December 12, 2017

To: Dean Van Galen, Chancellor
    116 North Hall
    University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Mialisa Moline, Chair
       Faculty Senate
       University of Wisconsin-River Falls

Re: UWRF Faculty Senate Motion 2017-18/76

The following motion was approved, with 15 in favor, 0 opposed, and 4 abstentions, by the Faculty Senate on December 6, 2017:

Motion from Faculty Welfare and Personnel Policies Committee (Doug Margolis, Chair) to approve the attached changes to Chapter V, 5.3 and the accompanying Merit Evaluation Form for Faculty (see attached).

[Initial]

Approved

[Initial]

Disapproved

Dean Van Galen, Chancellor     12/14/17

Date
Chapter V. Compensation Procedures and Issues
5.3 Merit Rating - Procedures

The following rating procedures are to be followed:

1. New updated merit pay files for each person are to be developed when merit pay is allocated in the budget annually because existing personnel files are confidential. Such files will be compiled by the supervisor or department chair. After the merit pay distribution is completed, the contents of the merit pay files will be transferred to the department personnel files.

2. The committee, chair of an academic department needs the following information for rating:

   (a) Professional achievement sheet provided by each person. This allows each person to present his or her achievements for the merit period/year.

   (b) Other data: student evaluations, peer evaluations, teaching loads, advisee loads, number of preparations, graduate courses, extension courses and other relevant information.

3. The Academic Staff Council is responsible for devising an instrument for reporting on and evaluating support personnel.

4. The committee, chair, supervisor shall place each faculty member into one of seven-graded merit groups: A, AB, B, BC, C, D, and F. The following connotative adjectives may be considered in making this placement: A—excellent, AB—very good, B—good, BC—fair, C—adequate, D—poor, and F—unmeritorious. In the rare occasion that all unit members are placed in the same group, all merit distribution documentation must be forwarded to the appropriate administrative office, which will review the justification of the [committee, chair, supervisor's] decision. In the committee option, the ranking of each member of the committee will be determined by the other members of the committee. In the [chair, supervisor] option, the [chair's, supervisor's] rating will be determined by the [dean, immediate supervisor] in consultation with unit members. In the committee option, the chair of the committee is to be elected. The committee chair, department chair, supervisor sends the merit pay ratings to the [dean, appropriate administrative office] along with recommendations for special merit and equity adjustments. Two merit groups: SME or I. The following connotative adjectives may be considered in making this placement: SME - Successfully meets expectations. I - Improvement needed, does not meet expectations. In the committee option, the ranking of each member of the committee will be determined by the other members of the committee. In the [chair, supervisor] option, the [chair's supervisor's] rating will be determined by the [dean, immediate supervisor] in consultation with unit members. In the committee option, the chair of the committee is to be elected. The I committee chair, department chair, supervisor sends the Merit Evaluation Form to the [dean, appropriate administrative office].

5. The department chair, supervisor will meet with each unit member and review the results.

6. Merit funds are to be distributed to the maximum extent possible for all faculty or staff achieving an SME rating, by the following rules. Assign to each member in groups A, AB, B, BC, C, D, and F the respective group weights: 4.0, 3.5, 3.0, 2.5, 2.0, 1.0, 0. The average salary of the unit is calculated by dividing the total salaries within the unit by the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) positions. An individual's salary weight is calculated by adding the individual's
salary within the unit to one-third of the average salary of the unit (a part-time employee would add only one-third of the equivalent proportion of the unit average salary). An individual's merit weight is calculated by multiplying his or her group weight times his or her salary weight. An individual's normalized merit weight is calculated by dividing his or her merit weight by the sum of all of the individual merit weights. A unit member receives a merit amount equal to his or her normalized merit weight times the total merit pool of the unit.

Motion 12/13-134 in effect for one year only (i.e. for 2013-14 pay plan determinations see Motion [FS-12/13-134]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating using Chapter V process</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>(E) Exceptional</td>
<td>This rating occurs infrequently and acknowledges one or more of the following achievements: completion of a major goal, work performance that far exceeded expectations this year due to exceptional quality in all essential areas of responsibility, and/or an exceptional or unique contribution in support of unit, department, or University objectives. Although used infrequently, this rating is achievable by any employee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>(EE) Exceeds expectations</td>
<td>Work performance consistently exceed exceptions. Demonstrates very high level performance in all areas of responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B, BD, or C</td>
<td>(SME) Successfully meets expectations</td>
<td>Solid performance that consistently fulfills expectations and at times may exceed expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>(I) Improvement needed</td>
<td>Performance does not consistently meet expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>(U) Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Performance is consistently below expectation, and/or has failed to make reasonable progress toward agreed upon goals. Significant improvement is needed in most of this position.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating using Chapter V process</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(SME) Successfully meets expectations</td>
<td>Solid performance that meets expectations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I) Improvement needed</td>
<td>Performance does not meet expectations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MERIT EVALUATION FORM
(Faculty)

INSTRUCTIONS: This form is to be completed and submitted to the Office of Human Resources. This form does not need to be completed for Instructional Academic Staff or Limited Term Employees. The Office of Human Resources will place this form in the employee's personnel folder.

EMPLOYEE NAME: Click here to enter text.
TITLE: Click here to enter text.
DEPARTMENT: Click here to enter text.
DATE OF EVALUATION: Click here to enter text.

Overall Evaluation Rating (select one):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating using Chapter V process</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(SME) Successfully meets expectations</td>
<td>Solid performance that meets expectations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I) Improvement needed</td>
<td>Performance does not meet expectations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have read the above evaluation. I understand that my signature does not constitute a concurrence or approval but signifies that I have been shown this evaluation.

Employee Signature: __________________________ Date: __________________________

SUPERVISOR NAME: Click here to enter text.

Supervisor Signature: __________________________ Date: __________________________

Director/Dean Signature: __________________________ Date: __________________________

Received Office of Human Resources (initials) ____________ Date ____________

DRAFT