

# Baylor University Faculty Evaluation and Compensation Policy

This document establishes a policy framework for the evaluation and academic-year compensation of full-time faculty members at Baylor University. Four principles inform this policy: 1) that all members of the university community should be accountable for the work they do; 2) that regular effective evaluation is an appropriate means of insuring accountability and determine merit; 3) that merit should be the primary basis for differentiation in compensation increases; and 4) that the university will provide a level of overall funding for faculty compensation that is commensurate with our standing as a major, comprehensive university.<sup>1</sup>

In keeping with the University's mission and historic purposes, the categories of professional activity that relate to faculty evaluation and compensation are threefold: teaching and its related scholarly work; research and scholarly/creative contributions; and service to the university, one's professional field, and the community. Although all of these categories of professional activity are important, Baylor University has long been recognized as an institution which places a very high value on scholarly teaching and on the faculty's responsibility to students. Therefore, every faculty member who has a teaching assignment must be evaluated in the category of teaching, and all full-time faculty members who hold the position of lecturer and who were hired primarily as teachers of undergraduates may elect to be evaluated only in the area of teaching and its related scholarly work. Furthermore, although all full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty members will be evaluated in all three areas of faculty responsibilities, from time to time individuals whose work assignment makes special demands in the category of teaching may seek specific approval from the appropriate dean to be evaluated only in the area of teaching and its related scholarly work.

As stated above, this document establishes a policy framework for faculty evaluation and compensation on a year-to-year basis. While all academic units of the university must adhere to the terms of this document, it is understood that the College and the various schools will, of necessity, implement this overall policy in discipline-specific ways. It is necessary, therefore, that each academic unit develop evaluative measures that reflect its particular mission, work, and professional interests. Whatever refinements are developed and implemented, they must be consistent with the mission of the University and the general policies contained in this document.<sup>2</sup>

## I. Teaching and Its Related Scholarly Work

Scholarly teaching involves the preparation and planning, implementation, and evaluation of learning activities for students. Research and experience indicate that student learning is positively related to the quality of teaching. Specifically, maintaining knowledge of current developments in the discipline, showing enthusiasm for what is taught as well as for those who are taught, planning, organizing, engaging students in the subject, directing student learning activities, and giving feedback to students concerning their performance are examples of relevant teacher behaviors that directly affect student performance and learning.

Effective teaching begins with preparation. Preparation involves not only the review of relevant text materials but also the thorough study of current, appropriate research that represents various approaches to the topics or activities involved. Good teaching requires continued learning in the library, in the on-campus or off-campus laboratory, and from the scholarly journals published in one's discipline. Planning involves the development of comprehensive and meaningful goals and syllabi to direct teacher and student activities. The culmination of preparation and planning occurs in meaningful learning experiences, whether in the classroom, the laboratory, or other contexts.

Successful implementation requires effective classroom presentation, with attention given to the needs of individual students. Furthermore, good teaching goes beyond the class period. An effective teacher is also readily available to students, particularly during regular office hours, to clarify, extend, and support the structured learning environment.

Evaluation of learning involves the systematic assessment of student academic progress. Evaluation is pursued not simply for the purpose of assigning a course grade; evaluation should be an ongoing process designed to assess student strengths and weaknesses for the purpose of selecting and planning appropriate learning activities. Final academic evaluation should be representative of the individual student's progress in meeting the goals of the course.

Determining the effectiveness of teaching in all these areas of preparation and planning, implementation, and evaluation is difficult. Nevertheless, each academic unit must develop its own criteria and procedures for documenting and evaluating teaching effectiveness within each particular discipline.<sup>3</sup>

## II. Research and Scholarly/Creative Contributions

Research and scholarly/creative contributions, as understood in this document, go beyond research and scholarly/creative activity primarily

related to scholarly teaching. Contributions refer to all of the scholarly activities in which a faculty member engages in the development of new knowledge or the application of knowledge in support of new concepts or conclusions. These activities include presentation of papers or performances, publications, and participation in exhibits or other public occasions recognized as making a contribution to the profession.

