



# UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

## Policies and Procedures

<b>Proposed Policy Number and Title:</b> Policy 633 Faculty Performance, Evaluation, and Feedback		
<b>Current Policy Number and Title:</b> Policy 633 Faculty Performance Evaluation and Feedback		
<b>Approval Process*</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regular	<input type="checkbox"/> Temporary	<input type="checkbox"/> Compliance Change
<input type="checkbox"/> New <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revision <input type="checkbox"/> Revision—Limited Scope <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion	<input type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Revision <input type="checkbox"/> Revision—Limited Scope	<input type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Revision—Limited Scope <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion
*See UVU Policy 101 <i>Policy Governing Policies</i> for process details.		

<b>Draft Number and Date:</b>	Stage 3 Regular, August 2025
<b>President's Council Sponsor:</b>	Wayne Vaught
<b>Policy Steward:</b>	Kat Brown

POLICY APPROVAL PROCESS DATES		
REGULAR	TEMPORARY	COMPLIANCE
<b>Drafting and Revision</b> Entrance Date: <u>3/27/2025</u>	<b>Drafting and Revision</b> Entrance Date: _____	<b>President's Council Approval</b> Approval Date: _____
<b>University Entities Review</b> Entrance Date: <u>3/27/2025</u> Close Feedback: <u>5/15/2025</u>	<b>Board of Trustees Review</b> Entrance Date: _____ Approval Date: _____	<b>Board of Trustees Ratification</b> Ratification Date: _____
<b>Board of Trustees Review</b> Entrance Date: <u>8/14/2025</u> Approval Date: _____		



# UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

## Policies and Procedures

Page 2 of 2

<b>POLICY TITLE</b>	Faculty Performance, Evaluation, and Feedback	<b>Policy Number</b>	633
<b>Section</b>	Academics	<b>Approval Date</b>	<a href="#">April 25, 2024</a>
<b>Subsection</b>	Faculty	<b>Effective Date</b>	<a href="#">April 25, 2024</a>
<b>Responsible Office</b>	Office of the Provost/Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs	<b>Last Review</b>	

### 1.0 PURPOSE

**1.1** To foster excellence in teaching and to support the University's educational mission, each full-time faculty member at Utah Valley University is comprehensively evaluated on teaching, scholarship/creative work, service, and compliance with institutional policies and other written institutional expectations as conveyed by supervisory authorities in accordance with UVU and the Utah System of Higher Education (USHE) policies.

**1.2** This policy establishes types of non-disciplinary supervisor feedback that can be used throughout the year, an annual goal-setting process, an annual review process, and processes for clarifications and appeals.

### 2.0 REFERENCES

**2.1** *Duties and Responsibilities of the President of a Degree-granting Institution of Higher Education—Approval by Board of Trustees*, Utah Code § 53B-2-106.1

**2.2** Utah Board of Higher Education Policy R481 *Academic Freedom, Professional Responsibility, Tenure, Termination, and Post-Tenure Review*

**2.3** UVU Policy 165 *Discrimination, Harassment, and Affirmative Action*

**2.4** [UVU Policy 635, Faculty Rights and Professional Responsibilities](#)

**2.42.5** UVU Policy 641 *Salaried Faculty Workload—Academic Year*

**2.52.6** UVU Policy 648 *Faculty Personnel Reduction*

**2.62.7** UVU Policy 649 *Faculty ~~Remediation~~, Sanction, and Dismissal [for Cause](#)*

### 3.0 DEFINITIONS



# UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

## Policies and Procedures

Page 3 of 22

**3.1 Academic year:** The Fall and Spring semesters combined.

**3.2 Annual review reporting period:** The annual review reporting period begins the first day of summer term each year and ends at the start of summer term the following year. Faculty who do not perform work for the University during the summer will report only on their work performed during the academic year.

**3.3 Annual goal-setting template:** A template supplied by Academic Affairs for use during the annual goal-setting process.

**3.4 Annual review template:** A template supplied by Academic Affairs for use during the annual review process.

**3.5 Compliance:** Adherence to policies and other written institutional expectations as conveyed by supervisory authorities per UVU and USHE policies.

**3.6 Faculty addendum:** An optional document submitted by the faculty member after the annual review meeting that asks questions about the supervisor's evaluation or that provides additional information or explanation regarding their performance.

**3.7 Faculty member:** For the purposes of this policy, the terms *faculty* and *faculty member* mean an employee hired into a full-time, benefits-eligible faculty position, whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track (e.g., lecturer, appointment in residence, visiting faculty/scholar, or similar).

**3.8 Notice of improvement needed (NOIN):** A non-[disciplinary sanction](#) type of feedback regarding a minor or first-time performance issue that includes a plan developed by a faculty member and their supervisor.

**3.9 Performance:** The faculty member's actions in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work as applicable, service as applicable, and compliance with policies and other written institutional expectations as conveyed by supervisory authorities.

**3.10 Professional Improvement Plan (PIP):** A non-[disciplinary sanction](#) type of feedback regarding a more serious or repeated minor performance issue or clear violation of policy that includes a plan developed by a faculty member and their supervisor.

**3.11 Post-tenure review criteria:** ~~Program/department criteria used in a post-tenure review that describe the minimum performance requirements of a tenured faculty member.~~



**3.123.11 Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) criteria:** Program/department criteria that establish expectations for teaching, scholarship/creative work, and service for the purposes of retention, tenure, and promotion.

**3.133.12 Second-level supervisor:** For a faculty member, the second-level supervisor is the dean or associate dean. For a department chair, the second-level supervisor is the Provost.

~~3.14 Self-evaluation: The portion of the annual review process completed by the faculty member in which they evaluate their performance in the previous annual review reporting period.~~

3.13 Self-reflection: The portion of the annual review process completed by the faculty member in which they reflect on their performance in the previous annual review reporting period.

**3.153.14 Supervisor:** The direct or first-level supervisor of a faculty member. For most faculty, the supervisor is the department chair. If the faculty member is a department chair or was a department chair during the previous year, the dean or associate dean is the supervisor for the purpose of conducting the annual reviews.

**3.163.15 Supervisor addendum:** A document submitted by the supervisor in response to a faculty addendum which indicates whether the supervisor is making a change to their evaluation of the faculty member as a result of the faculty addendum.

**3.173.16 Supervisor evaluation:** The portion of the annual review process completed by the supervisor in which they evaluate the performance of the faculty member in the previous annual review reporting period.

## 4.0 POLICY

### 4.1 Policy Statement and Scope

**4.1.1** This policy establishes the following:

**4.1.1.1** Types of non-disciplinary supervisor feedback that can occur throughout the year and during the annual review process;

**4.1.1.2** An annual goal-setting process that facilitates yearly faculty planning and supervisor guidance about those plans;

**4.1.1.3** An annual review process in which the faculty member and supervisor formally evaluate faculty performance from the previous year in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative work as applicable, service as applicable, and compliance with policies and other written institutional expectations conveyed by supervisory authorities; and



#### 4.1.1.4 Processes for clarifications and appeals.

### 4.2 Supervisor Feedback Levels

4.2.1 Supervisors may use three levels of non-disciplinary sanction feedback for faculty members: (a) guidance, (b) notice of improvement needed (NOIN), and (c) professional improvement plan (PIP).

4.2.1.1 *Guidance* is provided to faculty about how they can develop and improve professionally or, if they are already performing at an acceptable or high level, how they can maintain or enhance that level of performance. Supervisors must document guidance given as part of the annual goal-setting process.

