

**School of Dental Medicine
Protocol for
Annual Faculty Evaluation
&
Determination of Merit-Based Salary Increases
(Updated Jan. 3, 2017)**

I. Background and History:

The School of Dental Medicine has utilized a formal faculty evaluation approach, potentially linked to compensation, since 2001. The original protocol entitled “Faculty Evaluation and Compensation Plan” has been modified significantly over the years leading to the current plan, described here.

Paid faculty with $\geq 20\%$ Effort are annually evaluated.

II. The AAUP Contract:

The faculty of the School of Dental Medicine are members of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). The University of Connecticut Health Center and the School of Dental Medicine negotiate a contract with the AAUP Chapter that sets the criteria for salary increases along with other provisions. The contract determines whether an annual increase in base salary is provided in any year, its extent, and the manner in which it is calculated and distributed. The contract may also stipulate that a certain pool of funding be allocated for salary increases based on merit. Relative to merit-based increases, the School is expected to employ an annual evaluation protocol to measure or define merit. Merit scores/rankings derived from these annual reviews are used in formulas upon which merit-based increases are calculated.

III. Purposes of Annual Faculty Evaluation:

The annual evaluation of faculty serves the following purposes:

- a) Provides a structured opportunity for the faculty member and his/her division chair (or other unit leader) to review achievements from the previous year and to reset expectations and goals from the upcoming year;
- b) Provides formal feedback to the faculty member on whether s/he is meeting the expectations of the division or department;
- c) Provides a score or ranking upon which determination of merit-based salary increases can be made.

IV. Annual Evaluation and relationship to Decisions on Promotion and/or Tenure:

The annual evaluation of faculty by division chairs should be considered a process separate and distinct from evaluation of faculty for academic promotion and/or tenure. That stated, there should be a good faith effort made to set goals within the annual evaluation process that are consistent with those set forth in the School’s Senior Appointments and Promotions Committee’s (SAPC) guidelines. It should be noted, however, that the annual evaluation considers all aspects of faculty activity and that these activities may vary year to year based on division/department need or faculty desire. In comparison, faculty promotion and tenure may be heavily weighted on academic and scholarly achievement and is

referenced to the type of appointment that the faculty member holds and the School's and the University's expectations thereof. Therefore, some aspects of annual achievement may be important and integral to promotion and tenure while others may be less so. Further, the process for recommendation for promotion and tenure involves multiple groups and individuals (Division Chair/Department Head, SAPC, Dean, Provost, Board of Directors) while annual reviews are largely determined by agreement between the faculty member and his/her Division Chair.

V. Period of Annual Evaluation:

The period of annual evaluation will either be the calendar year or academic year. As of January 3, 2017, the period is declared as the calendar year, i.e. January 1-to-December 31.

VI. Process for Compiling and Recording Annual Goals and Achievements:

The School uses a structured, three page template for purposes of annual evaluation and for use by both the faculty member and the evaluator. The template covers the following areas: description of goals set for the calendar year in review for specific domain areas, including areas for faculty documentation and self- evaluation; description of prospective goals for the next or upcoming year; an area for overall, comprehensive review including the opportunity to suggest changes in % Assigned Effort based on goals or responsibilities assigned. Once the faculty member completes the self-evaluation, the evaluator (i.e. generally the Division Chair or Center Director) will use this template in review of the faculty member's achievements and proposed efforts. The template will be utilized during the annual review meeting between the faculty member and Division Chair. Scores or rankings will be determined along with assigned efforts, and the Division Chair will sign the pertinent areas of the document. If the faculty member is in agreement, s/he will also sign. Notes may be added for clarification and especially where disagreement may exist between the faculty member and Division Chair. The completed, signed 3 page template document will be copied, with one copy to the faculty member, one copy sent to the Dean's Office and the original kept on file in the Division.

VII. Domains for Evaluation and the Scoring/Ranking Protocol:

The specific domains for evaluation may vary over time but will generally be: Education/Teaching, Research, Administration; Service; Scholarship (e.g. publications, presentations, awards, honors, etc.)

The scoring or ranking system to be used for faculty self-evaluations and division chair evaluation of faculty for each domain and as a comprehensive score will be as follows:

- 3-meets or exceeds expectations
- 2-marginally meets expectations
- 1-fails to meet expectations.

The ranking of ["4"-significantly exceeds expectations] is reserved for determination during later stage review by a school-wide Review Committee.

