

Faculty Senate Meeting

24 February 2023

Senators present: Kim Delaney, Kyle Mara, Xavia Harrington Burton, Brandon Field, Erin Reynolds, Cindi Clayton, Nicholas Rhew, Amy Wilson, Jessica Mason, Stephanie Young, Shane White, Al Holen, Shannon Pritchard, Matt Hanka, Gary Black



Additional attendees: Mohammed Khayum, Julie McCoulough, Jaclyn Dumond, Jeff Sickman, Chuck Conaway, Kenny Purcell, Sally Vogel Bauer, Amy Chan Hilton

Held in BEC Boardroom

- Called to order: 2:32 pm
- Minutes from 27 January: Unanimously approved with a factual correction.
- Senate Chair report from Kim:
 - Business to close:
 - Charge 2021_14: Change in language reflecting Creative Commons license have been made to handbook.
 - Charge 2022_10: Senate bylaws changes have been made to handbook.
 - Charge 2022_15: University Promotions Committee modification of standing charge and process of promotion process; change has been made in the handbook, and this will be reported to the Board of Trustees at the next meeting.
 - All changes will be released in the next handbook.
 - Some candidates for the Chief Data Officer search have been on campus. Dean of Pott College search proceeding, Provost search proceeding.
- Report from the Provost:
 - Chief Data Officer search is undergoing.
 - Lily Endowment has an opportunity called University/Community collaboration that we are planning on submitting to.
 - Indiana College Core: Julie McCullough and Jaclyn Dumond
 - Indiana Commission for Higher Education is suggesting that the Indiana College Core courses be taught at the High School level. The High School students that complete this will get a certificate. Partnerships will be established between the institutes of higher learning and the secondary schools to be the provider for this but the Core, once completed, will transfer to any Indiana college. The CAP courses that we currently offer can fulfill this, and we are looking to form this relationship with the school systems that we currently have CAP arrangements with.

- Currently, 30% of our first-time-full-time-four-year, degree-seeking freshmen come in with CAP credit, and these students typically are retained and graduate at a higher rate. Increasing this demographic would be a positive for all.
 - We need to put a certificate through to the Commission to offer the credit for high schools, and for free. Julie McCullough will be putting the "paper" work through Curriculog, and the Curriculum Committee will act on the request.
- Charge 2023_01: Book Bundle Communication: Jeff Sickman in attendance to answer questions on the charge.
 - Barnes and Noble is the exclusive distributor for course materials, so we can not advertise any other sources. We (faculty) can let students find material on their own, but we can't direct them (by our syllabus) to go somewhere else.
 - The opt-out option was selected because the book publishers will not give as good prices to B&N if we had the opt-in as the default.
 - The bookstore is willing to work with departments (like the Art department) to figure out what sort of class supplies might be able to be included in the bundle, and also to see if any software packages could be included in the bundle (e.g. for Computer Science courses)
 - Kim will work with Jeff to see if there is any way to give individual students the option of what *type* of book (electronic/print), rather than just having the instructor make the choice for the entire class.
- Charge 2022_07: Merit Process Modification and Economic Benefits. The *ad hoc* committee's report has nine recommendations for action, and we want to discuss them individually to determine what to forward to the administration.
 - Recommendation 1 was passed with one abstention.
 - Recommendation 2 was passed with 12 in favor, none opposed, and one senator who voraciously disagreed with the Secretary's methodology of calling for a *viva voce* vote, and exercised his right to demand a division of the assembly, according to Article VII, paragraph 46 of Robert's Rules of Order.
 - Recommendation 3:
 - The first part of the sentence of Part A could be "Faculty members of an appropriate academic unit level as determined by the College/Library", and "appropriate academic level" should be used everywhere "department" is used.
 - A reference to College handbooks should be made in Part B, suggested was: "These criteria should align with College Handbook expectations for teaching, scholarship, service, and practice, as reported on the Faculty Annual Report."

Again, modification was made by changing 'department' everywhere to "appropriate academic level".

- Modified language was approved unanimously.
- Recommendation 4: Approved unanimously.
- Recommendation 5: With the modification of 'appropriate academic units' replacing 'departments', this was approved unanimously.
- Recommendation 6: The College dean should be directed use some sort of criteria. Modifications to this are desired, but in the absence of sufficient time to properly consider the wording of the recommendation, the remainder of this report was tabled until the next meeting.
- Next meeting: 17 March 2023. We will need someone to take minutes, as the regular Secretary will not be able to attend, and Stephanie agreed to do that. (Thank you, Stephanie!)
- Meeting adjourned: 4:30 pm.

