

**FACULTY SALARY MERIT PLANS**  
{effective Spring 2006}

**COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES**

**BIOLOGY**

The faculty salary merit plan approved by the faculty for previous merit distributions will be followed, but modified to fit the categories of the latest version of the F2.08 form. The plan was originated in the Department of Geology and is often referred to as the Cooper-Stevens Plan. There were four categories that were used this year regarding merit. These categories: High Merit, Merit, Minimum Merit, and No Merit, will be assigned a number (3, 2, 1, 0). These numbers will be the multiplier for the increment of merit pay for the faculty of the Biology Department. The increment will be calculated by dividing the department's merit allotment for faculty by the total merit units for the faculty, then multiplying each faculty member's merit multiplier by the increment.

Note: This plan was approved by the faculty for future use when adjusted for the five categories of merit on the "new" F2.08.

**CHEMISTRY & PHYSICS**

Department of Chemistry and Physics  
Merit Salary Administration Policy – October 19, 2000/ **Revised February 3, 2006**

The process is that agreed to at the April 7, 2000 Departmental Faculty meeting and reaffirmed at the October 10, 2000 Departmental Faculty meeting. **Revisions included below were made to the plan in the February 3, 2006 Departmental meeting.**

1. The Chair, in concurrence with the Dean, makes annual merit evaluations of each Faculty member based on the contents of F2.08 Report submitted annually by each Faculty member, as per Faculty Handbook regulations.
- 2. Thirty percent (30 %) of the merit money allocated to the Department for raises will be distributed to all faculty (if evaluated as meritorious by the chair) on a per cent basis of their current salary.**
- 3. The remainder of the merit money allocated to the Department (70 %) will be distributed as detailed below.**
4. Merit raises are determined based on the average merit ranking of each Faculty for an assigned period. That period is chosen by the Department Faculty.

5. The Chair averages the assigned merit rankings for each Faculty member over the period determined by the Department Faculty.
6. The Chair assigns merit raises on an equal dollar basis within each merit level. For example, a Faculty member with an excellent merit average will receive the same increase as another Faculty member with an excellent merit average.
7. Merit increases are calculated without regard to longevity or current salary. Merit does not consider equity nor cost-of-living issues. Raises associated with those issues are assigned following separate policies.
8. Assuming a total dollar amount returned to the Department by the College for merit raises, the following calculation method is applied to determine dollar amounts per merit level:
  - a. A point value (**0 to 5**) for each year's merit ranking is assigned, those with intermediate rankings were assigned an additional half point up from the lower ranking.
  - b. The Faculty member's rankings are averaged for the given period.
  - c. The sum of the individual ranking averages is taken.
  - d. An individual Faculty member's ranking average is divided by the sum of the Faculty ranking averages to determine a "merit factor."
  - e. The merit factor is multiplied by the total merit dollar amount provided to the Department to calculate each Faculty member's merit raise.
  - f. Adjustments to this amount are made for those with only partial appointments to the department by multiplying the appointment factor by the merit factor.
9. By University policy, Faculty members receiving salary contributions from sources not controlled by the Department Chair will have raises in those contributions, if any, determined by the budget head controlling that source.

### COMPUTER SCIENCE

#### Procedure for Calculating Merit Pay in the Department of Computer Science

1. Calculate for each faculty member the overall merit score  $S_i$  (from 1 to 5).

2. Find sum, S, of all  $S_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots$  Number of faculty in the department.
3. Calculate the value of  $F_i = S_i / S$  for each  $i$ .
4. Let T = total dollars available to the department for merit.
5. Then Merit raise for each faculty member =  $F_i \times T$ .

This procedure has been used at least since 2000.

### **EARTH & SPACE SCIENCES**

The following guidelines will be used by the **Department of Earth and Space Sciences** for the distribution of merit raise money. Merit raises will be based on a dollar amount rather than a percentage. Thus, everyone who receives a ranking of “Exemplary Performance”, 5.0, will receive the same monetary increase regardless of base pay.

Merit raises will be determined by a faculty member’s performance in the areas of research, teaching, and service, as reflected in the F2.08.

Highest Merit	5	Exemplary Performance
High Merit	4	High Performance
Merit	3	Adequate Performance
No Merit	2	Marginal Performance
No Raise	1	Unsatisfactory Performance

The three areas of teaching, research and service are evaluated with the above point system. These are unweighted scores. These are each multiplied by the weighting factor, i.e., the percentage effort established for each category by the faculty members and chair. The result is a weighted score for each category. The sum of the weighted scores is the composite score for the individual faculty members. For example,

Unweighted scores	x	Weighting Factors	=	Composite Score
Teaching Research Service		Teaching Research Service		
5 5 5		40% 40% 20%	=	
Weighted scores				
Teaching Research Service				
200 200 100			=	500

Raise pool/Total of Merit shares=Merit Share Value

Merit Raise=Composite Score x Merit Share Value

**Department of English and Modern Languages  
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty  
Approved on March 31, 2006**

Merit Pay Policy

The Department of English and Modern Languages will base merit pay raises on a dollar amount rather than on a percentage. Thus, everyone who receives a ranking of “Exemplary Performance” in all three areas of Teaching, Scholarship-Research, and Service will receive the same monetary increases, regardless of her or his base salary.