~~4.2.1.2~~ *Notice of Improvement Needed* is used when a supervisor becomes aware of a minor or first-time performance issue ~~for which a NOIN would be appropriate.~~

#### 4.2.1.2

4.2.1.3 *Professional Improvement Plan* is used when a supervisor becomes aware of a more serious or repeated minor performance issue ~~for which a PIP would be appropriate.~~ Faculty members with two or more performance issues that resulted in PIPs during a five-year period may be subject to discipline.

#### ~~4.2.1.4~~

### 4.3 Annual Goal Setting Requirements

4.3.1 Faculty members create goals once a year for the upcoming annual review reporting period.

4.3.2 Faculty should set professional goals, which will help them meet expectations and pursue meaningful activities and opportunities during the annual review reporting period. Goals should focus on high-stakes and high-level accomplishments that the faculty member intends to achieve. A strong starting point for defining high-stakes goals are the departmental RTP criteria and UVU Policies [632 Advancement in Academic Rank](#), [635 Faculty Responsibilities and Professional Responsibilities](#), [637 Faculty Tenure](#), and [638 Post-Tenure Review](#).

4.3.3 Goals should incorporate feedback from supervisor, peers, students, and others with knowledge of the faculty member's performance. Goals may be modified during the year as needs change and opportunities arise. Faculty members may consult with their faculty mentor, immediate supervisor, and the department RTP committee as they develop their annual goals.



## UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

### Policies and Procedures

Page 6 of 22

**4.3.4** If a faculty member holds administrative, professional, or other unique assignments during the annual review reporting period, those assignments should be included in their goals. Faculty members who have an appointment to two departments must submit their goals to both supervisors.

#### **4.3.4**

**4.3.5** Supervisors must review and provide guidance regarding faculty member goals. When a faculty member modifies their goals, the supervisor will again be able to review and provide guidance on the modified goals. Supervisors will not be held responsible for the goals set by faculty members.

#### **4.3.5**

**4.4.3.6** Faculty members will not be held responsible for their supervisor's failure to offer guidance on their goals, provided that the faculty member submitted their goals on time.

#### **4.5.4.4 Annual Goal-Setting Template**

**4.5.14.4.1** Academic Affairs creates and maintains the annual goal-setting template within the institutionally adopted system. At a minimum, it contains the following: (1) a place for faculty members to set goals for teaching, scholarship/creative work as applicable, service as applicable, and compliance; (2) a place for the supervisor to provide guidance regarding those goals; (3) a place for faculty members to modify their goals during the annual review reporting period, if necessary; and (4) a place for the supervisor to provide guidance regarding modified goals. Supervisors and faculty members must use the annual goal-setting template.

**4.5.24.4.2** The Faculty Senate, Academic Affairs Council, and relevant technological support staff shall be given the opportunity to provide input on the goal template each time [Academic Affairs](#) considers revisions.

#### **4.6.4.5 Annual Review Requirements**

**4.6.14.5.1** Consistent with the principles established in UVU Policy 641 *Salaried Faculty Workload—Academic Year*, expectations of a faculty member's performance correspond to their formally tracked and not formally tracked workload.

**4.6.24.5.2** At a minimum, an annual review must address the following: (1) the expectation inferred from department/program RTP criteria for teaching, scholarship/creative work as applicable, and service as applicable, but reflecting what might reasonably be accomplished in a single year in light of the faculty member's workload; (2) compliance with policies and other



## UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

### Policies and Procedures

Page 7 of 22

written institutional expectations conveyed by supervisory authorities, and (3) the details specified in a NOIN or PIP, when such exist.

4.6.34.5.3 The supervisor is not expected to make findings or conclusions regarding faculty member compliance with policies and other written institutional expectations outside their purview. In these cases, the supervisor will rely on information from the responsible institutional office.

4.6.44.5.4 Faculty will not be held responsible for their supervisor's failure to complete the supervisor evaluation or conduct the annual review meeting, provided the faculty member submitted their self-evaluation on time and submitted their self-reflection on time and made themselves available for a meeting with the supervisor.

4.6.54.5.5 When the supervisor is a department chair, they may delegate preparation of the supervisor evaluation of faculty to an associate or assistant chair or to the faculty member's program coordinator. When the supervisor is a dean, they may delegate preparation of the written supervisor evaluation of faculty to an associate or assistant dean.

4.6.64.5.6 The supervisor and faculty member must meet to discuss the faculty member's performance in the previous year and their respective evaluations of the performance. A supervisor cannot delegate the annual review meeting. The individual who prepared the evaluation should attend the meeting if the supervisor delegated that responsibility. Either the faculty member or the supervisor may request that Human Resources or Faculty Relations attend the meeting to support or document the proceedings of the meeting. This meeting should be in-person under normal circumstances. If special consideration is necessary for extenuating circumstances, such arrangements should be negotiated between faculty and supervisor in advance.

4.6.7 The annual review is included in the faculty personnel file.





#### **4.7.4.6 Annual Review Rating Scale**

**4.7.1** Faculty performance in each of the annual review performance areas (teaching, scholarship/creative works, service, and compliance) is rated using one of five two ratings:

##### **4.6.1**

**4.7.1.1** *Does Not Meet Expectations*, which is used when a faculty member must significantly improve their performance in order to meet the expectations of their job.

##### **4.6.1.1**

~~4.7.1.2 Faculty members whose performance warrants or unremediated a PIP during any portion of an annual review period or who have a PIP during any portion of the annual review period must be given a Does Not Meet Expectations rating for the relevant area(s).~~

~~In order for a faculty member who had a PIP during any portion of the annual review period to receive an overall Meets Expectations during the annual rereview period, that faculty member must have who have a completed and resolved PIP that is unrelated to any other PIP during the last two years. yea~~

~~4.7.1.3 Sometimes Meets Expectations, which is used when a faculty member must improve their performance in order to meet the expectations of their job. Faculty members whose performance warrants a NOIN during any portion of an annual review period or who have a NOIN during any portion of the annual review period must be given a maximum rating of Sometimes Meets Expectations rating for the relevant area(s).~~

**4.7.2** *Meets Expectations*, which is used when a faculty member consistently meets the expectations of their job and there are no areas of concern. Most faculty members at the University will receive a rating of Meets Expectations.

##### **4.6.1.2**

~~4.6.2 Faculty members who have an uncompleted or unremediated behavior that warrants a PIP must be given a Does Not Meet Expectations rating for the relevant area(s). In order for a faculty member who had a PIP during any portion of the annual review period to receive an overall Meets Expectations, that faculty member must have a completed and resolved PIP that is unrelated to any other PIP during the last two years.~~

**4.7.3** Annual review must be tied to portfolio activity reports and student ratings of instruction, not statement of accomplishments alone.

##### **4.6.3**





4.7.4 The rating of a faculty member who has completed a PIP during an annual review cycle should be based on their overall performance in that area, including the fact that they successfully completed the PIP.

#### 4.6.4

~~4.7.4.1 Sometimes Exceeds Expectations, which is used when a faculty member regularly exceeds the expectations of their job and there are no areas of concern.~~

~~4.7.4.2 Exceeds Expectations, which is used when a faculty member has consistently exceeded all expectations of their job by a significant margin and there are no areas of concern. This rating is reserved for a small minority of faculty and is used to highlight truly exceptional faculty performance.~~

~~4.7.4.3 is ranked Expectations.~~

#### 4.7.4.4

May not receive Meets Expectations if faculty member is on or has an unresolved uncompleted PIP in Teaching; and

#### 4.6.5

~~4.6.6 M~~The faculty member may not receive Meets Expectations if the faculty member has is on or has an uncompleted sanction.