Name: Rich Bennett (Optional)

Date of Submission: January 6, 2023

Name of Faculty Senate Representative:

1. Kim Delaney
2. Xavia Burton
3. Kyle Mara

Complete the following items and submit this form to either your Faculty Senate Representative or to the Faculty Senate Chair for consideration by the Faculty Senate.

1. Charge Title:

Archie's Book Bundle Notification

2. Background:

Provide an explanation of the background and context for the proposed charge. What problem, issue, or experience prompts the proposal of the charge?

In the fall 2022 semester, B&N College, the purveyor of books, supplies, and other sundries to our students here at USI rolled out their "Archie's Book Bundle" program onto our students. My understanding is that students are charged \$24/credit hour for books and some supplies related to the classes they are taking. While I get that this program may benefit some/most students, that is not the case for all. A good example is senior art students whose schedule might consist of primarily studio classes (i.e. making art) which usually do not require a book or the supplies, regardless of quality, for those course are not available through the USI Campus Store. Another example might be students that can get their materials elsewhere for cheaper than the price of their books through the book bundle program. While there are many things that I detest about this program, my charge is regarding the opt-out procedure.

From my experience, for a student to opt-out of the program, they first need to realize/remember that the program is an opt-in program by default, meaning if they do nothing their USI account will be charged \$24/credit hour for each semester. Information about the bundle program was sent to students prior to the fall 2022 semester, but, to date, there has been no information sent to students for the

spring 2023 semester as of the writing of this charge that I have received. I am also a student here, and I haven't received anything like this from the USI Campus Store.

Secondly, if they decide they do not want to be charged \$24/credit hour, they must find out how to opt-out of the program, which is not straightforward. Currently, to opt-out a student must first go to usi.edu/campus-store. You can't get to the Campus Store through usi.edu landing page by clicking on a link in any of the menus that I can find. You have to know the specific domain (?) of usi.edu to go to. So there's a roadblock right out of the gate. If there's another way to get to usi.edu/campus-store, it is not clear. I had to Google "USI Campus Store Opt-out" to find the page. Once you go to usi.edu/campus-store, you have to click on "Archie's Book Bundle" in the Campus Store menu. Then, you have to click on the "Archie the Eagle/Archie's Book Bundle" image on the right side of the page or the "More Details" link below the image. On the page that opens, you have to scroll down to the FAQ section and open up the question entitled "Can I opt out of the program?" You are then presented with a link to the "Archie's Book Bundle Opt-Out Form" with a warning that you must opt-out before the 100% refund period, which is not indicated until you click on the form. So, as you can see, this process is quite convoluted. I'm not aware of any other method of notifying students about opting out of the program. I would have gotten the message. I had to use Google and do some hunting to find the opt-out form.

Thirdly, they must do all of this on or before the close of business on the Friday of the first week of classes. For the spring 2023 semester, this is January 13, 2023. I think this was the case for the fall 2022 semester...the end of the first week...and suspect this will be the case going forward.

Lastly, as of the writing of this charge, there has been no attempt that I know of by the USI Campus Store to inform/remind students of the program, how to opt-out of the program, nor when the last date students can opt-out. Again, I am a student and would have gotten an email if they had.

I may not be giving our students enough credit. Maybe they are very keen and savvy and are already aware of the insidiousness of programs like this and are quick to avoid pitfalls. I hope that's the case. However, I can't imagine this is the case for all students. We advocate for students' mental health. We advocate for inclusion of students in their experiences at USI. I think we all advocate for their success in our classrooms. Why not advocate for their financial well-being as well?

3. Action Requested and Desired Result:

Specifically state what action you would like the Senate to take and the desired outcome that you would like to see.

I have three mostly mutually exclusive solutions:

1. My big ask is that the bundle program be changed to one where the student must choose to opt-in rather than opt-out. Thus, opt-out would be the default option.
2. If #1 can't happen, I would like for the administration to compel B&N College to notify/remind students of the bundle program; the fact that it is an opt-in by default program and that their USI account will be charged if they do not opt-out; a clear link to, or clear directions on how to, opt-out of the program; and the deadline for opting out clearly indicated in a stand-alone email to students within a reasonable time frame before the start of each semester (i.e. not too late and not too soon). Additionally, signage should also be placed in common areas reminding students of the program and its details if feasible.
3. If #2 can't happen, I would like for CETL to publish a "required/recommended" syllabus statement outlining the facts and deadlines of the Archie's Bundle program. The verbiage should be approved by Faculty Senate regardless of who writes it. I'm happy to provide a sample statement to start the process if this option is chosen.

