

## UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE

Wednesday, April 27, 2016

1 p.m., Hovey 102

### MINUTES

Members present: Angela Bonnell, Rick Boser, Diane Dean, Joe Goodman, Christopher Horvath, Doris Houston (via telephone), Sheryl Jenkins, Andy Rummel

Members not present: David Rubin, Sam Catanzaro (non-voting)

Others present: Bruce Stoffel (recorder)

#### I. Call to order

Vice-Chairperson Diane Dean presided for Chairperson Doris Houston, who joined the meeting via telephone. Dean called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

#### II. Approval of minutes from the April 12, 2016 meeting

Christopher Horvath moved, Andy Rummel seconded approval of minutes from the April 12, 2016 committee meeting as distributed prior to the meeting. The motion carried on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.

#### III. Final reports from spring 2016 ASPT working groups

##### Promotion increments (Joe Goodman and David Rubin)

Joe Goodman reported for the working group. He distributed copies of the working group final report, dated April 26, 2016 (see attached). Goodman stated that the working group recommends retaining the current ASPT policy of defining salary increases associated with promotions by fixed amounts rather than by percentages.

Goodman said he has reviewed archived Illinois State ASPT documents and has discovered that the current promotion increments have been in place for ten years. He reported that salary increments in the current ASPT document are lower than salary increments offered by other institutions about which the working group gathered information. He said the working group recommends that the Faculty Caucus (hereinafter the "Caucus") consider whether current increments are appropriate, noting that the working group was not charged by the Caucus to do so.

Goodman reported that, while conducting its research, the working group discovered a study at Iowa State University of costs incurred by that institution when replacing a faculty member. At the time of the study the average replacement cost to hire one nine-month assistant professor (tenure-eligible) was \$111,432, Goodman said. Goodman suggested that by increasing salary increments associated with promotion, faculty turnover at Illinois State might be reduced which, in turn, would save the University faculty replacement costs. Additional costs paid in salary increases in a given year might be less than total faculty replacement costs during that year, he added. Goodman pointed to a model adopted by West Virginia University that provides for the possibility of a 10 percent salary increase for tenured faculty members every five years. Such a policy might help address salary compression and inversion at the University, he noted.

Houston thanked Goodman and Rubin for their report. She said the discrepancies between the promotion salary increments offered by Illinois State and those offered by other institutions are eye opening. Dean agreed. She asked how the committee should proceed. Houston suggested asking Caucus Chairperson

Susan Kalter whether the Caucus will consider the additional issues raised by Goodman and Rubin's working group.

*Houston moved, Angela Bonnell seconded that the committee accept the working group report on tenure and promotion salary increases, that the committee recommend retaining the current policy of defining those increases by fixed amounts, and that the committee recommend that the Caucus consider other issues raised by the working group in the "Future Considerations" section of the working group report. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.*

Student reactions to teaching performance (Christopher Horvath and Andy Rummel)

Horvath reported that after the last URC meeting the working group made minor revisions to its draft report. He explained the changes.

Horvath said the working group is not recommending changes to policies in the current ASPT document regarding student feedback on teaching performance. He explained that referring to student feedback as either "student reactions" or "student responses" is acceptable to the group but using the term "student evaluations" is not. Horvath reported that the working group, at the request of the Caucus, also considered whether the ASPT document should be revised to require department/school faculty status committees to equally weigh methods of evaluating teaching performance when conducting annual faculty evaluations. He said the working group recommends against adding such a requirement. Instead, the group recommends that each academic unit be allowed flexibility to tailor its teaching evaluation policies to best meet its needs.

Horvath said the working group further considered modifying the current ASPT document to state that student reactions to teaching performance should not be the predominate method of evaluating teaching. He said the working group decided against recommending such a modification because that point is already covered in the ASPT document. What is not addressed well in the document, he said, is the matter of best practices. He said the working group decided against addressing best practices because the group was not charged by the Caucus to do so. Houston suggested that it would be appropriate for URC to make recommendations to the Caucus regarding best practices, because, she said, the role of URC is to initiate recommendations regarding ASPT policies in addition to responding to requests from the Caucus.