### **4.8 Faculty Annual Review Template and Rubric**

#### 4.7

~~4.9~~4.7.1 Academic Affairs creates and maintains the faculty annual review template within the institutionally adopted system. At a minimum, this template~~#~~ contains the following: (1) a place for a faculty member's self-~~evaluation-reflection~~ of their teaching, scholarship/creative work as applicable, service as applicable, and compliance; (2) a place for narrative and annual goals and related comments; (3) a place for the supervisor evaluation; (4) a place for addenda-NOINs, PIPs and sanctions if any needed; (5) a place for the second-level supervisor to sign off and provide optional written comments, if desired; and (6) a place for additional review and an appeal if needed.- Supervisors and faculty members must use the annual review template.

~~4.9.1~~ The Faculty Senate, Academic Affairs Council, and relevant technological support staff shall be given the opportunity to provide input on the annual review template each time Academic Affairs considers revisions.



#### 4.7.2

~~4.9.2~~ At the discretion of the dean, a college/school may elect to use an annual review rubric as a supplement to department/program RTP criteria to (1) make more explicit the criteria by which faculty will be evaluated in their annual reviews and (2) ensure equality and fairness in the evaluation of faculty members across the college. If a dean does not choose to use an annual review rubric for the college/school, then departments, at the discretion of the department chair and faculty and in cooperation with the dean, may elect to use an annual review rubric as a supplement to the department/program RTP criteria. Annual review rubrics should be based on and consistent with relevant RTP criteria and must be compatible with the annual review template.

#### 4.7.3

#### 4.10.4.8 Eligibility for Merit Pay

~~4.10.14.8.1~~ All full-time faculty in good standing are eligible for merit pay.

~~4.8.2~~ Merit awards are limited to the top 25% of full-time faculty, excluding placeholder lecturers, in the school or college.

~~4.10.24.8.3~~ In order to be in good standing for merit, a faculty member must have met the following:

~~4.10.34.8.4~~ Must have met expectations in all three areas if tenured or tenure-track, and have met expectations in teaching ~~and maintaining professional development~~ if non-tenure track;

~~4.10.44.8.5~~ Must have completed all mandatory trainings and conflicts of interest disclosures (and have a conflicts management plan, if applicable); and

~~4.10.5~~ Must not be on an incomplete NOIN, PIP, or discipline.

#### Eligibility for Merit Pay

All full time faculty in good standing are eligible for merit pay.

In order to be in good standing for merit, a faculty member must have met the following:

Must have met expectations in all three areas if tenured or tenure track, and have met expectations in teaching and maintaining professional development if non-tenure track;

Must have completed all mandatory trainings and conflicts of interest (and have a conflicts management plan, if applicable); and



Must not be on an incomplete NOIN, PIP, or discipline.

#### 4.11 Post-Tenure Review

4.11.1 A post-tenure review shall be conducted by the Provost or designee and a committee of tenured faculty member peers, including at least two individuals appointed from either a different department or a different degree-granting institution than the tenured faculty member going through post-tenure review, or both. These committee members shall be appointed by the appropriate vice president at the different degree-granting institution in consultation with the faculty member's department chair.

4.11.2 This post-tenure review shall consist of a comprehensive review of the tenured faculty member's performance over the previous five years. This review shall include an assessment of

4.11.2.1 teaching, including student evaluations, for all courses taught

4.11.2.2 the quality of the tenured faculty member's scholarly research

4.11.2.3 service to the profession, school, and community

4.11.2.4 annual performance reviews

4.11.2.5 intellectual property owned wholly or partly by, or commercialization efforts attributed to, the tenured faculty member

4.11.2.6 the tenured faculty member's compliance with the degree-granting institution's policies regarding the responsibilities and ethical obligations of faculty members, and

4.11.2.7 any improvement plans for underperformance

4.11.3 If, following a post-tenure review, the committee conducting the review determines that a tenured faculty member does not meet the standards established by the University, the department chair in collaboration with the faculty member shall create a remediation plan to address deficiencies and a timeline by which the tenured faculty member is expected to address the deficiencies. If the faculty member refuses to collaborate, the department chair creates the remediation plan as a directive.

4.11.4 A tenured faculty member who fails to address deficiencies as described in section 4.8.3 may be subject to disciplinary action by the University, including dismissal for cause, subject to the appeals process described in Policy 649 *Faculty Remediation, Sanction, and Dismissal*.



# UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

## Policies and Procedures

Page 12 of 22

~~4.11.5 If the President, in consultation with the Board of Trustees, does not dismiss a tenured faculty member who fails to address deficiencies, the President shall justify in writing to the Board of Higher Education why the tenured faculty member is not being dismissed.~~

### ~~4.12 Annual Report to the Board of Higher Education~~

~~4.12.1 The President shall provide an annual report to the Board of Higher Education, no later than October 1 of each year, with the following information:~~

~~4.12.1.1 the number of post-tenure reviews that took place at the University in the previous year;~~

~~4.12.1.2 an analysis of scores from post-tenure reviews that took place in the previous year with personal information redacted;~~

~~4.12.1.3 the number of post-tenure reviews from the previous year that resulted in a remediation plan;~~

~~4.12.1.4 a qualitative summary of the types of remediation plans created in the previous year, including an average timeline by which tenured faculty members are expected to address deficiencies; and~~

~~4.12.1.5 a summary of written justifications described in section 4.8.5, if any, with personal information redacted.~~

### ~~4.13 Eligibility for Merit Pay~~

### ~~4.14~~

~~4.15 To be eligible for faculty merit pay, a faculty member shall be tenured; in good standing according to the *Guidelines for Merit Awards* as maintained by the Office of the Provost; and in compliance with university policies and procedures.~~

### ~~4.16~~

~~4.17 A faculty member's annual performance evaluations serve as the primary indicator for determining qualification for merit pay. Qualification for merit pay shall be primarily based on exceeding expectations in teaching performance, and at least meeting or exceeding expectations in scholarship and/or creative works and service.~~

~~4.18 The Office of the Provost and Faculty Senate shall develop and maintain the *Guidelines for Merit Awards*, which outlines the specific requirements for merit pay and stipulates the current~~



~~base salary increase amount to be awarded to faculty members who meet those requirements. The guidelines shall be approved by President's Council and shall be published and accessible on the Faculty Senate webpage.~~

~~4.19 4 All tenured faculty who complete their annual review by established guidelines shall be considered for merit pay. An eligible faculty member must submit a *Merit Request Form*. The *Merit Request Form* shall be available at all times on the university employee portal under the faculty section. The faculty member's department chair, college/school merit pay committee, and dean shall evaluate and provide a recommendation on the submitted *Merit Request Form*. The dean shall submit final merit pay recommendations to the SVPAA for review and approval. The decision of the Provost is final.~~

~~4.20 After each five-year cycle, the Provost or designee, in consultation with Faculty Senate, shall review the merit pay system, along with the *Guidelines for Merit Awards*, to evaluate its ongoing role and efficacy in achieving the university's mission and to propose to President's Council any revision to the base salary increase amount.~~

#### 4.20.1-14.8.6

## 5.0 PROCEDURES

### 5.1 Guidance Procedures and Timeline

**5.1.1** Supervisors must give each faculty member guidance at least once a year during the annual goal-setting process. Guidance can be given during onboarding, when mentoring a faculty member, and at other times throughout the year.

