

## **Epidemiology Program Faculty Merit Metric Policy (To be approved by the Epidemiology Faculty TBD)**

### **General Provisions:**

1. All continuing members of the bargaining unit shall be eligible for annual merit pay increases. In the Epidemiology Program this includes tenure track and non-tenure track faculty.
2. Workload as defined by the Department's approved Faculty Workload Policy applies to each faculty member and is designated in terms of percentage of effort in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Workload is agreed upon by the faculty member and the Department Chairperson at the time of annual faculty appraisal.
3. As defined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, merit pay allocations shall be awarded based on the faculty member's performance as reflected in the annual faculty appraisal conducted by the Department Chairperson. The annual faculty appraisal shall be based on the individual's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service and will be related to the workload plan developed for that year.
4. The Department Chairperson shall be responsible for assigning annual merit pay in a manner that is consistent with the provisions of this document.
5. Upon request, the Department Chairperson shall review with a faculty member the specific information used to determine the faculty's merit pay.
6. Any modification to the provisions of this document must be approved by a majority vote of the departmental tenure track and non-tenure track faculty taken by written ballot.

### **Provisions for Merit Pay Allocation:**

1. Merit pay shall be allocated based on the 9-point scale appraisal ratings earned by each faculty member. To earn a satisfactory rating of 4-6, performance must be at a level that meets expectations set forth in the annual Faculty Planning Form governed by the Faculty Workload Policy. An unsatisfactory rating of 1-3 indicates that an individual's performance falls below these expectations. Outstanding achievement will be recognized by a rating of 7-9 indicating exceptional performance. Gradations between and within categories will be based on both the quality and quantity of work performed.
2. A faculty member who earns appraisal ratings where the average, weighted by workload percentage, falls below the arithmetic mean of 4 shall receive no merit pay.

3. The merit pool for the Department shall be divided among those faculty members eligible for merit pay in amounts proportional to the sum of the 9-point ratings weighted by workload percentage.
4. For satisfactory performance in the area of teaching, each faculty member is expected to provide evidence of quality teaching. Such evidence should be based on the criteria set forth by the Department's Promotion and Tenure document and may include, but are not limited to, the following: teaching load (contact hours/credit hours), student evaluations, course enhancements and/or revisions, use of technology, new courses developed, outside speakers, procurement of donations, independent study students, undergraduate research scholars, attending education and/or technology seminars, attending scientific continuing education related to field(s) of instruction, and student advisement.

To earn a satisfactory rating of 4-6, performance must be at a level that meets expectations set forth in the annual Faculty Planning Form governed by the Faculty Workload Policy. Evidence of performance must include all the following, but is not limited to these activities:

- a. Teaching the assigned teaching load,
  - b. Review and update of instructional materials as required by accreditation standards,
  - c. Satisfactory student and/or peer evaluations,
  - d. Attending an education or scientific continuing education seminar,
  - e. Participating in student advisement as assigned,
  - f. Participating in recruitment and/or other department-sponsored activities.
5. For satisfactory performance in the area of scholarship, each faculty member is expected to provide evidence of quality scholarship. To earn a satisfactory rating of 4-6, performance must be at a level that meets expectations set forth in the annual Faculty Planning Form governed by the Faculty Workload Policy. Supportive documentation will be based on the criteria set forth by the Department's Promotion and Tenure document and may include, but is not limited to, the following: refereed publications, grant proposals funded, grant proposals submitted, research initiatives, refereed publication of scientific findings in abstract form which may include presentation in poster or oral form, non-refereed publications, and invited seminars. In general, an acceptable performance level for faculty with 25-50% research effort entails accomplishing five of the above activities per year. It is understood that research is a dynamic activity and data collection may occur over a protracted

time period and as such it must receive due consideration at the time of annual evaluation.

While non-tenure track faculty members are not required to perform activities in the area of scholarship, it is possible for them to elect some percentage of activity in this area in consultation with the Chairperson. If an administered load is agreed upon, then the non-tenure track faculty will be evaluated in this area.

6. For satisfactory performance in the area of service, each faculty member is expected to provide evidence of service. To earn a satisfactory rating of 4-6, performance must be at a level that meets expectations set forth in the annual Faculty Planning Form governed by the Faculty Workload Policy. Supportive documentation will be based on the criteria set forth by the Department's Promotion and Tenure document and may include, but is not limited to, the following: University, College, and Department service, as well as professional and/or community service. In general, an acceptable performance level for faculty with 15% service effort entails participation in five service activities per year.