

**Merit Pay Policy Proposal**  
West Virginia State University Faculty

# Contents

---

Proposed Policy.....	3
Merit .....	3
Proposed Procedures.....	5
Section C-8 from Faculty Handbook .....	6
Evaluation Criteria/Procedures (revised, 8/03) .....	6
MERIT EVALUATION INSTRUMENT .....	8
TEACHING EXCELLENCE.....	8
Instructional Practices.....	8
Academic Discipline .....	10
Commitment to Student .....	11
Narrative on Student Evaluations .....	12
Summary of Teaching Excellence: Average of scores from items 1 through 8 above.....	12
RESEARCH, PROFESSIONAL, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES .....	13
SERVICE TO THE COLLEGE AND COMMUNITY .....	15
MERIT PAY WORKSHEET .....	16

# Proposed Policy

---

## Merit

In 2001 the West Virginia State University Board of Governors adopted a salary policy, effective 10/01/01, in compliance with that recommended by the Chancellor to the Higher Education Policy Commission. With regard to faculty, that policy reads:

- a. Faculty shall be compensated based on the salary goals established in the campus compact. A pool of funds equaling a percentage of the base salaries of full-time faculty, in addition to funds for promotion, will be created to determine the amount of increase faculty receives.
- b. Salary increases may be based on a combination of merit, market, and equity until the salary goal has been achieved for any particular year.
- c. Once the goal has been achieved, but not later than FY 2005, all or a substantial part of faculty salary increases shall be based on merit. This standard is in compliance with the Higher Education Policy Commission Salary Guidelines approved on June 29, 2001 and distributed by the Chancellor in a July 6, 2001 memorandum.

The policy of the faculty at West Virginia State University for the distribution of a salary increase shall proceed according to the policy of the Higher Education Policy Commission Salary Guidelines. The merit portion of any salary increase will be limited to the minimum allowable percentage as defined by the Higher Education Policy Commission Salary Guidelines for that period of evaluation. The hopes of the faculty at West Virginia State University are that this percentage will approach zero and that there will be no need to implement the merit pay policy guidelines.

The faculty of West Virginia State University previously asked the president to make provisions in the University Budget for a minimum salary increase each year to match the cost of living index for that period which would be defined as a cost of living adjustment, rather than a raise. This provision would ensure salary adjustments in years when the legislature does not mandate raises for faculty. The faculty of West Virginia State University would hope that the Board of Governors would ratify such a policy as part of the University compact.

The merit pay policy ensures that funds are divided by College in equal proportions based on the underlying salaries of faculty members in those Colleges. This provides equally for each College relative to one another across the University. This division of funds provides a mechanism so that each Dean has the discretion of rewarding faculty most closely under his or her supervision and control. The total funds will be divided based on a percentage of the total salaries of the faculty serving in that college relative to the total salaries of the faculty paid under the E&G budget as a whole for the University. This division of funds helps to reduce the risk of rater bias between Chairs and Deans across campus and provides a basis for fairness in the system.

The faculty of each academic college will be responsible for developing an ongoing definition of meritorious performance based on teaching excellence, scholarly activities, and service, and a new merit allocation instrument (see Appendix K) will be developed and modified as necessary by representatives of the university faculty under the supervision of the Faculty Senate.

Faculty members may choose to have their merit evaluated based upon a range of percentages reflecting the three categories of teaching excellence, scholarship, and service as indicated in the merit pay worksheet. This

allows for flexibility of different emphasis based on the nature of the given assignment for an individual faculty member.

The department chairperson evaluates the faculty member's teaching excellence, scholarly activities, and service based upon criteria found in [section C-8](#) of the Faculty Handbook, through a combination of a review of the faculty members self report ([see Appendix I](#)), classroom observations ([see Appendix L](#)), and input taken from the student evaluation of faculty process ([see Appendix N](#)).

An interactive review process involving a peer review committee of faculty elected by each respective college will assist in resolving issues of disagreement in merit ratings between the Departmental Chairperson and the faculty member being evaluated. In most cases, it would be expected that there would be no disagreement between the faculty member and the Departmental Chairperson concerning the ratings. In such cases there would be no need for resolution by the peer review committee.

The Dean of the respective college will finalize the ratings of the peer review committee and the Departmental Chairperson along with the faculty members input. The expectation is that this is an open discussion as necessary between the faculty member the Departmental Chairperson and the Dean of the College to ensure that each member is treated fairly and equally. This will also prompt an environment in which all functions of the college can prosper in a more collegial environment.

The Dean will review the final results with the faculty member and submit the results to the Vice President of Academic Affairs with his or her recommendations.

The Vice President of Academic Affairs notifies the faculty member as to the salary increase provided as a result of the process.

