

**UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE
DEPARTMENT OF
KINESIOLOGY AND APPLIED PHYSIOLOGY
POLICY FOR MERIT SALARY ALLOCATION**

APPROVED BY FACULTY VOTE ON 10/21/11

General Provisions:

1. All members of the collective bargaining unit, including all full-time employees who are regular members of the voting faculty of the University of Delaware, shall be eligible for annual merit salary increases.
2. As discussed in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, merit pay increases shall be awarded in a fashion that is consistent with the faculty member's performance during the previous year in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, as documented in the annual evaluation conducted by the Department Chairperson.
3. The Department Chairperson shall be responsible for assigning annual merit salary allocations in a manner that is consistent with the provisions of this document.
4. Upon completion of the faculty performance appraisal process, the Department Chairperson will provide the department faculty with a group summary of the merit disbursement (e.g., merit salary pool dollar total and the mean and range of merit salary amounts).
5. As part of the annual review with the faculty member, the Department Chairperson shall review with a faculty member, the specific information indicating the correspondence between the faculty member's appraisal worksheet and merit score.
6. Any modification to the provisions of this document must be approved by a majority vote taken by written ballot of the departmental faculty who are members of the collective bargaining unit with appointments of at least 50% workload in the department.

Provisions for Determining Appraisal Ratings:

Teaching

1. For satisfactory performance, or a rating of 5 on the annual faculty appraisal form, student comments and/or quantitative ratings should support that the instructor:
 - started and ended class on time
 - responded to students who sought help
 - presented material that gained students' attention
 - utilized teaching materials that aided students' learning
 - returned assignments and exams within two weeks
 - provided helpful feedback on students' course work/performance
2. Other evidential materials submitted in support of teaching effectiveness will be considered in evaluation of overall teaching effectiveness, including, but not limited to:
 - Any written peer reviews of teaching.
 - Any proposals for grants received in support of university instructional projects or instructional development.
 - Documentation supporting the development of any new instructional methods or content, courses, curricula, or programs.

- A list of supervision or committee service for any honors theses, master's theses, and doctoral dissertations.
- Documentation of any involvement with external accreditation of an academic program.
- Documentation of any consultation related to teaching, curriculum development, etc. for external constituencies.
- A descriptive list of any invited guest lectures in university courses or at university student recruitment events.
- Documentation of awards recognizing student achievement under faculty direction.
- A description of any teaching or advising awards received or nominations.
- A list of any Center for Teaching and Learning consultations
- A list of attendance at any workshops or conferences related to teaching

Scholarship

1. For satisfactory performance, or a rating of 5 on the annual faculty appraisal form, each 20% of workload allotted to scholarship shall require one original, refereed, data-based publication in a recognized scholarly journal, or the equivalent, with equivalency regarded approximately as:
 - 2 non-data based original scholarly papers or chapters contributed to books, or
 - 4 technical reports, book reviews, or professional newsletter contributions, or
 - 1 submitted major external grant proposal that includes pilot data, or
 - 2 submitted external grant proposals, or
 - 3 prepared and delivered refereed podium or poster presentations at national or international professional meetings, or
 - 2 prepared and delivered professional workshops, or
 - a commensurate combination of the above examples.
2. Published books may be counted as more or less than an original, refereed, data-based publication in a recognized scholarly journal, with evaluation based on the following criteria:
 - Whether the work is individually written or an edited volume with contributions from others,
 - Length,
 - Publisher, and
 - Estimated impact based on any published written reviews or specific, market-related information from the publisher.
3. Other forms of scholarly contribution not enumerated here shall be counted based on close equivalency with one of the above-mentioned examples or on the approximate duration and quality of effort expended relative to the achievement of one original, refereed, data-based publication in a recognized scholarly journal.

4. In cases of the co-authorship of a scholarly contribution, it is incumbent upon the faculty member to specify his/her individual contributions to the project, with the possibility that this co-authored contribution will count less than indicated due to the assistance of others.
5. Because of publication lag time, etc., accomplishments in the area of scholarship will be averaged over a rolling window that includes the previous three years (i.e., appraisal year plus the previous two years).

Service

1. For satisfactory performance, or a rating of 5 on the annual faculty appraisal form, each 10% of workload allotted to service shall require quality service on professional committees or boards, including university, community, and professional organization committees, such as:
 - Serving as the chair of one committee and serving as a member of or a consultant to a second committee, or
 - Serving in a major elected position for a professional organization (during the term or actual service,) or
 - Serving as the organizer of a conference or professional event, or
 - Supervising community groups in a manner related to professional expertise, or
 - Presenting speeches or workshops related to professional expertise to community groups, or
 - Serving as a primary consultant (unpaid) to community, civic, or government entities
2. Administrative assignments regarded as service to the Department shall be evaluated as a function of the quality of service provided for the number of assigned workload credit hours. Faculty assigned such responsibilities should be in sufficiently close communication with the Department Chair that the quality of service is apparent.
3. Other forms of service contribution not enumerated here shall be counted based on close equivalency with one of the above-mentioned examples.

Provisions Related to Distribution of Merit Pay:

1. Merit salary increments shall be based on each faculty member's 9-point scale appraisal ratings assigned by the Department Chairperson.
2. Faculty members receiving a weighted merit score below 5 shall receive no merit salary increment.
3. The merit salary pool for the Department shall be divided among those faculty members eligible for merit salary increments in dollar amounts as follows:

The weighted merit score for each faculty member will be calculated as:

$$\text{weighted merit score} = (a_{\text{teaching}} \times W_{\text{teaching}}) + (a_{\text{scholarship}} \times W_{\text{scholarship}}) + (a_{\text{service}} \times W_{\text{service}})$$

where a is the appraisal rating and w is the workload percentage for each workload area. The weighted merit scores for all eligible faculty members are summed to equal the *total merit score* of faculty in the merit pool. Individual merit salary amount is calculated as:

$$\text{individual merit salary} = \text{weighted merit score} / \text{total merit score} * \text{merit pool dollars}$$

Examples of these calculations are shown in the table for a five faculty member group, using \$11,500 as the merit pool dollars.

faculty member	a_{teaching}	w_{teaching}	$a_{\text{scholarship}}$	$w_{\text{scholarship}}$	a_{service}	w_{service}	weighted merit score	% of total	merit salary
A	5.0	50%	5.0	40%	5.0	10%	5.00	15.8%	\$1,815
B	6.5	70%	5.5	20%	6.0	10%	6.25	19.7%	\$2,269
C	7.5	50%	6.0	15%	8.0	35%	7.45	23.5%	\$2,705
D	4.5	25%	8.0	65%	6.5	10%	6.98	22.0%	\$2,532
E	6.0	100%	n/a	0%	n/a	0%	6.00	18.9%	\$2,179
TOTAL							31.68	100%	\$11,500