Faculty members will be evaluated in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship-Research, and Service as reflected in the F2.08:

Department Merit Pay Calculation Policy

Highest Merit	Exemplary Performance	5
High Merit	High Performance	4
Merit	Adequate Performance	3
Low Merit	Marginal Performance	2
No Raise	Unsatisfactory Performance	1

Teaching, Scholarship-Research, and Service will be evaluated in accord with the above point system. These un-weighted scores will then be multiplied by the **weighted factors** comprised of percentage effort established for each category by the faculty member. A weighted score for each category will result. Finally, the sum of the three weighted scores will be the individual faculty member’s composite score for the year of evaluation.

<u>Un-weighted Scores</u>			x	<u>Weighting Factors</u>			=	<u>Composite Score</u>
Teaching	Research	Service		Teaching	Research	Service		
5	5	5		30%	40%	30%		
				5 x 3	+ 5 x 4	+ 5 x 3	=	50 (highest)
5	4	5		30%	40%	30%		
				5 x 3	+ 4 x 4	+ 5 x 3	=	46
3	5	4		35%	25%	40%		
				3 x 3.5	+ 5 x 2.5	+ 4 x 4	=	39
4	4	2		40%	30%	30%		
				4 x 4	+ 4 x 3	+ 2 x 3	=	34

and so forth. The Raise Pool will then be divided by the sum of the composite scores for all faculty members in order to determine the dollar amount value for each merit unit share. Finally, the unit dollar amount per unit share will be multiplied by the faculty member’s composite score in order to arrive at the faculty member’s merit increase for the forthcoming fiscal year.

*Sample Worksheet (assuming a 3% merit pool allocation)*

Total number of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty	20
Total Combined Salaries	\$1,000,000.00
Merit	3%
Merit Pool	\$1,000,000 x .03 = \$30,000.00

	Composite Score	Unit Value	Merit Raise
Faculty #1	50	\$37.87	\$1,893.50
Faculty #2	50		\$1,893.50
Faculty #3	50		\$1,893.50
Faculty #4	50		\$1,893.50
Faculty #5	50		\$1,893.50
Faculty #6	50		\$1,893.50
Faulty #7	46	\$37.87	\$1,742.02
Faculty #8	46		\$1,742.02
Faculty #9	40	\$37.87	\$1,514.80
Faculty #10	40		\$1,514.80
Faculty #11	40		\$1,514.80
Faculty #12	40		\$1,514.80
Faculty #13	40		\$1,514.80
Faculty #14	36	\$37.87	\$1,363.32
Faculty #15	36		\$1,363.32
Faculty #16	30	\$37.87	\$1,136.10
Faculty #17	30		\$1,136.10
Faculty #18	24	\$37.87	\$908.88
Faculty #19	24		\$908.88
Faculty #20	20	\$37.87	\$757.40

---

**\$29,993.04**

Merit Raise Pool	Units	=	Unit Value
\$30,000.00 ÷	<b>792</b>		<b>\$37.87</b>

-\$6.96

Faculty #1 -6	x	1.16	+6.96
---------------	---	------	-------

---

**\$30,000.00**

**Department of English and Modern Languages  
Instructors and Lecturers  
March 31, 2006**

Merit Pay Policy

The Department of English and Modern Languages will base merit pay raises on a dollar amount rather than on a percentage. Thus, everyone who receives a ranking of “Exemplary Performance” for *Teaching Effectiveness* (plus Scholarship-Research and Service for some instructors) will receive the same monetary increases, regardless of her or his base salary.

Department Merit Pay Calculation Policy

Highest Merit	Exemplary Performance	5
High Merit	High Performance	4
Merit	Adequate Performance	3
Low Merit	Marginal Performance	2
No Raise	Unsatisfactory Performance	1

Teaching Effectiveness will be evaluated in accord with the above point system, whereby an Exemplary Performance score of 5 will count for 5 merit units, a High Performance Plus score of 4.5 will count for 4.5 merit units, an Adequate Performance score of 3 will count for 3 merit units and so forth.

