

Policy on the Use of Ratings to Determine Merit Raises

Martin J. Mohlenkamp

February 7, 2019

This policy replaces phase 3 of the current evaluation policy. The main formula is unchanged. The changes are:

- Our recent practice of averaging over more than one year when there were years with no raise is included.
- Discussion of across-the-board raises, which are not subject to department policy, is removed.
- Our rate for setting the amount used for the Chair's discretionary fund is set as a backup, since the college (or maybe provost) has been setting the amount.
- A parallel procedure is created for faculty in each raise pool.
 - This formalizes the process we have been using for Group II.
 - This sets a process for regional faculty, whether they are eventually included with Athens campus faculty or have a separate raise pool.
 - The language is generic, so it accommodates proposed name changes being considered by faculty senate.

Section 1 has a proposed policy. Section 2 has some discussion. Section 3 contains the current policy, of which phase 3 is relevant.

1 Proposed Policy

Faculty are divided according to the raise pools set by the College, and the merit raise is determined separately for each set of faculty. Let \mathcal{F} be the set of faculty under consideration. Each $f \in \mathcal{F}$ has the following parameters:

- R_f is the numerical rating assigned by the departmental evaluation process, with higher ratings better. If there were no merit raises the previous year, then the mean of the ratings since the last merit raise will be used instead.
- S_f is their current salary.

The set \mathcal{F} has the following parameters:

- P is the department merit raise pool. It does not include any amounts that the college or university reserves for discretionary, across-the-board, or other types of raises. If the department is given a single amount to use for both the Chair's discretionary fund and the merit raise pool, then 10% of that amount will be used for the Chair's discretionary fund.

- $S = \sum_f S_f$ is the total salary.
- $R = \sum_f R_f$ is the total rating.
- $T = \sum_f S_f R_f$ is a weighted total of salaries and ratings.

The salary increase for f will then be

$$I_f = R_f \frac{P}{2} \left(\frac{1}{R} + \frac{S_f}{T} \right).$$

2 Discussion

- We can verify

$$\sum_f I_f = \sum_f R_f \frac{P}{2} \left(\frac{1}{R} + \frac{S_f}{T} \right) = \frac{P}{2} \left(\frac{\sum_f R_f}{R} + \frac{\sum_f R_f S_f}{T} \right) = \frac{P}{2} \left(\frac{R}{R} + \frac{T}{T} \right) = \frac{P}{2} (1 + 1) = P,$$

so the merit raise pool is spent exactly.

- The raise formula is the same as the current one, which allocates half the money in absolute terms and half relative to current salary.
- Current policy says 10% of the department raise pool is for the Chair's discretionary fund. Recently, the total raise pool was split (by the college or provost) as 12.5% Dean's discretionary fund, 12.5% Chair's discretionary fund, and 75% merit raise pool.

3 Current Policy

Procedure for Determining Faculty Raises in the Department of Mathematics

The procedure consists of three phases:

Phase 1. An assignment of weight to the teaching, research, and service aspects of a faculty member's duties. This will take place close to the time of evaluation, usually at the start of Fall quarter.

Phase 2. An evaluation of the contribution of each faculty member to the Department in each phase of his or her duties. This will be the assessment of the individual's performance and will take place each winter quarter for the period of the preceding calendar year for research and the preceding academic year for teaching and service.

Phase 3. The conversion of 1 and 2 into raises.

Phase 1. Assignment of Weights.

The Evaluation Committee will assign to each faculty member x three numbers, $m_T(x)$, $m_R(x)$ and $m_S(x)$ representing the percentage of the member's time devoted to teaching, research and service, respectively. The weights will satisfy the following inequalities

$$.2 \leq m_T(x) \leq .7$$

$$.1 \leq m_R(x) \leq .6$$

$$.2 \leq m_S(x) \leq .5$$

and the equation $m_R(x) + m_T(x) + m_S(x) = 1$.