### 5.2 NOIN and PIP Procedures and Timeline

**5.2.1** When a faculty member falls short in performance on a minor or first-time issue (NOIN) or a more serious or repeated issue (PIP), the supervisor will inform them of the issue and begin the process of developing a NOIN or PIP with them to help them improve. The supervisor will inform the faculty member as soon as they become aware of an issue, regardless of whether the issue arises during the year or during the annual review process.

**5.2.2** When a supervisor develops a NOIN or PIP with a faculty member, they are responsible for (1) clearly indicating how the faculty member is not meeting expectations; (2) establishing a plan with the faculty member to help them meet expectations; (3) offering reasonable resources or training for the faculty member if needed and consistent with established practices; (4) setting a



# UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

## Policies and Procedures

Page 14 of 22

timeline by which the faculty member must meet expectations that is as short as feasible but no longer than 12 months from the time the NOIN or PIP is finalized; and (5) identifying how the faculty member's performance will be documented for the duration of the NOIN or PIP.

**5.2.3** After a supervisor informs a faculty member of an issue that warrants a NOIN or PIP, the collaborative process begins between the faculty member and the supervisor to develop the NOIN or PIP. If a faculty member is not collaborative or responsive, the supervisor can develop the NOIN or PIP and issue it as a directive.

**5.2.4** NOINs and PIPs, when they exist, are included in the faculty personnel file and must be included in the annual review for the annual review period during which they were in effect.

**5.2.5** When developing a NOIN or PIP, supervisors and faculty members should respond substantively to the other within two business days to ensure timely resolution.

NOIN and PIP Timeline	
NOIN – Total time to develop	20 business days
PIP – Total time to develop	40 business days

### 5.3 ~~NOIN or~~ PIP Appeal Timeline

**5.3.1** A ~~NOIN or~~ PIP may be appealed via additional review. ~~A NOIN is not appealable.~~

**5.3.2** If a faculty member requests an additional review at the conclusion of the process of developing the ~~NOIN or~~ PIP, ~~an ad hoc committee will~~ the dean or designee will complete an evaluation appeal. ~~In cases in which the department chair requests an additional review, the deputy provost will complete an evaluation appeal. The committee's recommendation is then sent to the faculty member's second-level supervisor to make the final decision]. The dean's or deputy provost's decision decision outcome arrived at through this process of additional review is final. Both the ad hoc dean's appeal report and the recommendation will be kept in the annual review file in the university-approved system.~~

**5.3.3** The dean may ask for additional information to help make a final decision.

~~5.3.25.3.4~~ The dean may determine to keep the PIP as is, change or eliminate the PIP, recommend a NOIN instead, or recommend additional sanctionsdiscipline.

~~5.3.35.3.5~~ If the ~~ad hoc committee~~ dean or designee determines that changes are to be made to the ~~NOIN or~~ PIP, the supervisor must complete the changes.

<del>NOIN or</del> PIP Appeal Timeline
--



The <del>ad hoc committee</del> <u>dean or designee</u> must render their decision	20 business days
If there are to be changes to the <del>NOIN</del> <u>or PIP</u> , the changes must be made	10 business days

## 5.4 Annual Goal-Setting Procedures and Timeline

**5.4.1** Each faculty member sets goals for the upcoming annual review reporting period in accordance with the details set forth in this policy.

**5.4.2** The supervisor reviews the faculty member's goals and provides guidance on those goals in accordance with the details set forth in this policy.

**5.4.3** ~~Either the faculty member or supervisor can request a meeting to discuss the goals or guidance.~~

Annual Goal-Setting Timeline	
Faculty submit goals for the upcoming annual review reporting period.	1) The system opens for faculty on April 1. 2) Goals are due no later than <del>September</del> <u>May 31</u> 15.
Supervisors review goals and provide guidance on goals.	1) Supervisors can review goals and provide guidance as soon as faculty share their goals with the supervisor, beginning on <del>April 1</del> <u>June 1</u> . 2) Supervisor review of goals and guidance must be completed no later than <del>October</del> <u>August</u> 15.
Faculty can modify their goals at any time during the annual review reporting period. <u>Faculty should notify their supervisor of their modified goals, but do not need to submit the modified goals in the template. When they do so, the supervisor will be notified and should review and provide guidance about the modified goals in a timely manner.</u>	

## 5.5 Annual Review Procedures and Timeline

**5.5.15.6** Faculty members must provide a self-~~evaluation~~ reflection of their performance in the previous annual review reporting period. ~~The self-evaluation includes a written component and a rating for each of the annual review performance areas.~~

**5.5.25.7** If a faculty member holds administrative, professional, or other unique assignments during the annual review reporting period, those assignments shall be included in the self-~~evaluation~~ relection. ~~Faculty members who have an appointment to two departments must submit their self-evaluation to both supervisors.~~





## UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

### Policies and Procedures

Page 16 of 22

5.5.35.7.1 Supervisors must provide a supervisor evaluation of faculty performance in the previous annual review reporting period. The supervisor evaluation includes a written component and a rating for each of the annual review performance areas.

5.5.45.7.2 The supervisor and faculty member must meet to discuss the faculty member's performance in the previous year and their respective evaluations of the performance.

5.5.55.7.3 Second-level supervisors sign off on annual reviews before they are finalized and can provide written comments if desired.



Annual Review Timeline	
Faculty prepare and submit their self- <del>reflection</del> evaluation.	<del>1)</del> The system opens for faculty on April 1. <del>2)</del> Self- <del>evaluations</del> - <del>reflections</del> are due by May 31 <del>0</del> .
Supervisors prepare and submit the supervisor evaluation.	1) Supervisors can review self- <del>evaluations</del> <del>reflections</del> and submit supervisor evaluations soon as faculty share their self- <del>evaluations</del> <del>reflections</del> with the supervisor, beginning on April 1. 2) Supervisor evaluations are due by August 15.
Supervisors conduct annual review meetings.	1) September 1 is the deadline for annual review meetings with faculty who are submitting midterm and tenure review portfolios on September 15. 2) November 30 is the deadline for annual review meetings with all faculty.
Second-level supervisors sign off on annual reviews and provide written comments, if desired.	1) Second-level supervisors can read annual reviews and provide comments as soon as the annual review meeting is conducted. 2) Second-level supervisor must read annual reviews and comments are due by December 15.

#### **5.65.8 Addendum and Appeal Procedures and Timeline**

**5.6.15.8.1** Annual reviews may be clarified via addendums and appealed via an additional review.

**5.6.2** If a faculty member would like to ask questions about the supervisor's evaluation or provide additional information or explanation regarding their performance, they may do so at any time before or during the annual review meeting. If a faculty member would still like to ask questions or provide additional information or explanation after the annual review meeting, they may do so via a faculty addendum.

#### **5.8.2**

**5.6.3** If a faculty member submits an addendum, the supervisor must also submit an addendum. At a minimum, the supervisor addendum must contain a statement of whether the supervisor has changed anything about their evaluation of the faculty member as a result of the faculty addendum.

#### **5.8.3**



**5.8.4** If a faculty member has completed the addendum process and believes that there is (1) an error of fact in their annual review or (2) an evaluation that is inconsistent with the RTP criteria or the annual review rubric (if one is in use), the faculty member can request an appeal review.

**5.8.5** ~~The dean or designee will evaluate the appeal, and their recommendation is then sent to the faculty member's second-level supervisor to then make the final decision.~~ An ad hoc committee will complete review the an-evaluation appeal, and then make the final decision.

**5.8.6** Both the ~~ad hoc dean or designee~~ appeal report and the recommendation decision will be kept in the annual review file.

~~5.6.4~~ The outcome arrived at through this process of appeal review is final.