Sample Worksheet (assuming a 3% merit pool)

Total Number of Instructors and Lecturers	20
Total Combined Salaries	\$600,000.00
Merit	3%
Merit Pool     \$600,000 x .03	\$18,000.00

Merit Raise Pool	Units	=	Unit Value
\$18,000.00     ÷	<b>76</b>		<b>\$236.80</b>

	Composite Score		Unit Value	=	Merit Raise
Faculty #1	5	x	\$236.80	=	\$1,184.00
Faculty #3	4.5	x	\$236.80	=	\$1,065.60
Faulty #7	4	x	\$236.80	=	\$947.20
Faculty #12	3.5	x	\$236.80	=	\$828.80
Faculty #13	3.5	x	\$236.80	=	\$828.80
Faculty #16	3	x	\$236.80	=	\$710.40
Faculty #17	3	X	\$236.80	=	\$710.40
Faculty #19	2.5	x	\$236.80	=	\$592.00

## HISTORY

The following guidelines are used by the history department for the distribution of merit raise money.

1. Merit raises will be based on a dollar amount rather than a percentage. Thus, everyone who receives a ranking of “highest merit,” etc. will receive the same monetary increase regardless of base pay.
2. Merit raises will be determined by a faculty member’s performance in the areas of research, teaching, and service, as reflected in the F2.08.
3. Although the chair will have some discretion in determining the dollar amount allotted for “highest merit,” etc. most of the merit money will be distributed in accordance with a formula in which a faculty receives so many shares for “highest merit,” etc.

Approved, 11-2005

## MATHEMATICS

Not submitted, please contact Dean of Arts & Sciences for the current plan.

## NURSING

Purpose: To define parameters for merit pay increases in the department of nursing. Merit pay will be determined as having performed activities outside the regular expectations of faculty teaching and departmental requirements.

1. All faculty will have an F2.08 evaluation each year by the department chair. The areas of Teaching, Research and Professional Service/Activities will be rated to determine merit pay. Lamar University’s Faculty Evaluation Procedure will be followed in completing the F2.08.
2. Merit pay may be awarded based on the following criteria and rating scale:

Exemplary Performance	5 points	Highest Merit
High Performance	4 points	High Merit
Adequate Performance	3 points	Merit
Marginal Performance	2 points	No merit

Unsatisfactory Performance	1 point	No raise
----------------------------	---------	----------

Each of the following areas will be scored appropriately with an overall average of the three areas awarded as the score used for merit pay.

- Teaching and Instructional Activities
- Research, Publication and Creative Endeavor
- Professional Services to Nursing, Lamar University, and/or the Community

An example follows of the application of the merit scoring scale if the university had 5% as the maximum merit increase:

Highest Merit	Exemplary Performance	5% raise
High Merit	High Performance	4% raise
Merit	Adequate Performance	3% raise
No merit	Marginal Performance	0 merit
No raise	Unsatisfactory Performance	0 raise

Merit pay and percent amounts will be adjusted according to university policy and funding.

Approved by Department of Nursing Faculty Association 12-12-05

**POLITICAL SCIENCE**

1. Merit raises are to be based on a dollar amount rather than a percentage.
2. Merit is to be determined on the basis of F2.08 evaluations.
3. Merit raises are to be correlated with F2.08 evaluations by establishing numerical “shares.” Each faculty member’s share is to be determined by dividing that faculty member’s F2.08 composite score by the sum of all department faculty composite scores. Merit raises are then calculated by multiplying each faculty member’s share by the total merit funds allotted to the department.

$[(\text{Teaching score}) \times (\% \text{ workload})] + [(\text{Research/Scholarship score}) \times (\% \text{ workload})] + [(\text{Service score}) \times (\% \text{ workload})] = \text{composite score}$

$(\text{Faculty member A's composite score} \cdot \text{sum of all department faculty composite scores}) \cdot (\text{total merit funds allotted to the department}) = \text{merit raise}$

Adopted October 9, 2000; adjusted to revised F2.08 dated December 1, 2004

### PSYCHOLOGY

1. The Department of Psychology is given a share of the salary increase pool.
2. Within the Department of Psychology, all eligible faculty members are considered. The chairs of each department have been handled separately by the Dean of the College.
3. Points will be assigned to the merit ratings in the following manner:
  - 0 = NM (no merit)/NR (no raise)
  - 1 = M (merit)
  - 2 = HM (high merit)
  - 3 = HstM (highest merit)
4. The sum of the mean scores based on the previous year's F2.08 for the Department is calculated. Our departmental allotment is then divided by that sum to get a dollar value for a "unit of merit."
5. Then, each person's F2.08 rating is multiplied by the "unit of merit" dollar amount to determine the amount of the raise.

This plan was first instituted in the Department of Psychology for the faculty salary merit increase for the 2000-01 academic year. This policy was discussed during the Department's faculty meeting of September 28, 2000 and all questions were addressed.

