

College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
CRITERIA and METHODOLOGY FOR AWARDING
PEFORMANCE-BASED INCREASES

In accord with the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), between United Academics and the University of Vermont, which went into effect September 2008, we hereby announce the criteria and methodology for awarding Performance-Based Increases. Please note that these criteria and methodology are identical to those employed in CALS for the past two review cycles.

Criteria for Evaluation

The primary criterion for evaluation of a CALS faculty member is their performance that year relative to their assigned workload for that academic year. In addition, the Chair and Dean will take into account the performance of the faculty member in the previous two years relative to their assigned workloads.

As described in the CBA, each faculty member has the opportunity to meet with their department Chair in the spring of each year to discuss their workload assignment for the next academic year. Afterwards, in consultation with the Dean, the Chair makes a written workload assignment for each faculty member, in accord with the teaching, research and service needs of the department, and the nature of the faculty member's appointment. The Dean reviews each faculty member's workload assignment with respect to: balance among departments in the College, balance among faculty in the department, and appropriateness for the skills of the individual. The workload assignment is placed in the faculty member's academic file with copies distributed to the faculty member, the Provost's office, and the department.

In addition, the department Chair and Dean will take into account the progress of the faculty member relative to the general expectations laid out for each faculty rank in the *CALS RPT Guidelines*.

The Chair and Dean will make a performance evaluation on a 1-to-5 numeric scale (5 is the highest score) as outlined below for each category of the faculty member's workload assignment (Instruction, Extension Instruction, Scholarship/Research, and Service/Outreach). The final evaluation numeric will be determined by a weighted average of performance in each assignment area in proportion to the fractional FTE assigned to each area (for example 0.4 FTE Instruction, 0.0 FTE Extension Instruction, 0.1 FTE Advising, 0.4 FTE Research, 0.1 FTE Service). The Chair makes the preliminary evaluation assessment, which is refined by discussion between the Chair and the Dean. The Dean then assembles evaluation recommendations for all faculty in CALS into a single spreadsheet. The Dean reviews the assembled recommendations with all CALS Chairs to assure a consensus ranking of all faculty in CALS relative to one another.

CALS Faculty Performance-Based Evaluation Numeric Guidelines

3 - SATISFACTORY – Meets expectations of workload assignment

Examples include, but are not limited to:

- **Academic Teaching** - Student and peer evaluations indicate quality in teaching
- **Extension Teaching** – Has adequate personal performance plan, regular contributor to project planning, delivers relevant teaching/programming to clientele groups, and completes reporting requirements
- **Academic Advising** – Student evaluations and comments indicate competent guidance to student advisees and an interest in assisting students’ academic progress.
- **Research/Scholarship** - Publishes regularly, consistent efforts or success in seeking extramural funding, or regular presentation at professional meetings; or on track for tenure/promotion
- **Service/Outreach** – Serves regularly on department, college, university or professional committees; or provides service to the community in a professional capacity

4 - EXEMPLARY – Quality performance

Meets all expectations of “SATISFACTORY” and exhibits quality efforts. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- **Academic Teaching** - Student and peer evaluations indicate consistent quality in teaching or advising; or consistent efforts to improve course content, enrollments or pedagogy; application for instructional improvement funds
- **Extension Teaching** – evidence of consistent quality in teaching/programming, leadership in program planning, or consistent effort in securing extramural funding for extension teaching/programming
- **Academic Advising** – Student evaluations and comments indicate quality guidance of student advisees, and a keen interest in assisting students’ academic progress.
- **Research/Scholarship** - Distinction in scholarly publications or extramural funding record; or evidence of stature in the field such as invited seminars or citations; or superior progress on track for tenure/promotion
- **Service/Outreach** – Major service commitment to department, college, university or profession, such as service on grant review panel, editorial board, symposium organizing committee, or faculty search committee; or provides major service commitment to community in a professional capacity

5 - EXCELLENT – Superior performance

Meets all expectations of “SATISFACTORY” and exhibits extraordinary performance in one or more activities. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- **Academic Teaching** – Exceptional performance in teaching or advising; receipt of teaching awards; major development of course curriculum, delivery or enrollment; or receipt of extramural instructional improvement grants
- **Extension Teaching** – superior leadership in teaching/program development or delivery; regional or national teaching/programming efforts, highly successful in obtaining extramural funding for teaching/programming or exceptional work with stakeholders
- **Academic Advising** – Student evaluations and comments indicate extraordinary effort in providing guidance of student advisees, in assisting students’ academic progress, and/or assisting the student’s career path.
- **Research/Scholarship** - Exceptional scholarly activity; international reputation reflected in publications, grant funding or invited presentations; or research awards; or exceptional progress towards tenure/promotion

- **Service/Outreach** – Chair or major role on important committees of the department, college, university or profession; directorship or a university program; editorship or a major journal; extensive peer reviewing; or exceptional service commitment to community in a professional capacity

2 - NEEDS IMPROVEMENT – Performance below expectations relative to peers

Examples include, but are not limited to:

- **Academic Teaching** - Student and peer evaluations indicate needs improvement with course development, delivery or advising; or efforts not evident to improve course content
- **Extension Teaching** – Performance plan inadequate, teaching/programming needs improvement, does only occasional reporting, or does not seek external funding for extension teaching/programming
- **Academic Advising** – Student evaluations and comments indicate faculty member is difficult to access, slow to respond to student inquiries, unable to provide sufficient guidance of student advisees, unaware of CALS or UVM requirements, or shows little interest in assisting students' academic progress.
- **Research/Scholarship** - Periodic scholarly publications, inconsistent efforts for extramural funding, periodic presentations at scholarly meetings or needs improvement to be on track for tenure/promotion
- **Service/Outreach** – Limited service on department, college, university or professional committees; or periodic service to the community in a professional capacity

1 - UNSATISFACTORY – Deficient in one or more workload assignments

Examples include, but are not limited to:

- **Academic Teaching** - Student and peer evaluations indicate consistent problems with teaching effectiveness or advising
- **Extension Teaching** – Has no personal performance plan, does not participate in planning, problems with teaching/program delivery or reporting
- **Academic Advising** – Student evaluations and comments indicate faculty member is often not available, often does not respond to student inquiries, provides poor advice or is unaware of CALS or UVM requirements, or shows little interest in assisting students' academic progress.
- **Research/Scholarship** - Infrequent scholarly publication, does not regularly seek external grant funding, or not on track for tenure/promotion
- **Service/Outreach** – Does not serve regularly on department, college, university, or professional committees, or does not serve the community in a professional capacity

Note:

Faculty on sabbatical leave are evaluated solely on their *scholarship* during the sabbatical period.

Methodology for Awarding Performance-Based Increases

CALS is provided with two pools of funds for distribution based on the performance evaluation. One pool is derived from the total FTE of CALS faculty salaries paid from *base* General Fund and VT AES sources. The second pool is the total FTE of CALS faculty salaries paid from Extension sources. As indicated in the CBA, these two pools must be distributed separately, and may not be comingled.

1. The department Chair fills out a CALS performance grid for each faculty member, providing numerical scores for teaching, research, and service categories (and extension where appropriate to the appointment) as weighted relative to the assignments in the workload form.
2. The performance values are submitted to the CALS Dean's office. Departmental means are compared to ensure uniformity in scoring among Chairs. Performance values for all CALS faculty are compiled into one Excel spreadsheet, from highest to lowest value.
3. The Dean reviews the performance evaluation data with the Chairs. The Dean may change values submitted by individual chairs based upon his/her perception of a faculty member's performance over the past year, in recognition of particular honors during the past year, or because of apparent parity differences among departmental evaluations by chairs.
4. The Dean's performance values for CALS faculty will be entered into one master Excel spreadsheet. Any change of performance values made by the Dean will be communicated to the faculty member.
5. CALS faculty with performance values of 3.5 or above will be eligible for a performance-based increase.
6. The magnitude of the dollar increase in base pay that a faculty member receives is dependent upon the number of faculty eligible for a performance-based increase, and the ranking of faculty relative to one another. The faculty will fall into one of approximately 20 ranking cohorts between 5.0 and 3.5 separated by 0.05, with the highest ranked cohort receiving the largest fraction of the pool and the lowest ranked cohort receiving the smallest fraction of the pool.

To illustrate the method simply, if there were 20 faculty eligible for the pool, and were separated evenly into 20 cohorts of 1 faculty member each, then the highest ranking faculty member (eg 4.84) would receive 20/210ths of the pool, the second ranked member would receive (eg. 4.76) would receive 19/210ths of the pool, the third ranked (eg. 4.71) would receive 18/210ths of the pool, etc, until the lowest ranked (eg. 3.53) faculty member would receive 1/210th of the pool.

So, if there were \$20,000 available in the pool, and 20 faculty members eligible for the pool separated into 20 cohorts, the funds would be distributed as follows:

- 1 (4.84) – 20/210ths = \$1,905
- 2 (4.76) – 19/210ths = \$1,810
- 3 (4.71) – 18/210ths = \$1,714
- 4 (4.68) – 17/210ths = \$1,619
- 5 (4.63) – 16/210ths = \$1,524
- 6 (4.59) - 15/210ths = \$1,428
- 7 (4.52) – 14/210ths = \$1,333
- 8 (4.47) – 13/210ths = \$1,238
- 9 (4.41) – 12/210ths = \$1,143
- 10 (4.38) – 11/210ths = \$1,048
- 11 (4.34) – 10/210ths = \$ 952
- 12 (4.26) - 9/210ths = \$ 857
- 13 (4.22) – 8/210ths = \$ 762
- 14 (4.18) – 7/210ths = \$ 667
- 15 (4.11) – 6/210ths = \$ 571
- 16 (4.07) – 5/210ths = \$ 476
- 17 (4.01) – 4/210ths = \$ 381
- 18 (3.88) – 3/210ths = \$ 286
- 19 (3.73) – 2/210ths = \$ 190
- 20 (3.53) – 1/210th = \$ 95

In actuality, this simplistic model is modified to reflect the FTE of the faculty member and also takes into account multiple faculty within each cohort. Note: the GF and Extension pools are kept separate, and are awarded relative to the fractional FTE of a faculty member in each pool (for example, a faculty member with 0.6 FTE Ext and 0.4 FTE AES would receive an allocation from each of the two pools, dependent upon the total amount of funds in each pool and their relative ranking).

Note: CALS distributes the performance-based increase as a dollar amount (a fraction of the total dollar pool), not as a percent of base salary.