

Merit Procedures Used In Sociology (revised June 9, 2014)

We have a Merit Raise Committee that consists of three faculty members: two are elected from the departmental faculty and the other committee member is the Department Head. We allow faculty on leave, sabbatical, and on 600-hours to serve if they consent to be on the ballot and if they will be in residence during the quarter that the merit decisions are to be made. The committee makes salary increase recommendations to the Department Head. We do not prescribe whether merit increases are made in dollar amounts or percentages, but leave this decision to the discretion of the committee and department head. The committee and department head shall monitor the relative range in absolute dollars between the largest individual merit raise and the lowest merit raise.

Procedures used for Tenure Track Faculty

We evaluate tenure-track faculty on scholarly work (45%), university service (20%), and teaching (35%). We do not use to an explicit quantitative rating scheme. Instead we weight these areas in much the way that a tenure and promotion committee might weight this sort of information. A faculty member's performance in each of the three categories above will be evaluated by the committee using the descriptors "exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or below expectations". To be eligible to receive a merit raise a faculty member must be evaluated as at least "meets expectations" in one of the three categories.

Documentation

The merit committee and department head will submit a report to the faculty that documents their procedures and deliberations. This report should include: committee procedures, the basis for the merit raises (i.e., percentages or whole dollar amounts), any special considerations or exceptions to standard procedures made by the committee, and in general terms, how the evaluations were turned into specific recommendations for merit raises. The department head will confidentially preserve records of the committee's evaluations, including the categorization of each faculty member as exceeding, meeting, or below expectations in terms of research, teaching, and service.

We ask for information from the faculty in the following categories:

1. List all written work that has been published or accepted for publication, e.g., books, edited books, articles, research notes, comments, book chapters, book reviews. Make sure that we can tell these apart and please list other authors and the "order of authorship."
2. List all convention papers presented or accepted for presentation as well as chairing or being a discussant at a major convention.

3. List all departmental and institutional service, including but not limited to the following:
 - a. Service on departmental committees, indicating whether you chaired the committee.
 - b. Service as a departmental officer such as head, associate head, graduate or undergraduate program director, or undergraduate advisor.
 - c. Other service to the department such as being library representative.
 - d. Service to other departments or institutional units, indicating whether you have a joint appointment with that unit.
 - e. Service on college, university, or union committees, indicating whether you chaired the committee.
 - f. Service as a college, university, or union officer such as union president.
4. List offices held and service to national or regional professional associations
5. List editorial board memberships and manuscript reviewing for journals and book companies. Distinguish between being on the editorial board and reviewing manuscripts and note the number of manuscripts reviewed.
6. List invited lectures.
7. List grants, fellowships and awards. For grants and fellowships indicate the amount of money involved.
8. List any other professional activities that you would like us to consider.
9. List dissertation and C-exam committees that you have served on and/or chaired in this or other departments.
10. List any information about your teaching that you think would be relevant to the merit review committee; e.g., teaching extra large classes, high student evaluations, teaching awards, and teaching innovations.
11. Individuals are invited to add a narrative, explanatory paragraph about the relative weights of scholarship, teaching, and service that should apply in their case.

Procedures used for Officers of Administration

The Department Head will base their merit increase recommendation on the performance reviews of the OA during the relevant evaluation period. If there has not been a performance review within the past year, the Department Head will undertake such a review using the Structured Approach evaluation form provided on CASWeb. 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 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 program's merit increase recommendation to the CAS Dean. The actual merit award will be based on funding availability and university criteria.

Procedures used for Non Tenure Track Faculty

The Department Head will consider performance reviews of the NTTF during the relevant evaluation period using the NTTF Merit Evaluation form found on CASweb. 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 the duties and responsibilities described in their contract language and his/her current job duties. The Department Head merit increase recommendation will be based on the extent to which the individual has 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 merit increase recommendations to the CAS Dean. The actual merit award will be based on funding availability and university criteria.

Addendum: Policies mandated by Academic Affairs or the Collective Bargaining Agreement that will apply to the Sociology Merit Review Process

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.