### SOCIOLOGY, SOCIAL WORK, CRIMINAL JUSTICE

1. Each faculty will receive points based upon 2.08 ratings in categories of Teaching, Research and Service.
2. Points are assigned as follow: Highest Merit=5, High Merit=4, Merit=3, No Merit=2 and No Raise=1

3. The weighted merit score will be calculated as follows: Points awarded multiplied by weight to be given to the category (as determined by faculty and chair.) .e.g. an “adequate/merit” rating (3) in research, weighted at 20%, gives weighted merit score of  $3 \times .20 = .6$ ; Teaching weighted at 40%, highest merit 5, yields  $5 \times .4 = 2.0$
4. The sum of weighted merit points for all faculty will be divided into total available merit money to determine a “per share” dollar amount.
5. Each faculty’s total points will be multiplied by “per share” figure to determine merit raise.
6. A faculty with a total weighted merit score of less than 2 points would not receive merit money.

## **COLLEGE OF BUSINESS**

Annually, Lamar University might allocate a percentage of current faculty salaries as merit based salary increases. This document outlines the procedures used at the College of Business to allocate such monies to individual faculty members.

### **Policies and Procedures**

1. When the aggregate College of Business percentage allocation is announced, the dean will retain a pool of money equal to that percentage of the salaries of the department chairs and the associate dean for merit distribution to those individuals. The dean will also retain any excess received for individuals who are not eligible for merit pay and a fraction of the total percentage, not to exceed 20%, to address merit inequities and differences in performance across departments.
2. The remainder will be distributed to department chairs based on the salaries of all eligible faculty members in the department.
3. Each department chair will distribute his/her pool of money to the departmental faculty based on the current f2.08 evaluation, ensuring that all faculty members rated in the same merit category receive the same percentage increase, and that exceptional merit faculty receive more than high merit faculty members who should receive more than merit faculty members. Faculty members rated no merit will receive 0% merit increases but will receive equity adjustments, if any. Faculty members receiving an unsatisfactory rating will receive 0% merit increases and will not be eligible for equity adjustments.

4. The dean will award merit increases to the department chairs and the associate dean based on the current f2.08 evaluation, ensuring that all chairs and associate dean rated in the same merit category receive the same percentage increase, and that exceptional merit ratings receive more than high merit ratings who should receive more than merit ratings.

5. The dean, in consultation with department chairs, will distribute the remaining pool of money to address merit inequities and difference in performance issues across departments.

Approved by the Executive Committee of the College of Business September 7, 2005

## DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES

### ASSUMPTIONS:

- X Director makes annual merit evaluations of each faculty member based on the content of F2.08 report submitted and results of student evaluations.
- X All salary increases will be performance based and not across the board pay raises.
- X Performance based salary increases will be based upon achieving set goals and meeting standards and not on comparative ranking of faculty.
- X Performance ratings will be made each year regardless of funding.
- X Merit raises are calculated without regard to longevity or current salary.

**RATING SCALE:** Faculty will be rated in the first and third categories of F 2.08 with the second category as a bonus for merit based rate. Numerous faculty discussions and meetings have occurred regarding this model, and all faculty members are aware of the standards. The following Rating Scale Standards are provided as part of the department's Merit Pay Increase Plan. The description utilized for each numerical rating should not be viewed as an exhaustive list of activities, nor do they represent a minimum check list of activities.

1. **Teaching and Instructional Activities, 60%:** Teaching and instructional activities will be rated according to student evaluations (30%) and director evaluations (30%).

### **Rating Standards for Teaching and Instructional Activities**

- a) Student Evaluations: 0-4 points based on GPA from student evaluations  
Ratings:
  - 0=less than 2.0
  - 1=2.0 - 2.4
  - 2=2.41 - 2.75

3=2.76 - 3.25

4=above 3.25

b) Director Evaluations: 0 - 4 points based on criteria including but not limited to the following

- X provides class information including office hours, telephone number, grading policies, etc.
- X uses current syllabus
- X holds regular office hours and is available by appointment outside office hours
- X provides varied learning experiences and engages students in learning process such as some or all of the following—utilizes lab, has students do notebooks, has students work at board, gives
- X quizzes, uses overhead projector, takes up homework, assigns take-home quizzes, uses power point
- X works with students with disabilities
- X meets class regularly
- X helps develop instructional material—such as some or all of the following—develops computer practice tests for the lab, prepares tests for standardized test bank, helps plan curriculum, prepares syllabi, prepares course information sheet
- X other indicators of excellence in teaching such as “best teacher” or
- X “outstanding” comments from student evaluations

Ratings:

0 =totally unacceptable

1 =little or no adherence to majority of criteria

2 =some adherence to most

3 =adherence to most

4 =exceptional adherence

2. Research, Publication, and Creative Endeavor, Bonus 10%: Research and scholarship activities including but not limited to authoring a book, having article published, other creative works, attending work-related conference, being a speaker at a conference, and other evidence of professional development.

