

**Department of Geography and Planning
Appalachian State University**

Merit Pay Rating System

(Approved Sept. 22, 2011)

The Merit Pay Rating System was developed to describe effective performance as applied to the previous year and/or since last merit pay allocation. This rubric provides examples of activities placed into qualitative categories used to assign summary performance scores for teaching, scholarship, and service: needs improvement, acceptable, good/very good, excellent, and exceptional. The acceptable category (rating score of 1) describes base level expected performance, good/very good (rating score of 2) describes examples of documented indicators of performance beyond base level, while excellent (rating score of 3) describes documented indicators of performance faculty peers recognize as significantly beyond good/very good performance. The exceptional category (rating score of 4) describes examples of documented indicators of performance faculty peers recognize as significant accomplishments or career milestones.

Procedure for Merit Pay Rating System

1) The Department Chair will examine all pertinent annual review materials and assign a ranking from 0 to 4 for the categories of teaching, scholarship, and service.

4 = exceptional performance

3 = excellent

2 = very good / good

1 = acceptable

0 = needs improvement

2) Individually, teaching and scholarship performance are weighted evenly in the rubric; service is weighted at 50% of the value of teaching and scholarship. The percent multipliers would need to be adjusted based on the total merit pool available each year. Recommended multipliers start at 0.25% for a performance ranking of 1 (acceptable) and ending with a maximum increase of 2% for a performance ranking of 4 (exceptional). The ranking of 4 is likely to be rare, but because a faculty member truly had “exceptional” performance in that category, it should be appropriately recognized.

Recommended Multipliers

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>Teaching/Scholarship</u>	<u>Service</u>
0	0.00%	0.00%
1	0.25%	0.125%
2	0.50%	0.25%
3	1.00%	0.50%
4	2.00%	1.00%

Thus, performance in the individual categories is rewarded, using a percentage multiplier, based on a ranking assigned by the Chair. What constitutes the difference between a ranking of “excellent” (4) or “very good/good” (3) would therefore be left up to the Chair.

3) The next step is a consideration of total performance across the three categories. The individual rankings are added together and a percent multiplier is applied to the total performance score; an exponential increase was considered to be appropriate, with rewards increasing at an increasing rate for an individual's total performance. Recommended multipliers represent a stepped-exponential increase, with slight differences between low-performing total rankings (3-5) and mid-level rankings (6-8).

<u>Total Rank</u>	<u>Percent Pay Raise</u>
3	0.25%
4	0.50%
5	0.75%
6	1.00%
7	1.25%
8	1.50%
9	2.00%
10	2.75%
11	3.50%
12	4.25%

4) The total amount awarded by the merit rubric (and any mandated minimum raise) would leave a discretionary pool of funds for the Chair to make any additional adjustments; it is recommended that the Chair should have a discretionary pool of somewhere between 10% and 20% of the total merit pay funds in any year for additional merit adjustments. There are many examples of why a discretionary pool is needed, but one would be an individual having two high-performing years in cycles with zero (or low) pay raises, followed by a year with a large merit pool. An adjustment to the person's salary to reward excellent performance in the years with small overall pay raises could then be made.

Example of Applying Merit Pay Rating System

- 1) Assume a 5% merit pool based on 10 professors with a total salary of \$649,000. This provides \$32,450 to be distributed for merit.
- 2) Typically, the state or ASU mandates a minimum pay increase for each faculty member. This example assumes a minimum raise of 1%.
- 3) In this example, the 1% base pay raise, the pat raises based on multipliers for the individual performance in teaching, scholarship and service, and the total performance multiplier result in the following allocations:

Total pool to allocate: \$32,450.00	
1% Base	\$6,490.00
Teaching	\$5,045.00
Scholarship	\$4,210.00
Service	\$2,340.00
Total Performance	\$8,265.00

4) The amount awarded by the merit rubric and mandated minimum raise totals \$26,350, leaving \$6,100 (or 18.8% of the total pool) for a discretionary pool of funds for the Chair to distribute.

Merit Pay Performance Ranking Rubric

The following rubric describes documented indicators of performance; a combination of many of the individual items listed would be used to determine the final rating as one item in itself may not thoroughly represent effective performance in that category. Ultimately, this rubric is a guideline for determining merit ratings for faculty members and the Department Chair has discretion in its application and implementation. A Merit Pay Committee will review and update this document as needed on a yearly basis.

