

Geography Department Merit Review Salary Adjustment Procedures

Adopted July 1, 2014

The Department of Geography employs tenured or tenure track faculty (TTF), career instructional and research-related non-tenure track faculty (NTTF), several part time adjunct NTTF instructors, Officers of Administration, and classified staff. Procedures for evaluating individuals in all these categories for the purposes of possible salary adjustment based on merit are explained below. The Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure in our department, approved by our faculty, provide additional detailed evaluation criteria that are used to supplement the broad procedures outlined below.

The following policies are required by the Provost/Academic Affairs and/or the Collective Bargaining Agreement and are hereby adopted by the Department of Geography:

1. All faculty must be evaluated for merit. It is not permitted to opt out.
2. Regardless of type of appointment or FTE, each faculty member is eligible for consideration for the highest merit rating.
3. All faculty who meet or exceed expectations will receive some merit increase.
4. Faculty will be informed of their raises after they have been approved.
5. The evaluation for merit includes review of both recent performance review(s) and the current CV.

In making merit-based salary adjustments, the Department Head or Merit Review Committee (see below) will keep appropriate documentation of how all decisions are made to allow for appropriate follow up or review if questions arise later. This documentation will be kept on file by the department's Office Manager for proper storage and archiving.

Tenure-Track Faculty

Administrative Process

1. The individuals affected by the merit review for salary adjustment take a secret ballot vote on whether they want assessments and recommendations to be handled (a) by a committee of two-three elected tenured faculty members who will review and make recommendations on salaries, or (b) by the Department Head alone. The latter option is followed only if there is unanimous support for it (i.e., even one secret ballot vote for the first option leads to the appointment of an advisory committee).
2. Each faculty member is asked to submit a statement detailing accomplishments in research, teaching, and service since the last merit-based salary review—along with any other material the faculty member deems to be relevant.
3. The materials of each faculty member are reviewed along with a recent curriculum vitae and student/peer teaching evaluations.
4. If the Department Head is empowered to make recommendations alone, s/he develops them in accordance with the raise criteria noted below, and then submits the recommendations to Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. If a committee is

appointed to make recommendations on salary increases, those recommendations are developed in accordance with the raise criteria noted below and then forwarded in written form to the Department Head. The Department Head then takes those recommendations into consideration in drawing up a plan for submission to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Any significant departure from the committee's recommendations must be accompanied by a statement detailing the committee recommendations and explaining the reasons behind the deviation from those recommendations.

Raise Criteria

1. In determining merit-based salary increases, consideration is given to (1) research productivity, (2) the quality and effectiveness of the individual's teaching, and (3) service to the department, university, discipline, and society. The relative importance of these matters will depend on the rank of the individual and other special circumstances, such as agreements between a faculty member and the Department Head to stress one or another of these matters during a particular period. Eligibility for a significant salary increase (within the context of available funds) will be determined by meritorious performance in at least two of these categories (see item 2 below), and at least satisfactory performance in the remaining category (see item 3 below). In cases of meritorious performance the amount of the raise will be higher if there is evidence of exceptional performance in multiple categories.
2. Meritorious performance in research productivity is demonstrated by a level of productivity that is resulting in the production of at least two substantial published research articles or book chapters each year, the completion of a significant portion of a scholarly book each year, or the production of other materials of comparable scope that represent the outcome of creative practice or scholarly research. Significant efforts and/or success in securing outside funding or the publication of a variety of shorter pieces could lower the publication threshold in a given year. Meritorious performance in teaching is demonstrated by a high level of teaching effectiveness (as indicated by peer and student evaluations); the use of high quality, innovative teaching materials and methods; significant contributions to curricular development; and active participation in the teaching/advising of a substantial number of graduate students. Meritorious performance in service is demonstrated by active, responsible participation in departmental/university committee work (appropriate to the rank of the individual) and significant service initiatives beyond the university.
3. Satisfactory performance in research productivity is demonstrated by a level of research productivity that is resulting in the production of at least one substantial published research article or book chapter each year—or equivalent progress on a book or other material of comparable scope that represents the outcome of creative practice or scholarly research. Satisfactory performance in teaching is demonstrated by acceptable teaching effectiveness (as indicated by peer and student evaluations); the use of teaching materials and methods appropriate to the courses being offered; modest contributions to curricular development; and participation in the teaching/advising of some graduate students. Satisfactory performance in service is demonstrated by at least modest, regular participation in departmental/university committee work and some service activity beyond the university.

Non Tenure-Track Faculty

Performance reviews of instruction-related NTTFs (officers of instruction) will be carried out by the Department Head. The Department Head will consider performance reviews of the NTTF during the relevant period. If there has not been a performance review within the past year, the Department Head will perform such a review to evaluate the NTTF's performance of duties and responsibilities described in their contract language and her/his current job duties. As the basis for this review, the Department Head will ask the faculty member to prepare a short (1-2 page) report on her/his teaching responsibilities and activities for the relevant period. The Department Head will also review the faculty member's quantitative and qualitative teaching evaluations which are required for every course. The Department Head's merit increase recommendation will be based on the extent to which the individual has met or exceeded performance of her/his assigned duties and responsibilities, as indicated by the relevant performance reviews. The Department Head will then write an evaluation based on these materials, and this will be shared with the faculty member, who has the opportunity to include a written response, if s/he desires. Performance reviews of research-related NTTFs (officers of research) will be carried out by the supervisor and then reviewed for approval by the Department Head. Reviews will evaluate the performance of research, creative activities, service, duties, tasks, and responsibilities described in the contract language and job descriptions for each position. Merit increase recommendations will be based on the extent to which the individual has met, or exceeded the expectations for performance of her/his assigned duties and responsibilities as documented in the performance reviews. The process includes evaluation of timely performance reviews; the consideration of a current CV, as well as any relevant material submitted that is not captured in the CV. The supervisor will request from the NTTF member a short (1-2 page) report on accomplishments covering the general area of job responsibilities. The supervisor or the Department Head will then write an evaluation based on these materials, and this will be shared with the faculty member, who has the opportunity to include a written response, if s/he desires.

Officers of Administration

The Department Head will base merit increase recommendations on the performance reviews, the consideration of a current CV, as well as any relevant material submitted that is not captured in the CV of the OA during the relevant evaluation period. If there has not been a performance review within the past year, the supervisor or Department Head where appropriate will undertake such a review. The supervisor or Department Head will first ask the OA to write a summary of accomplishments for each general area of job responsibilities (e.g., program administration, project management and development, fiscal and operations management, payroll, conference and event planning, office management and service). The supervisor or Department Head's review should provide a narrative evaluation of the OA's performance of the duties and responsibilities described in the OA's position description and his/her current job duties. While OA reviews are conducted by the supervisor or Department Head, they should also include, when possible, feedback from relevant constituent groups both internal and external to the department. If a supervisor rather than the Department Head conducts the performance review, the Department Head will review the evaluation for approval. The Department Head's merit increase recommendation should be based on the extent to which the OA has met or exceeded

expected performance of her/his assigned duties and responsibilities, as indicated by the relevant performance reviews. In the case of NTTF and OA positions working in research labs (e.g. the InfoGraphics Lab) the evaluations will be reviewed for recommendation and then submitted by the Director of the Lab to the Department Head. The Department Head will provide the department's merit increase recommendation to the CAS Dean.