**Rating Standards for Research and Creative Endeavor:**

0=No scholarship activity

1=Serves as proof reader or reviewer for proposed manuscripts

2=One or more of the following: Attends conference or seminar, does ancillary materials for proposed text, prepares manuscripts or research presentations that are not yet formally submitted

3=One or more of the following: Submits manuscripts for publication or for

research presentations. Is pursuing research presentations. Serves as a speaker or moderator at a conference. Works on creating a new edition of a published book.

4=One or more of the following: Publishes in national, regional, or state referred journals. Publishes books, monographs, book chapters. Obtains external funding. Provides leadership on collaborative research projects.

### 3. Professional Services to Department, College, University, and Community, 40%

#### **Department:**

Activities including, but not limited to, contribution toward achievement of departmental goals such as academic advising of students during orientation and at other peak times, scheduling course load for faculty, interviewing and training proctors to work in the computer lab, coordinating the computer lab, serving as math or reading coordinator, formulating teacher-created vocabulary practice tests and tests.

#### **University:**

Activities including, but not limited to serving on university or departmental committees, sponsoring a student organization, serving on faculty senate, conducting academic enhancement workshop.

#### **Community:**

Activities including, but not limited to, volunteer work in the community, being a member of a community service organization, serving as an officer of community service organization, participating in fund-raising activities for community service organizations.

#### **Rating Standards for Services to Department, University, and Community:**

(The following serve as guidelines to each of the rankings. Receiving a given ranking depends upon meeting some or all of the following criteria or other similar criteria.)

0=No service activities

1=Limited participation in department programmatic functioning, professional service is very limited, not involved in advising students. Does not step forward to shoulder program needs.

2=Minimal involvement in department/university committees and minimal involvement in professional organizations and community service projects. Limited involvement in advising students.

3=Serves on department or university committees, advises students, actively participates in departmental faculty meetings. Conducts statistical study of success rates of developmental students in college algebra. Active member of community organization. Major role in community project or fund-raising. Committee member on state level professional organization.

4=Major contribution to department such as a combination of some or all of the following: advised students, revised curriculum, developed technology plan, served as math or reading coordinator. Office holder or chair of university committee, elected member on university committee, active roles in serving student organizations, serves as sponsor for student organization, chair of a search committee. Officer in regional/national organization, extensive involvement in community project, officer for major community organization.

Let's assume the department receives \$5000 for salary increases. To determine how much each performance based point is worth; divide merit pool by the total number of performance points for the department. To determine the individual salary increases multiply the merit value of each point by the total points for each instructor.

## **COLLEGE OF EDUCATION & HUMAN DEVELOPMENT**

The College of Education & Human Development consists of the following departments: Educational Leadership; Family & Consumer Sciences; Health & Kinesiology; and Professional Pedagogy.

All of the departments in the College follow a plan for salary administration that contains the following elements:

Individual faculty members are allowed to assign percentage weights to the three categories of evaluation: teaching, research & service. The weights assigned to each category are governed by various minimums and maximums.

Individual faculty members are rated on each of the three categories using a five-point scale.

- 0= Non-meritorious
- 1= Minimal performance
- 2= Low performance
- 3= Average performance
- 4= High performance
- 5= Superior performance

The individual numerical totals for the entire faculty of the College of Education & Development are summed. That number is used to divide the total of merit salary money available to the college. Each point is worth a specific amount. For example, 20 points of

merit divided into \$10,000 of merit salary money means that each point is \$500. An individual with a total of three merit points would receive a \$1,500 raise.

Approved 11-2005

## **COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING**

### **CHEMICAL ENGINEERING**

1. The chair requests each tenure-track faculty member to recommend the percentage workload distribution. Then the chair takes average of the recommended percentages and used in the calculation of the chair's composite score shown in the evaluation item IV. This chair's composite score is recorded as the evaluation/merit score on the front page of the faculty annual review form, F2.08.
2. Each evaluation/merit score is normalized by dividing each score with the total evaluation/merit score. The sum of the normalized scores should be 100%. Each faculty's merit pay is the total merit pay (received by the department) times the normalized score.

Approved for Fall, 2005

### **CIVIL ENGINEERING**

The full-time faculty members in the Department of Civil Engineering shall be evaluated annually by the Department Chair relative to their various professional duties and activities. In February each year, each CE faculty member shall complete the annual report (F2.08) that sets forth what the individual faculty has contributed during the previous calendar year toward the accomplishment of the Department's goals in three areas:

- (1) Instruction;
- (2) Research and Publication
- (3) Professional Services to the Department, College, University, and Professional communities

For the purpose of both overall performance evaluation and salary administration, the Department Chair shall indicate the following to each faculty member:

- Exemplary Performance (highest merit, level 5)
- High Performance (high merit, level 4)

- Adequate Performance (merit, level 3)
- Marginal Performance (no merit, level 2)
- Unsatisfactory (no raise, level 1)

**The chair will calculate a Composite score for each faculty member according to departmental workload policies, with the department future goals and directions to justify merit raises.**

There are three criteria in the evaluation:

- Effective teaching, including a record of successful direction of the work of both undergraduate and graduate students,
- Scholarship supported by a publication record and funded research program
- Service to the university, community, and profession.