## Proposed Procedures

---

The Merit Pay Process will follow the following procedures as dictated by the Faculty Senate:

- a. On the date set forth by the Faculty Senate calendar for the given academic year, each college in the University will elect a committee of fulltime faculty members to serve as a peer group for purposes of merit pay review. The committee shall consist of a representative sample of the departments from within the college. Chairs and Deans are not permitted to serve on this review committee.
- b. On the date set forth by the Faculty Senate calendar for the given academic year, all faculty members will submit a self-report (see Appendix H) to their respective department chairpersons, based upon activities performed in the previous calendar year. This report will indicate the percentage weighting for teaching excellence, scholarly activities, and service by which the faculty member will be evaluated.
- c. No later than the prescribed date as set forth by the Faculty Senate calendar for the given academic year, the department chairperson evaluates the self-report, and completes the Merit Allocation Instrument (see Appendix K) and reviews the report with the faculty member. The intent is to promote interaction between the faculty member and the chair to mitigate any differences or misunderstanding prior to sending the information to the peer group of college faculty for review. This will also ensure a coordinated delivery of the Department Chairs evaluation and comments of the faculty member to the peer group of college faculty if any disagreement does occur.
- d. No later than the prescribed date as set forth by the Faculty Senate calendar for the given academic year, the faculty member may submit comments along with the department chairs evaluation to the peer group of college faculty for review in the case where a disagreement occurs between the Department Chair and the faculty member concerning the ratings on the merit instrument. The intent is to provide a period of time to resolve disagreements and time for the faculty member to draft the comments of appeal to the peer group of college faculty as necessary.
- e. No later than the prescribed date as set forth by the Faculty Senate calendar for the given academic year, the peer group of college faculty submits their report to the college dean and the respective department chairperson for all faculty under review.
- f. No later than the prescribed date as set forth by the Faculty Senate calendar for the given academic year, the Dean reviews the merit allocation in consultation with the Department Chair and the faculty member being evaluated and forwards the merit scores to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The intent is to promote interaction between the college dean, the department chair and the faculty member as necessary when a disagreement has occurred.
- g. No later than the prescribed date as set forth by the Faculty Senate calendar for the given academic year, the Department Chair consults with the faculty member and discusses opportunities to improve in the coming year setting goals and objectives jointly with the faculty member prior to the end of the academic year so that the faculty member can develop an effective plan for the coming academic year.
- h. No later than the prescribed date as set forth by the Faculty Senate calendar for the given academic year, the Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies the faculty member of the final merit allocation and the salary increase provided as a result of the process

## Section C-8 from Faculty Handbook

---

### Evaluation Criteria/Procedures (revised, 8/03)

There are three general criteria for the evaluation of faculty members:

#### A Teaching Excellence

Teaching excellence is the most important of the three criteria, and excellence in other areas cannot compensate for a deficiency in teaching. An excellent teacher is one whose work is characterized by commitment to subject, to student, and to constant improvement in teaching. The excellent teacher is well organized, has a thorough and demonstrable knowledge of the field and recent developments therein, and is able to communicate knowledge systematically, coherently, and enthusiastically. Such a teacher is actively concerned with the intellectual development of students, challenges their abilities, encourages their questions, welcomes diversity of opinion from them, and is considerate and fair in all dealings with them, seeking always to increase their capacity to think critically and independently. Finally, the excellent teacher welcomes and profits from constructive criticism.

Faculty members are also expected to be accessible to students. This will be evaluated on the basis of adherence to appropriate office hours, participation in advising and/or orientation, involvement in student clubs, and other ways of making oneself available to students.

Students, chairpersons, deans, and peers who serve on the retention and/or promotion and tenure committees evaluate teaching. Measurement tools and strategies include observation of classes, examination of syllabi and supplementary materials, scores from student evaluations, and review of faculty self-reports. Excellence will be determined by an overall performance on qualitative and quantitative measures that is above average for West Virginia State University faculty.

#### B Scholarly Activities

Scholarly activities fall into three basic categories: research/creative activities, recognized activity in professional and/or learned societies, and professional growth.

- 1 Research/Creative Activities: Research is broadly defined as the organized, deliberate efforts to collect, analyze, and evaluate information. This may be accomplished through a variety of methods including, but not limited to, the historic method.
- 2 Research should result in a tangible product such as a peer-reviewed journal article, book, proceedings abstract, presentation at a professional conference, or some other verifiable contribution to the discipline.
- 3 Studies in the areas of art, music, theatre, film, etc. may involve research activities as described above. These disciplines are often characterized by creative endeavors such as the composition of a musical score or the production of a film that are considered to be scholarly activities that contribute to the discipline.
- 4 Recognized Activity in Professional and/or Learned Societies: Most academic disciplines are affiliated with one or more professional societies or organizations on a national, regional and/or state

level. Activities within these societies that are considered significant include: chairing a panel, acting as a respondent on a panel, working as an officer or board member and/or working as a conference or convention organizer.

