

Faculty Merit Framework**November 2012**

The Merit Working Group has met five times over the summer and early Fall of 2012, and completed a great deal of work in between meetings. This report lays out the proposal of the working group for a transparent approach to merit allocation that recognises the culture of our Department and the enormous diversity of work pursued within it. Thanks are due to the members of the Working Group:

- Fiona Benson
- Eric Caplan
- Ratna Ghosh
- Kara Jackson
- Ron Morris (unable to attend meetings, but included in all communications)
- Caroline Riches
- Carolyn Turner
- Boyd White

Principles

The intention of the Working Group was to come up with an approach to merit that:

- Was transparent
- Clearly distinguished between “expectations” and “meritable activity”
- Was robust across diversity
- Maximised the potential for a systematic framework
- Was quantified where possible, but not where this was not appropriate
- Allowed faculty members to make a judgement about the meritable status of their own contributions (that is, ensured that there were few surprises)
- Recognised the different allocation of effort by different faculty members

Framework

The merit framework is based upon allocation of points to activities in three categories: research, teaching, and service. The allocation to activities can be found in the chart on page 4. The balance across the three areas of activity will be proportional to the faculty member's workload effort allocation. The actual number of potential points does not have to be equal across all three areas as this can be mathematically equalised in the calculation of the global score for the

individual. There is also a “floating” discretionary premium.

Research

This area is relatively straightforward, with points allocation for activities such as publication, presentations and so on. One notable feature is the broadening of the activities that gain merit recognition to reflect the work of the department. An example is keynote presentations, which gain recognition because they recognise expertise in a very significant way, raising the profile of both the individual and the department. Another example is the provision of points for “Supporting research apprenticeship,” intended to recognise non-supervisory work with students and others, such as employing RAs.

Teaching

The points allocation has been considerably broadened here as well, recognised supervisory effort more clearly and substantially, as well as class size.

Discretionary premium

The committee were keen that there be a 20 point “discretionary premium” to allow the Chair to recognise specific achievements that were not otherwise captured. These can be in one activity area or across the faculty member’s entire profile. There will be a page in the individual reports that asks:

*Are there activities you have completed in the last year that are not captured fully in this form and that you believe should be recognised in merit allocation?
Please provide details.*

Service

In developing a departmental approach to review service proved to be the most difficult area. This was not simply due to the difficulty of quantification, but because service is inherently a profoundly diverse area and merit structures must go beyond simply rewarding effort *per se*. The process applied to service looks quite complex as presented here, but is expected to be fairly straightforward in application. There are three elements: a merit expectations chart, a page to be added to the individual annual report, and a rubric clarifying the basis for merit allocation.

A chart clarifying service expectations by rank is attached at the end of this memo. It lays out what expected and meritable service areas look like. This cannot possibly be inclusive, but hopefully it provides useful guidance.

In the individual annual report there will be a page where faculty members will be asked:

Please list activities you consider to be meritable for your rank (see merit chart for details). Please provide a few words of description for each activity.

The Chair will then assess the listed activities and allocate one of the levels below. The allocation will then be balanced with research and teaching depending upon the agreed allocation of effort for the individual. There is a degree of Chair's judgement here, but the working group believed that this was both unavoidable and justifiable. There was considerable discussion about options such as having a committee allocate merit, but the final position of the committee was that the allocation of merit should remain the Chair's responsibility.

Points	Title	Description
0	Below expectation	Indicates that the faculty member should consider increasing service contributions
10	Meets expectation	Faculty member is engaged in service at a level consistent with the expectations of their career stage
20	Beyond expectation	Faculty member has examples of service of higher impact and scope than expected for their career stage
30	Considerably beyond expectation	Faculty member is largely engaged in service activities of higher impact and scope than expected for their career stage
40	Exceeds expectation	Faculty member is consistently engaged in service activities of a significantly higher impact and scope than expected for their career stage

Balancing across categories

Balancing across the categories of research, teaching and service is far from straightforward. This is because Faculty have different allocations of effort and because the number of points in each category is not capped. However the principle of merit is essentially comparative, which allows for the actual maximum points allocations for the Department in any year to be used as the *de facto* maximum. The formula proposed below takes each individual's comparative performance in each category and assigns a value. These values are then weighted to reflect workload allocation and produce a final comparative score.