**Teaching:** Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated through both peer and student assessments. Documentation may include: (a) teaching assignments, course syllabi, curriculum materials developed, and number of students, (b) student ratings and comments, (c) presentations and publications or innovations in teaching, (d) theses and reports supervised, undergraduate research projects directed, membership on thesis committees, diagnostic and comprehensive exams prepared.

**Scholarship and Research:** Accomplishment in scholarship will be required for merit evaluation. Documentation may include: (a) published books, papers in referred journals and conference proceedings, research reports, (b) presentations (invited and contributed) at professional meetings, (c) number of proposals submitted, sponsored research projects, federal, state, and industrial research funding.

**Service:** Service involves the use of the faculty member's professional knowledge to assist various constituencies. Documentation may include: (a) membership on department, college, university and/or professional committees, (b) actual participation in student recruitment and retention, visiting local high schools and promoting Civil Engineering profession, (c) student advising, both undergraduate and graduate students, (d) participation in university convocation, commencement, and other university-wide functions, and (e) active involvement in professional societies. Documentation relative to the effectiveness and quality of the contributions is important.

## **ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING**

The merit pay evaluation process in Electrical Engineering begins with the yearly F2.08 Faculty Annual Review document. Productivity is evaluated by the department chair with respect to department goals and how faculty met those goals with respect to the

average productivity of the faculty as a whole. A global weight is applied based on the faculty members rank. Prior to merit evaluation, weighting values for performance items are determined at a department meeting. The available merit funds are then distributed equitably based on the merit points earned from the chair's evaluation of the F2.08 documents.

**Revised**

**1/25/06**

### INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING

Merit pay increases are based on performance as evaluated on the F2.08 faculty evaluation forms. Each faculty member's overall score on the F2.08 for each of the three preceding years is used. The three numerical values are averaged to get a three year average overall evaluation score.

Each faculty member's merit pay increase is obtained by dividing his/her three year average overall evaluation score by the total of the three year average overall evaluation scores for all faculty members eligible for a merit pay increase and multiplying the result time the total amount of merit pay available for the department.

### MECHANICAL ENGINEERING

The full-time faculty members in the Department of Mechanical Engineering shall be evaluated annually by the Department Chair relative to their various professional duties and activities. In February each year, each ME faculty member shall complete the annual report (F2.08) that sets forth what the individual faculty has contributed during the previous calendar year toward the accomplishment of the Department's goals in three areas:

- (1) Instruction;
- (2) Research and Publication
- (3) Professional Services to the Department, College, University, and Professional communities

For the purpose of both overall performance evaluation and salary administration, the Department Chair shall assign one of the following faculty member:

- Exemplary Performance (highest merit, level 5)
- High Performance (high merit, level 4)
- Adequate Performance (merit, level 3)
- Marginal Performance (no merit, level 2)
- Unsatisfactory (no raise, level 1)

The chair will calculate a composite score for each faculty member based on weights given to three criteria indicated below.

### **Factors to be considered**

There are three criteria in the evaluation:

- Effective teaching, including a record of successful direction of the work of both undergraduate and graduate students,
- Scholarship evidenced by publication record and funded research program (s).
- Service to the university, community, and profession.

Teaching: Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated through both peer and student assessments. Documentation may include: (a) teaching assignments, course syllabi, curriculum materials developed, and number of students, (b) student ratings and comments, (c) presentation and publications or innovations in teaching.

Scholarship and Research: Accomplishment in scholarship will be required for merit evaluation. Documentation may include: (a) published books, papers in referred journals and conference proceedings, research reports, (b) presentations (invited and contributed) at professional meetings, (c) number of proposals submitted sponsored research projects, federal, state, and industrial research funding, (d) thesis and dissertations supervised, undergraduate research projects directed, membership graduate student committees.

Service: Service involves the use of the faculty member's professional knowledge to assist various constituencies. Documentation may include: (a) membership on department, college, university and/or professional committees, (b) actual participation in student recruitment and retention, visiting local high schools and promoting Mechanical Engineering profession, (c) student advising, both undergraduate and graduate students, (d) participation in university convocation, commencement, and other university-wide functions, and (e) active involvement in professional societies. Documentation relative to the effectiveness and quality of the contributions is important.

Merit Pay Raise: Faculty earning similar scores will be given the same amount of raise rather than the same percentage increase over their respective current salary.