VII. Suggested Timeline for Completion of Various Tasks:

Based on a calendar year review, the following timelines are recommended:

- January 31: Completion of faculty self-assessments and prospective goals/efforts and submission to the Division Chair/Center Director.
- February 28: Completion of Division Chair review with individual faculty and agreement on evaluation score and prospective goals for the remainder of the year.
- April 30: Comprehensive review of all evaluations by a school-wide Review Committee of assigned composition, e.g. a hybrid committee composed of SDM Division Chairs along with non-administrative faculty members representing the AAUP. Determination of final scores, including the score of ["4"-significantly exceeds expectations].
- May 31: Deadline for submission of appeals
- June 30: Completion of review of appeals (as required) and final rankings submitted to Dean's Office.

IX. Failure of Faculty to Comply with the Evaluation Process and Timelines

All paid faculty with $\geq 20\%$ effort are expected to comply with the basic expectations of the annual evaluation process and the timelines described. Failure to submit appropriate input within the evaluation or failure to submit documentation within the described timelines may result in a score of "2" or "1" be allocated to the faculty member, depending on the individual situation. The division chair or other evaluator in this process will be held to these same standards.

X. Evaluation Mechanisms

- A. Towards the end of each academic year, the Dean meets with each Division Chair, Center Director or Department Head and discusses School and unit objectives for the next 12 to 18 months. This aids division chairs in formulating goals for the upcoming year and evaluation cycle.
- B. Prospective goals with associated metrics should be formulated early in each year (Jan-Feb) during the annual meeting review between the faculty member and division chair. These prospective goals are recorded and entered into the faculty member's template.
- C. By January 31 of each year, faculty to complete their annual self-evaluations referencing the goals set for the preceding year.
- D. Between February 1- 29, Division Chairs to schedule a meeting with individual faculty to review achievements, discuss performance and effort designations, and arrive at a final overall score/ranking. It expected that the faculty member and the division chair will arrive at a mutual agreement on the final rating. If this is not possible, a note should be added to the evaluation template explaining the reasons why. In cases of exceptional or exemplary performance, the division chair may indicate his/her intention to request consideration of a ranking of ["4"-significantly exceeds expectations] during the comprehensive review by the school-wide Review Committee.

- E. Prior to March 31, Division Chairs complete their submission of faculty rankings to the Dean's Office. In addition, they will submit any nominations for ranking of "4" to the Dean's Office for consideration during the comprehensive review by committee.
- F. A meeting of the school-wide Review Committee will be scheduled prior to April 30 to review all SDM evaluations and nominations for special consideration. Per specifications in the UCH-AAUP contract, the review committee will include ad hoc voting members who are non-administrative faculty approved by the AAUP in addition to Division Chairs or others members of the SDM Executive Council assigned by the Dean. The construct of this committee is designed to provide a broader perspective during the review of final ratings and to achieve a certain level of standardization across the evaluation process.

Due to the inherent differences between some appointment types/categories, the review committee will generally review the faculty evaluations in these subsets:

- Part time paid faculty $\geq 20\%$ to $\leq 49\%$ Effort (FTE)
- Advanced education program directors
- Clinical instructors and clinical category faculty
- All other paid faculty 50% Effort (FTE) or greater

Ratings will be summarized, pertinent information will be reviewed and consideration will be given to either a) the maintenance of ranking submitted by the respective division chairs or b) changes to these ratings, based on an attempt to standardize achievement across the diversity of faculty of the school. Consideration will be given to those nominations received from division chairs for the granting of a rating of [4" - significantly exceeds expectations]. Scores/ratings of 1, 2, 3 or 4 will be proposed, voted upon and recorded.

- G. Within one week of the Executive Council committee meeting, Division Chairs will advise their faculty individually of their final score/rankings, and remind the faculty of methods for appeal.
- H. Appeals Process: Within four weeks of the review committee meeting (i.e. by approximately May 30), faculty may appeal their rating to the committee. The appeal must be in written format and limited to two pages. Support of the appeal by the faculty member's division chair is not required but may be included. The appeal will be considered by the hybrid review committee in a timely fashion at a meeting following the end of the appeal's period. Should the decision of the review committee on appeal not satisfy the faculty member, the faculty member may consider further appeal through established and appropriate Health Center appeal mechanisms.

XI. Formulation of Merit-Based Salary Increases

Prior to the next scheduled trigger for a merit-based salary increase, the Dean will forward finalized annual evaluation scores/rankings for faculty to the School's Director of Administration and Finance. The

Director will use this data to determine the amount and type of merit increase to be received by individual faculty as prescribed by the AAUP contract.

References noted in this Document:

1. **UCH-AAUP Contract, 2009**
2. **Original 2001 Faculty Evaluation and Compensation Plan**
3. **Criteria for Faculty Evaluation, proposed circa 2008**
4. **Minutes and Recommendations on Faculty Evaluation by the SDM Executive Council, March 7, 2012.**
5. **Proceedings of the SDM Executive Council meeting, January 4, 2017.**