

Merit Policy

Multidisciplinary Engineering and Computing Education, Systems and Management

Purpose: This policy establishes the process by which merit raises/bonuses are distributed to faculty in the Multidisciplinary Engineering and Computing Education, Systems and Management (ESM) department. Merit raises/bonuses are based on evaluations. Faculty are evaluated annually by the Chair; the Associate Chair may also be included in this process as needed/ when appropriate.

Definitions: Meritorious activity is superior to performance which is satisfactory; thus, to be judged satisfactory does not qualify one to receive merit, nor does one's not receiving merit imply that a faculty member's work was unsatisfactory.

Eligibility Criteria: Eligible faculty are those whose overall annual evaluations are “good” or better, cannot have an evaluation of “unsatisfactory” in any assigned area, and in accordance with conditions articulated in the CBA.

Procedure/Method of Distribution:

1. Merit raises/bonuses are always recommendations conveyed by the Chair to the Dean for approval.
2. The basis for the merit raise/bonus decision is the annual faculty evaluation and weighted percentage of the faculty assignment. In this document, the following rating scale is presumed: 5=Outstanding, 4=Very Good, 3=Good, 2=Satisfactory, 1=Unsatisfactory. If the rating scale changes, the merit raise/bonus guidelines shall be adjusted consistently with the new rating scale, without need for faculty revote.
3. Faculty in ESM must be eligible to receive a merit raise/bonus under the terms of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).
4. In the event of available merit raise or bonus pool, the pool will be divided into shares with eligible faculty whose evaluations are Very Good or Outstanding receiving a 1.0 share and the remaining eligible faculty receiving a 0.5 share.
5. This policy will be reviewed and potentially renegotiated on an annual basis. If the policy is modified, the modifications will take effect at the time of the subsequent annual evaluation.

If implementing the procedure above conflicts with the superseding requirements of the university, including the CBA, the Chair shall make best efforts to distribute funds consistent with those superseding requirements, minimizing deviation from the above stated unit procedure.

Recommended for Approval by the Department:

10/30/2025

Approved by the Dean:

11/04/2025

Approved by Provost Faculty Leadership & Success:

01/12/2026