

Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville
School of Engineering
Faculty Performance Evaluation & Salary Increase Plan

Approved by faculty vote on 12/15/97

Introduction

The SOE faculty evaluation system and salary increase plan is designed to comply with the Faculty Senate document, *Faculty Performance Evaluation and Salary Increase Plan*, a copy of which is given in the Appendix.

Definitions

For purposes of the discussion to follow, “faculty” shall refer to tenured or tenure-track faculty and “unit chair” shall refer to department chair, program director or dean as appropriate from the context.

The “units” of the school shall be defined as

1. the faculty members, not including the department chair, of the civil engineering department;
2. the analogous group in computer science;
3. the analogous group in construction;
4. the analogous group in electrical engineering;
5. the faculty members of the industrial engineering program, not including the program director;
6. the faculty members of the mechanical engineering program, not including the department chair; and
7. the associate dean, department chairs and industrial engineering program director.

Goal-setting discussions

Individual faculty members and their unit chairs shall meet annually to discuss the goals to be accomplished by the faculty member during the coming year (the “evaluation period”). Goals shall be chosen in each of the three areas of teaching, research and service. All faculty members’ goals must be consistent with those of the university, school and department, but those faculty members working towards eventual promotion and/or tenure must select goals that will meet the expectations listed in the school documents *Promotion Policy and Guidelines* and *Guidelines for Tenure*. If a faculty member and his or her unit chair are unable to reach agreement on the goals, the dean will be the final arbiter.

Written records of the outcome of the discussion shall be provided by the unit chair. The records shall document the faculty member’s goals and all commitments of personal and/or institutional resources to the attainment of those goals. In addition, the records shall document the specific criteria that will be used to assess both the faculty member’s progress toward the goals and her or his final position in relation to the goals at the time

when a performance appraisal is conducted for salary distribution, promotion, and/or tenure decisions. All written records of goal-setting discussions shall be accessible to other members of the school or equivalent unit.

Performance appraisals discussions

At the end of the evaluation period, individual faculty members and their unit chairs shall meet to discuss the faculty member's performance relative to the agreed-upon goals. The unit chair shall rate the faculty member's performance in each area (teaching, research and service) according to the categories (excellent, meritorious, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory) used in the school documents, *Promotion Policy and Guidelines* and *Guidelines for Tenure*. The unit chair shall prepare an appraisal document that cites evidence supporting the proposed ratings.

A similar evaluation shall be conducted by a peer review committee. Each faculty member shall stipulate, before the unit chair's evaluation has been conducted, whether the peer review committee is to be the other members of the faculty member's unit or the Personnel and Policy Committee (A faculty member who is a member of the Personnel and Policy Committee shall not participate in the review of his or her own performance). Regardless of which committee is selected, it shall rely on the same sources of information used by the unit chair.

Included in the criteria that the dean shall use in evaluating the performance of the unit chairs shall be the care and thoroughness that the chairs exhibit in evaluating the faculty members in their units.

Copies of the unit chair's evaluation and the peer-review committee's evaluation shall be given to the faculty member and to the dean. The dean shall make the final determination of performance ratings.

A faculty member who is dissatisfied with his or her evaluation by the unit chair and is in a unit other than that headed by the dean shall have one month to present a written appeal to the dean. A copy of the appeal shall be given to the unit chair. Faculty members in the dean's unit may appeal to the Personnel and Policy Committee, which may agree to meet with the dean to discuss the appeal. The dean, however, shall make the final determination in these cases as well.

Sources of information

Both goal-setting discussions and performance appraisals shall take into account information from four sources:

- (1) a self-assessment by the faculty member as provided by his or her completion of the Annual Review form;
- (2) an assessment by the unit chair;

- (3) an assessment by the peers (tenured and tenure-track faculty) in the unit (Each unit shall obtain this assessment by following a written procedure developed by the unit.); and
- (4) (if applicable) an assessment by students of teaching and advisement.

The assessment by the unit chair shall be grounded in evidence that is as reliable and valid as possible. Whenever possible, specific quantitative and qualitative standards for different levels of performance shall be specified. The reliability and validity of narrative, testimonial, or other anecdotal forms of evidence shall be weighed carefully and justified fully before they are incorporated into goal-setting discussions or written and oral performance evaluations. Unit chairs are obligated to make their recommendations on the basis of the evidence provided and other performance data and material routinely available to the school or unit.

