

Approved on May 8, 1998

WORKLOAD AND ANNUAL MERIT REVIEW POLICY  
FOR  
FULL TIME TENURE-TRACK FACULTY  
IN THE  
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

As stipulated by School and University policy, each member of the tenure-track faculty shall undergo an annual merit review. This policy refers to annual merit review of tenure-track faculty. This review is linked to workload according to the following:

1. WORKLOAD POLICY:

A. The basic workload for faculty includes the following or their equivalent: four three credit courses per year, at least one article accepted for publication in a refereed journal, and participation in six service assignments.

This corresponds to a workload time allotment of 40% for teaching, 40% for research, and 20% for service. In terms of annual evaluation and merit, these percentages will be flexed 10% by the Dean—increasing by 10% the faculty member's highest category, decreasing by 10% their lowest.

Faculty may flex up to 20% with the Dean's approval, but this must be consistent with workload; putting more than an additional 10% merit increase into teaching, or research, or service would reflect significantly increased workload in these areas (for example, more classes taught, more time spent with publications and grants, or more service assignments) not simply greater productivity or higher quality performance. The additional flex percentages would be determined by the faculty member and Dean either at the outset of a school year or prior to the annual evaluation. A record of those receiving the additional flex would be kept in the Dean's office and available to all faculty.

ANNUAL MERIT REVIEW POLICY

Timing of Review

The merit review, under usual circumstances, will take place as early as possible in the Spring semester.

Period of Review

This is established as the full calendar year prior to the semester in which the review is conducted. Exception to this December 31 deadline is allowable for publications and extends until the date which dossiers are due in the Dean's office.

## Criteria for Review

The criteria are similar to those used in the promotion and tenure review process of teaching, research/scholarship, and service. No activity can be listed in more than one category (i.e., teaching, research/scholarship, or service). Material should be presented, in brief, summary form, as follows:

### Teaching

- a. Teaching is defined as those activities provided to students in pursuit of a graduate degree. This includes, but is not limited to, classroom activities and assignments, membership or chairing a thesis or dissertation committee, curriculum development, academic advising, and field liaison duties. Student evaluations will be used to assess teaching and must be included with materials submitted for merit review.

- b. Weighting

Four (4) three SCH courses with a minimum average of 3.0 on all required items equals a **good** merit weighting. Additional factors which affect the final rating must be documented by the faculty based on materials submitted for merit review. Faculty may submit material related to SCH generation, teaching a new course, supervising independent studies, chairing\* and membership on theses and dissertation committees, quality and quantity of field liaison activities, student advising, curriculum development activities (such as modifying and development of courses), guest lecturing, truly exceptional course evaluations from students, teaching effectiveness efforts, and other teaching activities. It is the faculty member's responsibility to indicate how these activities reflect meritorious teaching.

\* Chairing a committee will be weighed more heavily.

### 2. Scholarship/Research

- a. Scholarly activity refers to original, peer-reviewed, research contributions to social work knowledge and/or practice. These might be documented and disseminated in a variety of ways: journal articles (print or electronic), book chapters, books, monographs, research reports, professional conference presentations based upon scholarly work, audio-visual, electronic and computer generated products. Funded proposals to support specific research activities and other non-sponsored research could also be documented. Copies of publications and manuscripts accepted for publication, and other items submitted for peer review should be provided.

b. Weighting

1) Articles. One refereed article (**single or co-authored**) or its equivalent equals a **good** merit rating.

Factors which may affect the total rating include the quality and quantity of other products of scholarship, e.g., technical reports, presentations, original works, grants, books, non-refereed articles; book and computer software reviews; and their equivalents. The quality and significance of other scholarship activities must be documented by the faculty member. Articles will be credited at the time of acceptance or at the time of publication, at the choice of the faculty member. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to indicate refereed journals. Articles published in these will receive more credit than non-refereed publications. Co-authors should be presented in documentation in the same way that they appear in print. The individual contribution of a faculty member to a co-authored article should be addressed. If a publication is a reprint, or a reworked version of a previous publication in another journal, or another edition of a book, this should be noted, with a description of the faculty member's added contribution.

2) Book chapters are given the same weight as a refereed article.

3) Books and Monographs.

Documentation of completed work and proof of acceptance for publication should be provided. A faculty member will be evaluated as at least **excellent** in scholarship for two years after the acceptance of the manuscript or its publication.