- 5 Professional Growth: Assessment of professional growth involves a judgment based on concrete experience and evidence. Some indications of professional growth include the following:
  - An appropriate degree and/or continuing study.
  - Participation in conferences.
  - Presentation on a discipline-related topic
  - Other indications of potential for growth, such as development of courses that could lead to further research.

### **C Service to the University and Community**

Valued service to the University and community may take many forms:

- 1 Active participation in university governance, especially faculty committees and meetings.
- 2 Helpful and generally supportive relations with faculty colleagues, so as to enhance the results achieved in departments and other academic programs.
- 3 Academic advising of students.
- 4 Recruitment of students.
- 5 Active advising of university honor societies and/or other student organizations.
- 6 Active participation in various programs of university life outside the classroom such as art, music, theatre, recreation, athletics, lectures, convocations, etc.
- 7 Service outside the institution that promotes the University such as contributions to business, industry, government, education, and the health care field, and to the cultural enrichment of the community. Community service activities and memberships not directly related to the faculty member's discipline do not satisfy this standard.

In addition to these examples, faculty are expected to: (a) cooperate and collaborate with colleagues in meeting departmental and university needs; (b) participate with colleagues in decision-making processes within the departments, schools, university committees, and other aspects of faculty governance; and (c) fulfill the faculty responsibilities described in Section E of the Faculty Handbook.

# MERIT EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

---

## TEACHING EXCELLENCE

Directions: Rate the Faculty Member on the teaching excellence, scholarly activities, and service. Provide evidence/comments to substantiate the rating. Use the following ratings:

Rating	Score
Excellent	90 up to 100
Above Average	80 up to 90
Satisfactory	70 up to 80
Below average	60 up to 70
Poor	Below 60

### Instructional Practices

- 1) Considerate and fair in all dealings with students (For example: prepares clear criteria for grading; encourages/inspires all students; progressively develops student skills). Explanation for Rating and Suggestions for Improvement (if necessary)

Score	
-------	--



- 2) Well organized (For example: returns student work promptly; communicates knowledge systematically, coherently; creates a syllabus with evidence of planning, course outcomes and student outcomes)

Explanation for Rating and Suggestions for Improvement (if necessary)

--

Score	
-------	--

- 3) Constant improvement in teaching (For example: attends training/workshops on pedagogy or educational technology; engages in discussion with colleagues; adopts new classroom strategies; assesses teaching effectiveness; learns from colleagues through activities such as team-teaching.) Explanation for Rating and Suggestions for Improvement (if necessary)

--

Score	
-------	--

- 4) Welcomes and profits from constructive criticism (For example: seeks interaction with supervisors and colleagues regarding classroom performance; seeks and applies assessment data.) Explanation for Rating and Suggestions for Improvement (if necessary)

--

Score	
-------	--

**Academic Discipline**

- 5) Thorough and demonstrable knowledge of the field and new developments herein (For example: is an active member of professional organization; attends professional conferences and/or scholarly events in discipline; keeps current by reading journals and newsletters, and incorporates current information and developments in the discipline into classroom instruction) Explanation for Rating and Suggestions for Improvement (if necessary)

--

Score	
-------	--

**Commitment to Student**

6) Concerned with the intellectual development of students (For example: encourages student use of office hours; follows through on student learning via such activities as assessment of attending student presentations/performances; challenges their abilities; encourages their questions; welcomes diversity of opinion; mentors students; seeks ways to increase their capacity to think critically and independently and assesses effectiveness of such efforts; supports education of whole student through participation in General Education.) Explanation for Rating and Suggestions for Improvement (if necessary)

--

Score	
-------	--

7) Concerned with the ability of students to apply knowledge, theory, and skills (For example: involves students in research or other creative activities; guides student research or other projects; involves students in field placements or internships; involves students in professional conferences, workshops, and/or seminars; creates work simulation projects and/or applications for students; assesses effectiveness of aforementioned projects; creates materials to encourage use of GE “skills” in major courses.) Explanation for Rating and Suggestions for Improvement (if necessary)

--

Score	
-------	--

**Narrative on Student Evaluations**

8) Overall evaluation of student evaluations of Faculty) Discuss the faculty member’s student evaluation scores. In general, how do the faculty member’s scores compare to the college average? The departmental average? Are there specific items of evaluation, which indicate strengths? Weaknesses? Provide suggestions for improvement.