~~5.1 Merit Pay~~ Based on guidance from the Provost's office, deans will determine merit pay awardees and the amounts in collaboration with department chairs.

~~5.1.1 Deans must submit a list of their faculty receiving merit pay and the amount the faculty member is receiving to the deputy provost for review.~~

The deputy provost may not add faculty or significantly alter the amounts awarded but may eliminate any faculty member who is found to not be in good standing.

~~5.1.25.8.7 Not receiving merit pay or disagreeing with the amount of merit pay may not be appealed.~~

Annual Review Addendum and Appeal Timeline	
Deadline for a faculty addendum after the annual review meeting	10 business days
Deadline for a supervisor addendum after receiving a faculty addendum	10 business days
Deadline for a faculty member to appeal their annual review after receiving the supervisor addendum	10 business days
The <del>ad hoc committee made by the Faculty Senate president in cooperation with Academic Affairs and the applicable Dean's office</del> must render their decision	20 business days
If there are to be changes to the annual review or supervisor addendum, the changes must be made	<u>10 b10</u> business days

## 5.9 Merit Pay

**5.9.1** Based on guidance from the Provost's office, deans will determine merit pay awardees and the amounts in collaboration with department chairs.



# UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

## Policies and Procedures

Page 19 of 22

5.9.2 Deans must submit a list of their faculty receiving merit pay and the amount the faculty member is receiving to the deputy provost for review.

5.9.3 The deputy provost may not add faculty or significantly alter the amounts awarded but may eliminate any faculty member who is found to not be in good standing.

5.1 Not receiving merit pay or disagreeing with the amount of merit pay may not be appealed Faculty cannot appeal the decision to be awarded merit pay or the amount of merit pay awarded. **Merit Pay**

Based on guidance from the Provost's office, deans will determine merit pay awardees and the amounts in collaboration with department chairs.

Deans must submit a list of their faculty receiving merit pay and the amount the faculty member is receiving to the deputy provost for review.

The deputy provost may not add faculty or significantly alter the amounts awarded but may eliminate any faculty member who is found to not be in good standing.

Not receiving merit pay or disagreeing with the amount of merit pay may not be appealed.



## 5.2 Submission of Merit Request

~~5.2.1 The department chair confirms the tenured faculty member's eligibility, and then reviews and signs the *Merit Request Form*. If the chair approves the request, the chair submits it to the college/school merit pay committee. If the department chair does not approve the request, the chair must submit to the college/school merit pay committee the signed *Merit Request Form* and a signed, written memo explaining why, based on the approved *Guidelines for Merit Awards*, the faculty member is not eligible for merit pay. The chair's recommendation of approval or non-approval must be submitted by the date specified in the *Guidelines for Merit Awards*.~~

## 5.3 College/School Merit Pay Committee

~~5.3.1 Each college/school shall establish a merit pay committee (see section 3.3). Each department shall elect, by a majority vote of tenured faculty, a faculty member to represent the department on the committee. Committee members shall serve three-year terms. The committee shall annually elect a chair from amongst its members. The chair serves as a point of contact for the committee and is responsible for delivering all materials to the respective parties in accordance with this policy.~~

~~5.3.2 If a committee member submits a *Merit Request* for review, that member shall recuse themselves from the vote. The member's department shall elect another tenured faculty member to vote on the committee member's *Merit Request*.~~

~~5.3.3 The college/school merit pay committee shall review submitted merit pay requests in accordance with the *Guidelines for Merit Awards*. Merit pay recommendations (supportive or non-supportive) are determined by a majority vote. The committee shall provide its written review and recommendation concerning merit pay to the faculty member who requested a merit pay award.~~

~~5.3.4 If a faculty member disagrees with the committee recommendation, the faculty member may supply additional information in writing to the committee for reconsideration based on the committee's initial decision. The committee shall determine its merit pay recommendation by a majority vote. The committee shall attach a report of all their proceedings and faculty submissions to the faculty member's *Merit Request Form* along with its merit pay recommendation.~~

~~5.3.5 By the date specified in *Guidelines for Merit Awards*, the committee shall submit the *Merit Request* and final recommendations to the dean. If the dean has any questions or concerns regarding the committee's recommendation, the dean shall inform the faculty member of those concerns in writing by the date specified in *Guidelines for Merit Awards*. The dean shall submit their recommendation to the faculty member by the established deadline.~~



# UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

## Policies and Procedures

Page 21 of 22

~~5.3.6 The faculty member may submit a written response to the dean's concerns by the established deadline. The dean shall attach their written concerns and the faculty member's response to the faculty member's *Merit Request Form* and submit the materials to the Provost by the established deadline.~~

### 5.4 Final Decision

~~5.4.1 By the dates specified in *Guidelines for Merit Awards*, the Provost or designee shall deliver a written decision based on the *Guidelines for Merit Pay* to the faculty member. The decision of the Provost is final.~~

~~5.4.2 If a faculty member believes they have been wrongfully denied a merit pay, they may submit a complaint in accordance with UVU Policy 326 *Workplace Conduct*.~~

### 5.5 Dates and Deadlines

~~5.5.1 Deadlines and associated dates will be established in the *Guidelines for Merit Pay*.~~

POLICY HISTORY		
Date of Last Formal Review: Click here to enter a date.		
Due Date of Next Review: Click here to enter a date.		
Date of Last Action	Action Taken	Authorizing Entity
June 22, 2017	New policy approved.	UVU Board of Trustees
March 31, 2022	Revised policy approved.	UVU Board of Trustees
April 25, 2024	Compliance change, mandated by HB 438, Utah Legislature, approved.	UVU President's Council
May 6, 2024	Compliance change ratified.	UVU Board of Trustees
	<a href="#">Revised policy approved</a>	<a href="#">UVU Board of Trustees</a>



**POLICY 633/654 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Policy Number and Title:** Policy 633 *Faculty Performance Evaluation and Feedback* (revision)/Policy 654 *Faculty Merit Pay* (deletion)

**Date:** March 27, 2025

**Sponsor:** Wayne Vaught

**Steward(s):** Kat Brown

**Policy Process:** Regular

**Policy Action:** Revision—Limited Scope

**Policy Office Editor:** Amanda Cooke

**Embedded Attorney:** [Click here to enter the name of the embedded attorney.](#)

**Issues/Concerns (including fiscal, legal, and compliance impact):**

The faculty self-evaluation and five different categories for annual review ratings have caused much confusion. The current merit pay system is too complicated, involves too many people, and grants access to personnel files that may not be appropriate. We have simplified the merit pay process and added that content to Policy 633. This means we can now delete Policy 654 *Faculty Merit Pay*. Additionally, we deleted content from Policy 633 that dealt with post-tenure review because UVU now has a separate Post-Tenure Review policy (Policy 638).

**Suggested Changes:**

We suggest the following **limited scope changes** to **Policy 633**:

**Section 5.5:** Remove self-evaluation and the related actions related to the self-evaluation;

**Section 4.7:** Change annual review ratings scale to two ratings;

**Section 4.7.1.2:** Clarify when a PIP will affect the overall rating, including adding provisions to make clear when certain ratings are required;

**Section 4.9:** Create a space in the annual review template for PIPs and NOINs;

**Sections 4.10, 5.3, and 5.4:** Revise the merit pay sections to better align with the researched norms including decisions regarding awardees and amounts of merit pay is at the discretion of the dean;

**Section 4.11:** Delete post-tenure review language due to the implementation of the new UVU Policy 638 *Post-Tenure Review*.

