

Department of English

Merit Pay

Approved: 2012

Merit Pay – English Department (Spring 2012)

THE PERSONNEL ADVISORY COMMITTEE offers the following set of Guidelines for Merit Ratings both to communicate to the Administration what we value as scholars and teachers and to provide our best attempt to award merit pay fairly to the faculty. The guidelines listed below are just that—guidelines—and should not be taken as a checklist completely ensuring or eliminating “level” raises by its specificity. We recognize that certain contributions (in all categories) cannot always be so neatly boxed into a checklist. Given that, faculty will provide a one page narrative and/or outline where they can either simply list their accomplishments or argue for or against the guidelines in their individual case. Faculty might consider offering supporting documents, e.g., acceptance letters, journal contents, etc., to help clarify their self-assessment. Again, these are guidelines. As such, they do not address every possible scenario. We assume faculty can best represent their case for merit raises when the guidelines do not list their specific contribution.

Five ratings are possible— 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4. A “0” signifies unsatisfactory and would signal a real problem to the department, one that might prompt reviews from PAC and/or the Department Head. We assume this rating would rarely, if ever, be given. On the other hand, a “4” would signify an exemplary year. We assume there would be few people to reach this category. We further suggest that faculty who receive the highest rating be announced to the department (either by email or newsletter), so we may applaud our colleagues for superlative work.

As in the past, we suggest that long term research projects, such as books, be counted for three years. Articles may be counted in the year of acceptance. However, faculty may defer “merit” for a year when there is actually money to be awarded. For example, the author of a book accepted by Harvard UP or an article accepted by *Essays in Criticism* in a year when merit pay is not available might defer his or her merit rating until a year when the administration has money to offer.

FACULTY DIRECTIONS AND GUIDELINES FOR MERIT RATINGS

1. By June 1st, give the Department Head a one-page summary and/or outline of your activities during the year, including the previous summer. If you wish, you may indicate the rating you claim for teaching, scholarship, and service. "0" is for unsatisfactory, "1" through "4" represent increasingly higher levels of merit. Use the following guidelines to determine what level of merit to claim.

2. In a message to you delivered on or before October 1, the Department Head will accept the ratings (0-4) you have claimed, or the Head will change the numbers according to his/her interpretation of the following guidelines. S/he will then multiply those ratings by the percentage numbers most advantageous to you. Percentages will be in the following ranges:

TEACHING: 50-60% SCHOLARSHIP: 30-45% SERVICE: 5-20%

Thus, for example, if you receive a "4" in teaching, a "3" in scholarship, and a "2" in service, the Head will multiply 4×60 , 3×35 , and 2×5 , for a total of 355. The Head will look at all the scores of department members and identify clumps of scores to which he will assign various levels of departmental merit pay. He or she will then ask for the Personnel Advisory Committee's advice concerning these levels.

3. If you disagree with any changes made by the head to your merit ratings, please appeal to the PAC by October 1st. The PAC will review your one-page summary/outline and any relevant materials, and will make a recommendation to the head by October 15th. The Head will forward the final version of the evaluation to the Dean of the College by October 21.

4. Do not "double-count" any activity listed in the guidelines.

5. Please include additional financial information regarding grants, fellowships, and the like. Though PAC can certainly envision a prestigious fellowship counting towards Merit Pay, we also believe additional finances should be taken into consideration. For example, should the professor who receives a university grant to develop a new GEN ED course over the summer get the same raise as a person who develops a new HONORS seminar, but receives no support from the university? Maybe, but, again, we believe this should be decided on an individual basis.

6. Any work may be counted as published in the year that it is accepted by a journal or press. The Head or the PAC may request evidence of acceptance.

RATINGS FOR TEACHING
(50-60%)

- “0” Unsatisfactory
- “1” Met classes as scheduled and taught well-prepared material. Received generally positive student evaluations. Demonstrated accessibility to students by keeping adequate posted office hours.
- “2” and “3” PAC recognizes that quality teaching is the hardest category to assess as well as prove, and unfortunately the burden of proof is largely yours. We suggest that when you describe your teaching success, you consider the following factors and possibly provide supporting materials:
- met classes as scheduled and taught well-prepared material
 - prepared strong syllabi, examinations, and assignments
 - received generally? overwhelmingly? extraordinarily? positive student evaluations (or, say, well-written evaluations that assess your teaching in detail)
 - prepared new course(s) and/or revised course preparation
 - thesis and/or independent study
 - student papers (originating from your class) leading to student publications or student conference
 - worked on new teaching program
- “4” Demonstration of Outstanding Teaching. As mentioned on the cover page, PAC assumes few faculty would achieve this rating every year. Supporting materials for such a rating might include
- strong syllabi, examinations, assignments
 - extraordinarily* positive student evaluations.
- as well as something else to distinguish this year from other years or other faculty
- recommendations from PAC and/or Department Head (from classroom observations?)
 - student papers (originating from your class) leading to professional publications or professional conferences
 - teaching awards (e.g., Carl Harter nominee and/or finalist)
 - pioneering new teaching program

MERIT RATINGS FOR SCHOLARSHIP

30-45%

“0” Unsatisfactory

“1” Research and Reading, i.e., evidence of scholarly activity, such as

- broadening one’s field of study
- research for course preparation
- preparing conference papers or articles

(PAC recognized that all contributions cannot be so easily boxed into a category. For example, one might argue that a short note in, say, *Shakespeare Quarterly*, was the product of substantial time and scholarly research and thus should be raised to a level “3”; the same might be argued for the key-note address at a prestigious conference. But, again, this is something that should be handled in the narrative.)

