

What is your system to calculate merit increases for faculty?

Name	Title	School	Approach	Notes
Beth Angell, PhD, MSSW	Dean & Professor	Virginia Commonwealth University School for Social Work	We use a four point scale for teaching, scholarship, and service; I created rating anchors for each. Then I weight each according to workload (for a 2-2 teaching load it would be 40-40-20, but if the faculty member has a greater teaching load or more buyouts the percentages are altered accordingly). The resulting score is a weighted average across workload categories.	
Audrey Shillington, PhD, MSW, MPE, FAASWSW, FAAHB	Director and Professor	Colorado State University School of Social Work	Annual reviews happen every Jan.-Feb. 3 categories: 1) teaching/mentoring 2) research/scholarship/creative activities 3) service/administration/engagement A person has their percentage time noted on the form for each category. For example: Typical TT faculty might be 40% teaching/50% research/10% service-- but a non-TT faculty might be at 80% teaching/20% service....then rated 1-5 in each category (5=superior). I then generate a weighted mean for each person. Weighted means are then used to rank people into merit raise categories.	
Jorge Delva, MSW, PhD	Dean, Director & Paul Farmer Professor	Boston University	At BU, every February faculty complete a 2-3 page form that lists the courses they've taught, number of students, and pubs, presentations, grants, committees, service, etc.... Then, the dean completes the attached form. The form was developed by Gail but what I have done this year is modify the scoring system a bit to make it easier to score people's work. I also instituted meeting with them and going over my ratings and making edits to them in case I missed something. Gail would meet with faculty to discuss their work but they never saw the scores she gave them. For transparency's sake, I do review my scores with them. Then, once I have the distribution of the scores for all 35 faculty, I create 7tiles (divide in 7 categories) and begin assigning percents based on the percent the Provost is allowing for merit. For example, if it is 3%, then those in the highest 7tile might get a 3.3 or 3.2% merit increase and those in the lowest will get 2.3 or 2.4%. All others in between the highest and lowest 7tiles will get a % increase between the lowest and highest.	
Cathryn Potter	Dean and Distinguished Professor	Rutgers University School of Social Work	We elect a faculty compensation committee (!) that reviews a set of information provided by the faculty members and makes a recommendation to the Dean. The dean has the final say, and works with the giant spreadsheet that figures out how to use every dime of our allocation. There is no set rubric for the committee, but they are to assess all three areas of faculty workload. I have asked that they sort faculty into 5 ranked groups, with faculty distributed, roughly, across the groups. I have to say that they have done a good job of this task. Sometimes a make a few changes, but usually because I know something they don't. I then assign a percentage raise to each group, reserving some portion for additional reward for the truly outstanding if we have that situation. This results in everyone who is similarly ranked receiving a similar percentage.	

What is your system to calculate merit increases for faculty?

Name	Title	School	Approach	Notes
Alan Dettlaff, PhD, MSW	Dean and Maconda Brown O'Connor Endowed Dean's Chair	University of Houston Graduate College of Social Work	I assign a rating (1-5) for three categories – research, teaching, service – and then the scores are weighted according to the person's workload. Standard workload would be 40% research, 40% teaching, 20% service. If people have course reallocations, etc., then the percentages adjust accordingly. Each course (2-2 load) counts as 10%, so if someone reallocates one course to work on a funded project, then the workload would adjust to 50% research, 30% teaching, 20% service.	Attachment
Goutham Menon, PhD, MSW	Dean & Professor	School of Social Work University of Chicago, Loyola	Attachment + Then we have a spreadsheet to split the work effort (40/40/20) and we get to a score. This year I added one more effort for administrative faculty.	
Nina Rovinelli Heller, PhD	Dean, Zachs Professor of Social Work and Co-Director, PhD Program	University of Connecticut School of Social Work	Typically, the dean reviews the meritorious (above the standard expectation) activities in each area, but we have not used a strictly quantitative method. Scholarship will generally carry the most weight – but unusual teaching performance and high levels of leadership in service activities are factored in. This year, I am including my associate deans in the process/decision making for faculty merit.	
Lynn Videka, PhD	Collegiate Professor and Dean	University of Michigan School of Social Work	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All faculty are peer reviewed each year. All salary increases are determined by merit. There is COLA at Michigan. The faculty turn in an updated CV and up to 7 pages of self-evaluation, and one scholarly work that they have completed in the past year. 2. Workload (teaching, research and service) is assigned by weights, which are essentially percent of effort, but expressed in a different metric (do not ask my why. I do not know). 3. Last year we added a 4th area for evaluation, contribution to the DE and I goals of the School. 4. The Executive Committee divides the reviews, and each faculty member has 2 reviewers rate their performance (separately in terms of teaching, research and service, and contributions to DEI) on a 7 point scale for each. "3" is considered acceptable and no merit is given for a score of 3 or below. 5. We do extensive training for the review, with practice cases (from previous years). 6. EC members rate each faculty, discuss their ratings and assign a final point amount to each colleague. There is a dollar amount assigned to each point. 7. A recommendation is made to the dean. The dean makes the final decision. 8. Other faculty members (an ad hoc committee) rate the EC by the same process. 	

