

Date: March 20, 2013

To: CSSH Faculty

From: James Alan Fox

Re: College Council Resolution regarding Merit

An ad-hoc subcommittee of the College Council, composed of Steven Vallas, Kathleen Kelly and me, was charged with the task of reviewing the array of workload and merit procedures used by the academic units within the College of Social Sciences and Humanities. Based on that review, the following set of recommendations were submitted as a formal resolution for consideration and vote by the full College Council. The resolution that appears below was approved on January 30, 2013 by a unanimous vote of 7-0. Note, however, that no particular timetable was given for units to complete these steps, but it is anticipated that this re-examination would be undertaken by all academic units sometime during the next year or two. It will be important for the next college dean to have the opportunity to review and approve all unit-based procedures, which then would go to the Office of the Provost.

RESOLUTION ON MERIT PROCEDURES: Whereas the College Council has undertaken a review of the wide array of workload and merit procedures used by the academic units within the College of Social Sciences and Humanities, finding various inconsistencies among them with regard to University policy, be it resolved that:

1. Academic units should revisit the nature and application of their variable workload policies to ensure that the proper weights are used to evaluate and reward faculty contributions.
2. Academic units should review their merit procedures and reporting practices to address any apparent contradictions to Faculty Handbook policies and related University guidelines.
3. Academic units should review their procedural arrangements to allow faculty to appeal their merit reviews in a timely manner; that is, before salary recommendations are sent to the Dean's office.
4. Academic unit heads should provide brief narratives for each of the recommendations made to the Dean with respect to individual faculty raises.
5. Academic units should review the possible ways of handling the distribution of merit raises (by dollars, by percentages, or a mixture of the two), and urged to have an open discussion of the options.
6. Academic unit heads should use their faculty members' five-year plans as a means of stimulating discussion of continuous scholarly productivity and workload options and expectations.