Instruction and Teaching

Rating: Needs Improvement

- Teaching substantially below the median for peers
- Non-positive feedback from students or peers
- Minimal engagement with Department's educational mission

Rating 1: Acceptable

- Teaching within range of the median for peers
- Satisfactory evaluation of teaching performance (both quantitative and qualitative) from student and peer reviews

Rating 2: Good/Very Good

- Documented substantial revision of existing courses
- Good/Very good feedback from peers and students
- Attending professional development workshops related to teaching at the Hubbard Center, at professional conferences, or equivalent
- Documented development of new courses
- Contributing to new instructional program development
- Development of innovative pedagogical methodologies and materials
- Direction of independent student research and independent studies
- Development of interdisciplinary courses or workshops integrating faculty and disciplinary materials from other departments
- Developing courses for interdisciplinary programs, e.g., Global Studies, Interdisciplinary Studies, Sustainable Development, Environmental Studies, First Year Seminar
- Development and implementation of non-commercially published instructional materials (e.g. laboratory manuals, readings, computer programs, video/dvd)
- Submission of external and internal grant proposals to improve instruction
- Service on PhD, Master's or Honor's committee (dissertation, thesis, internship, comprehensive exam)
- Supervision of internships or student teaching
- Organizing and leading international study abroad trips

Rating 3: Excellent

- Excellent evaluations (quantitative and qualitative) of teaching performance from students and/or peer reviews
- Publication of widely adopted or well-received instructional materials (e.g. books, manuals, videos, computer programs)
- Receipt of external funding to improve instruction
- Chairperson of theses: Doctoral, Masters, Honors
- Supervision and co-authorship of multiple first-authored undergraduate/ graduate research presentations at professional meetings or presentation with significant student contribution

Supervision and co-authorship of a first-authored student publication(s) or publication with significant student contribution

Rating 4: Exceptional

Receipt of university, regional, state, national awards (e.g., Outstanding Teaching Award, Award for Outstanding Master's Thesis)

Recognition of outstanding teaching materials (textbooks, books)

Award for outstanding scholarship related to teaching (e.g. Journal of Geography Best Paper Award)

Receipt of large award(s) (more than \$20,000) to improve geography or planning instruction

Research/Scholarship

Rating: Needs Improvement

Attended one or more conferences

Evidence of progress on work on some form of scholarship

Rating 1: Acceptable

Had minimum number of significant products

Submitted one paper to a journal

Presented a paper on research at one conference

Rating 2: Good/Very Good

Number of publications greater than the minimum expected amount

Presented a unique paper at multiple academic conferences

Invited to speak at a university or conference

Documented effective participation in interdisciplinary or inter-institutional collaboration

Submission of an internal or external grant proposal

Rating 3: Excellent

Number of publications much greater than the minimum expected amount

Received internal or external funding for a substantial amount of funding

Receipt of contracts and/or funding to support graduate/undergraduate student work.

A submitted grant proposal for a significant amount of federal funding was positively reviewed (e.g., NSF, NASA, USDA) and will be resubmitted, if not funded the first time

Publication(s) frequently cited

Edited an academic work such as a book or other edited volume

Publication in a very highly rated journal

Rating 4: Exceptional

Received an award for an outstanding publication

Received an award for scholarship

Received a large sum in external funding

Significant number of submitted papers accepted for publication in highly rated journals

Publication in an exceptionally prestigious journal

Service

Rating: Needs improvement

- Substandard participation in student advisement
- Irregular attendance at department faculty meetings
- Minimal service on departmental committees

Rating 1: Acceptable

- Participation in student advisement
- Service on multiple departmental committees
- Updating individual information on department faculty website annually

Rating 2: Good/Very Good

- Substantial participation in student advisement
- Membership on departmental or university committees focused on instruction
- Service to the College of Arts and Sciences, university and/or professional organizations
- Service at departmental events
- Substantial community or university service project
- Service to professional organizations
- Service at professional meetings
- Serving as an advisor with student organizations
- Chairing several departmental committees
- Reviewing a manuscript for publication in a journal
- Participating in or organizing fundraising projects for scholarships in the departments
- Contributing/developing an annual department newsletter that includes all faculty and grad students
- Documented involvement in promoting the department
- Involvement in interdisciplinary university activities (e.g., Global Studies, Sustainable Development, Environmental Science, Appalachian Studies)

Rating 3: Excellent

- Chairing a significant departmental committee
- Chair of a professional organization
- Chair of college or university committee
- Program committee for an academic conference
- Officer in a professional organization
- Member of editorial board of a refereed journal
- Grant or manuscript reviewer for multiple manuscripts for state, regional, or international organizations or for a refereed journal

Rating 4: Exceptional

- Chairing several significant departmental committees
- Serve on state or federal committees
- Receiving an award (college, university-wide, local, state, regional, national) for service excellence
- Serving as program chair for an international, national, regional or state professional organization
- Serving in high offices of professional organizations
- Editor of a refereed journal