Score	
-------	--

**Summary of Teaching Excellence:** Average of scores from items 1 through 8 above.

<span style="color: red;">❶</span> Average	
--	--

## RESEARCH, PROFESSIONAL, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

The Chair should determine the rating based on the items submitted in the self report concerning the faculty member's efforts in regards to research, professional and create activities during the previous year. A suggested list of appropriate items considered for scholarly work include but are not limited to:

1. Graduate coursework leading to initial professional license or certification in an area related to teaching responsibilities; course work meeting continuing education requirements to maintain professional license or certification points in an area related to teaching responsibilities; other course work subsequent to the terminal degree in a program approved by the dean (Must be done in the calendar year for which the evaluation is completed).
2. Attendance at workshops and professional meetings of professional peers
3. Article published in a refereed journal or creative work presented/performed in a refereed/juried professional venue (museum, theatre, gallery, etc.) The value of such activity is determined by the prestige of the journal/venue and the significance of the contribution as determined by faculty in the discipline.
4. A major research or creative production such as a published book, (vanity press publications do not meet this criteria), a nationally distributed film or video, a nationally performed score, or nationally shown work of visual art.
5. Paper presentation or address at a refereed conference or state/regional/national art show, music recital, theatre performance, film showing given/presented at a professional meeting, festival, or an award winning competition involving points faculty performance or faculty-supervised student performance/presentation and/or multiple presentations of the same activity or work.
6. Grant Related Activities including but not limited to successful grant application to a non-WVSU source, unsuccessful grant application to a non-WVSU source, serving as a grant reviewer for state, regional and national granting agencies, successful grant application to a WVSU source, (ACEOP, WVSU Faculty Research Committee)
7. Service as a reviewer or referee for a published book review, journal manuscript, or a performance in a referred journal. Service as a referee or reviewer for a conference or journal paper/article, published review of book, journal manuscript or performance in a non-refereed journal/newspaper or other periodical points
8. Chairing a panel for a professional organization/learned society.
9. Serving on a panel, as a respondent or as a discussant for a professional organization/learned society.
10. Service for a professional society as an officer, board member, and/or editorial, serving as an editor for a scholarly refereed journal
11. Working as a conference or convention organizer.
12. Formal honors or awards recognizing professional academic and creative work.
13. Serving on a regional or national accrediting team
14. Supervision of student/research/performance/project, guiding the independent research or creative projects of undergraduate or graduate students, guiding the research or creative projects of students which results in student presentations, serving on a thesis committee.
15. Discretionary recognition provided for research professional and creative activities not clearly identified above.

Comments:

2	Score	
---	-------	--

## SERVICE TO THE COLLEGE AND COMMUNITY

The Chair should determine the rating based on the items submitted in the self report concerning the faculty member's efforts in regards to service to the college and community during the previous year. A suggested list of appropriate items considered for service to the college and the community includes but is not limited to:

1. Active participation in university governance, especially faculty or other university committees and meetings.
2. Chairing or serving as an officer on faculty or university committees.
3. Active participation in the academic life of the university
4. Active advising of university honor societies and/or other student organizations
5. Active participation in university sanctioned recruiting activities
6. Academic advising of students.
7. Service outside the institution that promotes the university such as contributions to industry, business, education, the health care field, or to the cultural enrichment of the community. Paper presentation or address in non-refereed point's conferences or journals or local/community art show, music recital, theatre production, poetry reading, etc.
8. Cooperation and collaboration with colleagues in meeting departmental and university needs; participation in decision making processes within the department, school and university;
9. Assists colleagues by making guest lecturers in others' classes.
10. Formal honors or awards recognizing service directly related to the faculty member's discipline from national, regional or state professional organizations.
11. Student credit hours produced
12. Discretionary service activities not clearly identified above

Comments:

--

3	Score	
---	-------	--

# MERIT PAY WORKSHEET

**WEST VIRGINIA STATE UNIVERSITY  
MERIT EVALUATION WORKSHEET**

Faculty members may choose to have their merit evaluated based upon a range of percentages reflecting the three categories of teaching excellence, scholarship, and service as indicated by the table below.

Category	Range of Percentages		
<b>4 A. Teaching Excellence</b>	<b>50%</b>	up to	<b>75%</b>
<b>5 B. Research, Professional, and Creative Activities</b>	<b>10%</b>	up to	<b>50%</b>
<b>6 C. Service to College and Community</b>	<b>5%</b>	up to	<b>35%</b>

This allows faculty to be evaluated on a wider array of concentration of activities and be rewarded for their respective contribution to the overall mission and goals of the University.

Some faculty will be able to dedicate more time to research, some to service, and others concentrate mainly on teaching.

Selected Percentages	Category	Score	100 Weighted Score
<b>4</b>	<b>A. Teaching Excellence</b>	<b>1</b>	0
<b>5</b>	<b>B. Research, Professional, and Creative Activities</b>	<b>2</b>	0
<b>6</b>	<b>C. Service to College and Community</b>	<b>3</b>	0
0%	<b>Total Merit Score</b>		<b>0.00</b>

Evaluator Signature:

Faculty Member Signature: