



Policy for Merit Review and Allocation of Raises

Document Number: ACAD-0009

Date Published(sys): 10/6/2023

General Description

Policy Summary:

This policy defines a timeline of merit reviews for all tenured and tenure-track faculty. Further, this policy defines guidelines for yearly allocation of merit raises from the “faculty merit salary pool.”

Purpose:

To make the system for allocating merit raises transparent, moderately equitable, and clear.

Scope:

This policy applies to all tenured and tenure-track faculty who are not on phased retirement.

Policy Content

I. Review Rubrics

Each department has two review rubrics approved by and filed with Academic Affairs. The first rubric is one that is used on a yearly basis for tenure-track faculty; the second rubric is one that is used on a triennial basis for all tenured faculty.

Review rubrics define the criteria for judgments labeled as exceptional, exceeding expectation, meeting expectation, or below expectation in each of the three categories: Teaching/Librarianship, Scholarship/Artistic Work, and Service.

In each of the three categories, we expect that roughly 10% of all University faculty are exceptional, roughly 30% exceed expectation, roughly 60% meet expectation, and very few are below expectation. Department chairs will not be asked to observe these percentages within the department, but the individual Division Advisory Councils and the School of Business should attempt to achieve them. Toward this end, the Associate Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and the Dean of the School of Business will review all data to ensure campus-wide norms are being followed. Furthermore, each year Academic Affairs will supply the Faculty Senate with data on the previous year’s review distributions, and the Faculty Senate will summarize these data in a report to the Faculty.

II. Review Timeline

Each faculty member’s letter of appointment will state clearly the review rating associated with each category, the year their last review was completed, and the year of the faculty member’s next review.

Tenured Faculty: All tenured faculty will be distributed into three cohorts—A, B, and C—and every year one cohort will be reviewed based on the previous three years of teaching/librarianship, scholarship/artistic work, and service, according to the triennial review rubric. The merit evaluation assessed during the review year will then be used during yearly merit allocation until the next triennial review for that cohort (see III. below).

Tenure-track Faculty: Using the approved rubric for tenure-track faculty, all such faculty are reviewed in accordance with the Faculty Handbook.

Each review, whether it be formal or informal, must be accompanied by a review rating for each of the three categories.

The merit review rating submitted in the year that the faculty member is granted tenure will be a triennial review, and the faculty member will enter that year’s cohort.

III. Merit Allocation

Each year the University budget contains an allocation for merit raises that is separate from money allocated for promotion raises. This *faculty merit salary pool* will be split into two categories: *extra* merit and *regular* merit.

The faculty merit salary pool is defined as the increase in the budgetary allocation for faculty salaries for the next fiscal year, as compared to the current fiscal year. The percentage merit salary pool is defined as the faculty merit salary pool represented as a proportion of the budgetary allocation for faculty salaries in the current fiscal year. The pool for extra merit is defined as the dollar amount of the faculty merit salary pool that is reserved for distribution among the faculty, including faculty members who were recently promoted, whose performance receives a rating above “meets expectation” in any category, provided that they receive a rating of at least “meets expectations” in each of the three review categories. The pool for extra merit is one fifth of the faculty merit salary pool.

Distribution: Raises from the extra merit pool are distributed as dollar amounts using the standard that teaching and scholarship are weighted equally, and twice as much as service.

	Teaching/ Librarianship	Scholarship/ Artistic Work	Service
--	----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

Exceptional	\$4x	\$4x	\$2x
Exceeding Expectation	\$2x	\$2x	\$x

Although the size of this pool—and thus the corresponding value of x—will vary, the reward structure will remain consistent. The value of x is determined as follows.

Let:

M be the total number of reviews of exceptional teaching/librarianship and exceptional scholarship/artistic work;

N be the total number of reviews of exceptional service, exceeding expectations in teaching/librarianship, and exceeding expectations in scholarship/artistic work;

O be the number of reviews of exceeding expectations in Service.

Then $x =$

$$\frac{\text{total dollars in the extra merit pool}}{4M+2N+O}$$

Each year Academic Affairs will supply the Faculty Senate with data on the previous year’s extra merit distributions, and the Faculty Senate will summarize these data in a report to the Faculty.

Regular Merit: After the extra merit pool has been determined by Academic Affairs, the remainder of the University’s faculty merit salary pool will be distributed as a regular merit percentage increase. For this portion of the pool, each faculty member with a performance review of at least “meets expectation” in each of the three categories will receive the same percentage raise from this pool. Any faculty member who receives a rating of “below expectation” in any of the three categories will receive a percentage raise of at most the percentage corresponding to the regular merit raise, with the faculty member’s exact percentage raise determined by the faculty member’s supervisor and Academic Affairs.

IV. Possibility of Additional Review Outside the Normal Cycle

Each tenured faculty member’s triennial review is the basis for merit allocation in each year of the three-year cycle. The only exception to this cycle concerns faculty whose performance has been judged as “below expectation” in any category; in that case, the faculty member may take the following steps to move into “meets expectation” in the same category:

For any area in which the faculty member’s performance has been reviewed as “below expectation,” that faculty member and their supervisor may determine a plan of action to move the faculty member’s performance to “meets expectation.” This plan must be approved by Academic Affairs, and it must meet the criteria specified in the review rubric.

Once the faculty member successfully completes the plan of action in a particular area, their chair will petition to Academic Affairs to change the rating of the faculty member to “meets expectation” in that area for the current review period. At this point, that faculty member will be eligible for any future extra merit raises assessed during their review cycle; furthermore, this new rating will be reflected on the faculty member’s letters of appointment for the remaining time in the review cycle.

Revision Management

Revision History Log:

Revision #:	Date:	Recorded By:
v1.0	10/6/2020 10:31 AM	Sarah Perales

Vice President Approval:

Name:	Title:
Megan Mustain	Vice President for Academic Affairs