

GUIDELINES FOR MERIT ALLOCATION

Department of Consumer Studies

Fall, 2002¹

Merit salary increases are based on an individual faculty member's performance during the previous academic year, as evaluated during the annual faculty appraisal procedure. This evaluation is based on the premise that each faculty member is expected to be professionally productive and a contributing member of the University community, working toward the enrichment and positive development of the educational system. Performance of a faculty member is expected in the assigned workload areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

It is realized that individual working patterns, time management, and foci are difficult to systematize. Therefore, it is accepted that faculty productivity or output is the basis on which performance is to be evaluated, not the input of time.

Merit allocations are based upon a faculty member's performance as compared to a 4 rating (satisfactory) on a 9-point scale in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service:

1. **TEACHING:** Faculty members and the Chairperson will develop workload plans on an administered basis. Therefore, in any semester, teaching duties of individual faculty members may vary within the Department to permit variations in emphasis on research/creative activities and other aspects of individual workload provided the total teaching and scholarly needs of the faculty member and the Department are met.

A standardized department **TEACHING EVALUATION INSTRUMENT** will be used to evaluate teaching performance and the Chair will use this data as part of evaluating the teaching effectiveness of faculty. In general, tallies in the evaluation columns that indicate favorable responses must equal 80 percent of the combined total for all items on the instrument in order for the faculty member to be considered for merit for teaching performance. However, inasmuch as the Department of Consumer Studies recognizes and rewards innovation in instructional activities that serve to further department and university goals, exceptions to the 80-percent rule may be made to recognize the risk inherent in innovation.

Faculty are encouraged to submit additional evidence of teaching effectiveness.

¹ Ratified by faculty November 13, 2002. Additional language reaffirmed by faculty November 20, 2002.

2. SCHOLARSHIP: For a rating of satisfactory, each faculty member will show evidence of activity in this area. To be awarded merit, a faculty must show evidence of at least one refereed or otherwise peer-reviewed scholarly product. In keeping with the overall CNST philosophy of recognizing and rewarding change that furthers Department goals, exceptions to the general rule for rewarding merit may be made. For example, newly-hired faculty beginning a scholarly program or faculty who engage in new scholarly directions to support department initiatives may be exempted from the general criteria.

3. Service: For a satisfactory rating, a faculty member is expected to effectively contribute towards two service commitments within the University.

For merit consideration, a faculty member must serve in a meaningful capacity, and make significant contributions to, any of the following: 1) additional University commitments; 2) professional organizations; 3) agencies or institutions.

Paid consulting is not considered to be service.

STEPS TO BE FOLLOWED IN AWARDING MERIT

STEP 1 – Each faculty member² gathers appropriate documentation to support a self-evaluation in each of the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. This documentation may be selected from those activities stipulated in the CNST Department Promotion and Tenure Policy. Each faculty member should report to the chair the status of long-term research or other projects.

STEP 2 – The Chairperson assigns a rating for each faculty member's performance in the areas of assigned workload. TR denotes the rating for teaching, RR denotes the rating for scholarship, and SR denotes the rating for service. Each faculty member meets with the Chairperson of the Department during the annual appraisal process to discuss the Chairperson's ratings.

STEP 3 – Merit points (MP) for each faculty member are determined by the following calculation: The satisfactory rating of 4 is subtracted from the Chairperson's rating in teaching, scholarship, and service. The resulting figures are called "net scores" for the individual faculty member. Net scores that are negative are converted to zeros. The net scores are multiplied by the percentage workload agreed to between the faculty member and Chairperson during the prior year's planning session,

² The term "faculty member" is used to include all members of the Department merit pool.

averaged across the two planning periods. The weights derived from the previously agreed workload are denoted WT, WR, and WS. The result is the individual faculty member's Merit Points (MP).

STEP 4 –The Chairperson totals the Merit Points derived in Step 3 across all faculty included in the merit process to arrive at Department Merit Points (DMP).

STEP 5 – The Chairperson divides total merit pool dollars allocated to the Department (MDA) by Department Merit Points to derive the dollar Value Per Point (VPP).

STEP 6 – Each faculty member's merit points (MP) are multiplied by the monetary value per merit point (VPP). The result is the merit increase of the faculty member (MI).

NOTE: Persons on an approved sabbatical or other approved University program/internship, etc., receive merit consideration, based upon the fulfillment of specific goals established and agreed to by the faculty member and the Chair prior to the sabbatical or leave period.

MERIT ALLOCATION FORMULA

STEP 3

$$MP = WT \times (TR-4) + WR \times (RR-4) + WS \times (SR-4)$$

STEP 4

$$DMP = \text{Sum of Step 3 calculations for individual faculty}$$

STEP 5

$$\frac{MDA}{DMP} = VPP$$

STEP 6

$$MP \times VPP = MI$$