Section 10. Guidelines for Academic Faculty Salary Increases

10.1 Guidelines for Salary Increases. General areas, which might be used to evaluate the performance of an individual faculty member in making recommendations for salary increases, are as follows:

A. Advising and counseling students
B. Committee work
C. Comparisons with other faculty members in similar positions and circumstances within the University and Community College System of Nevada
D. Creative activity or research productivity
E. Evidence of continued professional growth
F. Inequities due to current hiring practices
G. Leadership activities in professional organizations
H. Professional curatorial duties
I. Service to the university as a department chairman
J. Teaching effectiveness
K. Total length of service in academic life
L. Total years in present rank
M. Voluntary community activity and public service for which no remuneration is received
N. Institutional special assignments

10.2 Annual Merit Recommendations. An award of merit is expected to recognize the person who has (1) performed at least "satisfactorily" in the areas for which the person is evaluated and (2) is considered meritorious in at least one of those areas. Merit awards are specifically not to be confused with inequity adjustments. Among the many legitimate reasons to award merit are the following:

A. To encourage exceptional academic faculty with excellent mobility to remain at UNLV;
B. To reward exceptional performance in any of the several areas for which academic faculty are evaluated;
C. To reward outstanding performance over a long period of time performance that may not have resulted in merit for any particular year;
D. To allow for other specific or general exceptions, which to the evaluators represent some outstanding, reason for awarding merit.

10.2.1 The award of merit shall require a specific application and an evaluation process separate from annual or other evaluations made of faculty. Documentation submitted for annual evaluations may be used for merit evaluation. Unit administrators, including chairs, directors, and assistant and associate deans and chairs, must file applications through the faculty process to receive merit awards for teaching, research and non-administrative service.

10.2.2 The determination of the minimum standards for satisfactory and meritorious performance in teaching, research and service shall be made by an elected committee of the faculty of each department and/or college as specified in the unit bylaws, with the advice and consent of the dean. Where possible, the same
standards shall be applied to all faculty within the college. Such standards shall take into account the variations in assigned workload present in the college.

10.2.3 Each unit may determine the process used to rank its faculty, except that a final ranked list shall be submitted to the dean from an elected faculty committee at the college level. Ranking of applicants for merit shall be based on the standards created under section 10.2.2 and all policies and procedures mandated by the Provost or President. The final ranking shall exclude those faculty who do not meet the minimum standards for an award of merit, which are satisfactory performance in all relevant evaluation areas and meritorious performance in at least one. No faculty member may be present during the presentation or ranking of their application for an award of merit.

10.2.4 The dean shall recommend the dollar amount of each award of merit for teaching, research and non-administrative service, in accordance with all policies and procedures mandated by the Provost or President. Where the award made by the dean differs from the final rankings presented by the committee, explicit reasons must be provided by the dean to the Provost. Reasons can include those outlined in Section 10.2A-D, input obtained from other sources deemed important by the dean, (e.g., chairs, departmental faculty committees, performance assessments by external constituencies, such as college awards, etc.) and/or specific knowledge of performance areas for a faculty member not reflected in the rankings. The President makes the final determination of the amount awarded to each faculty member, upon recommendation by the Provost.

10.2.5 The official date of notification of merit awards for the purpose of grievance shall be the later of (a) the first day of the Fall semester or (b) the day the merit list is released to the campus. The merit list shall be made available to all faculty. When responding to a request from a faculty member for the reasons they received a particular award of merit, or no award, the Dean shall include in the letter the ranking of the faculty member by the college committee and the reasons for that award, which must include any information provided to the Provost.

10.2.6 Merit for administrative service shall be recommended at the discretion of the Dean, approved by the Provost and awarded by the President. (B/R 3/03)

10.3 Statement of Reasons. A faculty member who has been denied a salary increase may, within 15 calendar days after notification of such denial, provide a written request to the department chair, supervisor, or dean who rendered the negative decision asking for a statement in writing of the reasons for the denial. The response must be received by the faculty member within 15 calendar days after the appropriate administrator receives the written request for reasons. Faculty members also may request reconsideration of the denial (University and Community College System of Nevada Code, Chapter 5, Section 5.2.4 and UNLV Bylaws, Chapter III, Sections 6.5 and 16.9).

10.4 Grievances. A faculty member who has been denied a salary or merit increase has the right to file a grievance concerning the decision to the Faculty Senate Grievance Committee once the reconsideration process has been completed through the administrative channels. (See UNLV Bylaws, Chapter I, Section 4.6.6 and Chapter III, Section 20.) (B/R 3/03)

Section 14. Evaluation of Administrators

14.1 Purpose. The purpose of the evaluations shall be improvement of the performance of the administrators during their term of office.

14.2 Evaluation of the President. The president shall be evaluated at least once every three years according to procedures and criteria established by the Faculty Senate. There shall be an assessment of the level of confidence in which the president is held by the faculty along with an assessment of the president's performance of assigned duties within the standards of effectiveness and efficiency.

14.3 Evaluation of Administrators Other Than the President. While acknowledging that administrators other than the President are subject to annual evaluations by their supervisors (University and Community College System of Nevada Code Chapter 5, Section 5.11), each college and unit shall develop procedures for allowing a periodic assessment of the level of confidence in which the administrator is held by the academic and nonacademic faculty who report directly to that administrator. These comments may include an assessment of the administrator's performance of assigned duties within the standards of effectiveness and efficiency. This periodic assessment shall be solicited no less than once every three years, and, when available, it shall be given consideration in the annual evaluation written by the administrator's supervisor.