## **COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS & COMMUNICATION**

### **ART**

In accordance with the Lamar University Faculty Handbook and the policies of the College of Fine Arts and Communications, the Department of Art has adopted the following standards for faculty performance to be used for the purposes of annual review, tenure review, post-tenure review, promotion, and the determination of merit pay. Maintaining the published mission and goals of the university, college, and the department, the areas of assessment will be Teaching, Creative Activity/Research, and Service.

The department's standard activity range for a full-time faculty member (based on the standard University work week) will be divided at a rate of 40% in teaching, 45% in research, and 15% in service activities. It is understood that individual faculty members can elect at the beginning of the academic year, after consultation and with the approval of the department chair, to adjust activities to fit the following ranges: 35-50% Teaching, 35-50% Research, and 15-30% Service; with a faculty workload totaling 100%. It is expected that a full-time, tenure-track faculty member weight his/her load in the areas of teaching and research at 40%/45%. Tenured, full-time faculty can, after consultation and with the approval of the department chair, elect to weight activities according to their demonstrated strengths as stated in the Faculty Handbook. However, in keeping with university policy in the faculty handbook, it is anticipated that those seeking or holding the rank of Full Professor will place greatest emphasis on research activities.

Annually as specified in the Faculty Handbook, the department chair will evaluate each tenured and tenure track faculty member using the F2.08 form. In keeping with the language used in the F2.08, activities will be rated highly meritorious, meritorious, minimally meritorious, and not meritorious. For evaluation purposes, each category will be given a numerical weight; highly meritorious (4), meritorious (3), minimally meritorious (2), and not meritorious (1). Reported activities outside of the list will be scored as "not meritorious" or (1). No activity reported in a category will be given a weight of (0). Scores in each category will be averaged. In sections I, II, and III of the F2.08, averaged scores will be designated: Exceeds Expectations (3.6-4.0), Meets Expectations (2.0-3.5), and Does Not Meet Expectations (0.0-1.9). Category scores will be weighted according to workload percentages and then averaged to produce a composite score. The averaged composite score will be rated according to the following: High Merit (3.6-4.0), Merit (2.7-3.5), Minimum Merit (2.0-2.6), and No Merit (0.0-1.9).

**TEACHING** (40% standard; 35-50% range)--Activities include teaching assigned courses, student mentoring, thesis committee work, course development, and maintaining currency of knowledge in the field.

These activities will be documented and evaluated through student evaluations, peer review, receipt of awards and recognition for teaching, new course approval documentation, and implemented syllabi and course outlines.

RESEARCH (45% standard; 35-50% range)--Appropriate creative activities for evaluation purposes include:

Exhibitions at the regional, national and international level that involve peer review (i.e. juried or invitational exhibitions). Of these, one person and invitational exhibitions at the national and international level and juried group exhibitions at the international level will be rated highly meritorious. One person and invitational exhibitions at the regional level and juried group exhibitions at the national and international level will be rated meritorious. And juried group exhibitions at the regional level will be rated minimally meritorious.

Artists' residencies, workshops, visiting faculty appointments, and guest lectureships. Of these, activities conducted at the national and international level will be rated highly meritorious; those at the regional level meritorious; and those at the local level minimally meritorious.

Receipt of grants, fellowships, and awards at the local, regional, national and international level. Of these, recognitions received at the national and international level will be rated highly meritorious; those at the regional level meritorious; and those at the local level minimally meritorious.

Documentation for creative activities shall include, but is not limited to, catalogues, exhibition cards, exhibition reviews, biographical materials or listings, or other media (CD rom, videotape, slides, etc.).

Appropriate scholarly activities for evaluation purposes include:

Publication of exhibition reviews, critical articles, scholarly papers, books, or other educational materials (i.e., CD roms, videotapes, etc.) at the local, regional, national and/or international level. Of these, materials published at the national and/or international level will be rated highly meritorious; those published at the regional level will be rated meritorious; and those at the local level will be rated minimally meritorious.

Presentation of scholarly material and/or participation at conferences and symposia. Of these, materials published at the national and/or international level will be rated highly meritorious; those published at the regional level will be rated meritorious; and those at the local level will be rated minimally meritorious.

Curation of annual, originating, and/or traveling exhibitions. Of these, traveling exhibitions will be rated highly meritorious; origination exhibitions will be rated meritorious; and annual exhibitions will be rated minimally meritorious.

Receipt of grants, fellowships, and awards at the local, regional, national and international level. Of these, those awarded at the national and/or international level will be rated highly meritorious; those awarded at the regional level will be rated meritorious; and those at the local level will be rated minimally meritorious.

Professional consultations and adjudication. Of these, consultations performed at the national and/or international level will be rated highly meritorious; those performed at the regional level will be rated meritorious; and those at the local level will be rated minimally meritorious.

