

**UNIVERSITY
OF
NEVADA,
RENO
(UNR)
MERIT INFORMATION**

NSHE MERIT AND SALARY INFORMATION

MAY 8, 2018

AB 202, 2017 SESSION

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO (UNR)

Merit is the method UNR uses to reward commendable and excellent performers and as a retention tool to retain talented faculty. The awarding of merit is directly related to the faculty member's performance and corresponding annual evaluation. The attached policy, *Merit Salary Increases*, addresses the five levels of merit. In summary:

<u>Evaluation Rating</u>	<u>Merit Steps</u>
Unsatisfactory	0
Satisfactory	0
Commendable	1, 2
Excellent	3, 4
*Extraordinary	6

**Extraordinary merit is awarded to fewer than 10 faculty members each year.*

UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATIVE MANUAL POLICY, 2,718: MERIT SALARY INCREASES

REVISED: DECEMBER 2016

Merit funds are provided to the University by the legislature specifically for rewarding meritorious performance of state-funded faculty positions and are not designed to be used for cost-of-living increases or to fund promotions or equity adjustments. One major objective of the merit distribution policy is to maintain the standards for awarding quality performance. Vice presidents are responsible for reviewing and approving the recommendation of merit within each unit for which they are responsible.

Merit funds are affected by the availability of funds provided by the legislature. The amount of the merit pool allocated will be based on the funding provided. Whenever possible, non-state-funded budgets should build in comparable funds to reward meritorious performance for non-state-funded faculty positions.

Recommendations for merit salary increases result from faculty evaluations. There are five levels of merit awards: commendable: steps 1 and 2; excellent: steps 3 and 4; and extraordinary: step 6. An extraordinary merit award must be approved by the executive vice president & provost. A satisfactory rating is not meritorious performance. Individual faculty merit dollar amounts are calculated by multiplying the step number by the dollar value of one merit step. The specific value of the merit steps, as well as any additional criteria or procedures for implementing the merit program are determined by the president, based on recommendations from the Faculty Senate. No NSHE, university, college, department, or professional award automatically results in recommendation for an extraordinary merit award.

ELIGIBILITY FOR MERIT

Full-time and part-time academic and administrative, tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track (Rank 0) faculty (.5 FTE or more) on a renewable "A" or "B" contract are eligible to participate in the merit program. Academic or administrative faculty hired or promoted on or before September 1st of the year for which merit is awarded are eligible to participate in the process.

**UNIVERSITY
OF
NEVADA,
LAS VEGAS
(UNLV)
MERIT INFORMATION**

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS (UNLV)

MERIT PAY - FACULTY AND PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES

- Merit is an increase in pay intended to encourage and reward exceptional performance by faculty and professional employees. The merit process begins with the evaluation process. To be eligible for merit, employees must be rated at least satisfactory in all areas and must be rated either commendable or excellent in at least one area.
- After the supervisor's recommendation, an employee's merit is approved by each unit's vice president or dean, and any increase that will place the employee above the maximum of the salary schedule for his or her position is sent to the president for final approval. The president also must approve merit for any employee who reports directly to a vice president.

MERIT PAY ELIGIBILITY

- Faculty and professional employees must have been hired on or before Sept. 3 to be eligible for a merit increase the following July. Employees hired after Sept. 3 are not eligible for merit increases until July of the next year. For example, an employee hired Sept. 15, 2009, would not be eligible for merit until July 1, 2011.

MERIT AWARD AMOUNTS

- For full-time employees, merit increases are awarded in one of six amounts:
- \$1,000
- \$1,500
- \$2,000
- \$2,500
- \$3,000
- \$4,500

Among the total increases in any division or department:

- No more than 20 percent may be at the \$1,000 level
- No more than 20 percent may be at the \$4,500 level

Attached are the UNLV administrative faculty guidelines originally established in 1997 as well, other than a change to remove the 20% from all categories except the \$1,000 and \$4,500 levels, the rules have remained essentially the same.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Deans, Chairs, Directors, and Professional Staff

FROM: Norval F. Pohl *(NP)*
Vice President for Finance and Administration

DATE: April 3, 1997

RE: Merit Policy and Procedures for Non-Academic Faculty

Please find attached a copy of the UNLV "Policy and Procedures" for the distribution of merit awards to non-academic faculty. These guidelines will be used for the awarding of merit to members of the professional staff for the period January 1 through December 31, 1996.

This merit assessment correlates with the required annual evaluation of non-academic faculty. Please remember that all professional staff members must have an annual evaluation on file with Human Resources in order to be considered for merit.

The respective cabinet level officers will establish the schedules within their units, and the aggregate recommendations from these officers will be forwarded to the President by June 2, 1997.

These procedures have been developed after extensive consultations among the Professional Staff, Human Resources, and the President's Cabinet. In general, these policies are intended to establish a policy that can be applied campus-wide, that is parallel to the merit procedures for teaching faculty, and that enlarges the number of non-academic faculty in cabinet level merit pools and thereby promotes a more consistent and equitable distribution of merit awards. The policy will be monitored and assessed according to these desired outcomes. If you have questions concerning the procedures, please contact Human Resources. The Professional Staff Issues Committee is also available to discuss the policy with staff members.

Attachment (6 pages)

NP/maw

Vice President for Finance and Administration
4505 Maryland Parkway • Box 451004 • Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-1004
(702) 895-3571 • FAX (702) 895-1090

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA LAS VEGAS
POLICY AND PROCEDURES
FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF MERIT AWARDS
TO NON-ACADEMIC FACULTY MEMBERS

An award of merit is expected to recognize the person who has (1) performed at least "satisfactorily" in the areas for which the person is evaluated and (2) is considered meritorious in at least one of those areas. Merit awards are specifically not to be confused with inequity adjustments. Among the legitimate reasons to award merit are the following:

- A. To encourage exceptional performance in any of the several areas for which a nonacademic faculty member is evaluated.
- B. To reward exceptional performance in any of the several areas for which a nonacademic faculty member is evaluated.
- C. To reward outstanding performance over a long period of time -- performance that may not have resulted in merit for any particular year;
- D. To allow for other specific or general exceptions which to the evaluators represent some outstanding reason for awarding merit.¹

Merit award recommendations will be made by the employee's department head/manager, reviewed and approved by the appropriate vice president or cabinet officer, and submitted for final approval to the president. Merit awards are not an entitlement and will be based on the meritorious performance and contributions of the faculty member; each vice president or cabinet officer must insure that merit is distributed according to this criteria rather than in an "across the board" or uniform fashion. Each vice president or cabinet officer must also insure that an equitable distribution exists among the faculty members reporting to his or her office. Revised and enlarged merit pools have been established to help promote equity within reporting areas and to eliminate artificially small pools as have sometimes existed in two- or three-person offices.

Eligibility

Eligible non-academic faculty members may be granted merit awards, if funds are allocated by the legislature.

All non-academic faculty members are eligible for merit awards except:

- New faculty members on probation, the first 12 consecutive months of University employment in the same position (*effective for faculty members hired after February 29, 1996*).
- Faculty members designated as temporary employees (*effective immediately*).
- Faculty members who are part-time employees appointed at less than 50% FTE (*effective immediately*).

The starting salary of a new non-academic faculty member must reflect that the employee is not eligible for a merit award while on probation. This will eliminate the conflict of awarding a performance based salary increase to an employee who may be terminated before the completion of his or her probation period. The supervisor and/or department head is responsible for informing the new faculty member that he or she will not be eligible for a merit award during the first year of University employment.

A proposed merit award which will place a non-academic faculty member either initially above or additionally above the top of a current salary range must have prior written authorization from the president.

Merit Award Recommendations

The call for merit award recommendations, along with any special instructions or restrictions, will be issued by the president, vice presidents, and appropriate cabinet officers. Departments must submit their recommendations within the deadline established by these officers. Department heads and managers shall not make recommendations regarding their own merit awards.

Managers may discuss their proposed recommendations with the faculty members; however, the recommendations of the department head/manager must be approved by and are subject to change by the vice presidents, cabinet officers, and/or president. The recommendations of the vice presidents and cabinet officers are submitted to the president for final approval.

The department head/manager shall inform each faculty member in writing of the amount of the merit award once the recommendation has been approved.