Dean asked if the new edition of the ASPT document is scheduled to be printed in the fall. Bruce Stoffel responded that Catanzaro plans to have the book printed this summer so it will be available at new faculty orientation in August. He added that Kalter has announced that the Caucus may consider amendments to the new edition as early as fall 2016.

Horvath noted that the section of the ASPT document that would have to be revised to address best practices is substantial, adding that it would take time and attention to draft the revisions. Boser agreed. Horvath suggested responding to the Caucus request now while planning to address the issue of best practices next academic year. Houston asked if that approach is stated in the working group report. Horvath responded that it is not but that it could be added. He suggested approving the report via consent agenda once he has added those sentences. All committee members present agreed. Dean thanked Horvath and Rummel for their research and for their efforts compiling the working group report.

Performance evaluation process (Angela Bonnell, Rick Boser, and Sheryl Jenkins)

Bonnell reviewed the working group report disseminated to committee members via email prior to the meeting (see attached). She reported that the working group recommends against conducting performance evaluations every other year but instead recommends that the current policy of conducting annual performance evaluations be retained. Bonnell said the working group recommends against revising the ASPT document to address time spent by faculty members on their evaluation portfolios. She explained that working group members believe time spent on portfolios is a matter of department or school culture, noting that the ASPT document states that each unit is to create its own policies and procedures regarding performance evaluation. Bonnell added that the working group recommends that, when reviewing those

policies and procedures, academic units should consider the burden they place on faculty members. To help academic units understand their options with regard to performance evaluation policies and procedures, the working group recommends that units be provided opportunities to discuss their ASPT policies and procedures with other departments and schools at the University, Bonnell said.

Dean noted the variation across campus in the amount of time being spent by faculty on their portfolios, adding that excessive time spent on the portfolios is a problem in only some units. She suggested that changing the document to address the issue may unnecessarily impact all units. Horvath suggested that trust between faculty members and their department faculty status committee is an important factor in time spent by faculty members on their annual portfolios. He suggested that when faculty members trust that their committee will do the right thing, broad rules regarding performance evaluation are acceptable, but, if such trust does not exist, detailed performance evaluation policies and procedures may be more appropriate.

Houston thanked the working group for its efforts. She asked if it would be appropriate for URC to share the working group insights with colleges, department, and schools. Dean suggested recommending to the Caucus that communicating “best practices” to departments and schools would be appropriate and helpful in light of the differences across campus with respect to time preparing annual performance evaluation portfolios. Dean added that a unit may adopt a certain culture of preparing annual portfolios because the unit does not know there are options. Boser noted that department representatives serve with representatives of other departments on college faculty status committees, leading to awareness across units of differences in performance evaluation policies and procedures.

Bonnell asked if she should revise the working group report to require the Provost’s office to offer programming to address concerns about the burden of performance evaluation on faculty. Boser and Dean suggested not doing so. Dean said it would be better to make such programming voluntary. She suggested working with the deans on the issue. Boser said it might be helpful to work with the council of department chairpersons and school directors.

*Horvath moved, Goodman seconded that the working group report be tabled, that the working group revise the report to incorporate suggestions made by URC members, and that the revised report be circulated to URC members via email for approval via consent agenda. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative.*

[Horvath then left the meeting.]

IV. Semester wrap and a look ahead to fall 2016

Houston announced that this is the last URC meeting for Rummel, as he has represented the College of Fine Arts on URC in spring 2016 to compete a three-year term vacated by another faculty member in the college. She thanked Rummel for his service to URC.

Houston announced that elections of 2016-2017 URC officers will be held in fall 2016.

V. Other business

There was none.