4. Potential Resources:

Provide any information that can help Faculty Senate fully address the charge. Attach additional documents if necessary.

I doubt senators have access to the contract between B&N College and USI, but that may need to be referenced.

Maybe see what SGA has to say about the student experience thus far with the bundle program? It could be that they find most students are satisfied with the bundle program the way it is.

Items 5-7 are to be completed by Senate Chair or Secretary:

5. Senate Comments:

6. Action Taken by the Faculty Senate:

7. Action Taken by the Administration:

Feedback Provided by Jeff Sickman for Senate Meeting on 1/27/2023

I just met with Campus Store yesterday to discuss Archie's Book Bundle and related topic for the spring term. They held their internal debrief at a corporate level today and will share those results with me during future meetings. Neither the store nor the Bursar's Office has received a significant number of complaints this term about Archie's Book Bundle. The Student Government Association hosted a widely-publicized open forum on November 16 to solicit student feedback and address concerns. One of the specific concerns about the program was the opt-out versus opt-in feature, which we explained and which the students in attendance seemed to understand and accept.

In addition, we demonstrated the simplicity of the opt-out process during the SGA presentation. Also, we highlighted price comparison tool that allows students to make an informed decision about whether to participate in the program. The opt-out link appears immediately below that tool. One of the outcomes of our meeting yesterday was a suggestion by Barnes & Noble to make that comparison tool more prominent. They are not interested in students making poor decisions because the company realizes that the success of the program depends on students recognizing its value. We plan to implement that change for Fall 2023. During the SGA forum, we agreed to remain in communication with SGA leadership, and we asked for their help with student communication and outreach. If they become aware of a problem, we asked them to alert us.

To support the fact that the opt-out link is not difficult to find, the percentage for Fall 2022 and Spring 2023 is nearly identical—33 percent opted out in fall and 34 percent opted out in spring. In rough numbers, those percentages equate to nearly 1,900 student in fall and over 1,700 so far in spring. The numbers are above the opt-out percentages at other schools to my knowledge, which tells me that access to the link is not a problem for most students at USI.

The communications for the Archie's Book Bundle program are a combined effort between the University and Barnes & Noble. The store, the Bursar's Office, and University Strategic Communications participate. The communications include emails, yard signs on campus, social media posts, information in TouchNet, and information on the student bills. We listened to feedback after the fall semester and made changes. For example, some students complained that they did not know if the opt-out worked. As a result, we worked with IT and instituted a confirmation email. We have added FAQs and redesigned that page more than once in an attempt to be responsive to constructive criticism.

Executive Summary

Merit Review Committee

Broad Summary Statement

At its April 1, 2022, meeting, Faculty Senate approved Charge #2022 07 titled “USI Merit Process Modification”. (see Appendix A). This charge recommended that Faculty Senate, with the support of the Provost’s Office, form a campus-wide committee to review the merit (salary/pay increase) decision-making process currently in place at the University of Southern Indiana. A committee representing all academic units on campus was formed in Spring 2022 to address the items noted in the charge (specific charge items are noted below).

Composition of the Committee:

- Sally Vogl-Bauer, Chairperson, College of Liberal Arts
- Chuck Conaway, College of Liberal Arts
- Alisa (AL) Holen, College of Liberal Arts
- Rick Hudson, Pott College of Science, Engineering, and Education
- Kenny Purcell, Pott College of Science, Engineering, and Education
- Jennifer Evans, College of Nursing and Health Professions
- Marilyn Ostendorf, College of Nursing and Health Professions
- Cindi Clayton, Romain College of Business
- Brian McGuire, Romain College of Business
- Becca Neel, Rice Library
- Sarah Will, Human Resources

The committee worked from June 2022 – February 2023 and (a) researched how merit pay increase process was performed by all academic units on campus, (b) reviewed how comparable peer institutions addressed merit, and (c) surveyed department chairs and directors across campus to learn how merit decisions were made.