The determination of weights begins with the faculty member's standard set of weights. (For the typical mathematics faculty member with a six course load, these are $m_T = 0.4$, $m_R = 0.4$ and $m_S = 0.2$.) In most cases, deviations from these weights will be determined by the faculty member's teaching load. In particular, if n is the sum of the number of courses taught and the number of load reductions for teaching-related activity, then the corresponding teaching weight is $(n - 2)/10$ when $4 \leq n \leq 9$ and 0.2 if $n < 4$. A teaching load reduction for an activity in research or service will result in a 0.1 increase in the corresponding weight with a corresponding reduction in the teaching weight until the teaching weight reaches 0.2 . (For instance, a load reduction for supervising a course will increase the service weight by $.1$.) In extraordinary circumstances, a faculty member may negotiate a different set of weights with the chair.

The only faculty members that can routinely request a service weight of 0.3 or above (with a corresponding reduction in research weight) are the vice chair and the graduate chair. This reflects

the heavy service component to these positions. Others can request such a weight but there would have to be exceptional circumstances for it to be granted.

After the weights are assigned, the Evaluation Committee moves on to the evaluation process given in Phase 2.

Phase 2: Evaluation of research, teaching and service.

Ratings for research, teaching and service will vary from 0 to 10. A satisfactory performance will be assigned a score in the range 6 to 7. A score below 6 reflects a sub par performance and scores above 7 will be assigned to better than typical performances. These ratings will be based on information from a variety of sources including the Chair, departmental committee chairs, student evaluations and, on the appropriate departmental forms, information provided by the faculty member. The faculty member's overall rating will be a weighted mean of the evaluations in each of the three areas.

2.1 The Evaluation of Research.

Research and scholarly activity will be evaluated based on publication during the year and the preceding two years and scholarly activity during the year. The faculty member's research portfolio will contain

- 1 Reprints of published articles and books.
- 2 Preprints of unpublished articles and books.
- 3 A summary of research and scholarly activity provided by the faculty member.

The portfolio should include activity related to publication for the preceding three years. Using the departmental form, the faculty member should report events related to the publication of an advanced monograph, advanced texts or refereed papers. The creation of a preprint, the acceptance of a paper and publication of a paper are regarded as distinct events; the (approximate) date of each event should be given in the faculty member's report.

The following are activities that will be reported on an annual basis:

- 1 External research grants (new and continuing).
- 2 Internal research grants received. These are grants that are reviewed by external referees (i.e. OURC grants, Baker Fund grants).
- 3 Editing a monograph or proceedings of a conference, revisions of previously published monographs.
- 4 Invited talks. This category includes colloquium talks, AMS Special Session talks, seminars presented at other universities, and conference talks.
- 5 Contributed papers presented in person.
- 6 Submitting a research grant proposal (internal or external).
- 7 Attending a research workshop or conference.
- 8 Contributed paper, not presented in person.
- 9 Having a Ph.D. student complete a dissertation.

- 10 Speaking at or attending an ongoing in-house seminar.

The following activities can be reported either as scholarly activity or service (but not both):

- 1 Organizing a conference (reported the year of the conference.)
- 2 Editor of a Journal.
- 3 Organizing an AMS Special Session (reported in the year of the session).
- 4 Book and article reviews.
- 5 Referee for journal, outside examiner of a dissertation in mathematics or reviewer for a tenure application.

Each member of the Evaluation Committee will use the above information to rate a faculty member. The Evaluation Committee will read each person's folder and, on a subjective basis, each committee member will assign the person a rating x , $0 \leq x \leq 10$. The Evaluation Committee will report the mean of these ratings to the Chair as a suggested research rating.