VI. Adjournment

Boser moved, Goodman seconded that the meeting adjourn. The motion passed on voice vote, all voting in the affirmative. The meeting adjourned at 2 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Rick Boser, Secretary  
Bruce Stoffel, Recorder

Attachments:

*URC Working Group on Tenure and Promotion Salary Increases, Joseph Goodman (COB/Management and Quantitative Methods), David Rubin (CAS/Biological Sciences), Submitted for review: 26 April 2016*

*University Review Committee, Spring 2016, Working Group on Annual Performance Evaluations, Angela Bonnell (Milner), Rick Boser (CAST/TEC), and Sheryl Jenkins (MCN), April 2016*

## **URC Working Group on Tenure and Promotion Salary Increases**

Joseph Goodman (COB/ Management and Quantitative Methods)

David Rubin (CAS/ Biological Sciences)

Submitted for review: 26 April 2016

### **TASK**

The subcommittee was asked to review and compare Article XII.A.5 (p. 42), “salary increments...Assistant Professor to Associate Professor...and Associate Professor to Professor...” and provide recommendations to the University Review Committee (henceforth, URC) regarding peer institution monetary increase. The request from Faculty Caucus:

*Should Illinois State University use a fixed monetary amount or a percentage based promotion and tenure salary increment?*

### **ISU HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE**

ISU, currently, awards a \$3000/year minimum salary increment for promotion to Associate Professor and a \$5000/year minimum salary increment for a promotion to Professor. These salary increments replaced the 2005-2006 ASPT Policy document: \$2250/year minimum for Assistant to Associate; and \$3000/year minimum for Associate to Professor, originally inserted in 2001 ASPT document. Prior to the 1995-1998 ASPT Policy document, there is no mention of a fixed or percentage based salary increment with promotion and/or tenure.

### **METHODOLOGY**

Comparison institutions were identified from the *Illinois State University Planning, Research, and Policy* “Peer Groups” website ([http://prpa.illinoisstate.edu/data\\_center/peer\\_groups/](http://prpa.illinoisstate.edu/data_center/peer_groups/)). ISU identifies four main peer groups. Institutions for this analysis were selected from the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) Peer Group for Salary Comparisons and the IBHE Peer Group for Non-salary Comparisons. Thirty-five institutions are listed across both comparison tables. Each university’s policy manuals concerning promotion and tenure were evaluated for salary increment raises. The manuals were searched, electronically, using the following symbols, phrases, or words: 1) “\$”; 2) “%”; 3) “promotion”; 4) “raise”; 5) “assistant to”; 6) “associate to”; 7) “salary increments”; and 8) “assistant professor”, “associate professor”, or “professor”. The search method generated 18 institutions with comparable data. Additional on-line searches were conducted on the remaining 17 institutions. However, the data was not available through public sources. No effort was undertaken to contact the schools’ administrative professionals.

Online searches generated additional data sources. Table 2 reports institutions from the search and not considered within ISU’s peer comparison groups.

## RESULTS

Table 1 presents data for ISU's Peer Salary and Non-Salary promotion and tenure salary increments. The average student enrollment for the comparable institutions is: 22,616 students, S.D. = 9949. Approximately, 83% of the peer institutions use a fixed monetary salary increment for promotion and tenure, 17% use either a percentage based or hybrid formula. The average fixed salary increment for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor is: \$4,788.00, S.D. = \$1135.81 (Median = \$5000.00). The average fixed salary increment for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor is: \$7,058.00, S.D. = \$1614.24 (Median = \$7000.00). Institutions using the percentage based salary increment range from 9% to 12% of the faculty's base salary.

## RECOMMENDATION

The URC was asked to consider using a fixed monetary or a percentage based promotion and tenure salary increment. ISU's fixed monetary salary increment is in line with peer institutions. As such, a full departure from past precedent appears unwarranted.

## FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

Faculty pay, direct and indirect compensation, continues to garner attention. A 2012 HR Horizons article identified, pay compression and inversion, competitiveness, pay progression, workload, and pay fairness as the Top Five problems with faculty pay<sup>4</sup>. Hutcheson, Stiles, and Wong note,

“Many institutions manage faculty pay effectively. Yet, many leaders also think their current practices need to be more contemporary...Institutions that do not regularly make market adjustments or lack a process for managing faculty pay progression will experience more significant, extensive, and costly compression and inversion issues.”