Based on the work done, the Committee is making a series of recommendations that align with the intent of the charge put forward. The following sections of this Executive Summary (a) provide the specific charge, (b) summarize the data collection and analysis done, and (c) make recommendations/action items in alignment with the findings and charge.

Specific Charge Items

There were nine specific items to Faculty Senate Charge #2022 07 “USI Merit Process Modification”:

1. Recommend the creation of an ad hoc committee to review/revise merit procedures, working in conjunction with Faculty Senate and the Provost’s Office, having representation across colleges, faculty, staff, and administration.

2. Review the level of consistency of procedures across academic units.
3. Determine what evidence/documents are to be used when making merit decisions.
4. Review the level of standardization across departments within Colleges.
5. Determine what criteria should be used when making decisions.
6. Determine the time periods that are to be used for merit decisions.
7. Address the lack of consistency in how information pertaining to merit is communicated and shared with faculty.
8. Ensure that merit increases are assessed separately from salary compression increases.
9. Determine a formal appeal or grievance process for merit decision appeals.

Summary of the Data Collection and Analysis

The Merit Review Committee gathered data from several areas: (a) reviewing faculty annual report (FAR) documents currently used by academic units, (b) examining how comparable peer institutions address issues of merit, and (c) surveying department chairs and directors to learn more about how merit decisions are made. Below is a summary of each of these efforts.

a. FAR Comparisons

At the onset, the Committee realized that faculty annual reports (FARs) played an important role in the merit process, as they are often the primary evidence provided by faculty members. Thus, while the Committee's charge was centered on merit-based salary decisions, the Committee felt it would be helpful to investigate the level of consistency of the templates used for faculty annual reports across academic units.

Although the Provost's Office provides a template to use for Faculty Annual Reports, most colleges modify this template for their own use. All faculty annual reports templates included documenting faculty activity regarding teaching/advising (or professional performance for Rice Library), scholarship/professional activity, and service. Each college describes what qualifies under each title slightly differently. At least one college and the Rice Library required faculty to identify professional goals for the next year.

b. Comparable Institutions

The committee reviewed the handbooks of Ball State University, Murray State University, Western Kentucky University, and Northern Kentucky University. Procedures and schedules for merit pay increases were found in each university's Salary/Compensation handbook section

(similar to our Section E.1). While procedures and schedules varied by institution, all had a defined process and required communication between the department or program chairs and the faculty members when merit pay increase recommendations were made.

c. Chair/Director Survey

During the Fall 2022 semester, Council of Chairs and Program Directors members were asked to complete a Qualtrics survey on the merit process used in their respective departments. Thirty-five individuals participated in the study; however, some data was missing. The results indicated there was little level of consistency across academic units, as evidenced by the following results:

1. Although 29 participants stated that they reviewed faculty annual reports (FARs), only 14 participants claimed they completed the spreadsheets generated by Human Resources for merit-based salary recommendations. Eighteen participants stated they provide written or oral feedback to the dean about merit-based salary decisions.
2. Participants reported different levels of providing feedback to faculty about their annual review.
 - a. 13 participants always provided feedback,
 - b. 7 participants only provided feedback sometimes or for some faculty,
 - c. 8 participants provided feedback only if necessary, and
 - d. 1 participant never provides feedback.
3. In written responses, some participants identified that their departments used rubrics for merit-based salary decisions, but this practice does not appear to be common.
4. As indicated above, practices regarding merit decisions vary by academic unit. In addition to the differences listed above, the survey of chairs and program directors found the following:
 - a. When merit-based salary pools were available, 12 participants reported that faculty in their department always get the same percent increase;
 - b. Whereas 11 participants reported faculty sometimes get the same percent increase; and
 - c. 1 participant reported that faculty never get the same percent increase.
5. Regarding training,
 - a. 6 participants indicated they had received training or guidance about reviewing annual reports and making salary recommendations,
 - b. 19 indicated they had not received training.