Each eligible non-academic faculty member denied a merit award must be notified of such decision in writing within 5 working days of the decision.²

Merit Award Performance Categories and Increase Amounts

There are six steps associated with the non-academic faculty merit model. No more than 20% of awardees in one of the cabinet level merit pools may be in any one step. There is no obligation that every category be used. The six performance categories and their associated increase amount include

VI. **\$ 4,500.00**

Performance which is rarely equaled and has dramatically moved and shaped the individual's department and the university. The step six rating must be endorsed by the appropriate vice-president or cabinet officer and approved by the president. Such endorsement by the applicable vice-president or cabinet officer shall be in writing.

V. **\$ 3,000.00**

Performance which is highly deserving of imitation and serves as a model for others. Excellent performance in all job assignments.

IV. **\$ 2,500.00**

Performance which is truly distinguished and significantly exceeds job requirements for most assignments.

III. **\$ 2,000.00**

Performance which consistently and significantly exceeds acceptable job requirements in a majority of assignments.

II. **\$ 1,500.00**

Performance which exceeds acceptable job requirements in several assignments.

I. **\$ 1,000.00**

Performance which exceeds acceptable job requirements.

Appeals

According to the UCCSN Code and UNLV Bylaws, all faculty members have the right to request reconsideration of a denied merit award. A merit award gained as a resolution to an appeal will be awarded retroactively to the initial start date identified for merit salary increases.

Appeal Process

Faculty members have the right to request reconsideration of personnel actions denying salary increases (salary increases include merit awards) in accordance with the University and Community College System of Nevada Code.³

Each eligible non-academic faculty member denied a merit award must be notified of such decision in writing within 5 working days of the decision.⁴

A faculty member who has been denied a merit award may, within 15 calendar days after notification of such denial, provide a written request to the department chair, supervisor or dean who rendered the negative decision asking for a statement in writing of the reasons for the denial.⁵

The response must be received by the faculty member within 15 calendar days after the appropriate administrator receives the written request for reasons.⁶

Within 15 calendar days after receipt of the written reasons for the denial of merit award, a faculty member may request reconsideration of such denial. The request shall be submitted to the faculty member's supervisor together with the reasons, arguments and documentation supporting the request for reconsideration.⁷

The request for reconsideration shall be promptly directed through regular channels with recommendations from each administrative level for or against reconsideration of the decision.⁸

Final action shall be taken within a reasonable time by the president after receipt of the recommendations.⁹

If the denial is not reversed after reconsideration, the faculty member may petition the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee.¹⁰

The Appeals Committee hears cases involving denials of salary increases and/or merit awards. The committee will be activated only after the appellant has exhausted all administrative remedies through the Provost or other appropriate administrator.¹¹

Membership of this committee changes with each appeal which is processed. Potential committee members shall be selected from a pool of either academic or non-academic faculty. The administration shall be represented on the committee by an administrator elected by the members of the Academic Council. The appellant and the administration may be represented before the committee by advocates of their choosing. The decision of the committee shall be advisory.¹²

Hearings before the committee shall be informal in nature. The decisions of the committee shall be in the form of recommendations and are advisory only. Such recommendations shall be sent to the president.¹³

1 see Chapter III, Section 11.1 of UNLV Bylaws
2 see Chapter III, Section 13.2 of UNLV Bylaws
3 see Chapter 5, Section 5.2.4 of Code and Chapter III, Section 13.1 of UNLV Bylaws
4 see Chapter III, Section 13.2 of UNLV Bylaws
5 see Chapter 5, Section 5.2.3 of Code and Chapter III, Section 13.2.1 of UNLV Bylaws
6 see Chapter 5, Section 5.2.3 of Code and Chapter III, Section 13.2.1 of UNLV Bylaws
7 see Chapter III, Section 13.2.2 of UNLV Bylaws
8 see Chapter III, Section 13.2.2 of UNLV Bylaws
9 see Chapter III, Section 13.2.2 of UNLV Bylaws
10 see Chapter I, Section 4.6.6 of UNLV Bylaws and Chapter III, Section 13.2.2 of UNLV Bylaws
11 see Chapter I, Section 4.6.6 of UNLV Bylaws and Chapter III, Section 13.1 of UNLV bylaws
12 see Chapter I, Section 4.6.6 of UNLV Bylaws
13 see Chapter 5, Section 5.7.3 of Code

March 27, 1997

**NEVADA
STATE
COLLEGE (NSC)
MERIT INFORMATION**



ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY

Administrative Faculty Merit Pay Policy

POLICY STATEMENT

The Nevada State College (NSC) Merit Pay Policy for Administrative Faculty supports the College's commitment to reward excellence. Merit pay is awarded to recognize and retain high performing administrative faculty who make significant contributions to the mission and goals of NSC.

Merit pay is awarded to administrative faculty who receive an overall rating of excellent or commendable.

REASON FOR POLICY

Merit pay is awarded to administrative faculty members based on their contributions, accomplishments, and ongoing high levels of performance. The ability to earn merit pay serves as an incentive to perform well. A fundamental premise of an equitable merit pay system is that it is built upon a sound and valid performance management system; one that is perceived as being fair, equitable, measurable, and objective.

This policy defines a College-wide framework for merit pay determination, in compliance with Chapter 6, section 9 of the NSC Bylaws.

The policy is pursuant to the preservation of transparency in merit pay award.

PROCEDURES

Introduction

The merit pay award was created by the Nevada State Legislature. Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 25 of the NSHE Board of Regents Handbook provides that NSHE professional employees shall be eligible to be considered for merit awards during fiscal years when a merit pool appropriation is provided. NSHE institutions are authorized to develop written policies and criteria for merit award recommendation. The award of merit pay is intended to recognize, reward, and reinforce exemplary performance. Merit pay must be earned each year.

Merit pay is awarded to administrative faculty who receive an overall rating of at least a commendable rating. Merit pay is added to base pay when calculating the salary for the new fiscal year.

The policy is administered by the Office of Finance and Administration upon recommendations by Department Heads and Vice Presidents/Provost. The President and/or appropriate Vice President makes the final determination of the award and the amount to each eligible administrative faculty member, upon recommendation by the Vice President of Finance & Administration.

Ineligibility

Administrative faculty who would otherwise be considered eligible for merit will be considered ineligible in the following circumstances:

- a) Administrative faculty who are not continuing employment at NSC for the next fiscal year.
- b) Newly-hired administrative faculty who begin employment at NSC on or after the first working day in October.
- c) Administrative faculty who are in a temporary appointment.
- d) Administrative faculty who were promoted and/or given a raise on or after the first working day in October.

Exclusions

The Administrative Faculty Merit Pay Policy does not apply to:

- a) Academic Faculty
- b) Part-time Instructors
- c) Classified Staff
- d) Casual Labor
- e) Student Workers

Criteria for Administrative Faculty Merit Pay

The Annual Evaluation Report will provide the basis for consideration of the annual merit pay increase. All Annual Evaluation Reports should provide sufficient information to allow for full and fair evaluation of Administrative Faculty in compliance with Chapter 5, section 7 of the NSC bylaws.

To be eligible for inclusion in the administrative faculty merit pool, an eligible administrative faculty member must receive at least a commendable rating overall. Administrative faculty members will not be eligible for merit pay if they receive a rating of unsatisfactory in any category.

Evaluation Process

Departmental supervisors will submit to their respective Vice President/Provost recommendations of eligible administrative faculty for merit pay consideration. The Annual Evaluation Report shall form the basis of this recommendation. The list of eligible faculty will be accompanied by supporting documentation.

Merit points will be awarded for attainment of an overall rating of commendable or excellent. Merit points will be awarded as follows:

Excellent:	2.0
Commendable:	1.5

Since the Annual Evaluation Reports are the basis for merit pay increases, those records are considered confidential and not a matter of public record. Once awarded, the amount of the

merit increase is a matter of public record.

Award Schedule

Merit salary increases will be awarded once annually.

The recommendations regarding administrative faculty eligible for merit salary award consideration shall be made by the Vice Presidents/Provost to the Vice President of Finance & Administration no later than May 15.

Publication of the calculations for merit pay disbursements will be provided to the campus on or around July 1 of each year.

Notice of Merit Pay

When an administrative faculty member has been awarded merit pay, the faculty member shall be informed about the amount of merit pay increase in writing.

The official date of notification of merit awards for the purpose of review and grievance shall be the day the merit list is released to the campus. The merit list shall be made available to the public.

Review of Merit Pay Evaluation

Pursuant to Title 2, Chapter 5, Section 5.16 of NSHE Code, administrative faculty members who are in disagreement with their particular award of merit may seek review in accordance with the procedure adopted in the NSC bylaws.

