

It has come to the attention of the Faculty Concerns Committee that there may be inconsistencies between the Faculty Handbook's requirements concerning yearly faculty evaluations and the distribution of merit pay and some academic unit's practices. However, the committee believes it would be counter-productive to seek out academic units that may be making errors, so the committee recommends that the Faculty Senate consider taking the following action:

The Faculty Senate requests that the PVPAA, through instructions to the deans, confirm

that each academic unit has evaluation criteria for the yearly evaluation.

(Faculty Handbook (FH): **III.E.1. Evaluation Fundamentals** Each academic unit shall establish written procedures and criteria for the three types of evaluations [teaching, scholarship, service]. See **III.E.2.b.** for specific criteria.)

that existing evaluation criteria were created following the FH's guidelines for approval, and that if an academic unit's current guidelines were not approved as per the FH, then that the academic unit revisit and, if necessary, revise the guidelines. (FH: **III.E.1.f. Approval** Academic unit evaluation procedures and criteria must be approved by the academic unit faculty members, academic unit head, dean and provost and vice president for academic affairs. See also **III.E.4**)

that faculty members have been provided copies of the evaluation criteria. This is especially important for new faculty members, for employees must be informed of the conditions of employment. (FH: **III.E.1.g. Distribution** Academic unit procedures and criteria shall be distributed to the faculty and provided to a new faculty member upon joining the faculty.)

that AUHs will make sure that faculty members are allowed to negotiate the "relative weights" applied to the three performance areas. (FH: **III.J.2.d.(1)**. . . . No later than the start of an academic year, each faculty member and his/her AUH shall agree on a personal set of relative weights to be applied to the three performance areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service in determination of the annual salary adjustment. This agreement may be amended by mutual consent during the academic year. See also **III.E.4.a.**)

that each AU has created a formula by which merit pay is distributed. (FH: **III.J.2.d.(1)**) In addition, there shall be an explicit, published description of the mechanism approved by the academic unit and employed by the academic unit head (AUH) in the allocation of merit pay adjustments to individual faculty member salaries. Each mechanism must be objective insofar as it is based on (a) the relative weights applied to the three areas of faculty performance (i.e., teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service) and (b) the annual evaluation ratings awarded to the faculty member in each of the performance areas.)

The Faculty Senate suggests that the PVPAA set a deadline of early January for the deans to bring their colleges' AUs' evaluation criteria and merit-pay-allocation mechanisms into alignment with the FH, with no presumption on the senate's part that serious misalignments exist. The senate also requests that every AU provide copies of the unit's evaluation criteria and merit-pay-allocation mechanisms to the Faculty Senate.

In addition, the Faculty Senate also requests that the PVPAA, through communication with all faculty members, for membership on AUs' PACs changes over time, that

all AUHs and PACs understand that faculty members must be evaluated by comparing their accomplishments to the evaluation criteria and not to other faculty members. (FH: **III.E.1.b. Applicability** The procedures and criteria for a particular type of evaluation shall be applied equally to all similarly situated faculty members in the academic unit. [The Faculty Concerns Committee interprets "similarly situated" to indicate the distinction between full-time and part-time faculty, not between tenured/tenure-track and RTA, or between full, associate, and assistant professors. However, the FH is vague on this point.]

all AUHs and PACs understand that personal philosophies of pedagogy and disciplinary theory and practice must be applied in a manner consistent with the established evaluation criteria. (FH: **III.E.1.h. Academic Freedom** The evaluation of a faculty member shall not infringe upon the exercise of academic freedom, as defined in *Faculty Handbook*, Section III.A.2. Also, see **Policy 2107** for AUH job description.)

all AUHs and PACs understand that, whereas teaching, scholarship, and professional service are indeed the activities evaluated each year, all of the items discussed above relate to fair employment practices and a healthy working environment.