

Merit Salary Review 2014
HOLZ Carsten A <socholz@ust.hk>
Wed 10/22/2014 5:16 AM
To: [Division head]
Cc: [Division faculty]

Dear [Division head],

your letter titled “Merit Salary Review 2014,” dated 1 September 2014, arrived recently together with other forwarded mail of mine.

Reading through the letter, the following caught my attention:

The Divisional Faculty Merit Review Committee’s and the Division Head’s evaluation are reported together and the DH’s evaluation cannot be isolated. This indicates that the DH’s evaluation has no more (and no less) weight in the merit salary review than any one of the DFMRC members.

The letter mentions that “relevant passages” of this letter will be shared with next year’s annual merit review committee, making it a secret what part of the letter will enter next year’s evaluation. No rationale is mentioned for sharing parts of this year’s evaluation with next year’s DFMRC. (As far as I can tell, this sharing could make sense if both this year’s evaluation and this year’s salary adjustment were shared with the DFMRC.)

The letter states that the “School of Humanities and Social Science’s priorities continue to be”... and that “SOSC shares these priorities.” I take it that the correct phrasing should be the “dean’s priorities continue to be”... and that “the SOSC DH shares these priorities.” As far as I know, none of these priorities are the outcome of School Board decisions, and none have been endorsed by a SOSC division meeting.

I am particularly concerned about the “School” (as far as I can tell, meaning: dean) making “the development of more collaborative faculty research” a priority. I do not know what the meaning of priority is in this context (how is it being made a priority, via the dean’s salary decisions?). I am concerned about HKUST management directing research via incentive structures. It just so happens that the type of research that is being favored is the type of research that the dean himself does, as well as those who he personally hired.

In an email of 31 July 2014 you wrote “The EVPP has indicated that these reports [in the Faculty Online Reporting System] will be consulted in the merit salary review discussions that he has with the dean and myself in a few weeks.” I subsequently received a letter from the dean, signed by the dean, that announces my salary adjustment (+5.8%). There is no mentioning of you or the Provost. I take it that the dean is solely responsible for the decision on salary adjustment.

Best,
Carsten