CONTACTS

SUBJECT	CONTACT	PHONE	EMAIL
Vice President of Finance & Administration	Buster Neel	702-992-2302	Buster.neel@nsc.edu
Human Resources	Cheri Canfield	702-992-2322	cheri.canfield@nsc.edu

DEFINITIONS

Academic Faculty	"Academic faculty" is defined in Section 1.1(a) of the NSHE Code and Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 2(1)(b) of NSHE Board of Regents Handbook, and generally consists of those professional staff members who specifically create and disseminate scholarly information through teaching, or providing counseling or library services closely and directly supportive of teaching and research. (NSHE Code, Chapter 7, section 7.2.1. and Chapter 3, Section 2 (a) and Section 3 (a) of the NSC Bylaws). □
Administrative Faculty	"Administrative faculty" refers to a subset of the category of administrators defined in section 1.1.b of the NSHE Code and Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 2(1)(d) of the NSHE Board of Regents

	Handbook. (Nevada System of Higher Education CODE, Chapter 7, section 7.2.1.; Chapter 3, Section 2(b) and 3(b) of the NSC Bylaws).
Eligible Administrative Faculty Member	Administrative faculty who have been hired by NSC through a competitive search or have been granted a search waiver. Administrative faculty hired in one-year, nonrenewable contracts are excluded.
Fiscal Year	Period beginning July 1 of one year and extending through June 30 of the next year.
Merit Pay	Addition to base pay earned by eligible administrative faculty for high levels of performance as documented in the annual evaluation report. Merit pay must be earned each year.
Merit Pool	Total funds allocated as a designated percentage of NSC's annual budget; the percentage is determined and funding is appropriated by the state legislature through the budget process. The State legislature may modify or rescind merit funds at any time before they are distributed.

RELATED INFORMATION

NSHE Code, Title 2, Chapter 5, Section 5.12 Evaluation, 5.16 Review of Evaluations and/or Denials of Salary Increase

NSC Bylaws, Chapter 6, Section 7 Evaluations

NSC Bylaws, Chapter 6, Section 9 Merit Determinations

NSC Bylaws, Chapter 6, Section 3 Grievance Procedures for Faculty

HISTORY

**DESERT
RESEARCH
INSTITUTE (DRI)
MERIT INFORMATION**

3.0 HUMAN RESOURCES GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES

3.02 Employment Related Policies and Procedures

3.02.13 DRI MBO Performance Evaluation Process & Schedule

MBO PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SCHEDULE

Steps in the MBO performance evaluation shall include: (1) initial negotiation of annual objectives with faculty member's supervisor; (2) self-evaluation by faculty member; (3) a discussion with the faculty member's supervisor; (4) determination of ratings by the faculty member's supervisors and if appropriate comments by the employee; and (5) procedural and consistency review and approval by the President or the President's designee.

- **No later than the last working day of January**, the supervisor should receive the faculty member's self-evaluation (which should be based on the previous year's MBOs).
- **No later than March 22**, the supervisor and faculty member should complete the Performance Evaluation discussion, discuss any areas for future development, develop new MBOs, and sign both the Performance Evaluation and new MBOs for the next calendar year.
- **No later than April 16**, the supervisor should forward the completed forms for the faculty to the appropriate Executive Director or VP who will forward them to the Human Resources office (North) for procedural and consistency review by the Director of Human Resources. The MBO objectives may be revised if needed throughout the year by mutual agreement of the faculty member and supervisor.

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PROCESS

Performance of each faculty member shall be evaluated annually with a possible midterm review depending on the results of the annual review. The categories/objectives for annual evaluations should be closely related to the qualifications for Research Professors and Research/Scientist Engineer as outlined in Chapter 7 of the DRI Bylaws. Faculty members may include objectives from one rank above their current rank in preparation for a promotion. The objectives and their importance are determined by the faculty member in consultation with the supervisor/Executive Director with possible difference/weights between faculty members according to Chapter 8 of the DRI Bylaws.

Due On or Before Date	Deliverables	Responsible Party
December 1	First notice to Executive Directors & faculty to initiate evaluation process & develop new MBOs	Director of HR
January 2	Final notice to Executive Directors & faculty to initiate evaluation process & develop new MBOs	Director of HR
January 31	MBO self-evaluation due to supervisor	Faculty Member
March 22	Evaluation discussion completed and MBOs signed. New annual MBO objectives set and signed	Faculty & Supervisor
April 16	Completed MBO performance evaluations to Executive Directors & VPs for review & signature	Executive Directors and Vice Presidents
		Division Directors

April 21	MBO performance evaluations with list of completed evaluations/ratings for each division to Director HR	and Vice Presidents Director of HR
April 21 – May 7	Procedure and consistency review period by Director of HR	Director of HR
May 10	Executive Directors review faculty salary calculation (with merit and COLA increases) worksheet across ranks for equity recommendations to Director of HR	Executive Directors Division Business Managers
May 10	Salary Calculation Worksheets to HR	Business Managers

FACULTY MBOs AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: INSTRUCTIONS AND GENERAL INFORMATION

The MBO process goals are to:

- to provide faculty with feedback to improve or maintain job performance;
- to recognize job-related accomplishments from rank criteria & performance objectives;
- to outline areas for faculty development, mentoring, and promotion/reclassification;
- to set MBO goals for the next review period aligned with the key goals of DRI;
- to provide competitive compensation through distribution of merit shares based on performance ratings.

PART I. DEVELOPING / APPROVING MBOs

A. Instructions and Schedule

No later than the last working day of January, *or within two months of time of hire*, the critical objectives for each DRI Rank 0-IV faculty position should be developed jointly by the faculty member and supervisor and subsequently revised if needed throughout the year. A signed copy of this document is to be sent to the Executive Director or appropriate VP with a copy to the HR department. The original will stay in the division until the end of the evaluation year.

B. Performance Categories

The following standard categories listed below are referred to in the **DRI Bylaws** as factors to be used to assess performance by rank and should be included in the research faculty's MBOs. The ranks described below are the normal expectations for individuals in each rank; it is possible to have exceptions under certain circumstances. The categories in next higher rank can be included in MBOs to lead to promotion to next rank:

Research Professor Track: Ranks II through IV

Rank II (Assistant Research Professor):

Doctoral degree and demonstrated superior expertise in an appropriate subject area; potential for ability to initiate, plan, obtain funding, and carry out research projects; and potential for professional growth.

Rank III (Associate Research Professor):

Rank II qualifications plus (1) program development and management experience; (2) a record of publications, including peer-reviewed publications, or other intellectual productivity including patents, intellectual property development, presentations, and reports; (3) success in achieving sustained research project or program funding; (4) evidence of increasing professional recognition at the regional, national, and/or international levels; (5) teaching and advising students as well as mentoring of DRI personnel; and (6) service to the community, the NSHE, DRI, and the researcher's profession. The first four are normally critical requirements; the last three are supportive.

Rank IV (Research Professor):

Rank III qualifications but increased, sustained, long-term success in (1) program management; (2) productivity including peer-reviewed publications, books and book chapters, patents, intellectual property development, and other measures; (3) development of funding including support for others; (4) professional national and international recognition; (5) teaching and advising students as well as mentoring DRI faculty (if appropriate); and (6) service to the community, NSHE, DRI, and the researcher's profession. The first four are normally critical requirements; the others are supportive. (Ch Appv 12/12)

Research Scientist/Engineer Track: Ranks I through IV:

Rank I (Staff Research Scientist/Engineer):

Professional education as evidenced by a bachelor's or higher degree in relevant field; capability of providing scientific, technical, and operational support to specific projects or programs.

Rank II (Assistant Research Scientist/Engineer):

Qualifications of Rank I plus demonstrated accomplishments in profession and potential for accomplishment in project or program promotion, development, and management as well as supervisory responsibility.

Rank III (Associate Research Scientist/Engineer):

Qualifications of Rank II plus demonstrated success in one or more of the following: (1) project promotion, development, and management; (2) development of funding; (3) productivity including publications, patents, or development of intellectual property; and (4) supervisory responsibility; and (5) service to the community, the NSHE, DRI, and the researcher's profession. The weighting, or importance, of each component depends on the individuals' specific responsibilities in the research unit, as approved by the individual's Executive Director and/or immediate supervisor.