Illinois State University is not isolated from the challenges of balancing fair compensation and economic conditions. For example, West Virginia University utilizes a “salary enhancement” policy<sup>5</sup> wherein fully-promoted faculty members submit 5-year revaluation dossiers. The faculty member is eligible for up to a 10% salary enhancement in addition to standard merit increases<sup>6</sup>. Two issues warranting future consideration, for ISU, are: 1) salary increment amounts; and 2) faculty turnover due to salary compression and/or inversion. Each issue is discussed below.

***Salary Increment Amounts.*** The IBHE Peer Comparison group data indicates ISU's salary increment rates are below the mean and the median for both, Assistant to Associate and Associate to Professor. It is recommended that a full peer group compensation survey examine this discrepancy. The survey and analyses should investigate direct and indirect compensation comparisons. Contextual items available, or absent, from ISU faculty will provide the necessary insight prior to any new salary increment implementation.

**Faculty Turnover.** Turnover costs are unique to each university. However, and by example, Iowa State University reported the average replacement costs to hire one 9-month Assistant Professor (Tenure eligible) was \$111,432.00<sup>7</sup>. Turnover has two facets, involuntary/voluntary or dysfunctional/functional, and is based upon either the employee's or organization's perspective. Involuntary turnover is defined as the employee is discharged from the organization, i.e. terminated or lay-offs. Voluntary turnover is the employee choosing to exit the organization. Dysfunctional turnover, then, is the organization losing a valuable, high performing employee. Conversely, in functional turnover the organization is losing a low performing employee. As addressed by Hutcheson et al (2012), salary compression and inversion concerns can contribute to faculty turnover, specifically voluntary and dysfunctional. It is imperative for Illinois State University to understand its costs and causes associated with faculty turnover. The recommendation is a full evaluation of faculty turnover rates and costs by academic rank.

Table 1: IBHE Comparison Institutions Salary and Non-Salary: Promotion and Tenure Increments

| Comparison Institutions                | Enrollment    | Assistant to Associate                | Associate to Full                     |
|--|---------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Ball State University               | 21,196        | \$4000                                | \$6000                                |
| 2. Bowling Green State University      | 16,912        | \$5500                                | \$9000                                |
| 3. Central Michigan University         | 27,069        | \$6250                                | \$7250                                |
| 4. Cleveland State University          | 16,936        | \$6000                                | \$9000                                |
| 5. Florida Atlantic University         | 30,364        | 9% of previous year's Base            | 12% of previous year's base           |
| 6. Georgia State University            | 32,082        | \$5000                                | \$6000                                |
| <b>7. Illinois State University</b>    | <b>20,807</b> | <b>\$3000</b>                         | <b>\$5000</b>                         |
| 8. Miami University (Ohio)             | 18,456        | \$6000                                | \$9000                                |
| 9. Old Dominion University             | 24,932        | \$4000                                | \$8000                                |
| 10. Ohio University                    | 29,217        | \$6000                                | \$9000                                |
| 11. Portland State University          | 28,241        | \$2169 <sup>1,2</sup>                 |                                       |
| 12. Rutgers University                 | 4,857         | 10% of base                           | 10% of base                           |
| 13. University of Northern Colorado    | 12,075        | \$3000                                | \$5000                                |
| 14. University of South Florida        | 48,793        | \$5000                                | \$7000                                |
| 15. University of Southern Mississippi | 14,551        | \$4000                                | \$5000                                |
| 16. University of Toledo               | 20,381        | 10% or \$10,000, whichever is greater | 10% or \$10,000, whichever is greater |
| 17. Western Michigan University        | 23,914        | \$4500                                | \$6500                                |
| 18. Wichita State University           | 14,495        | \$3000 <sup>3</sup>                   | \$5000 <sup>3</sup>                   |

Table 2: Non-comparison Institutions with Fixed or Percentage Based Advancement Increments

| Comparison Institutions        | Enrollment | Assistant to Associate | Associate to Full                                      |
|--------------------------------|------------|------------------------|--|
| 1. UT-Chattanooga              | 10,781     | 10% of Current Salary  | 10% of Current Salary                                  |
| 2. Virginia Military Institute | 1,700      | 5% or \$3000           | 5% or \$3000   |
| 3. Kansas State University     | 24,766     | \$11,075               | \$11,075   |
| 4. West Virginia University    | 29,175     | 10% of Current Salary  | 10% of Current Salary & 5 year review for 10% increase |



