

September 29, 2006

MEMORANDUM

TO: SLIR Faculty

FROM: Terry Curry

SUBJECT: October 1, 2006 Salary Adjustments

SCHOOL OF
**L
&
I
N
D
U
S
T
R
I
A
L
R
E
L
A
T
I
O
N
S**

Attached please find the list of faculty salary adjustments effective October 1, 2006 for the School of Labor and Industrial Relations. This memo provides details of the process.

MICHIGAN STATE
UNIVERSITY

Performance Evaluation Process

The faculty annual performance evaluation meeting to discuss 2005 calendar year performance was held on April 28, 2006, and attended by: Associate Director John Beck, Mark Roehling (who replaced Associate Director Dale Belman because of the loss of his mother and who had served as Acting Associate Director for the fall semester), and elected faculty representatives Tina Riley and Ben Wolkinson. At the meeting held to discuss faculty performance, no information was available about salary increases. Therefore, the discussions held focused solely on performance, without regards to salary. Individual performance review meetings were then held with faculty during the late spring and early summer and included the faculty member, relevant associate director, and director.

Salary Recommendation Time Limits, Guidelines, and Procedure for Tenure-System Faculty

On Friday, July 21st, I received the raise list materials, with instructions that recommendations were to be returned to the Dean's office by Wednesday, July 26th. According to these materials, there were three components to the FY 2006/07 raises: (1) a 3.0% merit pool to be distributed by the School; (2) a 0.6% market pool to be administered by the College, i.e. "Dean's Withhold"; and (3) a 0.6% market adjustment pool to be administered centrally, i.e. by the Provost. The College chairs and directors had been informed toward the end of the spring semester that College faculty access to the Provost funds would be limited because, apparently for the first time, funds provided by the Office of the Provost during the year to match competing salary offers for SSC faculty would be deducted from the SSC share of the 0.6% Provost market adjustment pool.

Recommendations for increases from the 0.6% Dean's Withhold were to consider that "this is a very small sum and will be reserved for a few of the most productive employees....Do not propose increases for individuals who have not received above-

average increases on [the] current raise list."¹

Recommendations for increases from the 0.6% University-Level Faculty Market Adjustment Funding Pool required that the following criteria must be met:

1. *Only faculty who have been consistently judged to be very meritorious by peers at MSU or at comparable institutions should be considered. Merit is based on the same criteria as applies to promotion tenure, or post-tenure review. Typically, these individuals are also recipients of consistent merit adjustments above respective unit averages (overall and/or by rank) over the past three years, inclusive of the October 1, 2005, general merit adjustment. A history of merit adjustments for the individual for the past three years and relevant unit and MAU averages must accompany any proposed market increases. Proposals without this information will not be considered.*
2. *While the program is targeted to tenure-system faculty, academic staff may be recommended with appropriate supporting information. Proposed adjustments for academic administrators must be based on their roles as faculty members.*
3. *Existing salaries are at a level that may not be competitive with peers (include salary comparisons across peer departments or colleges, if available).²*

All recommendations were due on July 26, 2006. They were submitted after consulting with associate directors Ed Montemayor and John Beck. Notices of approved salary changes were received in the School on September 29, 2006. The approved changes were consistent with my recommendations for distribution of general merit increases. However, as in past years, the Dean and Provost unilaterally made adjustments in my recommendations for the allocation of College and Provost "withhold" funds.

Increases: 3.0% Merit Pool

The School was provided with \$45,176 to distribute in increases. I deducted \$875 from that total to correct XXXXXXXXXXXX's 2005-06 salary, consistent with discussions that then Associate Director Dale Belman and I had with XXX. Using the remaining \$44,301, raises were distributed on the basis of merit in five categories – Exceptional, Outstanding, Very Good, Acceptable, and Unacceptable, using the following definitions:

¹July 21, 2006 memorandum from Dean Marietta Baba to Chairs/Directors re: "Academic Personnel Salary Adjustment Guidelines – FY 2006/07"

²July 21, 2006 memorandum from Dean Marietta Baba to Chairs/Directors re: "University-Level Faculty Market Adjustment Funding Pool – FY 2006/07"