Rank IV (Senior Research Scientist/Engineer):

Qualifications of Rank III plus sustained, long-term success in (1) project or program promotion, development, and management; (2) obtaining funding (including support for others); (3) productivity including publications, patents, or development of intellectual property; (4) supervisory responsibility; (5) service to the community, the NSHE, DRI, and the researcher's profession, and (6) Mentoring. The weighting, or importance, of each component depends on the individual's specific responsibilities in the research unit, as approved by the individual's Executive Director and/or immediate supervisor. (Ch Appv 12/12)

Administrative Rank:

The following key areas of responsibility listed below are referred to in the **DRI Bylaws** as factors to be used to assess performance for MBOs, and should be included in the Rank 0 faculty member's MBOs. Professional education as evidence by a bachelor's or higher degree in a relevant field with performance as evidenced by: (1) management (planning, organizing, directing); (2) customer service; (3) technical competence (job knowledge); (4) productivity (quality and quantity); (5) leadership/supervision (if appropriate); and (6) service to the community, the NSHE, DRI and the individual's profession, and other factors which show the faculty member's professional growth and achievements.

Postdoctoral Fellow Positions:

Completion of a doctoral degree in an appropriate discipline with postdoctoral appointments for a limited term (one calendar year with renewal for a sequential second and third year depending on funding and performance). The objectives will be determined by the employee and supervisor but could include publications, support to specific projects or programs and individual objectives.

PART II. THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

A. Instructions and Schedule

- No later than the **last working day of January**, the supervisor should receive the faculty member's self-evaluation (which should be based on the previous year's MBOs).
- **No later than March 22**, the supervisor and faculty member will have completed the performance evaluation discussion, discussed any areas for future development, and signed the performance evaluation form.
- **No later than April 16**, the supervisors will forward the completed forms for the faculty **to the appropriate Executive Director or VP for review and signature**. The forms will then be forward to the Human Resources Office (North) by April 21 for procedural and consistency review by the Director of HR. The MBOs may be revised if needed throughout the year by mutual agreement of the faculty member and supervisor.

New Employee MBOs:

MBOs for Rank 0-IV Faculty: New employee MBOs should be developed within two months of the time of hire and should be developed jointly by the faculty member and supervisor. The MBOs may be revised if needed throughout the year by mutual agreement of the faculty member and supervisor. A signed copy of the original MBO document and any subsequent revision is to be sent to the HR Office. The original will stay in the division until the end of the evaluation year.

B. Definition of the Importance of Each Item

- **Critical:** of greatest importance to individual performance and DRI advancement (goals and objectives). A rating of "needs improvement" on any critical performance category may lead to an overall "needs improvement" rating. A "needs improvement" overall rating acts as a warning and requires a development plan and mid-year review of performance. If following the midterm review the "needs improvement" rating has not been raised, then an "unsatisfactory" overall rating shall be issued.
- **Important:** of significant consideration in the overall rating. Important objectives are not critical to the faculty member or DRI advancement. A rating of "needs improvement" on one performance category will

not automatically lead to an overall performance rating of “needs improvement” but may on more than one category.

- **Minor:** of some relevance to the overall rating. Minor objectives are those where some activity will be undertaken, but objectives do not weigh heavily in overall summation. A rating of “unsatisfactory” on any performance objective will not lead to an overall “unsatisfactory” rating unless overall rating is “unsatisfactory”.

C. Definition of Ratings

- **Outstanding (2 Merit Shares):** Excellent performance, significantly exceeds MBO expectations on all critical objectives.
- **Commendable + (1.5 Merit Shares):** Very good performance, exceeds MBO expectations on most critical objectives.
- **Commendable (1 Merit Share):** Very good performance, exceeds MBO expectations on some critical objectives.
- **Satisfactory + (.5 Merit Share):** Meritorious performance, sometimes exceeds MBO expectations and just above satisfactory performance.
- **Satisfactory (0 Merit Shares):** Competent, meets MBO objectives and expectations.
- **Needs Improvement (0 Merit Shares):** Having performed below MBO expectations on critical or important objectives. Acts as a warning and requires a development plan and a mid-year review, at which point the overall rating must be changed to either a *satisfactory* or *unsatisfactory* rating.
- **Unsatisfactory (0 Merit Shares):** Does not meet expectations. May only be issued after a needs improvement rating. An overall rating of unsatisfactory leads to termination proceeding in accordance with NSHE Code, Chapter 8 Section 5.8 of the DRI Bylaws. Disciplinary action will start with the final written warning.


MBO Form

Updated and Approved for Use in 2012-2013 MBO Process; Reflects ByLaw Changes from 12/2012 (1/8/2013)

Updated and Approved for Use in 2010 MBO Process (12/21/2010)

Created and Approved for Admin Manual 12/7/2009

**COLLEGE
OF
SOUTHERN
NEVADA (CSN)
MERIT INFORMATION**

 CSN Policy	Academic Faculty Merit Pay Policy
Policy Category: Faculty	Effective Date: May 15, 2015
<p>Version #2: Removed Administrative Faculty into separate Merit Pay Policy. Version #1: Passed Faculty Senate; not approved by CSN President.</p>	

I. POLICY PURPOSE

The purpose is to provide the criteria for merit pay eligibility, distribution, and appeals for Academic Faculty. NOTE: NSHE BoR Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 25 (4) allows for separate merit policies for Academic and Administrative/Professional Faculty.

II. POLICY STATEMENT

- A. Merit pay eligibility shall be based on the faculty member's evaluation rating, as per the Academic Faculty Evaluation Policy.
- B. Only academic faculty members receiving Commendable or Excellent Overall Ratings shall be eligible for merit pay.
- C. Merit pay shall be distributed as shares of the allocated Academic Faculty Merit Pay Pool (MPP) for that particular fiscal year.
- D. Merit Pay Shares shall represent a specific dollar amount determined by the funding of the MPP and the number of academic faculty who received Commendable or Excellent Overall Ratings for the applicable academic year.
- E. Merit pay distribution:
 1. During years when merit pay will be awarded, Academic Faculty who receive a Commendable evaluation rating for the applicable academic year shall each have one share of merit pay added to their base salaries beginning with July 1 of the applicable contract year.
 2. During years when merit pay will be awarded, Academic Faculty members who receive an Excellent Overall Rating for the applicable academic year shall each have two shares of merit pay added to their base salaries beginning with July 1 of the applicable contract year.
- F. Merit awards for all faculty shall be awarded in full, even if an award results in a faculty member's salary being over the corresponding salary range/grade cap.
- G. Merit pay appeals:
 1. The Board of Regents Handbook provides: "If a merit pay determination is directly tied to the outcome of a faculty member's evaluation review, then the bylaws shall provide that the same process is followed for both the evaluation review and the merit pay determination."
 2. The Supervisory and Peer Review process in the corresponding Evaluation Policy shall serve as the exclusive Merit Pay appeals process.

III. PROCEDURE

A. For Academic Faculty:

1. In the fiscal years when a merit pool appropriation is provided for Academic Faculty, a Merit Pay Share (MPS) will be determined by dividing the MPP by the sum of the number of academic faculty members who received, in the applicable academic year, an Overall Rating of Commendable (C) plus two times the number of academic faculty members who received an Overall Rating of Excellent (E). The formula is as follows:

$$MPS = MPP / (C + 2E)$$

IV. AUTHORITY AND CROSS REFERENCE LINKS

NSHE *Procedures & Guidelines Manual*, Chapter 3, pp. 11-12, Rev. 49 (03/14)

<http://system.nevada.edu/tasks/sites/Nshe/assets/File/BoardOfRegents/Procedures/PGMCH03SALARYSCHEDULES.pdf>

Board of Regents Handbook, Title 2, Chapter 5, Section 5.16, p. 30, Rev. 258 (09/13)

<http://system.nevada.edu/tasks/sites/Nshe/assets/File/BoardOfRegents/Handbook/COMPLETEHANDBOOKREV260.pdf>

NSHE Board of Regents Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 25, p. 25

<http://system.nevada.edu/tasks/sites/Nshe/assets/File/BoardOfRegents/Handbook/T4CH03ProfessionalStaff%283%29.pdf>

V. DISCLAIMER

The President has the discretion to suspend or rescind all or any part of this policy or related procedure(s). The President shall notify appropriate CSN personnel, including the Administrative Code Officer and Faculty Senate Chair, of the suspension or rescission.

Questions about this policy should be referred to the CSN Administrative Code Officer general.counsel@csn.edu, 702.651.7488 and/or the Recommending Authority.