## End Notes

---

1. Portland State University has union representation. The 9-month rate is the minimum increase for rank reassignment. Faculty with a 12-month contract receive a minimum of \$2,640.
2. Portland State University provides for an "Academic Professional Compression Increase." Faculty receive a one-time salary increase based on years of service at the University.
  - a. Three years of service or more, but less than six years of service: 2%
  - b. Six years of service or more, but less than nine years of service: 3%
  - c. nine years of service or more: 4%
3. Data reflects 1999 rates.
4. Hutcheson, K., Stiles, Y., & Wong, C. (2012, February). The top five problems in faculty pay. *HR Horizons*, 7(1), Retrieved from <http://hrhorizons.nacubo.org/newsletter/past-issues/volume-7-issue-1/the-top-five-problems-in-faculty-pay.html>.
5. West Virginia University Board of Governors Policy 30. Retrieved from <http://bog.wvu.edu/files/d/07196b0e-11d0-43c3-aa1a-6af227c3bf6f/policy30.pdf>
6. McConnell, J. (2015, October 16). Memorandum to Academic Deans Re: Salary Enhancement for Continued Academic Achievement for 2015-2016. Retrieved from <http://wvufaculty.wvu.edu/r/download/220511>
7. Making the business case: The imperative for supporting and promoting workplace flexibility in higher education. *American Council on Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/Making-the-Business-Case-for-Workplace-Flexibility.aspx>.

**University Review Committee, Spring 2016**  
**Working Group on Annual Performance Evaluations**

Angela Bonnell (Milner)  
Rick Boser (CAST/TEC)  
Sheryl Jenkins (MCN)

**BACKGROUND**

At the Academic Senate's Faculty Caucus held December 9, 2015, several senators expressed concern that the current annual performance evaluation system is overly burdensome for faculty members and that too much time is being spent by faculty members preparing their performance evaluation documents. The following comments were made at that meeting:

- Performance evaluations should be conducted every other year rather than every year.
- Performance evaluations should be conducted annually for probationary faculty but every other year for tenured faculty.
- Performance evaluations should be conducted annually, but the extent of documentation being submitted by faculty members should be reduced.
- Performance evaluations inform annual salary increment decisions; not having an annual evaluation would be problematic in distributing salary increments (when salary increments are available).

The consensus of those Caucus members commenting during the meeting (there were several) was that it might be timely for University Review Committee (URC) to revisit how performance evaluations are conducted, since the current system has been in place for several years without discussion or change.

The URC convened a working group charged with investigating this issue at the January 19, 2016 meeting. Any resulting recommendations would likely be considered by Caucus off-cycle from the other ASPT items currently in the review process.

**WORKING GROUP INVESTIGATION**

To better understand the issue, working group members researched:

1. past and current practice of annual performance evaluations at Illinois State University
2. current practice at ISU's benchmark institutions
3. relevant policy statements by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP)
4. attitudes from faculty across campus

**FINDINGS**

***1. Past and Current Practice at Illinois State University***

Since the first *Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure (ASPT) Policies* document published in 1979, tenured and probationary tenure faculty members have been required to "submit to their DFSC reports on their activities and accomplishments for the purpose of evaluation" (X.B.2). Also, "Each DFSC will conduct merit evaluations of each tenured and probationary tenure faculty member annually" (X.B.4).

The current ASPT document references annual performance evaluations in several areas: Overview: Faculty Evaluation Process, V.C.1.; VII.E.; IX.D.1; X; and XII. The most substantive references are in VII. "Faculty Assignments and Evaluations" and XII.B.3 "Performance Evaluation and Salary Incrementation."

Annual performance review is one of several reviews tenure-track faculty will experience in their academic life. Others reviews include reappointment, promotion, tenure, sabbatical, and post-tenure (ASPT p.3).