Salary increase plan

The intent of the salary increase plan is to ensure that 1) faculty members meeting performance expectations receive at least a cost-of-living increase, and 2) faculty members performing above expectations receive recognition in the form of a monetary award, in addition to a cost-of-living increase.

Define

“merit-increment faculty member” = a faculty member who received all of the following ratings:

1. excellent in teaching
2. excellent in either research or service
3. not unsatisfactory in either research or service;

“below-expectations faculty member” = a faculty member who received both of the following ratings:

1. unsatisfactory in teaching
2. unsatisfactory in either research or service; and

“standard-increment faculty member” = a faculty member not in either of the above two categories.

In the event that one or more faculty members are found to have performed below expectations, they shall receive no salary increase—as specified by University policy. Their salary increases shall be used to increase the amounts of the awards (described below) for merit-increment faculty members.

Standard-increment and merit-increment faculty members shall receive the percentage salary increase approved by the University. In addition, merit-increment faculty members shall receive an award drawn from a single school account established at the SIUE Foundation exclusively for that purpose and funded through donations from sources

outside the University. The value of the award shall be X percent of each merit-increment faculty member's current salary, where X shall be adjusted so that the total amount awarded equals the current value of the account.

Appendix

Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville

Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

November 22, 1996

MEMO TO: SIUE Full-Time Faculty
FROM: David Werner
SUBJECT: Faculty Performance Evaluation and Salary Increase Plan

President Sanders, on the recommendation of Chancellor Belck, has approved the Faculty Performance Evaluation and Salary Increase Plan developed by the Faculty Senate. A copy of the Plan is attached.

As with the recently approved revised promotion and tenure policies, this policy is broadly framed with the requirement that units develop specific procedures for implementation. The timetable shown below will be used to implement the policy. Accordingly, the current salary plan will be used for salary increases for FY98 and FY99.

<u>Date/Period</u>	<u>Action</u>
AY 96-97 thru Fall 97	Development and approval of unit policies and procedures (Part 2 of Policy) Goal-Setting Conferences (Part 3 of Policy)
Calendar 1998	First period evaluated under new policy
Spring 1999	Salary decisions for FY00
July 1, 1999	Salary increases implemented for FY00

With approval of the Faculty Performance Evaluation and Salary Increase Plan, SIUE has completed major revisions in its policies on tenure, promotion, and salary increases in a relatively short period. I believe it is accurate to say that SIUE has made more progress in revising such policies than any other institution in Illinois and, perhaps, the nation. That progress was made possible by the cooperative hard work of the faculty and administration. However, if we are to realize the full benefits of these new policies, work must continue at the unit level. I urge you to be involved fully in that work.

Attachment

Rendleman Building, Edwardsville Illinois 62026-1021 692-3772

Faculty Performance Evaluation and Salary Increase Plan

(Welfare Council #1-94/95)

Approved by President Sanders, 10/30/96

1. The Assumptive Framework of the Plan
 - A Evaluation of faculty performance and the subsequent determination of salary increases are important, sensitive, and potentially divisive processes. In recognition of this fact, this plan proceeds from the assumptions that any effective system of faculty performance evaluation and rewards must be:
 - (1) **open** rather than closed (i.e., it must be public, while respecting sensitive personal information);
 - (2) **democratic** rather than authoritarian (i.e., it must be participatory and equitable);
 - (3) **developmental**, not only evaluative (i.e., it must go beyond thorough assessment of past performance and encourage improvement by identifying goals, avenues and resources for new work).
 - B. The majority of the faculty of a school or equivalent unit may request that the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs exempt the unit from the SIUE salary plan for faculty and allow it to use a salary increase distribution system commensurate with the mission and goals of that unit, as well as with the market value of faculty. The unit first must demonstrate, however, that its system will be based upon open, democratic, and developmental evaluation processes and that its salary distribution criteria and procedures are rigorous and demanding of faculty excellence.
- 2 Reward Strategies
 - A. Each school or equivalent unit shall define a policy and procedure to be used in the determination and distribution of salary increases. The awarding of salary increases shall be based upon an evaluation process, as specified in Section 3 (Performance Evaluation Process) of this plan, in which each faculty member's performance is reviewed in accord with procedures adopted by each school or equivalent unit. The review process must include an evaluation by an elected peer review committee. A statement of the performance expectations for its faculty members shall be approved by a majority vote of the faculty members of each school or equivalent unit. The policies, procedures, and performance expectations shall be reviewed and approved by the appropriate dean and the Provost for consistency with University policy.

