

## Merit Policy

### Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

Academic Unit: Department of Musicology, Composition and Theory (MUCT)

#### Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the department member on the following performance criteria: Teaching Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service. Each of the aforementioned criteria (e.g., teaching) will be evaluated using a number of performance indicators (e.g., quantitative student evaluations of teaching). Every Bargaining Unit Faculty Member (BUFM) will review information submitted by every other BUFM to assign a numerical score for each criterion using a rating scale (0–9, defined in more detail below).

The following tables specify how the component scores for each of the three criteria reflect performance that greatly exceeds expectations, exceeds expectations, meets expectations or fails to meet expectations for merit, understood as follows:

**Greatly exceeds expectations for merit:** Activities in area cumulatively greatly exceed expectations and reflect a clear and highly significant level of accomplishment beyond the level of “exceeds expectations” for an individual with a given faculty rank in the department, unit, and discipline.

**Exceeds expectations for merit:** Activities in area cumulatively exceed expectations and reflect a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for an individual with a given faculty rank in the department, unit, and discipline.

**Meets expectations for merit:** Activities in area cumulatively meet expectations and reflect standard levels of performance for the department, unit, and discipline.

**Fails to meet expectations for merit:** Activities in area cumulatively do not meet expectations and fall below the standard levels of performance for the department, unit, and discipline.

**Unacceptable performance:** Lack of activity in any area or failure to fulfill base obligations in any area.

#### TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

As a department, we recognize that our faculty have diverse teaching assignments, ranging from large classes of non-major undergraduates to one-on-one lessons with graduates in their area of specialization, and that these circumstances may impact quantitative teaching scores independent of quality of instruction. Quantitative teaching scores shall be taken into consideration, with a cumulative average score of 3.0 recognized as the baseline measure of effective teaching, but quantitative scores should not be the only factor considered. Because MUCT tenure-track faculty

(TTF) and non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) tend to work with different student populations and to have different degrees of access to opportunities, such as mentoring Honor's and graduate students, we choose to use separate criteria in evaluating TTF and NTTF teaching. Our department recognizes that teaching activities vary in scope and prestige and should be weighted accordingly by evaluators using their professional judgment.

### Teaching Criteria for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (all areas)

Evaluation Rating Category	TEACHING Expected levels of accomplishment in teaching—performance indicators	Possible Merit Score for Teaching
Greatly exceeds expectations for merit	A cumulative average score of 4.0 or higher on quantitative teaching evaluations for courses taught during the merit period, plus demonstration of teaching effectiveness and engagement that greatly exceeds typical performance expectations. See "exceeds expectations" for possible criteria.	7-9
Exceeds expectations for merit	Cumulative average score of 3.0 or higher on student course evaluations AND 1-3 of the activities or accomplishments from the following list (or equivalent): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supervision of Honors, MM, DMA, PhD projects or independent studies</li> <li>• Membership on Honors, MM, DMA, PhD committees</li> <li>• Noteworthy student achievements</li> <li>• Teaching awards</li> <li>• Organizing a learning community</li> <li>• Participation in instructional development activities (workshops, book clubs, learning communities)</li> <li>• Attendance at discipline-specific conferences</li> <li>• Development of a new course curriculum</li> <li>• Significant course revisions, innovations, and/or "above and beyond" teaching activities</li> <li>• Development or significant revisions to a program or curriculum</li> <li>• Completion of pedagogical publications, presentations, recordings, or similar professional projects (if not listed under research/creative work)</li> <li>• Guest teaching in colleagues' classes and/or other universities</li> </ul>	4-6
Meets expectations for merit	A cumulative average score of 3.0 or higher on quantitative teaching evaluations for courses taught during the merit period.	2-3
Fails to meet expectations for merit	A cumulative average score between 2.5 and 2.9 on quantitative teaching evaluations for courses taught during the merit period.	1
Unacceptable	Fails to meet with assigned classes and/or to fulfill other base obligations, such as submitting course grades, and/or overall mean on student evaluations is below 2.5.	0