**Sections 5.3 and 5.6:** Change the appeal process for NOINS and annual reviews

**Section 5.5:** Remove self-evaluation and the related actions related to the self-evaluation;

We also propose the **deletion** of **UVU Policy 654 Faculty Merit Pay** because including merit pay in the annual review policy is more appropriate to illustrate the connection between annual reviews and merit pay.





# UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

## Policies and Procedures

Page 23 of 22

**Requested Approval from President's Council:** Entrance to Stage 2

**Proposed Drafting Committee:** Kathren Brown, Nizhone Meza, Daniel Horns, Cathy Jordan, Evelyn Porter, Jonathan Allred, Laurie Toro, Roxanne Brinkeroff, Doug Gardner, Eric Russell, and Amanda Cooke.

**Target Date for Stage 1 Draft to Enter Stage 2:** 3/27/2025

**Target Date for Board of Trustees Review:** [Click here to enter a date.](#)



# UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

Page 1 of 2

## Policies and Procedures

### EQUITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (EAC) FORM

**Policy Number and Title:** Policy 633 Faculty Performance Evaluation and Feedback

**Sponsor:** Wayne Vaught

**Steward(s):** Kat Brown

**EAC Review:** April 7, 2020

**Owner Review:** [Click here to select the date.](#)

#### UVU Scope (Groups Impacted):

Adult learners

Age (40+)

Color

First-generation student status

Individuals with apparent or non-apparent disabilities

National origin and citizenship status

Pregnancy, pregnancy-related conditions

Race and ethnicity

Religion, spirituality, and worldviews

Sex, gender identity, and gender expression

Sexual orientation

Socioeconomic status

Veteran status (including uniformed military status)

*Note: This form is for internal use only by the EAC and policy owners (sponsors, stewards, and coordinators). This form captures general equity concerns and those that impact the specific groups listed. This form will accompany the Stage 2 draft.*

Section	Groups Impacted	General Equity	Equity Concern	Recommendation	Policy Owner Proposed Solution
5.6.5		X	Section 5.6.5. We are concerned with the ad hoc committee no longer part of the process and the final approval with dean, that there is a potential for too much discretionary power.	We recommend that the drafting committee reconsider giving complete authority of approval to the dean.	

## POLICY APPROVAL PROCESS - STAGE 2

### SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

<b>Policy Title:</b> <a href="#"><i>Faculty Performance Evaluation and Feedback</i></a>	<b>Policy Number:</b> 633/654
<b>Sponsor:</b> Wayne Vaught	<b>Steward:</b> Kat Brown
<b>Presentation to:</b> AAC	<b>Date Presented:</b> April 8, 2025

NOTE: Indicate with X whether the comment is editorial (grammar, punctuation, sentence structure, etc.) or is a substance comment (content, procedure, etc.).

CAMPUS ENTITY	POLICY SECTION	Editorial Comment?	Substance Comment?	CONCERN	SPONSOR/STEWARD RESPONSE
AAC	4.8		X	There is no guidance on procedures for selecting faculty members to receive merit pay	Procedures do not belong in 4.0 (Policy). They belong in 5.0 (Procedure). There will be guidance from the Provost's Office, as stated in the new section 5.7.
	4.8		X	Suggest language be placed in requiring an audit of merit awards each year provided to faculty senate. Audit would not indicate individual names nor amounts received- Would include distribution by gender, rank, if a person received previous year- done by each college/school- add as report evolves. Objectives include ensuring awards are for merit and not salary adjustments or other considerations. Add measures as the committee sees fit. This will also help alleviate concerns that merit is less than transparent under this distribution model.	P&C supervises audits of merit awards.
	3.3, 3.4, 4.1.1.2, 4.1.1.3, etc.		X	The goal setting template and annual review template should be a single template. The processes should also be combined. In some places in the policy draft (such as section 4.7.1) it looks like the policy is going to do this, but in	Due to technology, this is not yet possible. Current language does not prohibit the eventual merging, if possible.

				other sections it does not. The policy should be consistent in this regard.	
	3.14		X	<p><del>“Self-evaluation: The portion of the annual review process completed by the faculty member in which they evaluate their performance in the previous annual review reporting period.”</del> It is proposed that this section be deleted, but it is very important for faculty to evaluate their previous year’s efforts for several reasons: (1) there is inherent value in the reflection, (2) it allows faculty to provide an overview of their year, (3) it allows faculty to provide the larger context for the things found in the Activities portion of Faculty Success, (4) it allows faculty to report on whether they met their goals, and (5) it provides the narrative and evaluative framework for tenure and rank advancement submissions. This evaluation should be a written report about their performance in the previous year. This is different from a self-rating, but the deletion of this section and section 5.5.1 suggests that faculty do not provide anything written about their previous year. This section should not be deleted, but it may be worth considering other labels if “self-evaluation” is unclear. It could be a “faculty written report,” “written review,” “written summary,” or “annual report narrative” or something like that.</p>	We agree that faculty self-reflection would be positive and will include it in the policy.
	3.14		X	In addition to the points made above, limiting faculty analysis to the portfolio activities section alone could add an additional step if faculty must add context into the activities summary for annual review purposes but then need to remove it afterward for RTP purposes	

				(as a continuing record not connected to a specific year).	
	4.2.1.3		X	There is an important distinction that can be made between (1) the performance issue that led to a NOIN or PIP and (2) the non-disciplinary NOIN or PIP. "Faculty members with two or more PIPs in a five-year period may be subject to discipline" confuses the two. Faculty should not be subject to discipline because they had two PIPs, they should be subject to discipline because they had two performance issues that resulted in PIPs. The sentence should read, "Faculty members with two or more <u>performance issues that resulted in PIPs during</u> in a five-year period may be subject to discipline."	The suggested language was added. It now reads: "Faculty members with two or more performance issues that resulted in PIPs during a five-year period may be subject to discipline."
	4.3.4		X	"When a faculty member modifies their goals, <del>they should notify their supervisor the supervisor will again be able to review and provide guidance on the modified goals.</del> " Many faculty goals are fluid, especially related to scholarship. For example, the pandemic shut down many projects but opened up the possibility of others. Scholarly goals may change depending on changing access to data, archives and collections, participants, and invitations to contribute articles and book chapters. Faculty should notify their supervisor if goals change, but this does not need to be built into the Faculty Success workflow.	
	4.4.1		X	<del>"(3) a place for faculty members to modify their goals during the annual review reporting period, if necessary; and (4) a place for the supervisor to</del>	We disagree. These things mentioned are not required by every faculty member in goal setting, but there will be a place available if necessary.

