



INSTITUTIONAL POLICY: PE-12

Category: Personnel
Subject: Faculty Merit Pay Distribution Plan
Effective Date: September 24, 2005
Last Revision Date: N/A

PE 12-1. Authority

- 1.1 WV Code §18B-1-6
- 1.2 WV CSR §133-4

PE 12-2. Introduction

The West Virginia School of Osteopathic Medicine formally adopts the Faculty Merit Pay Distribution Plan which has been existence for many years as part of the Faculty Handbook.

PE 12-3. Basis of the Plan

3.1 School missions

The merit pay distribution plan for the West Virginia School of Osteopathic Medicine is based on the three missions of the school, with teaching the primary goal, and service and professional development as secondary goals. Definitions of these missions for the purpose of the merit pay distribution plan are presented below. When a description of a responsibility is accepted as a component of one of the missions, it will not be considered in any of the other missions, e.g. the development of special teaching materials will either be considered under teaching or professional development, not both.

3.2 Merit pay evaluation

Merit pay evaluation will be included as part of the yearly evaluation process of each faculty member as described in Section Five of the Faculty Handbook. A faculty member can choose to not participate in the merit pay evaluation as part of his/her yearly evaluation process by notifying his/her supervisor in writing at the time of the yearly evaluation. If such a choice is made, the faculty member will not be eligible for merit pay distribution during the next fiscal year.

PE 12-4. Procedure

4.1 Proportions for distribution of available funds:

- 4.1.1 Prior to implementation of the merit pay plan the proportional distribution of available money will be established by the faculty and administration.

4.1.2 The proportional distribution for the current fiscal year for any merit pay is:

Teaching	50%
Service	15%
Professional Development	35%

4.1.3 This proportional distribution will remain in effect for the entire fiscal year. A change in the distribution can be negotiated by the Faculty Council and Administration between August 1 and September 15 of each year. If the distribution is not changed during this negotiation period it remains in effect until the following negotiation period.

4.2 Evaluation Procedure

4.2.1 The total pool of funds available for merit raises will be divided into Division sub-pools based on the number of FTE positions in the Divisions prior to distribution to individual faculty.

4.2.2 Evaluation by Area. Each faculty member will be evaluated in the three areas related to the missions of the school, i.e. teaching, academic service, and professional development. Evaluation will include activities for which the faculty member receives an administrative or research supplemental contract. Appropriate goals and objectives shall be developed for these activities, and they will be assessed as part of the faculty members' overall assignment. Supplemental contract activities may also be independently assessed by other administrative personnel or committees using different methods or criteria.

4.2.3 Point Scale. The evaluator will "grade" each member on the basis of the following scale. The number assigned to an individual faculty member is based on quality and quantity of effort in each of the assigned areas.

Scores 0-1.9: No demonstrable productivity or, quality was poor. Did not develop or address stated goals and objectives.

Scores 2-3.9: Productivity (quality and/or quantity) was reduced, or, below the average of all faculty. Fell short of accomplishing stated goals and objectives.

Scores 4-5.9: Productivity (quality and/or quantity) was average to above average. Met stated goals and objectives.

Scores 6-7.9: Productivity (quality and/or quantity) was excellent to superior. Exceeded stated goals and objectives.

Scores 8-10: Productivity (quality and/or quantity) was exceptional – well beyond expectations. (Note: Scores of 8-10 will rarely be awarded. They are reserved for accomplishments greatly exceeding normal expectations or, receipt of national awards or recognition).

