

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE POLICIES FOR ANNUAL REVIEWS
AND SALARY INCREASES BASED UPON PERFORMANCE (SIBUP)

- A. Annual reviews aim to enhance the quality of the faculty by recognizing and rewarding performance in terms of the department's and the unit's goals and objectives. Annual reviews and salary increases based upon performance (SIBUP) should reflect the same values as promotional and other career reviews. They should document yearly progress toward promotion or satisfactory periodic career review. Annual reviews shall become part of the record to be used in the reviews specified in the preamble to Redbook Article 4.2 such as pre-tenure, tenure, promotional and periodic career reviews.
- B. The Dean may use up to 5% of the general funds allocated to the School of Medicine for salary increases for a particular year to award special, one-time payments to faculty members for exceptional effort or achievement beyond that rewarded in the regular salary increase process. The criteria and amount of such rewards shall be reported annually by the Dean to the members of the Faculty Forum and Performance Criteria and Economic Welfare Committee and the Provost.
- C. Each department shall award salary increases based upon performance as documented in annual reviews. Annual reviews shall provide qualitative feedback on performance in each category (teaching, research and service) of the work assignment for the year under review. The departmental documents establishing the process for awarding salary increases shall be consistent with this policy and the Minimum Guidelines.
1. Each faculty member, in conjunction with the departmental chair or his/her designee, shall develop an Annual Work Plan for the upcoming calendar year. The written Annual Work Plan must be approved by the chairperson and the Dean of the School of Medicine and filed in the department office by December 31 of each year. These work plans shall specify the work assignment and percentage efforts in each category (teaching, research and service) and provide a basis for the subsequent annual performance evaluations.

The Annual Work Plan for probationary (pre-tenure) faculty must contain provisions for demonstrating broad proficiency in all three categories (teaching, research and service).
 2. All decisions concerning salary increases shall be made in accordance with criteria and procedures contained in departmental documents adopted by a majority vote of the executive faculty with primary appointment in the department. To assure compliance with these Minimum Guidelines, the departmental documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Performance Criteria and Economic Welfare Committee. Only those plans or revisions which are approved by the Performance Criteria and Economic Welfare Committee of the School of Medicine by December 31 may be used as the basis for faculty performance evaluations or salary increases for the next year.
 3. The Departmental Plan shall specify criteria and procedures by which annual reviews are related to salary decisions made by the chair of the unit. In identifying the criteria to be used for performance evaluations, reference may be made to departmental, unit or university Promotion, Tenure and Periodic Career Review Policies or other applicable documents. Although the department may specify criteria in addition to those enumerated in these documents, the criteria must be clear and accessible to every faculty member of the department. Only those criteria contained in or specifically referenced by the Departmental Plan may be used in the evaluation of faculty performance or in the determination of salary increases. The departmental document shall include each of the following provisions:
 - a. The procedures used for judging faculty performance and recommending salary increases must be clearly described in the Departmental Plan. These procedures must be consistent

with those described in these Unit Policies and the Redbook. These procedures must include an identification of the person(s) or committee responsible for evaluating Annual faculty performance and making recommendations to the departmental chairperson. This departmental review body may be an elected, appointed or ex officio committee or may be the departmental chair alone.

- b. At the beginning of each year, each faculty member will be provided an opportunity to present documentation of performance and effort relative to his or her Annual Work Plan of the preceding calendar year. This document must be received by the departmental performance evaluation and review body by February 1.
- c. The annual performance evaluation based on the Annual Work Plan will be used (along with the previous two annual evaluations - an average of a three-year time period of performance evaluations or the time period the individual has been a faculty member of the University if less than three years) as the basis for the award of performance-based salary increases. This procedure would avoid penalizing faculty members who demonstrate exceptional productivity during years in which there is little or no money available for salary increase. The performance evaluation shall characterize an individual faculty member's performance as Satisfactory or above if the performance meets or exceeds the minimum levels of performance. An Unsatisfactory performance rating indicates that the faculty member has not met the minimum departmental criteria in that category of work assignment. A faculty member who obtains an overall rating of "unsatisfactory" or a rating of "unsatisfactory" in the category of greatest percentage effort (as specified in the Annual Work Plan) for the most recent year shall not be given a performance-based raise, i.e., a three-year average should not be used.
- d. The department chairperson is responsible for reviewing and approving the performance evaluations and salary increase recommendations made by the departmental review body. Each faculty member in the School of Medicine will receive an annual written performance evaluation, recommendations for improvement if necessary, and relative data relating to their salary increase and departmental norms from the departmental chairperson by March 15. Receipt of the evaluation will be indicated by faculty signature. Each faculty member shall be given timely opportunity to respond to these recommendations and his or her performance evaluation so that timely adjustments may be made before the dean's final recommendation.
- e. A faculty member regardless of work assignment will be eligible for the maximal salary increase given in the department if optimal performance on his/her work assignment is demonstrated. No faculty will be penalized for having little or no work assignment in any of three areas (teaching, research or service) on his/her Annual Work Plan. No part of the merit raise pool may be designated to reward activities in a given area and thus be rendered inaccessible to faculty with no work assignment in that area.