				<del>provide guidance regarding modified goals.</del> Delete this. It is not needed.	
	4.5.4		X	Faculty should submit a self-evaluation. See comments on 3.14.	Addressed.
	4.6.1		X	If the university is going with a two-level rating scale where <i>Meets Expectations</i> is defined as “consistently meeting the expectations of their job and there are no areas of concern,” what is the appropriate description for <i>Does Not Meet Expectations</i> ? The policy current has “a faculty member must significantly improve their performance in order to meet the expectations of their job,” but the description in <i>Sometimes Meets Expectations</i> may be the better descriptor, “a faculty member must improve their performance in order to meet the expectations of their job.”	Deleted “significantly” and added “in order” so it now reads: “when a faculty member must improve their performance in order to meet the expectations of their job.”
	4.6.2		X	The first sentence can be simplified. “Faculty members who have an <del>uncompleted PIP or have un-</del> remediated behavior that warrants a PIP must be given a Does Not Meet Expectations rating for the relevant area(s).”	Addressed.
	4.6.2		X	It is unclear why we would be going back to an overall rating or what the advantage would be for doing so. <del>“In order for a faculty member who had a PIP during any portion of the annual review period to receive an overall Meets Expectations, that faculty member must have a completed and resolved PIP that is unrelated to any other PIP during the last two years.”</del>	Addressed.
	4.6.2		X	“Annual review must be tied to portfolio activity reports <u>and student ratings of</u>	Addressed.

				instruction, not statement of accomplishments alone.”	
	4.6.2		X	It is unclear when faculty should update portfolio activity for annual review purposes. A deadline would be helpful, to provide chairs enough time to complete their portions of the review.	This is a procedural issue and should go in section 5.0.
	4.6.3		X	“The rating of a faculty member who has completed a PIP during an annual review cycle should be based on their overall performance <u>in that area, including the fact that they successfully completed the PIP.</u> ”	Addressed.
	4.6.4		X	It is unclear why we would be going back to an overall rating in addition to the ratings for teaching, scholarship/creative works, and teaching, or what the advantage would be for doing so. <del>“If the teaching category is ranked Does Not Meet Expectations, or two or more areas are ranked Does Not Meet, the faculty member shall receive an overall Does Not Meet Expectations.”</del>	Addressed.
	4.7.1		X	This section appears to combine the annual review and goal templates. That is a good move, but there should be a place for faculty to write a self-evaluation or report about their year. It seems odd that faculty can write their goals for the next year but are not allowed to write about whether they met their goals from the previous year. Remove the strikethrough from “a place for a faculty member’s self-evaluation of their teaching, scholarship/creative work as applicable, service as applicable, and compliance.” As noted above, if “self-evaluation” is confusing another term could be used for the	Addressed.



				faculty member's written account of their previous year's performance.	
	4.8.2		X	<p>"Merit awards are limited to the top 25% of faculty in the school or college in each of the following categories: (1) lecturers (this includes professional-in-residence); (2) tenure-track faculty; and (3) tenured faculty." This is ambiguous. Does this mean that the 25% of faculty number is calculated based on the number of faculty in these categories, or does it mean that merit must be given to 25% of the faculty in each of these categories? Are all lecturers including placeholder lecturers eligible for merit if they continue for a second year because of a failed search?</p>	Changed to "top 25% of full-time faculty, excluding placeholder lecturers in the school or college."
	4.8.4		X	<p>"Must have met expectations in all three areas if tenured or tenure-track," Note that eligibility for merit pay makes no reference to the overall rating, which is a good thing. There is no reason to have the overall rating.</p> <p>"and have met expectations in teaching <del>and maintaining professional development</del> if non-tenure track." Professional development is a well-established part of teaching. It is not an area that is rated separately in annual reviews. It is misleading as written.</p>	Addressed.
	5.4 and 5.5		X	These section should be combined and the headings and tables should be adjusted accordingly.	We disagree.
	5.4.3		X	<del>"Either the faculty member or supervisor can request a meeting to discuss the Faculty goals or and supervisor guidance can be discussed in the annual review meeting."</del>	We eliminated 5.4.3 since it is implied in 5.4.2.
	5.4 table 2 <sup>nd</sup> row		X	The first item isn't needed. Recommendation to delete. The	We left it in to clarify that the report is not open year-round.

				deadline for completing the review is the important part. <del>“Supervisors can review goals and provide guidance as soon as faculty share their goals with the supervisor, beginning on June 1.”</del>	
	5.4 table 3 <sup>rd</sup> row		X	“Faculty can modify their goals at any time during the annual review reporting period. <u>Faculty should notify their supervisor of their modified goals, but do not need to submit the modified goals in the template.</u> <del>When they do so, the supervisor will be notified and should review and provide guidance about the modified goals in a timely manner.</del> ” See comments on 4.3.4. What is possible in Faculty Success?	Addressed.
	5.5.1 (currently strikethrough)		X	“5.5.1 Faculty members must provide a self-evaluation of their performance in the previous annual review reporting period. <del>The self-evaluation includes a written component and a rating for each of the annual review performance areas.</del> ” Keep the reference to the self-evaluation or use another term. Delete the reference to the self-rating.	Addressed.
	5.5		X	“If a faculty member holds administrative, professional, or other unique assignments during the annual review reporting period, those assignments shall be included in the self-evaluation.” The first sentence should be retained.  <del>“Faculty members who have an appointment to two departments must submit their self-evaluation to both supervisors.”</del> If this is being deleted, the similar wording in 4.3.3 about goals should also be deleted.	Addressed.

	5.5 table 1 <sup>st</sup> row			This row should not be deleted. There needs to be a deadline for faculty to have their annual review materials ready. Change “self-evaluation” to another term if that is the issue. The deadline should be the same as the deadline for goals (May 31).	We changed evaluation to reflection and the date to May 31.
	5.6.5		X	“The dean’s <del>or</del> designee will complete an evaluation appeal, and their recommendation is then sent to the faculty member’s second-level supervisor to make the final decision.” For the vast majority of faculty, the dean is the second-level supervisor. This should be modified as suggested for clarity.	Suggestion noted, and changed language to “The dean will review the appeal and make the final decision.”
	5.6.6		X	“Both the <del>dean or designee</del> appeal report and the recommendation will be kept in the annual review file.” This edit addresses the same issue as the edit for 5.6.5 above. It also simplifies the sentence.	Addressed, though changed “recommendation” to “decision.”
	5.7.3		X	“Faculty cannot appeal the decision to be awarded merit pay <del>of</del> <u>or</u> the amount of merit pay awarded.”	Fixed the “f” to an “r” to read “or” instead of “of”.

<b>Policy Title: Faculty Performance Evaluation &amp; Feedback</b>		<b>Policy Number: 633</b>
<b>Sponsor: Wayne Vaught</b>	<b>Steward: Kathren Brown</b>	
<b>Presentation to: Faculty Senate</b>		<b>Date Presented: April 29, 2025</b>

NOTE: Indicate with X whether the comment is editorial (grammar, punctuation, sentence structure, etc.) or is a substance comment (content, procedure, etc.).

<b>CAMPUS ENTITY</b>	<b>POLICY SECTION</b>	<b>Editorial Comment ?</b>	<b>Substance Comment ?</b>	<b>CONCERN</b>	<b>SPONSOR/STEWARD RESPONSE</b>
Faculty Senate	3.8, 3.10, 4.8.5		X	While 3.8 and 3.10 refer to them as non-disciplinary, making faculty with an active PIP or NOIN ineligible for merit pay (4.8.5) by default makes these disciplinary in nature. Recommend removing non-disciplinary from the definition or add a definition of disciplinary and non-disciplinary to the definition section.	We changed non-disciplinary to “non-sanction”.
Faculty Senate	4.2.1.1	X		Cut everything after the “for” or this sounds a lot like a circular argument.	Done.
Faculty Senate	4.2.1.3	X		Cut everything after the “for” or this sounds a lot like a circular argument.	Done.
Faculty Senate	4.2.1.1, 4.6.1, 4.6.2, 4.6.6		X	Clarify the influence a PIP must/should have on the annual review rating. Also need to clarify the seriousness of a NOIN and if it must affect the annual review rating.	We changed “non-disciplinary” to “non-sanction.” The consequences of a NOIN PIP on the annual review differs widely, based on the behavior warranting a NOIN or PIP. Thus, we cannot codify what impact a NOIN or PIP will have on the annual review.
Faculty Senate	4.3.2	X		We should help new faculty members out by narrowing this broad wording down to a few specific policies (perhaps 635, tenure, rank, and post tenure review) in addition to department RTP criteria.	Done.
Faculty Senate	4.6.3	X		Ensure policy wording stays broad enough that if we have to change the technology tool we are using for	4.6.3 does not address technology, so we are not sure what is meant to be addressed.