The accepted norms of each academic or professional discipline and the mission of the university should define the expectation for research and scholarly/creative contributions for faculty members in those fields. These norms should be taken into consideration when evaluating the research and scholarly/creative contributions of each faculty member. Thus, norms for faculty members in disciplines in which musical or artistic performance or exhibits are customary will be different from norms for faculty members in disciplines in which presentation of papers or publications are customary. Similar distinctions should be observed in all disciplines.

In weighing the elements of this category, it is important to be sensitive to the variety of ways faculty members participate in and contribute to the discovery and creation of new dimensions and interpretations of the world. Furthermore, the quality rather than the quantity of the scholarly participation and contributions is singularly important. Peer recognition should be a primary means of evaluating quality. Faculty members who have received released time or been awarded sabbaticals should report on both the progress and the completion of their projects. Moreover, the quantity and quality of research should be commensurate with the amount of released time received.

### III. Service

The category of service recognizes activities in which the faculty member contributes in some significant way to the university, to the quality of life of students and faculty, to the development of professional organizations, to the life of a community, and to the life of a church.

### IV. Annual Performance Review

Each year the faculty of each academic unit should review the specific procedures and criteria for the evaluation of all full-time faculty, including those who receive released time for administration, research, or other activities. The procedures and criteria for faculty evaluation must give attention to the three areas of faculty responsibilities that have been identified in this document. The procedures and criteria for the evaluation of faculty with released time must necessarily provide for evaluation of specific areas of responsibility and duties determined by the academic unit.

If the faculty within an academic unit wish to make modifications in these procedures or criteria, they will nominate and elect a committee to revise, in consultation with the appropriate dean, the procedures and/or criteria. If the faculty of the academic unit includes full-time lecturer positions, the committee should include representation from the lecturer faculty. Any revisions in the procedures and criteria for the evaluation of faculty must be approved by a majority ballot vote of all full-time faculty in that unit, validated by the appropriate dean and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and then distributed to all faculty members in the academic unit prior to the evaluation period.

Each faculty member will review with the department chair/dean at the time of employment and each year thereafter the expectations for his or her specific position. Some faculty members may have greater responsibilities in one of the categories than in another, according to the conditions under which he or she is employed. The relative importance of each category should be made clear at the time of employment and should be reviewed for possible modification each year.<sup>4</sup>

By February 15, annually, each faculty member will have been evaluated according to the established procedures and criteria and will be informed in writing of the assessment of his or her performance.<sup>5</sup> The administrator responsible for submitting the evaluations to be used to determine salary increases will review the performance assessment personally with the individual being evaluated. The conference will center upon the specific strengths and weaknesses of the individual's performance in the appropriate areas over the preceding year and expectations for his or her performance in the appropriate areas for the coming year. If an individual's performance is deemed marginal or unsatisfactory and if the decision is made that the individual is to be retained, the department chair and/or the dean should encourage and support the individual who seeks to overcome these deficiencies, should make specific recommendations for improvement, and should outline specific ways in which the academic unit can support the faculty member to make the necessary improvements.

#### V. Salary Recommendations

Before salary recommendations are submitted each year, a base-salary increase shall be established, taking into account the cost of living increase for the previous year. An additional and separate amount of money should be available for faculty merit increases that exceed the base-level increase in salary. To the extent that resources are available, these merit increases should be awarded as an additional percentage increase of the previous academic year's salary.<sup>6</sup>

By March 1 the dean will submit to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs specific recommendations for merit increases based on the results of the annual performance reviews. The number of faculty qualifying for merit increases should be determined only by the application of the criteria adopted by the academic unit and verified by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Promotion in professorial rank should be utilized to reward meritorious achievement which spans a number of years, and these changes in rank generally should be accompanied by separate and additional increases in compensation. Furthermore, if a chair or a dean becomes aware of inequities in salary which can not be addressed by the evaluation and compensation guidelines provided in this document, he or she may present to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs a case for additional specific salary increases to remedy these inequities.

Final approval of all faculty salaries rests with the President of Baylor University upon the recommendation of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

After salaries have been determined, the dean may at his or her discretion choose to inform faculty members of the approved salaries prior to the issuing of letters of appointment. Academic-year faculty letters of appointment should be issued by April 1, annually.

