



Department of English
Merit Review Procedures
(Revised May 27, 2014)

Merit

When performance-based (merit) raises are authorized by the University, the English Department follows the following procedure to evaluate all faculty eligible for merit (no one may choose to opt out):

1. Two ad hoc merit raise advisory committees—a TTF committee consisting of one Full, one Associate, and one Assistant Professor and an NTTF committee consisting of two career NTTF of different ranks—are elected by the tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty of the department respectively, each faculty member voting by secret ballot for one person in that member's rank. (Faculty tenured in English but serving as program directors outside the department are excluded from the list of candidates, as are faculty on leave, although they may vote.)
2. All faculty eligible for merit salary increases are asked to submit a current c.v. indicating activities during the merit review period and complete the Faculty Activity Report form provided by the department on-line. Teaching evaluations for each faculty member are assembled by the department. An individual file for each faculty member is assembled containing these materials, and faculty may submit supplemental material to assist the committee's deliberations (promotion or tenure reviews are ineligible for inclusion). Reports on activities are kept on file to be consulted in future merit reviews for salary increases.
3. The elected merit review committees are convened by the Department Head and provided with these files.
4. Based on this information, each member of the merit review committees is asked to rate each TTF faculty member's performance within the categories of teaching, research, and service, and each NTTF's performance within the categories of teaching and service, including how faculty performance in each of these activities contributes to university objectives on equity, inclusion, and diversity. The following scores and criteria shall be used:

- 3 Exceeds Expectations
- 2 Meets Expectations
- 1 Below Expectations

TTF are expected to meet or exceed expectations in research, teaching, and service. In the area of research, a faculty member who is not actively involved in ongoing research projects as demonstrated by a steady rate of publications and preparation of new work for publication through presentation of new research at regional, national, and international conferences and

through invited lectures, would fall below departmental expectations. TTF and NTTF whose teaching evaluations are consistently lower than the departmental averages and who do not seek to improve their teaching success through participation in the Teaching Effectiveness Program or through other remedial means would fall below departmental expectations. TTF and Career NTTF who do not participate equitably and responsibly in department service obligations would fall below department expectations for service. TTF are also expected to extend their service beyond the department to college and university committees. Consistent failure to do so would fall below department expectations.

These guidelines are given to the committee members: Pay particular attention to both the quantity (e.g. how many articles have been published?) and the quality (e.g. where did they appear? how substantial is the work?), consider both numerical rating of teaching and what those numbers often can't show (e.g. was the course a large lecture serving a general audience of students? a required course? innovative?), and try to note the amount, the difficulty, and centrality of the service.

5. Each committee member excludes him or herself from these ratings. The Department Head compiles a separate rating on the same basis for each committee member with input from the rest of the merit raise committee membership in each case.
6. For TTF: these scores are tallied, weighting research and teaching scores as 40% each and service 20%, yielding a ranked list of merit candidates.
7. For NTTF: these scores are tallied, weighting teaching and service in accordance with the faculty member's contract (e.g. 90% teaching and 10% service; 50% teaching and 50% service/administration; 10% teaching and 90% service/administration), yielding a ranked list of merit candidates.
8. Each committee then meets and discusses this ranked list to arrive at a final version. The rankings are then grouped according to the dollar increments of merit increase available:

Far Exceeds Expectations
Exceeds Expectations

Fully Meets Expectations
Meets Expectations

Below Expectations
Far Below Expectations

Merit raises shall be awarded to faculty who meet, fully, meet, exceed, or far exceed expectations. Each faculty member is eligible for consideration for the highest merit rating regardless of type of appointment or FTE.

Equity and Retention

Consideration of equity and retention increases will follow the Collective Bargaining Agreement policies for such raises. The department head will consult as necessary with members of the faculty before making recommendations for such raises.

Officers of Administration

The Department Head will base his/her merit increase recommendation on the performance reviews of the OA during the review period. If there has not been a performance review within the past year, the Department Head will undertake such a review. The review should evaluate 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 Department Head, they should also consider, when possible, feedback from relevant constituent groups both internal and external to the department or program. The Department Head's merit increase recommendation should be based on the extent to which the OA has met, not met, or exceeded expected performance of her/his assigned duties and responsibilities, as indicated by the relevant performance reviews.

When requested, the Department Head will provide the department's or OA merit increase recommendation to the CAS Dean. The actual merit award will be based on funding availability and university criteria.

Faculty members will be informed of their merit raise after they have been approved by Academic Affairs.