Recommendations/Action Items

The Merit Review Committee is making nine (9) recommendations to address the merit review process at the University of Southern Indiana:

1. In the event that the pay pool for raises does not exceed 2% of the current salary base,
 - a. All faculty should receive an equal percentage increase in their salaries.
 - b. No evidence or documentation other than continued employment is required to calculate the increase.
2. In the event that the pay pool for raises exceeds 2% of the current salary base,
 - a. The first 2% of the pay pool will be distributed as described above.
 - b. The portion of the pay pool that exceeds 2% of the current salary base will be distributed applying the process defined in the University Handbook that is based on the Faculty Annual Report (FAR) submitted by the Faculty member.
3. Given the radically different natures of disciplines both within and across the colleges, no universal set of criteria can be developed for merit pay calculations.
 - a. Rather, the faculty members of each department should determine appropriate criteria for merit pay calculations to be made by the department chair.
 - b. These criteria should align with faculty activity reported on the Faculty Annual Report (FAR), but each department shall determine how to prioritize faculty achievements in these categories to calculate merit pay increases. When setting criteria for their department, faculty should be mindful of the different expectations associated with different faculty ranks and types of contracts. All full-time faculty, regardless of rank or type of contract, are eligible for merit pay increases.
4. The time period to be used for making merit pay decisions will be the most recently completed calendar year (January-December) as documented in the Faculty Annual Report (FAR).
5. In the event that no pay pool is available for merit raises in any given year, faculty accomplishments shall be carried forward to the next year in which such raises are calculated.
 - a. The carryover time window is two years.
 - b. Individual faculty members and their departments may deem a long-term project appropriate for carryover.
6. Process:
 - a. Department chairs will forward merit pay recommendations to the college dean.
 - b. The college dean makes an independent evaluation and forwards their recommendation and the department chair's to the Provost.
 - c. Merit amounts may be adjusted at any level during this process.

7. When making their recommendation to the college dean,
 - a. Department chairs shall notify faculty of their recommendation in writing.
 - b. Provide each faculty member with a justification for their recommendation.
 - c. After this or any subsequent adjustments to the amount awarded, faculty will have five business days to respond in writing to the recommendation. This response should go to the faculty member's immediate supervisor (e.g., department chairperson or dean).
 - d. Further actions should follow the conflict resolution steps outlined in the University Handbook.
 8. Faculty will receive fiscal year salary increase letters indicating their new salary and the percentage increase that was awarded to the previous year's salary.
 9. To address items 1-3 and 6-8, the committee recommends Section E.1 of the University Handbook be edited to include the language outlined in Appendix B of this report.
-
-

Appendix A
CHARGE TO THE USI FACULTY SENATE
Formal Request for USI Faculty Senate Action

Name: Sally Vogl-Bauer (Optional)

Date of Submission: March 21, 2022

Name of Faculty Senate Representative:

1. Charles Conaway
2. Michael Strezewski
3. Stephanie Young

Complete the following items and submit this form to either your Faculty Senate Representative or to the Faculty Senate Chair for consideration by the Faculty Senate.

1. Charge Title:

USI Merit Process Modification

2. Background:

Provide an explanation of the background and context for the proposed charge. What problem, issue, or experience prompts the proposal of the charge?

Last year was the first time I participated in the merit process at USI as a faculty member. This experience showed me that the current merit process used for reviewing faculty performance has many issues that need to be reviewed/ revised in order to provide consistency and transparency for these decisions. This issue impacts employee relations as well as morale because most faculty don't know how merit increases are determined (if merit rubrics are used, they are often not shared with faculty; when they are shared, there may be inconsistencies between how merit is determined versus how faculty performance is reviewed using faculty annual report (FAR) data). This also impacts those individuals charged with completing faculty merit reviews, as they would also benefit from clear, standardized, guidelines. I break down the specific concerns in item #3.

3. Action Requested and Desired Result:

Specifically state what action you would like the Senate to take and the desired outcome that you would like to see.

There are many action steps I would like to see addressed. They include the following: (1) I recommend the creation of an ad hoc committee to review/revise merit procedures, working in conjunction with Faculty Senate and the Provost's Office, having representation across colleges,