For example, suppose we have a Professor Z (this is not meant to refer to the real Professor Z!). In each category, Professor Z will gain points proportional to the highest score in that category. So, if Prof Z has a total of 17 for research and the leading score in the category is 28, the points are:

$$\frac{17}{28} = 0.61$$

This number will then be multiplied by the effort allocation to that category. Assuming it's 40%, the final total for that category will be 24.3.

This can be generalised to the formula:

$$\frac{r_z}{r_{\max}} \times w_z$$

So overall, across three categories:

$$\sum z = \left(\frac{r_z}{r_{\max}} \times w_z \right) + \left(\frac{t_z}{t_{\max}} \times w_z \right) + \left(\frac{s_z}{s_{\max}} \times w_z \right) + dz$$

Where:

r = research

t = teaching

s = service

wz = individual's allocation for that category

d = discretionary premium

DISE Merit Point Allocation (Research and Teaching)

Research	Peer-reviewed short contributions	*	15
	Edited book/journal special edition	*	25
	Authored book	*	40
	Conference presentation	Peer-reviewed papers	5
		Peer-reviewed posters	2
	Report		3
	Professional writing/media/interviews		2
	Supporting research apprenticeship (Describe briefly)	Per student	2
	Collaboration		2
	Invited presentation		8
	Keynote presentation		15
Teaching	Innovation in teaching quality		5
	Students graduating	PhD (Supervisor)	10
		PhD (Co-Supervisor)	8
		PhD Committee	3
		MA Thesis (Supervisor)	5
		MA Thesis (Co-supervisor)	4
		MA project supervision	3
	University level teaching award		10
	Development and design	Major program change	30
		Minor program change	15
		Course	6
	Co-ordination	3 or more sections	6
	Class size	Undergraduate > 75	10
		Graduate > 30	10
	Reading course		2
	Discretionary premium		20

*For each of these publications Faculty will be asked to assess the percentage of the total effort they are responsible for.

Grant grid

Merit for grants generating McGill managed funds (current year amount)

Amount	PI/Co-PI	Non-PI
0-100K	20	10
101-250K	25	12
251K+	30	15

DISE Meritorious Service Chart

	Expected Activity	Meritable Activity
Assistant Professor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participation in department and faculty committees - Membership of key organisations - Beginning to engage with international networks - Journal reviewing - Building partnerships with community organisations - Involvement in program management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participation in university committees plus committee leadership roles - Leadership/elected roles in key organisations - Active international research/teaching networks - Editorial roles - Creation of new community partnerships - Honours and awards - Involvement in delivering professional development
Associate Professor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participation in university committees plus committee leadership roles - Leadership/elected roles in key organisations - Active international research/teaching networks - Editorial roles - Creation of new community partnerships - Honours and awards - Involvement in delivering professional development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leadership of univ/faculty/dept. initiatives - Leadership/elected/merit-based recognition in key organisations (including committee membership) - Substantial international activity and responsibility - Editorship of major journals (including board membership) - Leadership of community partnerships - Program leadership/development - Leadership in professional development of teaching - Substantial management responsibility - Invited presentations and keynotes - Honours and awards
Full Professor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leadership of univ/faculty/dept. initiatives - Leadership/elected/merit-based recognition in key organisations (including committee membership) - Substantial international activity and responsibility - Editorship of major journals (including board membership) - Leadership of community partnerships - Program leadership/development - Leadership in professional development of teaching - Substantial management responsibility - Invited presentations and keynotes - Honours and awards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of univ/faculty/dept. initiatives and committees - Contribution to evolution of key organisations/International leadership roles - Founding/leading editorship of major journals - Responsibility for development of community partnerships - Program initiation and implementation - Leadership in teaching (esp. beyond the dept.) - Major management responsibility - Honours and awards