- f. In calculating the final amount of the salary increase, the percentage efforts on the annual work assignment must be taken into consideration (i.e., used as a weighting factor). The formula used is at the discretion of the department.

An example calculation for a “Faculty X” with 30% Teaching, 50% Research and 20% Service assignment may be as:

<u>Annual Work Plan</u>		Rating	Score	Max Possible Score
Category	Assignment %			
Teaching	30	4	120	120
Research	50	3	150	200
Service	20	1	20	80
TOTAL			290	400

Rating: 4 = Outstanding, 3 = Excellent, 2 = Proficient, 1 = Satisfactory, 0 = Unsatisfactory. The formula for the salary increase for “Faculty X” would be the Score of “Faculty X”/Total score of the departmental faculty x \$ amount available for the salary increases

Because the criteria for judging scholarship and the procedures used in making determinations of faculty performance vary substantially among various departments of the School of Medicine, each department shall develop a Departmental Plan for Annual Review with clear definitions of rating categories for faculty performance and for calculating salary increases based upon performance.

(Please note: The method described is consistent with the promotional criteria in which excellence in the area of greatest work effort is required for promotion. Thus above average performance in an area of greatest effort should be rewarded more than above average performance in an area that does not comprise a large part of the faculty member's work assignment. However, this is just one example of how this can be done. Each department may develop its own model as long as efforts are rewarded in proportion to the work assignment.

4. Based on the approved criteria of the department, only the faculty whose overall performance is judged to be satisfactory or above will receive a salary increase. These increases shall not be across-the-board, and should reflect an award structure that is based on performance on the Annual Work Plan. The amount of the increase will be appropriate to the performance and the size of the pool for salary increases in a given year.
- a. It is recognized that sometimes recommendations for zero salary increases are not the result of unsatisfactory performance, but rather may be due to fiscal limitations or voluntary surrender of merit increase by a faculty member.

- b. A recommendation by a chair to the dean for a zero salary increase based on unsatisfactory performance must be submitted for approval of the provost. This recommendation shall include the reasons for the zero salary increase and specific suggestions for improving any performance considered to be unsatisfactory. Simultaneously, a copy of the recommendation shall be given to the faculty member involved.
 - c. The Departmental Plan must also contain clear indications of or reference to minimum levels of acceptable performance in each category of the work assignment.
5. Appeals to reconsider performance evaluations and/or salary adjustments may be made to the School of Medicine Performance Criteria and Economic Welfare Committee around April 15 who will make recommendations for changes to the department chair no later than May 7.
 6. The dean shall report annually to the Faculty Forum and to the provost the frequency distribution of the percentage salary increases received by all faculty members in the School of Medicine and a description of the evaluation systems used to arrive at such salary increases.
 7. The department must preserve the annual reviews. Individual faculty members shall be responsible for maintaining the documentary evidence supporting each annual review through the next tenure, promotion or periodic career review. The chair of the department shall be responsible for maintaining copies of the annual reviews for inclusion in career reviews.
 8. Departmental policies for salary increases may be amended following the same process by which they were adopted and must be approved by the Performance Criteria and Economic Welfare Committee of the School of Medicine as explained under C2.

A calendar of important dates is attached as Appendix 1.

Approved by School of Medicine PCEW 06/21/01

Approved by the School of Medicine Faculty Forum 06/12/0

Approved by School of Medicine Executive Faculty 11/20/02

Recommended Changes by Faculty Senate Redbook Committee 02/25/03

Approved by PCEW 04/21/03

Approved by Faculty Forum 05/14/03

Approved by Board of Trustees 09/11/03

APPENDIX 1

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE CALENDAR FOR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

Beginning with the calendar year 2002, the new schedule of annual performance evaluations goes into effect. The calendar is as follows:

Merit evaluations are for the calendar year January 1 through December 31.

Work assignments will be for the calendar year January 1 through December 31, although significant changes can result in modified assignments mid-year.

Performance data for faculty will be gathered for the previous calendar year by February 1. It is the responsibility of the faculty to forward their data to the department by this deadline.

Departmental evaluations of all faculty data will be completed by March 1.

Performance evaluations and departmental normative data (so that the faculty member can determine their standing and thus their relative anticipated raise) will be provided to all faculty by March 15 by the Chair.

Disputes must be forwarded by faculty in writing to the Chair by March 22.

The Chair must either adjust the evaluations or answer all disputes by April 7 and the recommendation of the department chair for the amount of each raise will be determined by April 7 (depending on the availability of amounts from Central Administration OPB).

If the faculty member is not satisfied they must forward their concerns to the School of Medicine Economic Welfare Committee immediately thereafter for resolution before May 7.

Raises are effective July 1.

Approved by School of Medicine Faculty Forum 06/12/02
Approved by School of Medicine Executive Faculty 11/20/02
Approved by School of Medicine PCEW 04/21/03
Approved by Faculty Forum 05/14/03
Approved by Board of Trustees 09/11/03