

DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING

Metrics for Merit Salary Allocation

I. INTRODUCTION

Merit salary increases are intended to serve as incentives and recognition for exceptional faculty efforts that further the mission of the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering. To do this fairly, the basis for determining these increases must be clearly defined. Accordingly, the following are the metrics used by the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering to allocate merit salary increases for faculty. The merit allocations are based on the annual faculty evaluations, and the merit metrics must be made available to the faculty prior to the period of evaluation.

II. DEVELOPMENT OF MERIT METRICS

- A. Merit metrics are developed by the Chairperson in consultation with the faculty.
- B. The metrics must be approved by a majority of the faculty and the chairperson, and forwarded to the Dean of the college for approval.

III. APPLICATION OF MERIT METRICS

- A. The department is allocated a single merit pool for the faculty. The pool will not be divided prior to application of the merit metrics, nor will separate sub-pools be created. There will be no pre-allocation of the merit pool funds and no separation of funds to reflect differences in base salaries of the pool members.
- B. All merit funds will be made available to all members of the merit pool based on the metrics stated below. No merit funds will be withheld for distribution by any other method.
- C. Merit pay increases are allocated based on the faculty member's performance as reflected in the annual evaluation conducted by the department chairperson and according to the metric that follows. General criteria for the annual evaluation are given in Appendix A of this document. Persons on an approved sabbatical or other approved University programs should receive merit consideration.

IV. MERIT METRICS

- A. A faculty member's merit pay increase will be determined as follows:
 - 1. The three ratings (research, teaching, and service) from the faculty member's annual evaluation will be multiplied by their respective percent workload efforts and summed to get a total score (individual faculty score).
 - 2. Faculty members whose total score is above the departmental median will receive a percentage of the merit pool above the department median; the converse will also be true. The magnitude of the increase will reflect the chair's assessment of the faculty member's performance as measured by this score, as well as the chair's assessment of the impact of the faculty member's activities on the accomplishment of the department's mission as a top program in the field.

V. REVISION OF MERIT METRICS

- A. The merit metrics will be reassessed every five years, or when requested by the Chairperson or a majority of the departmental faculty.
- B. Modification to these merit metrics must be approved by a majority of the faculty and the chairperson, and forwarded to the Dean of the college for approval.

APPENDIX A: GENERAL CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION

Annual evaluations will be made in the areas of research, teaching, and service. Within these areas, faculty members will be rated on a nine-point scale (with nine being the highest score). The rating will be made using materials supplied by the faculty member for the period of review. The Chairperson's evaluation of a faculty member's activities shall consider all evidence submitted by a faculty member which is consistent with written departmental workload policies.

In determining ratings for each category, accomplishments (both quality and quantity) will be evaluated by the Chairperson in a manner consistent with the department P&T guidelines. The ratings will be consistent with the corresponding workload effort.*

The following are examples of accomplishments to be considered in each of the three areas. The categories evaluated are intended to be consistent with both the workload policy and the department P&T guidelines.

A. Teaching

- a. Instruction of courses.
- b. Demonstration of effective teaching as indicated by teaching evaluations or other means.
- c. Effective instruction of individuals (such as independent study).
- d. Improvement and development of courses, curricula, and instructional methods and materials.
- e. Undergraduate student advisement.
- f. Thesis and dissertation advisement resulting in graduate degrees.
- g. Teaching-related activities, e.g., workshops and seminars.
- h. Recognition via teaching-related awards and honors.

B. Research

- a. Book preparation and publication.
- b. Refereed journal publication.
- c. Award of patents.
- d. Conference proceedings.
- e. Presentations at professional events.
- f. Research proposals submitted.
- g. Funded research.
- h. Supervising of graduate and undergraduate students.
- i. Recognition via research-related awards and honors.

C. Service

- a. Participation on University, College, and/or Department committees.
- b. Significant departmental programmatic responsibility, e.g. graduate and undergraduate recruiting, graduate and undergraduate program coordination, etc.
- c. Administration of Center activities (other than research).
- d. Contributions towards accreditation (ABET) preparation.
- e. Activities for professional organizations.
- f. Responsibilities as editor or associate editor of a professional publication.
- g. Accomplishments as chair/organizer of a technical meeting, conference, and/or workshop.
- h. Recognition via service-related awards or honors.

Although the above listing of teaching, research and service accomplishments will include most faculty activities of relevance, it is not meant to be exclusive. Meritorious activities of any nature should be reported and will be taken into account in determining overall merit.

* For example, if one faculty member has a 60% workload effort in research, and is deemed to have twice the level of research accomplishments as another faculty member who has a 30% workload effort for research, both faculty members would receive the same 9-point scale rating. This rating is then weighted by the percent effort in determining the final score.