

## CRITERIA FOR MERIT INCREASES

### MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT

Approved by the Mathematics Department, 5/28/2014

Approved by the Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs: October 6, 2016

#### Preamble:

1. All TTF and Career NTTF (faculty) are potentially eligible for merit raises and must be evaluated for merit. There is no opt out procedure.
2. Each faculty member, regardless of type of appointment or FTE is potentially eligible 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. Faculty will be invited to submit current vita for evaluation along with a supplementary document explaining anything that should be considered which either doesn't appear on the vita or requires more explanation. Any performance reviews made during the period covered by the merit raise will be considered alongside the vita and supplementary document.
6. Documentation of decisions will be retained by the Department Head and archived with the Mathematics Department Budget Manager to allow for any appropriate follow up or review.

#### **Tenure related faculty:**

The criteria used by the Department of Mathematics for evaluating Faculty for merit pay increases are given in Part A. Based on these criteria the current Department Head, in consultation with former Department Heads, makes the recommendations for merit increases. The procedures followed by the Department Head are described in Part B.

#### Part A. Criteria.

The Mathematics, Department employs criteria in three general areas, Professional Activity, Teaching, and Service (including academic and administrative service and service to the larger community). Below are listed in greater detail the specific criteria within these three general areas addressed in evaluating faculty members for merit pay increases in the Mathematics Department.

#### I. Scholarly Activity

1. Publications of significance and quality
2. Active research program

3. Professional recognition
  - a. Invited lectures and colloquia
  - b. Invited papers
  - c. Invitations to special sessions and workshops
  - d. Professional honors
4. Participation in professional meetings
  - a. General national and regional meetings
  - b. Specialized seminars and workshops
5. Activity in departmental seminars and colloquia.
6. Regular and constructive use of leaves of absence.
  - a. Sabbaticals
  - b. Visiting appointments
7. Grant activity
8. Service on editorial boards and as journal referees

## II. Teaching

1. Quality and effectiveness of classroom instruction
  - a. Student evaluations
  - b. Student performance.
2. Supervision of research.
3. Development and maintenance of special programs.
  - a. Undergraduate program
  - b. Graduate program
  - c. Mathematics education program
4. Student advising
  - a. Undergraduate
  - b. Graduate
  - c. Liaison with peer advisors
5. Enrichment of the undergraduate experience
  - a. Freshmen seminars
  - b. Pi Mu Epsilon

c. Putnam Exam

6. Course text and material

III. Service

1. Departmental

a. Administration

b. Committee work

2. College and University

a. Administration

b. Committee work

3. Academic and administrative service

a. State

i. Liaison with other institutions (e.g., IFS)

ii. Liaison with high schools (e.g., OMEC)

b. National

i. Professional societies (e.g., MAA, ANS, IMS)

ii. Academic societies (e.g., AAUP)

4. Public contributions

a. Public addresses

b. Service on civic and other public bodies

Part B. Procedures.

I. Quantitative. The Department Head scores each Faculty member on a scale of 0 to 10, on each of the three main categories, Professional Activity, Teaching, and Service. Guideline weights for these categories are 55% for scholarly activity, 35% for teaching and 10% for service. Faculty whose weighted score is below 2.5 will be considered not to have met expectations sufficient for merit raises.

II. Descriptive. The Department Head writes a brief evaluation of the work of each faculty member assessing his or her strengths, weaknesses, and contributions to the vigor of the Department and the University. Although this is largely subjective, it should be based on the record and on the experience of the Head. This serves to identify specialized merit that may be hidden in a purely numerical analysis.

III. Preliminary Recommendations. The Department Head then uses the information gathered and prepares preliminary recommendations for salary increases.

IV. Review. The Department Head selects two other active senior faculty members with a view toward coverage of research areas to review the data, scores and written evaluations given by the Department Head. These faculty members make recommendations for adjustments to the scores. During this review none of the material or recommendations for the reviewing faculty is seen or discussed by the reviewing faculty.

V. Final Recommendations. Based on the preliminary analysis and the advice of the senior faculty reviewing the Department Head's recommendations, the Department Head makes the final recommendations for merit increase to the Dean.

### **Non-tenure track faculty:**

The department has different groups of non-tenure track faculty with differently defined duties.

Instructor appointments have teaching duties, but not scholarship (or graduate teaching) expectations. In addition, some instructor positions have administrative or other duties as explicit expectations in place of some teaching responsibilities. Career instructors will be evaluated on teaching and service criteria only (not scholarly activities) and any additional responsibilities they have been assigned in lieu of teaching

The criteria and procedures are as for tenure related faculty except that they are reviewed with the Assistant Department Head instead of former department heads. Guideline weights are 90% for teaching and 10% for service. The weights will be adjusted appropriately for instructors with additional responsibilities assigned in lieu of teaching.