### Teaching Criteria for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (all areas)

Evaluation Rating Category	TEACHING Expected levels of accomplishment in teaching—performance indicators	Possible Merit Score for Service
Greatly exceeds expectations for merit	Cumulative average score of 3.5 or higher on student course evaluations AND 4 or more of the activities or accomplishments listed in <i>Exceeds Expectations</i> .	7–9
Exceeds expectations for merit	Cumulative average score of 3.0 or higher on student course evaluations AND 1-3 of the activities or accomplishments from the following list (or equivalent): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cumulative average score of 4.0 or higher on student evaluation</li> <li>• Supervision of Honors, MM, DMA, PhD projects or independent studies</li> <li>• Membership of Honors, MM, DMA, PhD projects</li> <li>• Noteworthy student achievements</li> <li>• Teaching awards</li> <li>• Organizing a learning community</li> <li>• Participation in instructional development activities (workshops, book clubs, learning communities)</li> <li>• Attendance at discipline-specific conferences</li> <li>• Development of a new course curriculum</li> <li>• Significant course revisions, innovations, and/or “above and beyond” teaching activities</li> <li>• Development or significant revisions to a program or curriculum</li> <li>• Completion of pedagogical publications, presentations, recordings, or similar professional projects (if not listed under research/creative work)</li> <li>• Guest teaching in colleagues’ classes and/or other universities</li> </ul>	4–6
Meets expectations for merit	Cumulative average score of 3.0 or higher on student course evaluations	2–3
Fails to meet expectations for merit	A cumulative average score of 2.5-2.9 on quantitative student course evaluations, and no evidence of participation in teaching/professional development activities	1
Unacceptable	Fails to meet with assigned classes and/or to fulfill other base obligations, such as submitting course grades and/or overall mean on student course evaluations is below 2.5	0

### RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK

TTF are expected to engage in a steady pattern of research/creative work. NTTF are not required to perform research/creative work. The area-specific performance indicators shown below are meant as guidelines to help inform holistic evaluations for merit, not as fixed checklists. Our department recognizes the diversity of sub-disciplines and inter-disciplinary fields of inquiry in music scholarship and values them equally. Our department also recognizes that performances, publications, presentations, and other research-related activities vary in scope and prestige and should be weighted accordingly by evaluators using their professional judgment.

Specific merit scores should reflect:

- the scope of the work;
- the quality of the press or journal (refereed versus non-refereed);
- the prestige of the venue/audience for presentations (juried versus invited, national/international versus regional, etc.); and
- the overall number of distinct publications and/or presentations (though quantity should not be valued over quality).