4.3 Quality

4.3.1 As judged by the respective Division Chairperson, partly through documentation supplied by faculty.

- 4.3.2 Information pertaining to performance quality in teaching, professional development (including quality of patient care), and service may also be solicited by the respective Division Chairpersons from System Chairpersons, Discipline and Course Coordinators, faculty peers, Committee Chairpersons, appropriate administrative personnel (e.g., Director of Professional Development, Assistant/Associate Deans for Preclinical, Problem Based Learning, Predoctoral, Osteopathic and Graduate Medical Education, and Assessment and Educational Development), and the RCBC CEO and/or Medical Director.
- 4.3.3 The evaluation of teaching (lecture, laboratory, PBL facilitation, OPP integration, and, clerkship, internship and residency supervision) may include the use of student evaluation instruments. Division chairs are encouraged to avoid sole reliance upon student evaluations for teaching assessment, and should consider multiple indices of successful teaching, from multiple sources.
- 4.4 Teaching
- 4.4.1 Types of activities assessed: Lecture, laboratory instruction and/or PBL facilitation and examination; clerkship, internship and residency supervision; revising, updating, of course content and computer presentations/handouts; curriculum revision/development activities; utilization/incorporation of alternative teaching methods; evaluation (testing) of students using appropriate PBL/SBL instruments; student/peer awards; tutoring, mentoring, and remediation. OPP integration activities will be assessed annually.
- 4.4.2 Especially for new and as yet untenured faculty, the assessment of classroom teaching quality should be assessed by direct observation. Minimally, the Chairperson and assigned peer evaluators/mentors should supply written assessments, which include suggestions for improvement. Assessors should focus on the faculty member's knowledge of their academic specialty (intellectual competence), classroom integrity and enthusiasm, independence, organization, the ability to transfer knowledge, respect for student differences and diversity, and the ability to stimulate, cultivate, and facilitate the intellectual interest of students. Continued improvement, or lack of, should also be documented. Assessment might also include analyses of course content, evaluation of products produced by the instructor such as handouts, textbooks or videos, the development or use of instructional technology and computer-assisted instruction, studies of the success rates of students taught, both in courses and on licensing exams, or other evidence deemed appropriate.
- 4.4.3 Examples: total number of hours in the SBL, PBL classrooms; hours as OSCE evaluators, simulated patients; development, grading, of examinations; hours spent tutoring/advising students; hours with shadowing MSI or MSII students, rotating MSIII, MSIV students, and with interns or residents (preceptors, clerkship directors, mentors).
- 4.5 Professional Development
- 4.5.1 Types of activities assessed: Scientific, clinical, educational, health policy, etc., research, usually as demonstrated by peer-reviewed papers and abstracts submitted, published, or presented, or grants submitted and/or awarded; participation in

scientific, medical or educational conventions, meetings, workshops, CME programs, etc.; grant and publication reviews; involvement in course, system, program, or divisional administration/management; board certification/re-certification/maintenance of certification; meeting current standards of patient care; acquisition/implementation of new clinical, research, educational or management skills; participation in NBOME/COMLEX question writing, analysis, or review.

4.5.2 Examples: number of papers, abstracts and grant applications submitted, published and/or awarded, outside presentations made, meetings attended; hours spent providing or receiving continuing (medical) education, or in faculty development programs; administrative/management activities, usually as a percentage of overall workload.

4.6 Service

4.6.1 These activities include service to the college, but also to one's profession, and within national and international research, academic or medical societies. The majority of service is usually demonstrated by participation on institutional committees. Consideration should be given to the fact that participation on committees is by election, which may therefore preclude desired participation. Service to the college also includes contributions to the efficiency and effectiveness of the faculty member's division, and to the college. Another important service to the college is participation in the faculty governance system. Community, state, regional, or broader service contributions considered for evaluation are those which are within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member, and are performed with one's college affiliation identified.

4.6.2 Examples: hours spent in committee meetings, working on committee projects (college, profession, and/or community), interviewing student applicants, advising student clubs or organizations; attendance at faculty/divisional meetings, institutional ceremonies.

4.7 Quantity

4.7.1 Generally, measured by contact hours, committee workload, tangible products of work effort, or other educational, medical (e.g., clinic, hospital), research, administrative or service assignments.

4.7.2 Assessment of the quantity of work product by an individual should not necessarily be comparative between faculty, and should take into consideration the faculty member's assignments/expectations upon being hired, and thereafter continuing. The faculty member's area of specialization (e.g., number of contact hours allotted for teaching that specialty in the curriculum) should also be considered, since curricular time for each discipline/sub-discipline varies widely. Also a consideration is whether assigned teaching hours involve lecture only, laboratory, and/or PBL facilitation and assessment. Lecture hours usually involve more preparation time and/or annual revision. Time spent developing and grading SBL/PBL examinations should be reported as teaching hours, especially with regard to the PBL curriculum, where exam questions are solicited, and voluntary, and outside of assigned facilitation duties. A

faculty member's workload history, and whether there is an increasing or decreasing trend, should also be assessed in each evaluated area.

- 4.7.3 Information pertaining to quantity may be solicited by the respective Divisional Chairs from Committee Chairpersons (e.g., attendance at meetings, committee workload and contributions), appropriate administrative personnel (e.g., Director of Professional Development, Assistant/Associate Deans for Preclinical, Problem Based Learning, Predoctoral, Osteopathic and Graduate Medical Education, and Assessment and Educational development) and the RCBC CEO and/or Medical Director.

PE 12-5. Appeal Procedure

A faculty member who disagrees with the point value assigned in any category may appeal such assignment to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean. The decision of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean is final and may not be appealed further.