IV. SIGNATURES/s/ Jodie D. Mandel

Signature

05/20/15

Date

Faculty Senate Chair

Recommending Authority Title

Reviewed for Legal Sufficiency:/s/ Richard Hinckley

General Counsel

05/15/15

Date

Approved by:/s/ Michael D. Richards

CSN President

05/15/15

Date

V. ATTACHMENTS


A. History

ATTACHMENT A**HISTORY****Version #2:**

1. Merit awards for all faculty shall be awarded in full, even if an award results in a faculty member's salary being over the corresponding salary range/grade cap. (Sec. II E)
 2. Link for NSHE Procedures & Guidelines Manual updated.
 3. Link added for NSHE BofR Handbook, Title 4, Ch. 3, Sec. 25 (which allows for separate Academic and Administrative/Professional Merit Policies).
- 05/15/2015: Approved by CSN President (M. Richards).
 - 05/15/2015: Reviewed by General Council (R. Hinckley)
 - 03/06/2015: Presented to Faculty Senate (J. Mandel)
 - 02/23/2015 Submitted to Faculty Senate Executive Committee (J. Matovina)

Version 1:

- Not Approved by CSN President (M. Richards) due to a lack of process for Administrative/Professional Faculty. *NOTE: That issue was resolved by the introduction of a new policy specifically for Administrative/Professional Faculty.*
- 05/02/2014: New Policy Submitted by Academic Faculty Merit Increase Committee and presented to Faculty Senate (T. Chodock)

 CSN Policy	Administrative/Professional Faculty Merit Pay Policy
Policy Category: Faculty	Effective Date: May 15, 2015
Version #1: New Policy	

I. POLICY PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to provide the criteria and formula for merit pay eligibility, distribution, and appeals for Administrative/Professional Faculty. NOTE: NSHE BoR Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 25 (4) allows for separate merit policies for Academic and Administrative/Professional Faculty.

II. POLICY STATEMENT

- A. Merit pay eligibility shall be based on the faculty member's evaluation rating as per the Administrative/Professional Faculty Evaluation Policy.
- B. Only Administrative/Professional Faculty members receiving Commendable or Excellent Overall Ratings shall be eligible for merit pay.
- C. Merit pay shall be distributed as an approved salary percentage rate from the allocated Administrative/Professional Merit Pay Pool (APMPP) for the applicable fiscal year.
- D. The Administrative/Professional Merit Pay Rate (APMPR) shall be determined by the funding of the APMPP and the total number of faculty who receive either commendable or excellent evaluations in the applicable academic year.
- E. Merit pay distribution:
 1. During years when merit pay will be awarded, Administrative/Professional Faculty who receive a Commendable evaluation rating shall each be awarded merit at a calculated rate. Merit will be added to employees' base salaries beginning with July 1 of the applicable contract year.
 2. During years when merit pay will be awarded, Administrative/Professional Faculty members who receive an Excellent evaluation rating shall each be awarded merit at one and one half times the rate awarded to the Administrative/Professional Faculty receiving a Commendable evaluation rating. Merit will be added to employees' base salaries beginning with July 1 of the applicable contract year.
- F. Merit awards for Administrative/Professional Faculty shall be awarded in full, even if an award results in the person's salary being over the corresponding salary range/grade cap.
- G. Merit pay appeals:
 1. The Board of Regents Handbook provides: "If a merit pay determination is directly tied to the outcome of a faculty member's evaluation review, then the bylaws shall provide that the same process is followed for both the evaluation review and the merit pay determination." Title 2, Chapter 5, Section 5.16, p.30
 2. The Supervisory and Peer Review process in the corresponding Evaluation Policy shall serve as the exclusive Merit Pay appeals process.

III. PROCEDURE

- A. In fiscal years when a merit pool appropriation is provided for Administrative/Professional Faculty; the APMPR will be determined based on a percentage award rate at a ratio of 1.5 for excellent and a ratio of 1 for commendable.
- B. Exact percentage rates for Excellent and Commendable ratings are expected to fluctuate based on yearly rating distributions between non-merit eligible employees, merit eligible employees (Excellent and Commendable) and the Administrative/Professional Merit Pay Pool (APMPP). The annual merit award percentage rate will fluctuate to ensure that the maximum possible funds from the APMPP are utilized.
- C. Formulas for determining percentage based merit awards at the aforementioned 1.5-to-1 ratio are as follows:
 1. Merit calculations for employees who earn commendable evaluations are:

$$APIMA(C)_{1toN} = C\%(IS(C)_{1toN})$$

Where:

APIMA = Administrative/Professional Individual Merit Award

C% = commendable rating percentage award

IS = Individual's Salary

2. Merit calculations for employees who earn excellent evaluations are:

$$APIMA(E)_{1toN} = E\%(IS(E)_{1toN})$$

Where:

APIMA = Administrative/Professional Individual Merit Award

E% = excellent rating percentage award = 1.5(C%)

IS = Individual's Salary

3. Yearly merit award percentage rate fluctuations will also ensure that the maximum possible funds from the APMPP are utilized such that the sum of all excellent and commendable merit awards will be less than or equal to APMPP.

$$\sum APIMA(E)_{1toN} + \sum APIMA(C)_{1toN} \leq APMPP$$

IV. AUTHORITY AND CROSS REFERENCE LINKS

NSHE Procedures & Guidelines Manual, Rev. 49 (03/14) Chapter 3, pp. 11-12

<http://system.nevada.edu/tasks/sites/Nshe/assets/File/BoardOfRegents/Procedures/PGMCH03SALARYSCHEDULES.pdf>

The Board of Regents Handbook, Rev. 258 (09/13) Title 2, Chapter 5, Section 5.16, p. 30

<http://system.nevada.edu/tasks/sites/Nshe/assets/File/BoardOfRegents/Handbook/COMPLETEHANDBOOKREV260.pdf>

NSHE Board of Regents Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 25, p. 25

<http://system.nevada.edu/tasks/sites/Nshe/assets/File/BoardOfRegents/Handbook/T4CH03ProfessionalStaff%283%29.pdf>

V. DISCLAIMER

The President has the discretion to suspend or rescind all or any part of this policy or related procedure(s). The President shall notify appropriate CSN personnel, including the Administrative Code Officer and Faculty Senate Chair, of the suspension or rescission.

Questions about this policy should be referred to the CSN Administrative Code Officer (general.counsel@csn.edu, 702.651.7488) and/or the Recommending Authority.

VI. SIGNATURES

/s/ Jeffrey Fulmer

Signature

05/15/15

Date

AFA Chair

Recommending Authority Title

Reviewed for Legal Sufficiency:

/s/ Richard Hinckley

General Counsel

05/15/15

Date

Approved by:

/s/ Michael D. Richards

CSN President

05/15/15

Date

VII. ATTACHMENTS

A. History

ATTACHMENT A

HISTORY

Version #1:

- 05/15/2015: Approved by CSN President (M. Richards).
- 05/15/15: Reviewed by General Council (R. Hinckley)
- 02/27/2015: Approved by the Administrative Faculty Assembly (J. Fulmer, Chair)

**TRUCKEE MEADOWS
COMMUNITY
COLLEGE (TMCC)
MERIT INFORMATION**

Truckee Meadows Community College Bylaws

2.1 In addition to the annual evaluations of deans, vice president and other administrators who supervise academic faculty, a performance survey will be conducted by the Faculty Senate at least every two years, which shall be compiled by the employee's supervisor. The compiled results of the survey will become part of the annual evaluation of the administrator and will include input from all faculty and classified staff supervised by the administrator. A confidential institution committee consisting of the Faculty Senate Chair or his/her designee, the Faculty Senate Chair-Elect or his/her designee, the Classified Council President or his/her designee, a representative from Human Resources, the respective supervisor and the employee being evaluated will meet to review the survey results. The confidential institution committee is consistent with the NSHE Code, Title 2, Section 5.6.2a.

- 3. Academic Faculty.** The NSHE Code mandates that faculty be evaluated at least once annually. The faculty evaluation process is outlined in the TMCC-NFA Contract.