4) Research Grants or Contracts.

Information must include names of Principal Investigator and all Co-Investigators, title of grant/contract proposal, nature and purpose of research, funding agency, amount of grant/contract, and time frame. Credit for continuation grants can be given for the life cycle of the grant, depending upon the individual contributions being made. If not Principal Investigator, individual faculty member's contribution to the project should be described. Faculty member should also describe individual contribution to securing grant or contract as well as their individual role in implementing the project.

1) Book reviews.

2) Conference Presentations.

Conference presentations will be considered as scholarship if: a) evaluated for acceptance by a group of professional peers; b) presented to a professional audience; and c) they report conceptual or empirical findings derived from scholarly pursuits. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to demonstrate a presentation as scholarship if it does not appear to meet the above criteria.

### 3. Service

4. Service to the college, the university, the profession, and the community includes, but is not limited to, work on committees, task forces, boards, as well as consultation, practice activities that contribute to the mission of the GSSW or pro bono practice activities, editorial board membership of refereed professional journals (service to the profession); manuscript review for professional publishers (service to the profession); continuing education courses (service to the college, the university, the community, the profession) and training grants conducted in community. Whether a service activity is remunerated, partially remunerated, or completely voluntary will not be a factor when evaluating service activities.

### b. Weighting

In order to receive a **good** merit rating for service faculty must assume six (6) service responsibilities or their equivalent with a minimum of two (2) assignments internal to the GSSW. A rating higher than satisfactory can be obtained by additional quantity and quality of service to the school, university, profession and community.

### 5. Weighting of Criteria (as related to workload policy)

The three major criteria must be weighted based upon an allotment of 40% for teaching, 40% for research, and 20% for service. These percentages will be flexed 10% by the Dean increasing by 10% the faculty member's category of highest evaluation, and decreasing by 10% their lowest category of evaluation.

Faculty may flex up to 20% with the Dean's approval, but this must be consistent with workload policy as noted previously; putting more than an additional 10% merit increase into teaching, or research, or service would reflect significantly increased workload in these areas.

The additional flex percentages would be determined by the faculty member and Dean either at the outset of a school year or prior to the annual evaluation. A record of those receiving the additional flex would be kept in the Dean's office and available to all faculty.

Exceptions to these percentages up to 20% must be negotiated with the Dean, but all exceptions in merit weighting should be congruent with faculty workload. A record of those receiving the exception will be kept in the Dean's office and available to all faculty upon request.

## 6. Review Process

Utilizing the material submitted and the teaching evaluation results, each member of the A&P Committee will rate each faculty member on performance in (teaching, research/scholarship, service). Any activity may only be reported in one category.

A five-point scale will be used:

- 1 = unsatisfactory;
- 2 = satisfactory;
- 3 = good;
- 4 = excellent; and
- 5 = outstanding.

Committee members conduct their reviews independently, then present their ratings verbally to the Dean in the context of a committee meeting. The Committee makes no recommendations as to actual salary increases. When a given committee member's rating is being communicated, that committee member leaves the room. The Dean reviews the faculty dossiers **AFTER** the committee has presented its ratings.

The Dean's letter to each faculty member will provide:

(1) the merit ratings recommended by the committee (i.e., the average of the individual committee member's ratings), (2) the merit rating assigned by the Dean, (3) aggregate data on the overall distribution of ratings by the committee and the Dean, and (4) the Dean's placement of faculty aggregate ratings (average of committee and Dean's) into final categories for merit increment(s).

When possible, the individual's merit salary increase and aggregate data on the overall distribution of salary increases also will be given. If such is not available when merit categories are assigned, the salary information will be provided later.

In those instances where there is a significant deviation (e.g., greater than +/- .5 between numerical ratings from the committee and numerical ratings from the Dean) in the category assigned by the Dean and the recommended ranking by the Committee, the Dean will provide to the Committee the reasons for the deviation.

The initial appeal of an assigned merit category and salary increase is to the Dean. If this does not result in a satisfactory resolution, the faculty member may appeal directly to the Senior Vice President/Provost. Each faculty member also has access to the School and campus grievance process.

Approved by School Council

February 13, 1987

February 10, 1989

May 5, 1989

April 20, 1990

February 7, 1992

October 22, 1993

October 20, 1994

May 8, 1998