What is your system to calculate merit increases for faculty?

Name	Title	School	Approach	Notes
Deana Morrow, PhD, LICSW, ACSW	Director and Professor	West Virginia University School of Social Work	<p>We weight teaching at 40%, research at 40%, and service at 20% for tenure line positions. Here's additional info:</p> <p>Annual evaluations will be used to determine performance based salary recommendations. Evaluations of Excellent and Good characterize performance of merit. Satisfactory characterizes performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure. The performance-based salary policy is intended to reward performance of merit.</p> <p>The School uses the College's descriptor values. College values translate rating descriptors to points as follows: "Excellent" = 4.0; "Good" = 2.5; "Satisfactory" = 1.0. A total score is calculated by multiplying appointment distribution x rating; e.g.</p> <p>40% teaching = 40 x 2.5 (rating of "Good") = 100 40% research = 40 x 4.0 (rating of "Excellent") = 160 <u>20% service = 20 x 1.0 (rating of "Satisfactory") = 20</u> Merit Score = 280</p>	
Debra McPhee	Dean/Professor	Fordham University Graduate School of Social Service	See Attachment.	
Hye-Kyung Kang, MSW, PhD	Chair Director Associate Professor	Department of Social Work Master of Social Work Program Seattle University	<p>In our College, faculty annual performance review (APR) is merit-based and affects annual salary increase. We have a faculty committee that is working on improving the whole APR system.</p> <p>Our T/TT faculty APR form includes specific criteria for a scale that goes from Substantially Below Expectations to Substantially Above Expectations on Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. One feature that I like is that each T/TT faculty can elect how much each domain should be weighed (somewhere between 20% to 50%). This works well for someone like me whose work falls mostly on administration (included in the Service section), though I constantly remind pre-tenure faculty that they need to have excellent scholarship and teaching records for their tenure dossier, no matter what they decide to weigh in terms of their APR.</p>	
Stephanie Robert, PhD, MSW	Director and Professor	University of Wisconsin-Madison School of Social Work	<p>We have been weighting them equally, but we always have discussions about changing this (e.g., what if someone buys out of their teaching, should their weighting be different from someone who doesn't? Isn't research more important for our junior faculty? etc.). This year we moved to one change -- if someone has an administrative role, we weight their admin score for the percentage time of that role, and use the combined, equally weighted score for the teaching, research, and service for the rest of their %.</p>	

What is your system to calculate merit increases for faculty?

Name	Title	School	Approach	Notes
Grover Gilmore, PhD	Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandeel Dean in Applied Social Sciences	Case Western Reserve University Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences	<p>The evaluation review of faculty at the Mandel School is based on teaching evaluations, publications, grant activity, academic year salary supported by external funds, service activity, and the Dean's rating. Note that the first four measures are objective. The service rating is based on my judgment on a five point scale of their contributions in the school, university, and the community. The Dean's rating is on a four point scale.</p> <p>The six measures are used for faculty who are tenured or in the tenure-track. The NonTenure line faculty members are evaluated on teaching, service, and the Dean's rating. Some do publish and have grant support. Their performance in those areas is seen as a plus and it leads to higher merit pay.</p> <p>I determine the mean and standard deviation for each metric and then calculate a Z score for each faculty member in each category. The use of the Z score standardizes the measure and illustrates whether the faculty member is above or below their peers.</p> <p>The Z scores are multiplied by weights as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> .2 Teaching evaluation .2 Publications .2 Grant activity .1 AY Salary Support .2 Service rating .1 Dean's rating <p>The resulting weighted Z score shows where each person falls relative to all others in their track. I then use the weighted Z score to calculate the merit raise. I set the mean raise and the standard deviation (SD) and then solve for the faculty member's raise (X).</p> $X = (\text{Weighted Z Score}) * (\text{SD}) + \text{Mean raise.}$	
Grover Gilmore, PhD Continued			<p>At the May faculty meeting, I reveal the mean scores in each metric and state the mean merit raise pool for the year. People can easily determine where they fall relative to the mean in each category. When their scores are above the mean, they know that they can expect a better than average salary.</p> <p>I find that basing 70% of the merit raise on objective measures leads people to be accepting of the process.</p>	

What is your system to calculate merit increases for faculty?

Name	Title	School	Approach	Notes
Rick Barth, PhD, MSW	Dean and Past-President	University of Maryland School of Social Work, American Academy of Social Work and Social Welfare	<p>We have a very simple measure. 100% is 40% scholarship, 40% teaching, and 20% service.</p> <p>You must have two peer reviewed papers published to get your scholarship points and you must serve faithfully on two committees to get service points. We don't have a metric for teaching, alas (but would welcome one if you have).</p> <p>If someone is consistently productive and has a few papers in press but nothing that came out during the academic year, we can make a case to give them the merit. If they have one paper published they get 20%.</p> <p>So, if the merit pool is 4%, we give them 4% X whatever proportion of points they get from the above rubric.</p>	