## VI. Evaluation/Compensation Appeal Process

When substantial reason arises for a full-time faculty member to question either his or her annual evaluation or compensation set for the successive academic year, the following steps should be followed in the appeal process:

1. A faculty member who wishes to question either his or her evaluation or compensation should first confer with the administrator responsible for the initial salary recommendation to review and clarify the conclusions reached in the most recent annual evaluation and salary consideration.
2. If the faculty member is still dissatisfied with his or her evaluation or compensation following this conferral, the dean of the unit, if he or she is not responsible for the initial salary recommendation, will appoint the chair of an ad-hoc evaluation/compensation review committee. If the dean is responsible for the initial salary recommendation, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the dean, will appoint the chair of the committee. The chair of the committee will appoint the additional members of the committee.
3. The evaluation/compensation review committee should meet to consider written material and oral remarks of all the parties involved.

4. A written report of the review committee's findings should be given to the faculty member, the chair, the appropriate dean, and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. With as much objectivity as possible, the committee's report should address the questions of fairness, accuracy, and appropriateness in the evaluation process and offer observations and recommendations to the faculty member and to those responsible for the evaluation.
5. On the basis on the report of the review committee, the appropriate dean, if he or she is not responsible for the initial salary recommendation, will make the final determination of the appropriate salary recommendation. If the dean is responsible for the initial salary recommendation, the final determination of the salary recommendation will be made by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the dean.
6. The final performance evaluation and salary recommendation will be communicated in writing to the faculty member and to the administrator or administrators responsible for the initial salary recommendation. Further appeal will be considered only at the written request of the faculty member to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Because such appeals should remain confidential, no public statement about an appeal should be made either by the faculty member in question or by any individual or group involved in the appeal process.

---

<sup>1</sup>*The principle of accountability applies to all university faculty and staff. This document establishes policy for the evaluation and compensation of individual faculty members in the various academic units of the university. It does not provide for the evaluation of the various academic units themselves nor for the evaluation and compensation of those holding full-time administrative positions in those units.*

<sup>2</sup>*The procedures developed in each academic unit should allow each faculty member within that unit to submit a report outlining his or her activities for the previous year. This report should be limited to no more than two pages.*

<sup>3</sup>*One means to evaluate teaching which has proven effective is the teaching portfolio. The portfolio, which is prepared by the faculty member being evaluated, contains items selected by the teacher to document teaching effectiveness. These items might include, but are not limited to, a description of teaching responsibilities, a statement of teaching philosophy, course syllabi and other materials, statements from colleagues who have observed the faculty member teaching, statements from alumni concerning teaching effectiveness, sample graded essays, etc. See The Teaching Portfolio: A Practical Guide to Improved Performance and Promotion/Tenure Decisions. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Co., 1991.*

<sup>4</sup>As has been indicated throughout this document, although most faculty will be evaluated in all areas, the terms of a faculty member's employment might permit an individual not to be evaluated in one of the areas. For example, a position as lecturer might not require research or scholarly/creative contributions. A research position might not involve teaching responsibilities. Furthermore, faculty members hired primarily as teachers of undergraduates should be actively engaged in research and scholarship that supports their teaching, but they should not necessarily be expected to produce scholarly contributions in order to achieve merit.

<sup>5</sup>Effective with the 2002-2003 academic year, a written evaluation of performance will accompany each faculty member's annual letter of appointment.

<sup>6</sup>When the resources available for salary increases are not sufficient to provide a total compensation increase of at least 1% above the Consumer Price Index for the central Texas region, the implementation of the procedures for merit pay outlined in this document are optional for each academic unit, to be determined by each dean in consultation with the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Furthermore, experience indicates that announcements of "the average percentage raise" undermine a system of compensation based primarily on merit. To allow the merit-raise system to work effectively, it is recommended that no information regarding average raises be distributed.

**Approved June 2, 1993**  
**Revised December 6, 1995**  
**Revised March 1, 2000**  
**Revised July, 2002**