Section J. Merit Awards

1. Eligibility for merit awards

- 1.1 Academic and Administrative Faculty shall be eligible to be considered for merit awards during fiscal years when a merit pool appropriation is provided (NSHE Code, Chapter 3).
- 1.2 Academic and Administrative Faculty with full time regular contracts, both tenured and tenure track, shall be eligible to be considered for merit awards. Faculty holding a Rank 0 contract shall be eligible to be considered for merit awards. Faculty who are grant funded, and whose grants include funding for merit pay for that faculty member, shall be eligible to be considered for merit pay. All other temporary one-year and half-year contracted faculty shall not be eligible for merit awards.
- 1.3 Academic and Administrative faculty who begin employment after December 31 of the applicable year shall not be eligible to be considered for merit awards for that year. The applicable year is defined as the year that starts on July 1st and ends on June 30 of the year immediately prior to the fiscal year in which the merit award is disbursed.
- 1.4 Awards of merit for administrative faculty shall be based on the overall rating received by the faculty member on the Administrative Faculty Performance Review – Form "A" for the applicable year.
- 1.5 Awards of merit for academic faculty shall be based on the overall rating received by the faculty member in the annual evaluation process as defined by Article 12 of the TMCC-NFA contract for the applicable year.
- 1.6 Academic and administrative faculty must receive a "commendable" or "excellent" overall rating on their annual evaluation for the applicable year to be eligible for consideration for merit awards.
- 1.7 Faculty who do not participate in the evaluation process for the applicable year shall not be eligible to be considered for merit award for that year.
- 1.8 Faculty on leave without pay for more than one half of their contract period of the applicable year shall not be eligible to be considered for merit award for that year.
- 1.9 Academic Faculty on sabbatical for the applicable year shall be eligible to be considered for merit awards for that year.
- 1.10 Merit awards shall be added to the base salary for all faculty.

2. Distribution of merit awards

Truckee Meadows Community College Bylaws

- 2.1 The amount of merit pay award for each faculty member shall be determined by that faculty member's overall annual evaluation rating for the applicable year.
- 2.2 Evaluations shall be completed by May 1st of the year in which the associated merit award is being distributed.
- 2.3 Merit awards shall be distributed only to eligible faculty members who receive a "commendable" or "excellent" overall rating on their annual evaluation.
- 2.4 Merit pay awards shall be distributed to eligible faculty by a "3-4-5-6" distribution plan. Under this plan there will be four levels of merit pay awarded with each tied to an evaluation rating score. The lowest level award will be equivalent to three-sixths (3/6) of the highest level award. The second level award will be equivalent to four-sixths (4/6) of the highest level award, and the third level will be equivalent to five-sixths (5/6) of the highest level award.
- 2.5 Faculty who receive an overall "commendable" evaluation rating shall receive either a three-sixths (3/6) award for a "commendable 1" rating, or a four-sixths (4/6) award for a "commendable 2" rating. Faculty who receive an overall "excellent" evaluation rating shall receive either a five-sixths (5/6) award for "excellent 1" or six-sixths (6/6 - highest level) award for "excellent 2".
- 2.6 The highest level merit pay award amount will be determined by dividing the pool of merit money appropriated to TMCC for eligible academic and administrative faculty by the sum of all of the awards given in each rating level multiplied by the corresponding fraction for that award rating.

Example:

There are 300 total eligible faculty and a merit appropriation of \$400,000.

Faculty evaluation ratings earned:

excellent 2 (6/6):	69 faculty
excellent 1 (5/6):	90 faculty
commendable 2 (4/6):	72 faculty
commendable 1 (3/6):	54 faculty
satisfactory:	12 faculty
unsatisfactory:	3 faculty
	300 total faculty

The highest award m would be calculated:

$$\$400,000 = (69 \times 6/6m) + (90 \times 5/6m) + (72 \times 4/6m) + (54 \times 3/6m)$$

$$\$400,000 = (69 + 75 + 48 + 27)m$$

$$m = \$1,826.48$$

Thus the merit awards for each rating would be:

excellent 2 (6/6 of \$1,826.48):	\$1,826.48
excellent 1 (5/6 of \$1,826.48):	\$1,522.07
commendable 2 (4/6 of \$1,826.48):	\$1,217.66
commendable 1 (3/6 of \$1,826.48):	\$913.24
satisfactory:	\$0
unsatisfactory:	\$0

3. Appeal of evaluation for merit award

- 3.1 Evaluation ratings that affect merit awards may be appealed by the faculty member under this section or under the NFA contract, Article 13, whichever is applicable. Evaluation appeals for an overall "unsatisfactory" rating may follow the procedures in Section K. Unsatisfactory Evaluation Review.

**WESTERN NEVADA
COLLEGE
(WNC)
MERIT INFORMATION**



Western Nevada College Policies

Policy 4-5-2-3: Administrative Faculty Merit Policy

Procedure: Administrative Faculty Merit Policy
Policy No.: 4-5-2-3
Department: Human Resources
Contact: Vice President of Human Resources and General Counsel

Policy: This policy applies to all administrative faculty, except the President, as defined by the Board of Regents Handbook, Chapter 3, Section 2, D, Title 4.

Policy Files/Forms

Section 1: Policy

A. Administrative faculty merit is determined through the following process:

1. The employee's immediate supervisor will provide recommendations for merit adjustments based on the results of the employee's Annual Evaluation. These recommendations will be reviewed, approved or revised by other supervisors up the reporting line to the President.
2. To be considered for merit, a professional staff member must have been employed by WNC for six months prior to the end of the evaluation period (e.g., July 1 hire date) must have not been given notice of termination of employment and must not be on an emergency appointment contract. Exceptions require the approval of the President.
3. Normally, merit awards will not be made to professional staff members who have received a salary increase due to a promotion (including promotions from "classified" to "professional" status) that occurred during the calendar year covered by the annual evaluation. Exceptions require the approval of the President.
4. The pool for merit awards will be set when and if funded by the legislature and is awarded as of July 1 of any given year.
5. Merit Shares: The President will review the supervisors' summary recommendations with supervisors and will determine a final performance rating (Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Commendable, Excellent) for professional staff. Staff members whose performance is rated Commendable or Excellent will be considered for merit awards.
 - a. Calculation of Merit Increase:
 The following assumes an annual merit pool of k% of total salaries. See calculation example spreadsheet below.
 1. Ratings and Initial Merit
 - a. Ratings of Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory earn no merit increase
 - b. The percent increase for Commendable is 80% of that for Excellent
 2. Formulas for percent increase:
 - a. Percent increase for Excellent:

$$k\% \text{ of total salaries} / [(\text{sum of excellent salaries}) + .8 * (\text{sum of commendable salaries})]$$
 - b. Percent increase for Commendable:

$$.8 * (\text{Percent Excellent calculation listed in item a})$$
 3. Important consequences of this model:
 - a. 100% of the merit pool is distributed (unless all ratings are satisfactory or lower)
 - b. The percentage increase for a rating of excellent is always higher than that of commendable
 - c. Percentage increase is the same for all employees who earn a particular rating regardless of salary or grade
 - d. If all ratings are excellent, each merit increase is exactly k% e. If all ratings are commendable, each merit increase is exactly k%
 - b. Cost of Living Allowance (COLA):
 COLA, if funded by the legislature, will be awarded to professional staff on July 1 of any given year.

Section 2: Files/Forms

A. Calculation Example [PDF / 2.09 MB]

Date Adopted May 17, 2005

Dates Revised

March 13, 2014; September 2, 2008; October 5, 2006

Please direct comments about this page to the Assistant to the President
 URL: <http://www.wnc.edu/policymanual/4-5-2-3.php>
 Date Printed: April 27, 2018



Western Nevada College Policies

Policy 4-5-3-6: Academic Faculty Merit Policy

Procedure: Academic Faculty Merit Policy
Policy No.: 4-5-3-6
Department: Academic & Student Affairs
Contact: Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs

Section 1: Equal Distribution first year(s), then combination

A. First Year of Merit (2014-2015 Academic Year) and until an Evaluation System is in place:

1. All faculty members will get an equal dollar amount. This amount will be calculated by dividing the total amount in the merit pool by the number of recipients.

B. For the purposes of Merit, the ratings of Commendable and Excellent will be derived from the following scenarios on the Annual Plan/Self Evaluation and Classroom Observations:

1. Commendable: Commendable/Commendable, Commendable/Satisfactory, or Excellent/Satisfactory
2. Excellent: Excellent/Excellent or Excellent/Commendable

C. Subsequent Years in Which Merit Is Available and an Evaluation System is in place:

1. One third of the merit pool will be awarded in equal dollar amounts to all recipients earning commendable and above.
2. Two thirds of the merit pool will be awarded based on faculty evaluations. Points will be awarded as follows:

- a. Excellent: 2
- b. Commendable: 1
- c. Satisfactory: 0
- d. NOTE: The maximum points that can be earned by a faculty member is 2.

3. The points from all recipients will be totaled and 2/3 of the total merit pool will be divided by the total points to make a "share". Each recipient will receive the merit increase of the points earned times the shares plus the equal distribution of the 1/3 merit pool.