Documentation for scholarly activities shall include, but are not limited to, copies of publications, biographical materials and listings, catalogues, peer reviews (by means of exhibition reviews or other means of written evaluation), or other media as appropriate.

**SERVICE** (15% standard; 15-30% range)--Activities for evaluation in this category include:

Student advisement

Faculty sponsorship of student organizations and extracurricular activities

Departmental administrative duties as assigned

Approved 9/98

### COMMUNICATION

The chair calculates the amount of merit pay for each faculty by using the following procedures:

1. Add the "Evaluation/Merit Scores" for the entire faculty in the department to arrive at a total Department Evaluation/Merit Score.
2. Divide the available department merit pay funds by the Department Evaluation/Merit Score to arrive at a Unit Amount.
3. Multiply each faculty's Evaluation/Merit Score by the Unit Amount to arrive at each faculty's merit pay amount.

### COMMUNICATION DISORDERS & DEAF EDUCATION

In 1996, the faculty decided that the evaluation of faculty would have the following ratings.

Exceeds Expectations = 2

Meets Expectations = 1

Does Not Meet Expectations = 0

Each of these points is factored by the percentage assigned in the initial meeting between the faculty and chair (see evaluation memo Teaching 35-50%, Research 35-50%, and Service 15% for 100% total). The points for each category are added and measured against the range to determine merit.

High Merit                    1.6 – 2.0

Merit                            1.5 – 1.0

Minimum Merit .9 - .5  
No Merit below .5

\*Example: Teaching – Exceeds (2) x .50 = 1.00  
Research – Meets (1) x .35 = .35  
Service – Meets (1) x .15 = .15

The **total** is **1.5 (Merit pay category)**

It was also decided that the pool of money would be divided on a base amount multiplied by the factor.

Example: Faculty 1 = merit score of 1.5                      Pool of money given by the Dean  
Faculty 2 = merit score of 2.0                                  is \$1,000.  
Faculty 3 = merit score of 1.0

Total is 4.5

\$1,000 is divided by 4.5 = a unit amount of \$222.22

Faculty 1 would receive \$222.22 x 1.5 = \$333.33  
Faculty 2 would receive \$222.22 x 2.0 = \$444.44  
Faculty 3 would receive \$222.22 x 1.0 = \$222.22

**Note: December 2004**

The new F2.08 Annual Faculty Evaluation forms have modified merit raise eligibility categories for (as approved by administration and accepted by faculty senate, CID, and the ACD). The evaluation is still based on the faculty and chair agreed to percentages for research, teaching, and service areas. The performance scores have five different categories ranging from Exemplary to Unsatisfactory (note that both Unsatisfactory and Marginal categories have no merit raises associated with these levels). These are the only changes to the Departmental policy.

MUSIC, THEATER & DANCE

The Department of Music, Theatre & Dance uses form F2. 08 (Annual Faculty Review) in assigning merit pay increases. The review period is a calendar year beginning on January 1 and ending on December 31.

The F2.08 is distributed to tenure-track faculty near the end of the year to be completed with goals for the coming calendar year. Faculty are normally evaluated in three basic areas: teaching, research/scholarship/creative activities and service. Part of this process is defining one's workload distribution. Faculty may choose to emphasize one area over

another (example: teaching, 60%; research, 20%; service, 20%). Faculty are normally required to have some degree of activity in each of the three areas.

Faculty will be required to revisit the F2.08 at the end of the calendar year to list their accomplishments relative to the goals they set. At this time, the chairperson scores each area on a five point system.

<u>Performance Scores</u>	<u>Numerical Score</u>	<u>Merit Reward Level</u>
Exemplary Performance	Level 5	Highest Merit
High Performance	Level 4	High Merit
Adequate Performance	Level 3	Merit
Marginal Performance	Level 2	No Merit
Unsatisfactory	Level 1	No Raise

Point values are awarded to each of the three areas according to the five point system listed above, multiplying by the faculty member's preferred workload distribution percentages. This result is the faculty member's overall achievement score.

Example: A faculty member chooses to have his F2.08 scored with teaching, 60%; research, 20%; service, 20%. The department chair rates the faculty member at "High Performance", Level 4, in teaching and service, and "Adequate Performance", Level 3, for research. Multiplying  $4 \times .60 = 2.4$  for teaching;  $3 \times .20 = .6$  for research;  $4 \times .20 = .8$  for service. The sum of the three "area" scores is 3.8.

Individual scores for all faculty members are totaled to form a composite score for the entire faculty. This number is then divided into the funds given to the department for merit increases. This results in a dollar amount that corresponds to a single unit of merit increase.

Each faculty member's merit increase is figured by multiplying that individual's achievement score by the single unit dollar amount.

