



# UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

## Policies and Procedures

Page 1 of 22

<b>Proposed Policy Number and Title:</b>		Policy 633 Faculty Performance Evaluation and Feedback	
<b>Existing Policy Number and Title:</b>		Policy 633 Faculty Performance Evaluation and Feedback	
<b>Approval Process*</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Regular	<input type="checkbox"/> Temporary	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Substantive Change	<input type="checkbox"/> Compliance Change
<input type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Revision <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion	<input type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Revision <input type="checkbox"/> Suspension	<input type="checkbox"/> Revision–Limited-Scope	<input type="checkbox"/> Revision–Limited-Scope <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion
Anticipated Expiration Date (Temporary Policies): Click or tap to enter a date.			

\*See [UVU Policy 101 Policy Governing Policies](#) for process details.

<b>Draft Number and Date:</b>	Stage 2 March 25, 2025		
<b>President's Council Sponsor:</b>	Wayne Vaught	<b>Ext.</b>	
<b>Policy Steward:</b>	Kat Brown	<b>Ext.</b>	

POLICY APPROVAL PROCESS DATES	
<b>Policy Drafting and Revision</b> Entrance Date: <u>3/27/2025</u> <b>University Entities Review</b> Entrance Date: <u>3/27/2025</u> Close Feedback: <u>5/15/2025</u> <b>University Community Review</b> Entrance Date: _____ Open Feedback: _____ Close Feedback: _____ <b>Board of Trustees Review</b> Entrance Date: _____ Approval Date: _____	<b>POST APPROVAL PROCESS</b> Verify: <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Number <input type="checkbox"/> Section <input type="checkbox"/> Title <input type="checkbox"/> BOT approval <input type="checkbox"/> Approval date <input type="checkbox"/> Effective date <input type="checkbox"/> Proper format of Policy Manual posting <input type="checkbox"/> TOPS Pipeline and Archives update  <b>Policy Office personnel who verified and posted this policy to the University Policy Manual</b> <b>Name:</b> _____ <b>Date posted and verified:</b> _____



# UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

## Policies and Procedures

Page 2 of 22

<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 641 *Salaried Faculty Workload—Academic Year*

**2.5** UVU Policy 648 *Faculty Personnel Reduction*

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

### 3.0 DEFINITIONS

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



## UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

### Policies and Procedures

Page 3 of 22

**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 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 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.~~

~~3.15~~**3.13 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.

~~3.16~~**3.14 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.

~~3.17~~**3.15 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 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



## UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

### Policies and Procedures

Page 5 of 22

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 PIPs in 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.

**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.

**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**



## UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

### Policies and Procedures

Page 6 of 22

**4.44.3.6** 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.

#### **4.54.4 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.

#### **4.64.5 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 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~~ 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



## UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

### Policies and Procedures

Page 7 of 22

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.





#### **4.74.6 Annual Review Rating Scale**

**4.7.1** Faculty performance in each of the annual review performance areas (teaching, scholarship/creative work, 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 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 PIP or have 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, 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.

#### 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 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 ExpectationExpectations.~~

#### ~~4.7.4.4~~

~~May not receive Meets Expectations if faculty member is on or has an unresolveduncompleted 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

~~4.94.7.1~~ Academic Affairs creates and maintains the faculty annual review template within the institutionally adopted system. At a minimum, this template~~it~~ contains the following: ~~(1) a place for a faculty member's self-evaluation of their teaching, scholarship/creative work as applicable, service as applicable, and compliance;~~ ~~(12)~~ a place for narrative and annual goals and related comments; ~~(2)~~ a place for the supervisor evaluation; ~~(323)~~ a place for addenda NOINs, PIPs and sanctions if anyneeded; ~~(434)~~ a place for the second-level supervisor to sign off and provide optional written comments, if desired; and ~~(545)~~ 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 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.

~~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 (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*.~~

~~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.~~



## UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

### Policies and Procedures

Page 12 of 22

#### ~~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 4All 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 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



## UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

### Policies and Procedures

Page 14 of 22

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 sanctions ~~discipline.~~

**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 or</del> PIP, 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-May 31</del> 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> June 1. 2) Supervisor review of goals and guidance must be completed no later than <del>October</del> August 15.
Faculty can modify their goals at any time during the annual review reporting period. When they do so, the supervisor will be notified and should review and provide guidance about the modified goals in a timely manner.	

## **5.5 Annual Review Procedures and Timeline**

~~5.5.1 Faculty members must provide a self-evaluation 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.~~

~~5.5.25.5 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. Faculty members who have an appointment to two departments must submit their self-evaluation to both supervisors.~~

~~5.5.35.1~~ 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.

~~5.5.45.2~~ 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.

~~5.5.55.3~~ Second-level supervisors sign off on annual reviews before they are finalized and can provide written comments if desired.





## UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

### Policies and Procedures

Page 16 of 22

Annual Review Timeline	
<del>Faculty prepare and submit their self-evaluation.</del>	<del>1) — The system opens for faculty on April 1.</del> <del>2) — Self evaluations are due by May 30.</del>
Supervisors prepare and submit the supervisor evaluation.	<del>1) — Supervisors can review self-evaluations and submit supervisor evaluations soon as faculty share their self-evaluations with the supervisor, beginning on April 1.</del> 2)1) 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.

### 5.6 Addendum and Appeal Procedures ~~and~~ and Timeline

5.6.1 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.

#### 5.6.2

~~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.

#### 5.6.3

5.6.4 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.



# UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

## Policies and Procedures

Page 17 of 22

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

5.6.6 Both the ~~ad hoc~~ dean or designee appeal report and the recommendation 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.~~

5.1.25.6.7 ~~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 D</del> <u>dean's office</u> 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	<del>10 b10 b</del> 10 business days

### 5.7 Merit Pay

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

5.7.2 ~~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.~~

5.7.3 ~~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.~~



## UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY Policies and Procedures

Page 18 of 22

~~5.15.1.1 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 of the amount of merit pay awarded.. **Merit Pay**

~~5.1.1 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.~~

~~5.1.1 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.~~

~~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~~



# UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

## Policies and Procedures

Page 20 of 22

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*.

### 5.7.4

POLICY HISTORY		
<b>Date of Last Formal Review:</b> Click here to enter a date.		
<b>Due Date of Next Review:</b> 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)

**6 Date:** March 27, 2025

**7 Sponsor:** Wayne Vaught

**8 Steward(s):** Ka Brown

**9 Policy Process:** Regular

**10 Policy Action:** Revision—Limited Scope

**11 Policy Office Editor:** Amanda Cooke

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

**13 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 22 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.](#)