Additionally, Illinois State University's policy on tenure (3.2.6) states that "The University shall, at regular intervals, review and evaluate the performance of tenured faculty in order to offer constructive guidance and to encourage a continuing high level of faculty accomplishment. The University shall establish the policies, procedures and criteria needed to accomplish such periodic evaluations."

## **2. Benchmarking**

Illinois State University's benchmark institutions <[http://prpa.illinoisstate.edu/data\\_center/peer\\_groups](http://prpa.illinoisstate.edu/data_center/peer_groups)> require annual performance evaluations except those in the University of California (UC) system (Santa Cruz and Riverside). In the UC system, "Faculty are reviewed on average every two to three years by faculty peers and administrators." (See attached appendix for overview.)

## **3. American Association of University Professors (AAUP)**

The AAUP 2005 report, "Managing Faculty Productivity after Tenure," <<http://www.aaup.org/issues/tenure/managing-faculty-productivity-after-tenure-2005>> states that "In view of the fact that salary increase decisions are made annually at most institutions, an annual review of faculty performance would be necessary to support these salary increase decisions. If merit pay plans are adopted, the process should be made more transparent. Such transparency will be achieved, in part, by:

- ensuring that salary enhancement programs have clear objectives
- incorporating faculty peer-review committees into the process
- developing and implementing policies by peers
- applying criteria for such increases consistently and fairly
- ensuring appeals procedures to provide additional opportunities for decision-maker(s) to obtain relevant information
- ensuring that merit pay criteria are not used to squelch the speech of faculty

## **4. Feedback from Faculty at ISU**

Bonnell, Boser and Jenkins sought feedback from tenured and probationary tenure faculty members across campus. Attitudes varied across departments/schools. Respondents reported

- spending a range from two hours to more than 40 hours preparing and/or writing their activity reports
- that required elements varied greatly within departments/schools from a CV with a brief 3-page narrative to a dossier including cover page, table of contents, a CV, lengthy narratives, appendices, future plans, summary of student evaluations, summary of peer evaluations, past DFSC/SFSC evaluations, evidence of an updated productivity report entries into in a third-party activity tracking and reporting e-portfolio system (e.g., Digital Measures, Sedona)
- that the presence of an e-portfolio system in a Department/School can add time that does not benefit the individual or the department/school and is duplicative of other required elements of the activity report

Feedback varies by department/school. The working group surmises that the culture of the department/school, as well as required elements of an activity report, are determining factors in how much time is spent preparing and writing annual activity reports.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Changes are not necessary in the ASPT document. Annual evaluations are a standard practice at other universities, including those that we compare ourselves against. AAUP supports the use of annual evaluations when they are used in making annual salary increase decisions.

Departments/Schools should consider reviewing their performance evaluation policies and procedures (p.18, V.A.5) and as they are required to “provide guidance regarding the format and content of activities reports” (p.25, VII.D.) they should strive to offer guidance that considers the time spent creating annual activity reports. According to the ASPT document, “Each Department/School is both allowed and expected to design a document that, without violating the intent of the criteria given herein, shapes these criteria to reflect its own identity, mission, and culture” (p.1). Departments/schools are free to set their own performance evaluation policies but face the consequences that result from those policies. Requiring faculty to submit extensive dossiers—especially those that also require submission with duplicative information into third party e-portfolio systems—is not an efficient use of faculty members’ time or that of members of the DFSC/SFSC who are required to review those lengthy dossiers.

Since annual evaluations provide the framework on which departments/schools determine salary incrementation among faculty, annual evaluations should provide sufficient detail for the DFSC/SFSC to make appropriate merit determinations. Similarly, annual evaluations should provide enough detail that DFSC/SFSCs can review and evaluate the performance of tenure-line faculty to offer constructive guidance and to encourage a continuing high level of faculty accomplishment. That feedback can contribute toward better faculty performance in teaching, research and service.

Departments/Schools should be provided an annual opportunity to discuss their DFSC/SFSC policies and procedures. These conversations can encourage DFSC/SFSCs to learn best practices from across the university.