May 22, 2025

				the process we still have a method to meet policy requirements.	
Faculty Senate	4.6.4		X	Recommend removing the overall rating and just rating faculty in each area, teaching, scholarship, and service.	Removed.
Faculty Senate	4.4 & 4.7		X	Clarify how the annual goal setting (and the goals once they are set) integrate into the annual review process.	This will be done in training.
Faculty Senate	4.7.1		X	Provide a place where faculty can frame their accomplishments in narrative form.	We added/kept a narrative place for self-reflection.
Faculty Senate	4.8		X	Policy should state how merit pay is funded. There should be more transparency regarding funding given the importance of merit pay in promoting faculty morale & retention.	While this would be ideal, the funding will differ from year to year. Deans will be required to have a merit pay plan.
Faculty Senate	4.8.2 & 5.7		X	Create clear & transparent guidelines on how merit pay is being decided & how the amount of each individual (assuming it could be different across colleges/schools or even within a college/school) is determined.	Merit pay decisions are at the discretion of the dean and in collaboration with department chairs. And you are correct in that it could be different across colleges/schools.
Faculty Senate	5.2		X	Include specific language stating how PIPs and NOINs will end or be resolved and how it is officially tracked as resolved.	Because each NOIN/PIP is different, we believe section 5.2.2 gives chairs enough guidance to set a timeline and determine how the intervention will be resolved. Section 5.2.4 states how it is tracked.
Faculty Senate	5.2.1		X	Either make the language for what falls short more specific, or tie it to section 4.4 of policy 635 (which does have more specific language).	NOINs/PIPs are for a variety of reasons. We have added Policy 635 to the list of references, as it encompasses faculty professional responsibilities.
Faculty Senate	5.2.3		X	Responsive is defined in 5.2.5 given faculty members 2 days to substantively respond, but the collaboratively section could be misused. Recommend adding clarity to process that emphasizes there should be discussion between	The 2 days for response is for both supervisors and faculty members.

				all parties to come to an agreed upon solution.	
Faculty Senate	5.3		X	If a NOIN can impact the ability to receive merit pay, tenure and/or post-tenure review it should be something a faculty member can appeal. Either include an appeal process/procedure for a NOIN or adjust policy so that the presence of a NOIN does not affect eligibility for merit pay.	Both PIPs and NOINs are appealable.
Faculty Senate	5.5.3		X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy needs to state a date by which faculty members need to ensure their activities section is updated (i.e. what's the earliest date supervisors can start reviewing portfolios).</li> <li>- This is especially important since there is no longer a self-evaluation portion and it is unreasonable to allow faculty to continue to upload items until the last day supervisors have to have the evaluations completed by.</li> </ul>	Supervisors can begin reviewing portfolios after the faculty member submits it, which is after April 1 <sup>st</sup> . There will be self-reflection section and faculty will still be responsible to submit their portion before supervisors evaluate their portion.
Faculty Senate	5.5.3		X	Ensure the timeline supports people being able to complete their evaluations during contract time.	Annual reviews open on April 1 <sup>st</sup> and faculty are allowed to complete their evaluations during their contract time. The deadline is extended beyond contract time for those who need more time.
Faculty Senate	Overall		X	These revisions seem beyond the spirit of limited-scope. These changes would be more appropriately addressed under a full revision.	This policy will be opened for full revision shortly after this limited scope revision so we can spend more time with various parts of the policy.
Faculty Senate	4.3.1.2, 4.7.3, 4.8.6, 5.6.3	X		There is no text in these sections. Recommend deleting these sub-section headings.	It's a formatting issue that the Policy Office will take care of when they get the document ready for final approval.
Faculty Senate	5.7.4	X		"Faculty cannot appeal the decision to be awarded merit pay of or . . .", replace "of" with "or".	Done.

CAMPUS ENTITY	POLICY SECTION	Editorial Comment	Substance Comment	CONCERN	SPONSOR/STEWARD RESPONSE
PACE	Overall 4.6.1, 4.6.2, 4.6.4		X	<p>4.6.1 talks about “in each of the annual review performance areas (teaching, scholarship/creative work, service, and compliance)” and has no mention of an overall rating. But then sections like 4.6.4 talks about “the rating of a faculty member” and 4.6.2 says “receive an overall Meets Expectations”.</p> <p>Would help if there was an explanation of what the overall rating is, how it is calculated, and what it means or impacts.</p>	We have removed the reference to “an overall rating”. There are just the ratings in the three areas of teaching, scholarship/creative works, and service.
PACE	4.5.4		X	In the Annual Review requirements, it states that the supervisor and faculty member must meet but that faculty will not be held responsible for their supervisor’s failure to complete the supervisor evaluation, provided the faculty member made themselves available. What happens if the supervisor doesn’t set up a meeting? Should that be included in policy?	As with all duties that an employee does not fulfill, when a supervisor fails to set up a meeting required by policy (Policy 644 Department Leadership), then it will be reflected in the supervisor’s annual review. This is standard practice and does not need to be reflected in policy.
PACE	5.3.1		X	There is no appeals process for a NOIN, but is there a way for the faculty to write a response or otherwise have a additional review? What if the NOIN is created unfairly / unjustly?	There is now an appeal process for a NOIN.
PACE	5.3.4		X	<p>5.3.4 uses the word sanctions, with discipline crossed out.</p> <p>4.6.6 and 4.7.1 also use the word sanction.</p>	Disciplinary action can be action taken to correct performance while all sanctions are disciplinary in nature, not all disciplinary actions are sanctions. Thus, it is appropriate to use both words

				<p>4.2.1.3 uses discipline.</p> <p>4.8....6? says “must not be on an incomplete NOIN, PIP, or discipline.”</p> <p>Difference between sanction and discipline is not clear and confusing to have both.</p> <p>Policy 371 for Staff uses sanctions for a discipline system. This policy could be worded similarly for consistency.</p>	because of that distinction.
PACE	4.8.5	X		Should say “conflict of interest disclosures” not just “conflicts of interest”.	We have added “disclosures”.
PACE	5.7....4? (Numbering is crazy, sorry)	X		<p>“Faculty cannot appeal the decision to be awarded merit pay <b>of</b> the amount of merit pay awarded.”</p> <p>Should be “or” not “of”</p>	Corrected.
UVUSA				Clarify differences of SRI and new changes	We are not sure what you mean here, nor which section you are referring to. Would you please clarify.

<b>Policy Title: Faculty Merit Pay</b>			<b>Policy Number: 654</b>		
<b>Sponsor: Wayne Vaught</b>			<b>Steward: Kat Brown</b>		
<b>Presentation to: Faculty Senate</b>			<b>Date Presented: April 29, 2025</b>		

NOTE: Indicate with X whether the comment is editorial (grammar, punctuation, sentence structure, etc.) or is a substance comment (content, procedure, etc.).

<b>CAMPUS ENTITY</b>	<b>POLICY SECTION</b>	<b>Editorial Comment ?</b>	<b>Substance Comment ?</b>	<b>CONCERN</b>	<b>SPONSOR/STEWARD RESPONSE</b>
----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------	---------------------------------



Faculty Senate	Overall		X	The deletion of this policy is rushed. Care is warranted here, given the sensitive nature of the discussion surrounding the limited-scope revision of Policy 633.	654 will be replaced by 633, and therefore must be deleted as 633 is approved.