2.2 The Evaluation of Teaching.

The procedure for the teaching assessment is as follows. There will be a "teaching folder" compiled for each person. This will contain all material that the office has about the courses taught: first-day handouts, schedules, enrollment figures, grades given out, course evaluation material, summaries of complaints coming to the Chair and/or to the Dean's office, any memos or other material that come to the office about teaching-related activity of the person, and any other material deemed relevant. In addition the faculty member will provide a summary of teaching related activity. A departmental form will be used to report on the number of tutorial students, Ph.D. students, course development work, and so forth. There is also a place for the person to report any other activity relevant to the evaluation of teaching.

There are a variety of activities that can positively affect one's teaching evaluation. These include, but are not limited to, such activities as:

- 1 Taking on tutorial or dissertation students.
- 2 Offering approved independent studies.
- 3 Developing new courses or modifying existing ones.
- 4 Attending teaching related conferences or workshops.
- 5 Being well regarded by students.

There are also a variety of activities that can negatively affect one's teaching evaluation. These include, but are not limited to, such activities as:

- 1 Failing to pass out first day handouts.
- 2 Failing to keep office hours.
- 3 Failing to meet classes every time and for the full period.
- 4 Failing to make effective use of class time.
- 5 Failing to hand out evaluations on approved department forms.
- 6 Failing to follow college policy with regard to final examinations.

- 7 Failing to cover the syllabus of the course.

and, in general, for failing to do the routine things required of all faculty by the Faculty Handbook and/or departmental policy.

Both the quality and quantity of such activities will be considered in the evaluation.

Each member of the Evaluation Committee will use the above information to rate a faculty member. The Evaluation Committee will read each person's folder and, on a subjective basis, each committee member will assign the person a rating x , $0 \leq x \leq 10$. The Evaluation Committee will report the mean of these ratings to the Chair as a suggested teaching rating.

2.3 Evaluation of Service.

The service portfolio will consist of information provided by the faculty member, reports from departmental committee chairs (for committee members) and reports from the Department Chair for committee chairs, the graduate chair and vice-chair.

The following is a list (though not an exhaustive list) of activities that can be considered as "Service."

- 1 Proctoring a Ph.D. comprehensive examination.
- 2 Supervising a multi-section course.
- 3 Writing and grading a tutorial comprehensive.
- 4 Substituting for an absent faculty member.
- 5 Writing and grading a Ph.D. comprehensive examination.
- 6 Being a member of a thesis/dissertation committee. (Will be counted in the year of completion of the degree.)
- 7 Member of an ad hoc committee (e.g., member of a College Promotion and Tenure Committee.)
- 8 Advising students.
- 9 Being an active member of a department committee.
- 10 Being a member of a college/university committee.
- 11 Service to the community.
- 12 Service to the profession.

The following are among the things that will impact negatively on the service evaluation.

- 1 Refusing appropriate service requests.
- 2 Accepting an assignment and then not carrying it out satisfactorily.
- 3 Failure to attend meetings of assigned committees.
- 4 Failure to attend department meetings.

Each member of the Evaluation Committee will use the above information to rate a faculty member. The Evaluation Committee will read each person's folder and, on a subjective basis, each committee member will assign the person a rating x , $0 \leq x \leq 10$. The Evaluation Committee will report the mean of these ratings to the Chair as a suggested service rating.

2.4 Exceptions.

There are some exceptions to the above procedure. The Evaluation Committee will evaluate untenured faculty in their first two years and faculty on leave on an *ad hoc* basis. Faculty taking two or more quarters of sabbatical leave will:

- 1 For the academic year of their sabbatical leave, receive the mean of their teaching and service ratings from their three previous evaluations.
- 2 For the academic year of their sabbatical leave, have their weights set at the mean values of their weights for the previous three evaluations.
- 3 Have their research ratings determined as described in section 2.1.

2.5 Incomplete portfolios.

The Evaluation Committee will evaluate all faculty members on all aspects of their duties. If the faculty member does not present any information about his/her activities to the Committee, then he/she will be evaluated on what is provided by the Chair. This will include information given to the Chair by other official sources. The faculty member will be evaluated as if there is no other activity.