D. The criteria for faculty evaluations for the purposes of merit will be developed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

E. Example of Merit Pool Distribution:

1. In a pool of \$90,000, the pool would be divided into two parts 1/3 equal distribution for those with Commendable and Excellent and 2/3 for the "shares" portion.
2. 1/3 of \$90,000 = \$30,000 which will be equally distributed to those earning Commendable and above. For 51 faculty earning Commendable or Excellent, that would be \$588.24 per person.
3. 2/3 of \$90,000 = \$60,000.
4. If a faculty member earned Commendable, the faculty member would get 1 = 1 share.
If a faculty member earns Excellent, the faculty member would get 2 shares.
5. If 2/3 of the faculty get Excellent and 1/3 get Commendable, then, out of 51 faculty:
 - a. $34 \times 2 + 17 \times 1 = 85$ shares.
 - b. $\$60,000 / 85 = \705.88 per share.
 - c. Faculty earning Commendable will receive a Merit of: $\$588.24 + \$705.88 = \$1294.12$
 - d. Faculty earning Excellent will receive a Merit of: $\$588.24 + 2 \times \$705.88 = \$2000$

Date Adopted

October 17, 2014

Dates Revised

Please direct comments about this page to the Assistant to the President
 URL: <http://www.wnc.edu/policymanual/4-5-3-6.php>
 Date Printed: April 27, 2018

**NSHE
SYSTEM
ADMINISTRATION
MERIT INFORMATION**

NSHE SYSTEM ADMINISTRATION MERIT AWARDS

- 1) The staff member's immediate supervisor will develop recommendations for merit adjustments based on the results of the annual evaluation. These recommendations will be reviewed and approved or revised by other supervisors up the reporting line to the Chancellor.
- 2) To be considered for merit, a professional staff member must have been employed by System Administration, SCS or EPSCoR for six months prior to the end of the evaluation period (e.g., July 1 hire date) and have not been given notice of termination of employment.
- 3) Normally, merit awards will not be made to professional staff members who have received a salary increase due to a promotion (including promotions from "classified" to "professional" status) that occurred during the calendar year covered by the annual evaluation. Exceptions require the approval of the Chancellor.
- 4) The pool for merit awards will be set when and if funded by the legislature. Historically the pool, if funded, is at 2.5% of total base salaries and is awarded as of July 1 of any given year.
- 5) Merit Shares: The Chancellor will review the supervisors' summary recommendations with supervisors and will determine a final performance rating (Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Commendable, and Excellent) for professional staff. Staff members whose performance is rated Commendable or Excellent will be considered for merit awards, with Commendable counting for one (1) share of merit, and Excellent counting for one and one-half (1.5) shares. Merit is awarded on July 1st.

GREAT BASIN COLLEGE (GBC) MERIT INFORMATION

Memo

To: Faculty Senate, Stephen Theriault, President

From: Compensation and Benefits Committee, George KleeB, Chair

cc: Mike McFarlane, VP for Academic Affairs & Sonja Sibert, VP Business Affairs

Date: December 5, 2014

Re: Changes to Merit Pay Policy and Professional Development Policy.

The Compensation and Benefits Committee has met this fall and voted to approve the following change to the Merit Pay Policy and Procedures.

Merit Pay for those hired within the Fiscal Year (July/June)

Merit Pay increases can be given to those that have been hired before March 1, each fiscal year, based upon the following pro-rata share of the award that would be given for annual service, for time served on the job.

Hire date July to September 100%

Hire date October to December 75%

Hire date of January or February 50%

The Compensation and Benefits Committee has met this fall and made some minor edits to the Professional Development Funds Request documents. Our purpose was to add clarity and ease for the committee's use and the person completing the form.

We also voted and approved the following change for reporting after funding a Professional Development Funding Request that a person receiving professional development funds should make after attending the event.

Professional Development Funds Request Policies and Procedures

The Professional Development Procedures shall be revised:

A person receiving Professional Development Funds is required to provide the Chair of the Compensation and Benefits Committee a one page memo reporting on the meeting/event attended. The recipient may have additional reporting requirements to their supervisor or department.

A sample report is shown below:

Memo to: Chair, Compensation and Benefits
From: Pete Bagley
Subject: Report on the 12th Biennial Scientific Conference on the GYE
Cc: Supervisor, Dean or others in your department.
Date: November 3, 2014

My attendance at the 12th Biennial Scientific Conference on the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem was well worth the institution's support. As usual, it was a great opportunity for professional development, interactions with other institutions, and a wonderful opportunity for the three students who attended.

The mix of presentations was spot on for the BAIS-NR. Presentations ranged from basic research in wildlife ecology to the dilemmas of management from the three major government agencies and NGO's. A common theme from many presentations was "Science is the critical first step in the process, but only the first step in a long process involving multiple stakeholders." I came away from this conference knowing that our model for the BAIS-NR is absolutely appropriate for potential workers in the field of resource management. The inclusion of social science and integrative thinking is essential to our curriculum.

While I had many opportunities to interact with other professionals and represent GBC, it was our students who had the greatest opportunities. It was obvious that being exposed to the broader professional world was both eye opening and inspiring for them. They saw that not only are career paths open to them, but that resource management is an interesting profession. As one student commented, "I can't believe that conversations here begin with how to manage the consequences of global warming, instead of an argument about whether or not it is real!" Exposure to Yellowstone has positively influenced the careers of more than one young scholar. Further, they had the chance to meet and interact with other undergraduate students from other institutions. All three were very enthusiastic about the experience.

In conclusion, I'd like to thank GBC, and the Compensation and Benefits committee for their support. It was a worthwhile cause.

GBC Merit Pay Award Plan

The Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) Board of Regents approves guidelines for the development of college faculty salary plans. Plans are developed by the individual college and merit pay awards are applied as they may be funded through the state and system budget allocation processes, and according to the college and NSHE guidelines. Once the college plan is developed and approved by the Faculty Senate, the president approves the final plan regarding merit pay awards for each eligible faculty member. The action of the president is submitted to the Nevada System of Higher Education for review and final approval. Upon NSHE approval, the college generates "Faculty Employment Contracts" according to the provisions of the faculty salary plan.

Policy:

The amount of merit pay award for each faculty member is determined by that faculty member's final performance evaluation rating. To receive a merit salary award, a faculty member must receive a final evaluation result of "Excellent" or "Commendable" and meet all qualifying steps for consideration.

Merit salary increases are distributed to academic and administrative faculty by a "share" distribution plan. Under this proposal, faculty who receive a "Commendable" or "Excellent" final overall composite score (OCR) will be awarded a merit salary increase equivalent to the Merit Unit Award (MUA) as designated under the Moderate Distribution Plan developed by Dr. Areola within his book "Using OCR in Promotion, Merit Pay, and Post Tenure Review Decisions". Additional qualifying factors are listed under the **Initial Merit Consideration Qualifiers** heading in this document.

A faculty member with an "Excellent" or "Commendable" final evaluation may not be able to receive all of the prescribed merit award increase added to their salary if the increase would cause the person's salary to exceed the maximum allowed for the person's range. In this case, the portion of merit pay increase that exceeds the maximum salary limitation will be awarded as a one-time, non-cumulative merit bonus.

Merit pay is mutually exclusive from COLA (Cost of Living Allowance). COLA will be awarded in years when the Legislature funds such increases.

Faculty who do not have a performance evaluation for the preceding year because they are returning from a one-year leave of absence (sabbatical, etc.) will return in July at the same salary they had when they took leave (plus COLA, if any was given). Their last evaluation will be used to determine their Merit Award for the new academic calendar year.

Frequency:

The merit plan shall require faculty evaluation once annually.

Appeal:

Faculty may appeal the results of their evaluation through the Faculty Appeals Procedure as outlined in the current Great Basin College By-Laws.

Review:

The college system of evaluation and merit award shall be reviewed periodically. The review process shall provide for the involvement of all college personnel holding faculty rank. Recommendations for change shall be approved by a majority of the college personnel holding faculty rank by vote by container representatives in the Senate, before submission to the president of the college for final approval and implementation. If the recommended changes are not approved, the president should submit recommended modifications to the proposed plan back to the college personnel holding faculty rank, via the Faculty Senate, for further consideration and resubmission. In the meantime, the existing plan would remain in effect.