- B. Each school or equivalent unit shall receive for distribution a salary increase allocation proportionate to the total base salary of its faculty who are included in this salary plan.
 - C. Since there are differing levels of performance, there should be differing levels of reward. Each school or equivalent unit shall establish at least three categories for faculty performance, one of which shall be "below expectations."
 - D. Each school or equivalent unit shall determine the relative weights for each of the merit categories that it defines. It shall place individuals who meet the performance expectations of the school or equivalent unit into their respective categories by using the unit's established evaluation processes and criteria.
 - E. The allocation for salary increases for faculty shall be distributed in the following way:
 - (1) those not meeting merit performance expectations and placed in the category "below expectations" shall receive no increase;
 - (2) those whose merit performance meets college/school expectations shall receive approximately the allocated salary increase percentage;
 - (3) those exceeding merit performance expectations shall be distributed an additional merit allocation as determined by the faculty of the college/school.
 - F. Reward strategies shall take full account of regular institutional assessments of salary equity and shall be integrated fully into any plan for salary equity adjustments.
3. Performance Evaluation Process
- A. The process of evaluating faculty performance should center on dialogue between faculty members and their immediate supervisors. Unless a school or equivalent unit can demonstrate that another method is superior for improving performance, it shall establish a faculty performance appraisal system that incorporates:
 - (1) face-to-face, goal-setting discussions between individual faculty members and their immediate supervisors. In addition to the criteria which follow these discussions shall take into account criteria for salary increases, promotion, and tenure established by the school or equivalent unit.

- (2) written records of the outcomes of the discussions. As a minimum, the records must document: (a) the faculty member's goals in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service; (b) all commitments of personal and/or institutional resources to the attainment of those goals; and (c) specific criteria that will be used to assess both the faculty member's progress toward the goals and her or his final position in relation to the goals at the point when a performance appraisal is conducted for purposes of making salary distribution, promotion, and/or tenure decisions. All written records of goal-setting discussions shall be accessible to other members of the school or equivalent unit.
- B. Each school or equivalent unit may establish its own cycle of goal-setting discussions and appraisals for tenured faculty members, but each tenured faculty member shall be engaged in a goal-setting discussion and receive a written appraisal of her or his performance at least once every three years. Faculty who are not tenured shall be engaged annually in a goal-setting discussion with their immediate supervisors and shall receive an annual written appraisal of their performance. As noted in Section 2 above, each school or equivalent unit shall establish procedures for allocating merit monies in a fair and equitable way.
- C. Goal-setting discussions and written and oral performance appraisals shall take into account information from four sources:
- (1) the faculty member, who will provide a self -assessment of her or his performance to the immediate supervisor;
 - (2) the faculty member's immediate supervisor, who will provide an assessment of the faculty member's performance in relation to the criteria established during goal-setting discussions;
 - (3) the faculty member's peers in the department or equivalent unit, who will provide the faculty member and the immediate supervisor with assessments of the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service;
 - (4) the faculty member's students, who will provide the faculty member and the supervisor with assessments of the faculty member's teaching skills and, if applicable, advisement practices.
- D. The goal-setting discussions and performance evaluations for each individual faculty member shall take into account her or his specific situation, the components of which include (but are not limited to) the mission of the unit, the faculty member's particular strengths and competencies, and her or his contractual assignment and functional role in the unit.

- E. The evaluation criteria that are developed in goal-setting discussions and are applied in written and oral performance appraisals shall be grounded in evidence that is as reliable and valid as possible. Whenever possible, specific quantitative and qualitative standards for different levels of performance shall be specified. The reliability and validity of narrative, testimonial, or other anecdotal forms of evidence shall be weighed carefully and justified fully before they are incorporated into goal-setting discussions or written and oral performance evaluations. The chairperson and other individuals who are responsible for evaluations are obligated to make their recommendations on the basis of the evidence provided and other performance data and material routinely available to the school or unit