- **Exceptional** – Exceptional in a majority of ratings areas, plus outstanding in others
- **Outstanding** – Exceptional or outstanding performance in a majority of ratings areas, plus no less than very good in others
- **Very Good** – No areas of unacceptable performance; exceptional or outstanding in a minority of ratings areas
- **Acceptable** – A majority of areas are very good or acceptable, or performance that borders on unacceptable in one or more areas
- **Unacceptable** – Repeated performance that is unacceptable in one or more areas

I assigned the percentage increase to each category as follows:

- Exceptional 4.0-4.4%
- Outstanding 2.8%
- Very Good 0.9%
- Acceptable NA
- Unacceptable NA

It was the consensus of the performance review committee, with which I concurred, that the performance of one faculty member fell between two categories, leading to an award of 3.75%. Professor XXXXX XXXXXs was on unpaid leave during the 2005-06 academic year and has been granted a continuation of that leave for a second year. Because of the uncertainty of XXX return, XXX is being granted no salary increase. Should XXX return for the 2007-08 academic year, adjustments will be made so that XXX salary is held harmless. The performance of those on leave during part of the performance period (the 2005 calendar year) was considered in light of the School policy adopted in May 2003.

***Policy for Handling the Performance Evaluation
for Faculty on Leaves – May, 2003***

1. *An annual activity report is required of all faculty, including those on sabbatical or unpaid leaves*
2. *For faculty on sabbatical leave, performance is evaluated based upon all accomplishments during the annual cycle, including the leave period. There is no requirement that faculty accomplishments fit into all of the categories of teaching, research, service, (and for outreach faculty, program development/administration).*

3. *For faculty on unpaid leave:*

- *If the leave period covers the entire annual cycle for the review period, the performance will be considered to be acceptable during the leave period. Any publications during the leave period will be considered in the returning year.*
- *If the leave period straddles evaluation cycles, the faculty member will be evaluated based upon the period of time she/he was on the payroll.*

Increases From the 0.6% Dean's Pool and the 0.6% Centrally Administered Pool

The following SLIR faculty members received additional salary adjustments from these special pools. As indicated above, the amounts awarded were reduced at the College and Provost level from the amounts that I recommended.

•	XXXXXXXXXX	\$1,000
•	XXXXXXXXXX	\$2,000
•	XXXXXXX	\$2,500
•	XXXXXXXXXX	\$2,500
•	XXXXXXXXXX	\$2,000
•	XXXXXXXXXX	\$3,500
•	XXXXXXXXXX	\$1,500

Special Adjustments

Ed Montemayor's appointment was changed from an academic year to an annual appointment when he assumed the associate director position, and his salary was adjusted to reflect that change. As associate directors, John Beck, Ed Montemayor, and Ed Welch continue to receive an administrative increment of \$1,500. XXXXXXXXXXXXX's salary includes a correction for 2005-06, as well as the use of funds from the College/Provost withhold funds to more fully fund the competitive offer XXX received two years ago.

Faculty Not Supported From the General Fund

The 2005 performance of all SLIR faculty was assessed at the April 28th performance review meeting, even though salary increases for those positions not supported from the University general fund come from neither the 3.0% Merit Pool nor the pools administered by the Dean and Office of the Provost. The School funds these increases from the "21 Account" or other funding sources, using the same percentage increases described above for exceptional, outstanding, very good, acceptable and unacceptable performance. XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX's appointment is 50% within SLIR and 50% within the Graduate School. Dean Karen Klomprens and I communicated about the SLIR and Graduate School assessment of her performance and

SLIR Faculty
September 29, 2006
Page 5

agreed on an overall merit award.

Summary

The performance of SLIR faculty was stellar during the 2005 calendar year. The performance review committee and I considered the performance of a large number of faculty to be exceptional, and nearly all were exceptional or outstanding. Every faculty member's performance was at least "very good." There were no acceptable or unacceptable performers. This makes it challenging to distribute the limited merit funds in a way that adequately recognizes the meritorious performance of all SLIR faculty.

Attachment (2006-2007 salary list)

Enclosure: "Notification of Salary," (tenure-system faculty only)

