

## **Report on the Results of the Merit E-Survey**

---

---

A total of 255 Members, of whom 224 were tenure or tenure-track faculty, responded to the survey.

In summary, a majority clearly indicated that:

- ▶ the current merit system is not an incentive to work harder or better;
- ▶ they do not clearly understand the criteria for administrative decision-making;
- ▶ the current merit system is not an indicator of a member's value to Queen's; and
- ▶ the current merit system is demoralizing rather than affirmative to morale.

### **Proposal for Changing Merit**

Based on the results of the membership e-survey on merit, and recommendations from the Salary Advisory Group to the Bargaining Team and the Council of Representatives, with approval by the Executive Committee, The Bargaining Team has proposed the following changes to the existing merit scheme:

- a revised merit system be adopted, separating the career development (CD) portion of annual compensation (e.g., a "10"= to \$2365) from the merit award, currently available to those who score "12" (get an additional \$473), "15" (get an additional \$1182.50), or "20" (= to an additional \$2365) in 2004/05 respectively; (See Table below for distribution of merit in the last two years.)\*
- merit awards shall be one-off awards with clear criteria, not built into base salary, distributed as a small pool of pro-rated bonuses for each academic unit, based on the number of members in each unit;
- career development (CD) funds should be increased to include the total amount currently awarded as either career development or merit;
- a list of recipients of all merit awards shall be published (within units and Faculties and across the University, similar to current teaching and research awards) with the reasons for such awards noted to ensure transparency of criteria.

This recommendation is a compromise position between the status quo and the total elimination of merit. Other details of the proposal will need to be developed by the Bargaining Team.

To date, the University has not responded to this proposal.

### **Linkage to More Fair and Effective Evaluation**

An important consideration in the proposal for change recommended below is that a major component of the dissatisfaction with the current merit system is the University Administration's over-reliance on USAT in its annual performance evaluation of faculty members. QUFA has therefore also proposed a suspension of USAT, the current, flawed tool for student evaluation of teaching, until another more valid and effective assessment instrument can be designed and implemented. QUFA has proposed the use of more broad based evidence to evaluate teaching.

\* **Distribution of Merit During the Present Contract**