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 Materials Science and Engineering (MSEG) and/or the College of Engineering. Accordingly, the following are the metrics used by MSEG to allocate merit salary increases for faculty. The merit allocations are based on the annual faculty evaluations and the Chair’s assessment of additional exemplary efforts carried out by faculty on behalf of the department. The merit metrics are 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.
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 (see Appendix A of this document) conducted by the department chairperson and according to the metric that follows. Faculty 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 departmental median whereas those below the median will receive a percentage lower than the departmental median. 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 additional exemplary efforts carried out by faculty on behalf of the department.

V. REVISION OF MERIT METRICS

A. The merit metrics will be reassessed every three 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 information supplied by the faculty member for the period of review. The Chair’s evaluation of a faculty member's activities will consider all evidence submitted by a faculty member that is consistent with written departmental workload policies.

In determining ratings for each category, accomplishments (both quality and quantity) will be evaluated by the Chair 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 (raw scores supplied by the department) 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. Thesis and dissertation advisement resulting in graduate degrees.
   f. Teaching-related activities, e.g., workshops and seminars.
   g. Recognition via teaching-related awards and honors.

B. Research
   a. Publication in refereed scientific and technical journals.
   b. Publication of scholarly books.
   c. Patents and other indications of professional inventive accomplishments.
   d. Research proposal submission and award.
   e. Conducting of funded and unfunded research.
   f. Supervising of graduate students.
   g. 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 recruiting.
   c. Administration of Center activities (other than research).
   d. Activities for professional organizations.
   e. Editorial responsibilities of a professional publication.
   f. Accomplishments as chair/organizer of a technical meeting, conference, etc.
   g. Recognition via service-related awards or honors.

Although the above list is meant to 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.