“2” Scholarly research, leading to a product with a specific audience, e.g.,

- published a note, a short review, or a short entry in a literary encyclopedia or other scholarly reference work
- presented a conference paper at a regional, national, or international conference (not primarily a local audience)
- presented your creative work at a regional, national, or international reading (not primarily a local audience)
- directed or produced a performance at a regional, national, or international venue (not primarily a local audience)
- served on the editorial board for a refereed, widely recognized journal (for instance, a journal listed in the MLA Guide to Publications).

“3” Scholarly research, leading to a substantial product with specific audience, e.g.,

- published a scholarly article in a refereed journal
- published a creative work in a refereed or academically respected journal
- edited a refereed, widely recognized journal (for instance, a journal listed in the MLA Guide to Publications)
- published a monograph. (The monograph must be published by a recognized press that employs a third-party refereed system or some other form of objective evaluation procedure for determining the merit of a work. Publication of a monograph will count as a rating of “3” for three years after its citation in the professor’s merit evaluation resume.)
- edited a book. (The book must be published by a recognized press that employs a third-party refereed system or some other form of objective evaluation procedure for determining the merit of a work. The editing of a book counts as a rating of “3” for three years after its citation in the professor’s merit evaluation resume.)

“4” Demonstration of Outstanding Scholarship

- published a scholarly book or creative book-length work. (The book must be published by a recognized press that employs a third-party refereed system or

some other form of objective evaluation procedure for determining the merit of a work. The publication of a book counts as a rating of "4" for three years after its citation in the professor's merit evaluation resume.)

— published one or more articles in a journal considered to be one of the very few top publications in the faculty member's field of research: British literature, U. S. literature, "world literature," linguistics, or literary theory. Be prepared to make a case that this journal is as prestigious as you assert, based on its circulation, acceptance rate, and reputation among scholars in your field. You may also make an argument that a "4" should be received for three years after the article's citation if your field is such that books are not the highest form of recognition in publication, and if the journal in which you have published is among the journals which do represent the highest form of recognition in publication.

MERIT RATINGS FOR SERVICE

5-20%

- “0” Unsatisfactory
- “1” Advised an average of at least 15 advisees during the academic year, plus LIGHT DUTY (might include one or two service-related activities; see listings below)
- “2” Advising plus MODERATE DUTY (see listings below)
- “3” Advising plus SUBSTANTIAL to HEAVY DUTY (see listings below)

SERVICE ACTIVITIES (This is not a complete list of all contributions, but is provided to jog your memory as you describe your service to the department.)

- performed special assignments within the department (e.g., interviewed candidates at IMLA; provided transportation or hospitality for on-campus job candidates or visiting scholars)
- participated in program assessment
- substituted for a colleague who was unable to teach
- coordinated a department newsletter
- served with distinction on two department, college, or university committees
- chaired a department, college, or university committee
- collaborated with the department, college, or university in the development, administration, or coordination of programs within the department, college, or university
- developed new or redesigned existing on-campus programs that contributed to the enrichment of the department, college, or university
- contributed to the development or enrichment of the department, college, or university through fund-raising, recruitment, or promotional activities
- sponsored or advised student groups (e.g., Sigma Tau Delta)
- organized on-campus organizations or conferences that contributed significantly to the enrichment of the department’s creative or academic missions
- held office in professional or academic organization within our discipline
- served as an officer, executive, or board member of a professional or academic organization directly associated with our academic discipline
- held office in a professional or academic organization directly associated with our academic discipline
- reviewed manuscripts/submissions for a professional meeting or conference (local, regional, national, or international)
- organized/officiated at a program at a professional meeting or conference
- performed public service by applying professional skills and knowledge (e.g. lectures as part of the Speaker’s Bureau Program, media interviews, advising of community groups, outreach programs)
- developed classes or workshops for groups outside the university
- participated in local, state, national boards, commissions, and/or task forces.

“4” Advising plus HELL’S BELLS, GET ME OUT OF HERE! DUTY

— chief officer of a professional or academic organization directly associated with our academic discipline

— head a search (Be prepared to delineate the extraordinarily heavy demands made by this search.)

— served on a major, heavy-demand college or university committee. (Be prepared to delineate the extraordinarily heavy demands made by this committee.)