Due to the fact that we do not have solid historical Administrative Faculty Evaluations data on a scale comparable to the Academic Faculty using the OCR ratings, the first allocation of merit after the inaugural transition awarding of July 2014, will be based on the raw OCR scores for both faculty classifications. After the Merit Awards have been issued on or about July 2015, the college will conduct a statistical analysis of the Academic and the Administrative Faculty data to determine if a Standard Normal Distribution should be instituted going forward for the July 2016 awards of merit. The Compensation and Benefits Committee will be charged with reporting the results of the analysis to Faculty Senate for consideration.

Academic Freedom:

Evaluation shall not be used to restrain faculty members in their exercise of constitutional rights or academic freedom as set forth in TITLE 2 - Nevada System of Higher Education Code, Chapter 2, Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

Evaluation Procedural Guidelines for Merit Award Considerations:

The standard approved GBC annual evaluation forms and the rating numbers they produce shall be used by supervising Dean, VP, or President as the primary basis for arriving at an overall evaluation rating of each full-time faculty member in each evaluation year. This rating shall be the primary basis for the award of any merit pay. Only in the event of egregious acts or acts requiring disciplinary action may the evaluation rating be reduced more than one level, or the individual eliminated from consideration for merit by the supervising Dean, VP, or President as appropriate. Supporting documentation for these cases must be available to the affected faculty member, and if not agreed to by the faculty member, established procedures of grievance and appeal may be followed. Only faculty supervisors (Dean, VP, or President) shall be involved in any adjustment of annual evaluation ratings for merit consideration.

1. Faculty salary increases will be awarded on a college-wide basis rather than on a divisional basis. In other words, all Faculty at the college who receive a given overall

- composite rating will receive the same Merit Award based on the share value in that given year and the distribution method in place at that time.
2. Faculty who have reduced load contract responsibilities will have their teaching and administrative responsibilities evaluated on a proportional basis.
 3. These procedures become college policy beginning with the Fall 2014 semester evaluation period.

Initial Merit Consideration Qualifiers:

1. Faculty must have completed and submitted their evaluation within the time frame specified by senior administration.
2. Must achieve a minimum of "Satisfactory" in all categories or roles of the Faculty Self-Evaluation form totals that specifically apply. If no Management or Supervisory duties are part of the faculty's normal responsibilities, then that category will not be included in the evaluation.
3. Must currently be employed as a Faculty Member. Adjunct Faculty, Classified Staff, and those with a rank of Dean or higher are excluded from merit award per NSHE guidelines.
4. The Legislature, and subsequently the Board of Regents, must fund the college specifically for Merit Pool allocations.
5. Understanding that a "share" of the pool will vary in monetary amounts depending on the size of the pool allocated. A "share" does not equal to a percentage of the faculty member's current or base salary.
6. Merit allocation gets added to current base salary to establish a new salary for the next year. It is not awarded as a one-time bonus with the exception of those faculties who are at the top of their salary range.
7. Merit shall be awarded based on the score a member received with the criteria indicated on the Faculty Self-Evaluation forms, with additional consideration given by the final evaluator (Dean, VP, or President).
8. Mandatory completion and inclusion of the two course assessments under the Instructional Design section of the Evaluation for Academic Faculty.
9. At final level of evaluation, the Dean, VP, or President could either downgrade or upgrade the faculty member's Self-Evaluation form but it will be just one category (i.e. Excellent to Commendable, or Satisfactory to Commendable). When multiple monetary award levels are part of a category, then the Faculty Member will be awarded Merit Pay at the highest level within the downgraded category (i.e. Commendable 4.59) or lowest level within an upgraded category (i.e. Excellent 4.60).
10. Great Basin College, to assure Faculty of transparency in Merit Awarding, will provide a report at the conclusion of each merit award cycle that includes a breakdown of the OCR scores and their accompanying monetary awards confirming full allocation of available funds.

Merit Award Plan Distribution:

In the spirit of continued collegiality, Great Basin College Faculty has chosen the following “Moderate Distribution” plan for implementation at the start of the 2015 – 2016 academic calendar year when merit pay is funded by the Legislature and NSHE. A transitional plan, to be identified later in this document, has been developed to allocate the current funds available on July 1, 2014.

Plan Specifics:

1. All faculty regardless of funding sources are eligible for merit award.
2. Faculty who are not state funded (i.e. contract, grant, self-funded, etc.), are to build merit consideration into their funding source.
3. State funded faculty will be awarded Merit based on a share of available budgeted funds per the guidelines of the plan.
4. Qualifiers are identified within the section titled “**Initial Merit Consideration Qualifiers**”.
5. Faculty must have an overall composite rating (OCR) of at least 3.80 to be considered for merit award and have achieved at least a “Satisfactory” rating on each role or category within their evaluation.
6. Mandatory completion and inclusion of the two course assessments under the Instructional Design section of the Evaluation for Academic Faculty.
7. The merit pool will be distributed using the following mathematical principles and formula.
 - a. Given facts:
 - i. Total number of faculty who qualified for merit award, who are included in the state fund allocation.
 - ii. Total sum of money available in the Merit pool.
 - b. Calculations:
 - i. All qualifying faculty OCR scores are to be summed.
 - ii. The total is divided into the fund allocated for merit award.
 - iii. This arrives at a Merit Unit Award (MUA).
 - iv. The MUA is multiplied by the OCR score for each faculty member achieving meritorious service levels to establish the individual monetary award that is added to the faculty member’s coming year salary.
 - v. The total of all awards combined is to be equal to the entire fund allocated to the college for merit.

The Transition Plan:

Great Basin College faculty has overwhelmingly stated their preference that equity and fairness continue to be the norm for all faculty. To that end, all faculty members who are deemed qualified for merit award on July 1, be awarded an equal share of the fund pool regardless of the particular OCR rating each achieve as long as they are at the minimum Commendable level. This award will be added to their base salary for the coming 2014 – 2015 academic year.

**NEVADA SYSTEM OF
HIGHER EDUCATION
(NSHE)
ADDITIONAL
FACULTY STIPEND
INFORMATION**

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO (UNR)

Stipends are used to pay academic faculty for additional duties that are additional duties to the faculty member's normal responsibilities of teaching, research and service. Examples of this are Department Chairs, and Directors of Graduate Programs. The attached policy, *Types of Contract Arrangements for Faculty*, addresses the purpose of stipends. In general, stipends are awarded only to 9-month academic faculty.

2,550: TYPES OF CONTRACT ARRANGEMENTS FOR FACULTY

3. Stipends for Academic Faculty

Both "A" and "B" contract academic faculty may be designated as part-time administrators and be issued administrative stipends for additional administrative duties. There are two stipend matrices: one applies to the School of Medicine Clinical Faculty and the other applies to all other academic faculty. These stipend matrices are built on the assumption that there is a desire for strong academic leadership at the University and a need for consistency and equity in administrative stipends for academic faculty. Such stipends are assigned a cell or level based on the complexity of the unit or program and the level of management responsibility and authority of the administrator.

Description of the cell model:

Each model is two-dimensional with three levels within each dimension. The horizontal dimension represents the complexity of a unit or program with "X" being the least complex and "Z" being the most complex. The vertical dimension is the level of the management responsibility and authority of the position of the unit or program administrator with "I" representing the position of an administrator with the least responsibility and "III" representing maximum responsibility and authority.

Calculation for the Model:

The range in Cell II-X is 25% lower than Cell II-Y, and the range of Cell II-Z is 25% higher than Cell II-Y.

Cells I-X through I-Z are 35% lower than Cells II-X through II-Z and Cells III-X through III-Z are 35% higher than Cells II-X through II-Z.

Last update July 2006:

UNR ACADEMIC FACULTY CONT'

Management Responsibility & Authority	Complexity		
	X	Y	Z
III	\$8,100-13,500	\$10,800-18,000	\$13,500-22,600
II	\$6,000-10,000	\$8,000-(10,694)-13,400	\$10,000-16,700
I	\$1,000-6,500	\$5,200-8,700	\$6,500-10,900

Last update July 2005:

UNR SCHOOL OF MEDICINE CLINICAL FACULTY

Management Responsibility & Authority	Complexity		
	X	Y	Z
III	\$16,000-26,600	\$21,000-35,600	\$26,600-45,000
II	\$12,000-20,000	\$16,000-(21,000)-26,000	\$20,000-33,000
I	\$7,700-13,000	\$10,000-17,000	\$13,000-21,400

Administrative Stipends for Resident Physicians:

Residents identified in their final year of training may be designated as part-time administrators and be issued administrative stipends. Such stipends are assigned based upon each individual program's guidelines, which is referenced in the School of Medicine's Graduate Medical Education handbook