2.6 Appeals.

A faculty member can request the Evaluation Committee to reconsider his/her rating by writing to the committee within one week of the evaluation being placed in the faculty member's mailbox. The request should also indicate why he/she believes the rating should be revised.

Phase 3: From Ratings to Raises.

This section describes how an individual's teaching, research and service ratings, together with that individual's weights in each of these areas, determine a dollar figure that will be a portion of his/her raise for the next year. We start with some notation, which will be fixed for the duration of this section.

Let Γ denote the set of all Group 1 faculty in the Mathematics Department.

For $x \in \Gamma$, let $T(x)$, $R(x)$ and $S(x)$ denote, respectively, x 's teaching, research and service ratings (as determined in Phase 2) and $m_T(x)$, $m_R(x)$ and $m_S(x)$ denote, respectively, x 's teaching, research and service weights as determined in Phase 1. The overall rating for x is denoted $Rat(x)$ and is computed by

$$Rat(x) = T(x) * m_T(x) + R(x) * m_R(x) + S(x) * m_S(x).$$

DRP denotes the department's raise pool. This is the total figure of all money available to the department for raises. In addition, the dean may have some additional money in a discretionary fund.

$CurSal(x)$ denotes the current salary of faculty member x .

$Total$ denotes the sum of current salaries, i.e. $Total = \sum_{x \in \Gamma} CurSal(x)$.

$Abr(x)$ denotes the across the board raise, if any, for $x \in \Gamma$. This MAY BE based on a percentage. For instance, the Dean may tell the department that each faculty member will receive an across the board raise (Abr) of 2%. ABR denotes the total of the raise pool used for across the board raises, i.e. $ABR = \sum_{x \in \Gamma} Abr(x)$.

CDF denotes the Chair's discretionary fund. This will be 10% of the department raise pool.

Π denotes the total dollar figure of all money available to the department beyond the across the board raise and the Chair's discretionary fund, i. e. $\Pi = DRP - ABR - CDF$.

A faculty member will receive his/her departmental raise from several sources. There may be a portion given as an across the board raise, a portion based on the evaluation, possibly a portion from the Chair's discretionary fund and possibly a portion from the Dean's discretionary fund.

The portion based directly on the evaluation will be determined by the member's relative rating and current salary. 50% of Π will be divided proportional to evaluation without taking the faculty member's current salary into account and 50% of ? will be divided in such fashion that the percentage raise will be directly proportional to the faculty member's evaluation.

The relative rating for a faculty member x , denoted $RelRat(x)$, is the faculty member's rating divided by the sum of all faculty rating, i.e.

$$RelRat(x) = Rat(x) / \sum_{y \in \Gamma} Rat(y) .$$

The amount that faculty member x receives out of the 50% of Π being (used for raises proportional to ratings is $.5 * \Pi * RelRat(x)$.

A faculty member x 's salary weighted relative rating, denoted $SalRat(x)$, is the faculty member's rating divided by the sum of the products of each member's ratings and salary, i.e.

$$SalRat(x) = Rat(x) / \sum_{y \in \Gamma} Rat(y) Sal(y) .$$

The percentage of current salary faculty member x receives out of the 50% of Π being used for percentage raises is $.5 * \Pi * SalRat(x)$.

Hence the amount of a faculty members x 's raise based directly on $Rat(x)$ is

$$.5 * \Pi * RelRat(x) + .5 * \Pi * SalRat(x) * CurSal(x) .$$

Thus a faculty member's final departmental raise, excluding the portion from the Chair's discretionary fund or the Dean's discretionary fund, is given by

$$Abr(x) + .5*\Pi*RelRat(x) + .5*\Pi*SalRat(x)*CurSal(x).$$

Adopted by vote of the faculty, on April 25, 1995.

Revised version of Phase 3 adopted by vote of the faculty, November, 1997

Revised version adopted by vote of the faculty, June, 2000