faculty, staff, and administration. The merit process impacts faculty across campus, so having representation across units is recommended; (2) Review the level of consistency of procedures across academic units. For example, College websites do not clearly indicate what the FAR guidelines are. This does not mean annual reports are not done, but there are inconsistencies with what is required when completing a faculty annual report. There is even less known when it comes to merit; (3) Determine what evidence/documents are to be used for making merit decisions. Faculty often assume that it will be faculty annual reports, but this may not be the case. Colleges may be using different types of evidence and all of this complicates what evidence is being gathered and used to make these decisions; (4) Review the level of standardization across departments within Colleges. For example, every department in the College of Liberal Arts has its own merit guidelines; (5) Determine what criteria should be used when making merit decisions. It should not be assumed that the criteria used for merit align with FARs. In some instances, there are merit criteria that may contain departmental-centric biases (that are often unknown by faculty). It is also unclear how balanced merit criteria are. Presently, there are not percentages or weights for how faculty are to be spending their time/being evaluated per each main criteria area (e.g., teaching, research, service); (6) Determine the time periods that are to be used for merit decisions. Is it the calendar year (January - December), the academic year (July - June)? Furthermore, how do these time periods coincide with evidence provided by faculty? For example, FARs often use calendar years. But if an academic calendar year is being used for merit, faculty may not have had opportunities to provide evidence for the entire time period. Whatever decision is made about the time period under consideration, it should be standardized for all individuals to aid in consistency and whether goals have been achieved within the designated period and to ensure that faculty have been able to provide evidence for the time period under review; (7) Address the lack of consistency in how information pertaining to merit is communicated and shared with faculty. At the present time, University contract letters are vague. They do not indicate a faculty member's previous year's salary, just the new salary. They also do not indicate the percentage of pay increase for the particular contract period. Faculty in some colleges receive formal verification of the size of their merit increase, but this does not happen for all academic units. In other instances, faculty receive no verification in advance of receiving their university contract letters; (8) Ensure that merit increases are assessed separately from salary compression increases. These two items are not the same thing and merit funds should not be used to correct for larger salary compression issues on campus. Salary compression is a real thing, but it should be addressed separately from decisions about merit; and (9) Determine a formal appeal or grievance process for merit decision

appeals. There is no formal process currently in place for appealing a merit decision.

4. Potential Resources:

Provide any information that can help Faculty Senate fully address the charge. Attach additional documents if necessary.

In order to fully address the items in this charge, this will require an extensive review of current practices across academic units. Therefore, based on the items listed, it is recommended that these items (e.g., FAR reports, current merit practices) be gathered at the committee level.

Items 5-7 are to be completed by Senate Chair or Secretary:

5. Senate Comments:

6. Action Taken by the Faculty Senate:

7. Action Taken by the Administration:

Appendix B

Proposed University Handbook Language

The following language is recommended to be inserted in the University of Southern Indiana's University Handbook to reflect the recommendations made in this Executive Summary.

- In the event that the pay pool for raises does not exceed 2% of the current salary base,
 - All faculty should receive an equal percentage increase in their salaries.
 - No evidence or documentation other than continued employment is required to calculate the increase.

- In the event that the pay pool for raises exceeds 2% of the current salary base,
 - The first 2% of the pay pool will be distributed as described above.
 - The portion of the pay pool that exceeds 2% of the current salary base will be distributed applying the process defined in the University Handbook that is based on the Faculty Annual Report (FAR) submitted by the Faculty member.

- Given the radically different natures of disciplines both within and across the colleges, no universal set of criteria can be developed for merit pay calculations.
 - Rather, the faculty members of each department should determine appropriate criteria for merit pay calculations to be made by the department chair.
 - These criteria should align with faculty activity reported on the Faculty Annual Report (FAR), but each department shall determine how to prioritize faculty achievements in these categories to calculate merit pay increases. When setting criteria for their department, faculty should be mindful of the different expectations associated with different faculty ranks and types of contracts. All full-time faculty, regardless of rank or type of contract, are eligible for merit pay increases.

- The time period to be used for making merit pay decisions will be the most recently completed calendar year (January-December) as documented in the Faculty Annual Report (FAR).

- In the event that no pay pool is available for merit raises in any given year, faculty accomplishments shall be carried forward to the next year in which such raises are calculated.
 - The carryover time window is two years.
 - Individual faculty members and their departments may deem a long-term project appropriate for carryover.

- Department chairs will
 - Forward merit pay recommendations to the college dean.
 - The College dean makes an independent evaluation and forwards their recommendation and the department chair's to the Provost.
 - Merit amounts may be adjusted at any level during this process.

- When making their recommendation to the college dean,
 - Department chairs shall notify faculty of their recommendation in writing.
 - Provide each faculty member with a justification for their recommendation.
 - After this or any subsequent adjustments to the amount awarded, faculty will have five working days to respond in writing to the recommendation. This response should go to the faculty member's immediate supervisor (e.g., department chairperson or dean).
 - Further actions should follow the conflict resolutions steps outlined in the University Handbook.

 - Faculty will receive fiscal year salary increase letters indicating their new salary and the percentage increase that was awarded to the previous year's salary.
-
-