PE 12-6. Summary

- 6.1 A summary of the evaluation procedure and distribution of merit pay is presented in the spreadsheet below.
- 6.2 Each faculty member is evaluated and assigned a value from 0 to 10 in each category, i.e., teaching, academic service and professional development.
- 6.3 After all faculty are evaluated the assigned numbers in each category are summed. The amount of money available in each category is divided by the total points assigned in that category to determine the dollar value per point. This value is multiplied by the point value assigned to a faculty member to determine the merit pay per category.

PE 12-7. Example

An example of the WVSOM merit pay distribution plan is provided.

Assume there is \$10,000 available for distribution to five faculty members using this merit pay plan.

The distribution of merit funds for each category is determined by the negotiated proportions.

Teaching Proportion - 50%	\$5,000.00
Service Proportion - 15%	\$1,500.00
Professional Development Proportion - 35%	\$3,500.00

Each faculty member is "scored" by his/her supervisor during the yearly evaluation process.

	Teaching "Score"	Service "Score"	Professional Development "Score"
Faculty Member A	9.0	7.5	1.5
Faculty Member B	6.0	3.6	3.6
Faculty Member C	6.0	3.0	7.5
Faculty Member D	3.0	3.0	8.7
Faculty Member E	8.7	8.7	8.1

Both quality and quantity are used to determine the "score" for each faculty member. For example, in academic service there may be a great difference in the activity of committees during the year. Faculty member "B" may provide excellent service on a committee which only meets once or twice a year. Faculty member "E" may provide excellent service on a committee which meets every other week. The lower score for faculty member "B" is not a reflection of the quality of service to the academic community; rather, it reflects the overall activity of the committee on which he/she serves. Similar considerations can be given to each of the evaluation categories.

Following the evaluation and assignment of a merit pay score to each faculty member the scores are summed together in each category:

	Teaching "Score"	Service "Score"	Professional Development "Score"
Faculty Member A	9.0	7.5	1.5
Faculty Member B	6.0	3.6	3.6
Faculty Member C	6.0	3.0	7.5
Faculty Member D	3.0	3.0	8.7
Faculty Member E	8.7	8.7	8.1
TOTAL	32.7	25.8	29.4

The total points for each category are divided into the amount available for distribution within the category to determine the "dollar value per point."

Teaching Dollar Value	$\$5,000 / 32.7 = \152.91 (X)
Service Dollar Value	$\$1,500 / 25.8 = \58.14 (Y)
Professional Development Dollar Value	$\$3,500 / 29.4 = \119.05 (Z)

Using this method it is not necessary to score everyone at the top of the scale as the scores are totaled, and divided into the dollars available. The range of scores in this example could just as well have been between 1 and 2; the dollar value per point would still be determined by dividing the sum into the total amount available. This allows the evaluators to retain points at the top of the scale to reward someone who has truly accomplished more in some category.

The Dollar value is then multiplied by the "score" to determine the dollar distribution for each faculty member in each category:

	Teaching X = \$152/91	Service Y = \$58.14	Professional Development Z = \$119.05	TOTAL Merit Pay
"A"	9.0 * X = \$1,376.15	7.5 * Y = \$436.05	1.5 * Z = \$178.57	\$1,990.76
"B"	6.0 * X = \$917.46	3.6 * Y = \$209.30	3.6 * Z = \$428.57	\$1,555.30
"C"	6.0 * X = \$917.46	3.0 * Y = \$174.42	7.5 * Z = \$892.86	\$1,984.71
"D"	3.0 * X = \$458.73	3.0 * Y = \$174.42	8.7 * Z = \$1,035.71	\$1,668.85
"E"	8.7 * X = \$1,330.32	8.7 * Y = \$505.81	8.1 * Z = \$964.29	\$2,800.37
TOTAL	\$5,000.00	\$1500.00	\$3500.00	\$10,000.00

It can be noted that the total dollar distribution value may be similar for some faculty members, however, the areas of excellence are different. Faculty members "A" and "C" are quite close. Faculty member "A" excelled at teaching and academic service; faculty member "C" did well in teaching and professional development yet the total for each is similar. A similar comparison can be made between faculty members "B" and "D".

The yearly evaluation process in place at WVSOM involves the immediate supervisor, usually the Division Chairman, and the Associate Dean for Preclinical Education for the Basic Science Divisions, and the Associate Dean for Predoctoral Clinical Education for the Clinical Science Division. The Associate Deans can serve as a check to determine whether each Division is scoring activities in a similar manner, i.e. one division does not have a score higher than 5 while another has most scores in the 7 to 8 range.