Salary Adjustment Program. The Merit Fund and the Special Salary Adjustment Fund are comprised of a percentage of salaries for merit recognition and special adjustments. This fund is standardly allocated as 85% to the Merit Fund and 15% to the Special Salary Adjustment Fund. The Provost will review special adjustment needs to determine if a slight modification of the percent of allocation to these two funds is required before final allocations occur. The Promotional Increment Fund is a separate fund based on anticipated number of promotions that will occur in a given year.

The Merit Fund is calculated as a percent of the base salary of all current faculty. This fund is to be used exclusively for merit adjustments (see Sections 4-6 below). Appointing officers make recommendations to the Provost on the distribution of this fund. All funds allocated should be expended in the salary adjustment process.

The Special Salary Adjustment Fund is assigned to the Provost for special salary adjustment, which is used for market and equity adjustments and extraordinary performance (see Section 3 below). This fund should not exceed 15% of the Merit Fund unless designated for a clearly defined purpose.

The Promotional Increment Fund is allocated to the Provost for faculty promotions. The amount of the fund is based on the number of faculty promoted and the current promotional increments (see Section 8 below).

### **2. Range of Salary Adjustments from the Merit Fund**

Recommendations for individual salary adjustments from the appointing officer to the Provost must fall within the following ranges. These ranges should be based on performance over the preceding academic year; however, in special situations, an aggregate of years may be used with rationale provided by the appointing officer. The merit increase is determined by the percentage category in the appropriate range below, multiplied by the percentage increase of the Merit Fund (described in Section 1 above). For example: 70% based on the category assigned for satisfactory performance \*3.0 Merit Fund percentage increase = 2.10% merit increase.

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

- b. Satisfactory performance: 70% to 100%.
- c. Exemplary performance: 105+% to 140%.

The appointing officer may also make requests for special salary adjustments (see Section 3.c below) to the Provost, to be funded by the Special Salary Adjustment Fund.

### **3. Guidelines for Increments**

- a. Appointing officers are required to recommend salary adjustments to the Provost for the distribution of the Merit Funds. The appointing officer will consider the summary of peer evaluations (see Section 5 below) as the most important factor in determining the recommendation.
- b. The Provost will consider individual salary adjustment issues that cannot be resolved by the merit process.

The Special Salary Adjustment Fund assigned to the Provost is intended to address outstanding performance, extraordinary circumstances, and market or equity conditions. These are allocated based on written requests from appointing officers for salary adjustments that cannot be resolved by the Merit Fund, as well as cases identified by the Provost that require special adjustment. In making these adjustments, the Provost must consider salary compression as an important factor.

**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 and implement alternative procedures. This decision must be communicated in writing to the appointing officer by the end of fall semester.
- b. The unit head will collect relevant Faculty Workload Plans, Faculty Workload 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, faculty evaluations of the unit head will be sent directly to the

appointing officer.

e. If peer evaluation does not take place, and alternative procedures have not been agreed upon, 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 Workload Plan.
- iii. A discussion of any departmental concerns regarding contract renewal, tenure, or promotion for untenured faculty.
- iv. The annual performance category that the faculty member was assigned.

After the written performance summary has been completed, the unit head will make themselves available to meet 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 and exemplary performance.
- 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.
- iii. All special salary adjustments require written justification which shall be shared with the chairs of ECS and FSBC upon request.

c. Annual Salary Letter

i. The annual salary letter will communicate both the percent and actual dollar amount of the total faculty salary adjustment as compared to the previous year. This letter will be available in Workday once the Board of Trustees has approved the upcoming fiscal year budget. Human Resources will alert faculty when the salary letter is able to be viewed in Workday.

ii. The annual salary letter will communicate the salary adjustment breakdown for each category received merit, promotional increment, and special salary adjustments.

Special salary adjustments will include the breakdown for market, compression, equity or exemplary performance.

**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 salary established for each rank.

Promotion to:

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

---