

ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY
Memo No. 11
Revised December, 2006

SUBJECT: FACULTY CONFERENCES; MERIT REVIEWS; COMPETITIVE OFFERS

In order to conform to the Faculty Code the following procedures are established by the School.

Note:

The College guidelines state that each department is required to adopt an activity report format that individual faculty members use to update their teaching, research, and service accomplishments. The reports must be submitted annually by each faculty member to the chair and are used as a basis for consideration of tenure, promotion, reappointment renewal and merit increases. Each drama faculty member should prepare this activity report in Spring Quarter prior to the Faculty/Chair Conference.

Faculty/Chair Communication/Conference

The purpose of the regular conference is to help individual faculty members plan and document their career goals. The discussion at each conference should include (1) the School's needs and goals with respect to the unit mission statement and the faculty member's teaching, scholarly, and service responsibilities and accomplishments; (2) shared goals for the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service in the forthcoming year(s) in keeping with the unit's needs and goals for the same period; and (3) a shared strategy for achieving those goals. The discussion will also identify specific duties, responsibilities and resources for the faculty member, and include specific suggestions to improve or aid the faculty member's work. Mutual decisions may be made at that time for a faculty member to move in a different direction from when hired, or from previous reviews, shifting his or her emphasis between teaching, research and service.

A meeting at least once a year will be scheduled for Assistant Professors, Senior Lecturers/ Artists, and Lecturers/Artists. Associate Professors will be scheduled at least every other year, and full Professors every third year. Meetings may be more frequent should either party feel the need.

After each meeting, a written understanding will be prepared by the chair to be reviewed by both parties as both need to agree on the substance of the conversation. Should there be a disagreement; the faculty member is entitled to write a separate document clarifying his or her understanding of the discussions. Any documents generated will be used as part of the merit review process.

Salary & Merit Reviews

The revised Code states that all faculty who are judged meritorious will receive at least a 2% merit pay increase each year. The procedure to determine merit awards is as follows.

All faculty members are to be reviewed annually by their colleagues to evaluate their merit and to arrive at a recommendation for an appropriate merit salary increase. This recommendation should be based on the faculty member's cumulative record, his/her current salary, and documentation of the review conferences. Salary compression and other inequities may be considered as well.

While the faculty Code specifically states faculty superior in rank shall evaluate other faculty, it does not preclude the lower ranks evaluating senior faculty. The School of Drama will seek from all full-time faculty their input in the merit process. This consideration may be expressed by a system of ranking (to be determined in advance) or delegated to the Chair by unanimous consent of the faculty as expressed in a written ballot.

The Code requires a separate consideration for merit input by and for full Professors.

Annually the members of the faculty, regardless of rank, will decide in advance if they will delegate authority for the Chair to act for the full Professors, or if each full Professor will provide written input to the Chair regarding the other full Professors, in addition to their participation in the ranking procedure.

No merit increase granted

Should a faculty member not receive a merit increase for a period of two years when funding is available, s/he will be referred to a special departmental committee composed by the Executive Council. This committee will be appointed as required by the Chair, and will consist of faculty superior in rank to the faculty member (or in the case of a full Professor, equal in rank). The committee will follow the guidelines in the revised Code to make a recommendation for what steps should be taken to help the faculty member contribute at a meritorious level.

Procedure for retention negotiations in the case of outside competitive offers

The faculty delegates to the Director the authority to negotiate any counter-offers. Therefore the following process will be followed if required.

Any individual receiving a competitive offer from a comparable institution will present it to the Executive Director. The Director, in consultation with the Executive Council, will determine if a retention offer should be made. If more than 2% is available for merit

raises in the next allocation, the College expects the School to contribute approximately 150% of the value of the average raise in the next allocation as is outlined in A&S Guidelines for Retention Offers (10/27/03). If the A&S guidelines change, the Council may act for the faculty to determine what amount the School will contribute. The College and the Provost are the primary source for funds for retention offers.

If a competitive offer is to be made, the School will gather relevant materials for College review: a vita, the last three years of student teaching evaluation, and peer teaching reviews. The Director will then prepare a letter outlining the case for the candidate paying particular attention to the issue of impact.

PM8111/REV06-04

Administrative Policy Memo No. 11, first established April 2000
Subsequent Revisions: 12/15/03
Executive Council Approval: 6/2/04
Faculty Approval: 6/7/04
Faculty Approval: 12/11/06