April 2016

## Appendix

### Working Group on Annual Performance Evaluations, Spring 2016

Benchmark Institutions for ISU [http://prpa.illinoisstate.edu/data\\_center/peer\\_groups/](http://prpa.illinoisstate.edu/data_center/peer_groups/)

1. **Ball State University** Annual evaluations used for salary increment, page 98  
<http://cms.bsu.edu/-/media/WWW/DepartmentalContent/FacProfHandbook/201516/201516C2.pdf>

2. **Bowling Green State University** Annual review with rolling three-year review to determine merit increases

“The annual merit review will be based upon the accomplishments over the most recent three-year period on a rolling basis, ie., each year new information is added to the file for the most recent year, and information from the oldest year is eliminated from the file. This will help to reduce inequities that can result both from differences in the merit funds available each year and from fluctuations in performance that may occur from year to year.

<http://www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/philosophy/graduate-program/graduate-student-handbook/philosophy-department/departments-policies-and-procedures/iv-annual-faculty-evaluation-and-determination-of-merit.html>

3. **Clemson University** Annual performance evaluations via Faculty Activity System (FAS), Appendices E, F

“An individual's recommended merit increase is based upon the performance evaluation by the chair or director although there may be no precise correlation between the annual faculty evaluation and the amount of salary increase.” page IV-10

“Post Tenure Review Merit salary increments are based on these annual performance reviews.” page IV-8

<http://www.clemson.edu/administration/provost/documents/facultymanual.pdf>, page IV-4

4. **Miami University (Ohio)** Annual evaluations used in determining salary recommendations

“Each tenured and probationary member of the instructional staff shall receive at a minimum a written annual evaluation based at least in part on data supplied by the person in his or her Annual Report of Professional Activities. Evaluations shall serve two functions: (1) to guide the professional development of the person and (2) to record part of the evidence upon which personnel decisions and salary recommendations shall be based.”

<https://blogs.miamioh.edu/miamipolicies/?p=163>

**5. and 6. University of California-Riverside and University of California-Santa Cruz** A system of rigorous performance review is linked directly to compensation on salary scales.

“Faculty are reviewed on average every two to three years by faculty peers and administrators.”

“Faculty continue to be reviewed regularly after tenure is conferred. Senior faculty who reach the highest “step” at the professorial level (Professor, Step IX) may receive a special review and be placed “above scale,” where they still undergo regular review but the salary exceeds the maximum salary designated for the title series. On many UC campuses, these “above scale” faculty are awarded the title of “Distinguished Professor.”

[http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/\\_files/uc-faculty-comp-summary-jun-2014.pdf](http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/_files/uc-faculty-comp-summary-jun-2014.pdf)

Academic Salary Scales

<http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/compensation/2015-16-academic-salary-scales.html>

**7. University North Carolina-Greensboro** Annual reviews contribute toward merit increases  
“Annual reviews should provide a means of recognizing, encouraging, and rewarding faculty performance by means of merit pay increases, when funds are available for this purpose.”

<http://provost.uncg.edu/documents/personnel/posttenurereview.pdf>

**8. University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee**

“The Departmental Executive Committee shall provide for the periodic review of the performance of every faculty member. These reviews include those for determining annual merit salary increases, contract renewal, tenure and promotion and tenured faculty review.” page 30

<http://www4.uwm.edu/secu/policies/faculty/upload/May2015P-P.pdf>

## Sources

Euben, Donna R., and Barbara A. Lee, "Managing Faculty Productivity After Tenure." *American Association of University Professors*. Last modified August 2006.

<http://www.aaup.org/issues/tenure/managing-faculty-productivity-after-tenure-2005>.

Illinois State University. *Illinois State University Faculty Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Policies*. Normal, Ill.: Illinois State University, 1979.

[Milner Library, floor 6 [LD2347 .A132](#)]

———. "Tenure Policy (3.2.6)." Last modified April 2012.

<http://policy.illinoisstate.edu/employee/3-2-6.shtml>.

———. Planning, Research, and Policy Analysis. "Peer Groups." Accessed February 15, 2016. [http://prpa.illinoisstate.edu/data\\_center/peer\\_groups/](http://prpa.illinoisstate.edu/data_center/peer_groups/).