### Research/Creative Work Criteria for Ethnomusicology/Musicology/Theory

Evaluation Rating Category	RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK Expected levels of accomplishment in research/creative work—performance indicators	Possible Merit Score for Research/Creative Work
Greatly exceeds expectations for merit	<p>The faculty member should achieve <i>one</i> of the following (or equivalent):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a textbook or scholarly monograph authored or co-authored, published by a reputable publisher;</li> <li>• a scholarly book chapter authored or co-authored, included in a volume that is part of a prestigious series and/or is published by a prestigious academic press);</li> <li>• a full-length, peer-reviewed scholarly article, authored or co-authored, in a highly respected and competitive journal (print or online);</li> <li>• a scholarly edition of a music score/composition edited or co-edited, published by a reputable publisher;</li> <li>• a juried presentation or participation on and/or organization of a juried scholarly panel at an international or highly selective and prestigious national conference such as an annual meeting of the American Musicological Society, the Society for Ethnomusicology, the Society for Music Theory, or similar;</li> <li>• an invited keynote address or pre-conference workshop led at an international/national professional conference;</li> <li>• received a highly competitive grant, award, fellowship or prize;</li> <li>• received a national publication award; or</li> <li>• four or more of the items listed under “meets expectations for merit” or two or more of the items listed under “exceeds expectations for merit” (the same type of activity may be repeated, provided the content changes—for example, two different conference presentations will count as two items).</li> </ul>	7–9
Exceeds expectations for merit	<p>The faculty member should achieve <i>one</i> of the following (or equivalent):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a scholarly book chapter authored or co-authored, published by a reputable publisher;</li> </ul>	4–6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a full-length, peer-reviewed or invited article in any reputable journal;</li> <li>• received a competitive grant, award, fellowship, or prize;</li> <li>• a juried presentation or participation on and/or organization of a juried scholarly panel at a less prestigious national conference (for example, the College Music Society) or at a highly selective regional conference (for example, the Midwest Chapter of the American Musicological Society, SEM Midwest, or Music Theory Midwest); or</li> <li>• two to three of the items listed under “meets expectations for merit” (the same type of activity may be repeated, provided that the content changes—for example, two different conference presentation will count as two items).</li> </ul>	
Meets expectations for merit	<p>The faculty member should achieve one of the following (or equivalent):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a juried presentation or participation on and/or organization of a juried scholarly panel at a less selective regional conference;</li> <li>• invited presentation or participation on and/or organization of an invited scholarly panel;</li> <li>• a research presentation on the CMA’s Faculty Scholars Series or for some other general audience;</li> <li>• a scholarly book or CD or DVD review published in a reputable journal;</li> <li>• a scholarly blog post (hosted by a professional organization), or other short-format publication (for example, <i>Dial “M” for Musicology</i> [blog hosted by the AMS], or Music Theory “Flip Camp” essays or <i>Music Theory Spectrum</i> research notes);</li> <li>• a discipline-related publication or presentation aimed at a general audience (including, for example, works of public musicology, program notes or liner notes, or pre-performance lectures);</li> <li>• received university-level or external grant to support publication and/or research; or</li> <li>• discipline-related performance(s).</li> </ul>	2–3
Fails to meet expectations for merit	Evidence of work in progress toward a tangible research outcome beyond the prior year’s efforts or evidence of on-going impact of previous work. This might include: articles, book proposals, conference proposals, or external grant proposals submitted but not yet accepted or submitted but rejected; field research completed; in-progress work initiated; professional workshops or conferences attended; citations of previous work; or equivalents.	1
Unacceptable	No evidence of productivity, work in progress, or scholarly engagement.	0

### Research/Creative Work Criteria for Composition

Evaluation Rating Category	RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK Expected levels of accomplishment in research/creative work—performance indicators	Possible Merit Score for Research/Creative Work
Greatly exceeds expectations for merit	<p>The faculty member should receive five performances of their original compositions plus achieve <i>one</i> of the following (or equivalent):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an international premiere;</li> <li>• recording multiple original compositions commercially published by a reputable recording label on compact disc or online (solo CD);</li> <li>• received a highly competitive grant, award, fellowship or prize;</li> <li>• scholarship detailing the body of one's work (dissertation, book, book chapter, article), or biographical inclusion in a prestigious music collection (such as New Grove Dictionary);</li> <li>• completing an invited international residency (3 or more activities at one location);</li> <li>• a textbook or scholarly monograph authored or co-authored, published by a reputable publisher;</li> <li>• a scholarly book edited or co-edited, published by a reputable publisher;</li> <li>• an original composition or a scholarly book chapter authored or co-authored, published by a prestigious publisher;</li> <li>• a juried presentation or participation on and/or organization of a juried scholarly panel at an international conference;</li> <li>• an invited keynote address or pre-conference workshop led at an international/national professional conference;</li> <li>• six or more of the items listed under "meets expectations for merit" or three or more of the items listed under "exceeds expectations for merit" (the same type of activity may be repeated, provided the content changes—for example, two different conference presentations will count as two items).</li> </ul>	7–9
Exceeds expectations for merit	<p>The faculty member should receive five performances of their original compositions plus achieve <i>two</i> of the following (or equivalent):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• five additional performances;</li> <li>• a national or regional premiere;</li> <li>• the recording of an original composition commercially published by a reputable recording label on compact disc or online;</li> <li>• received a competitive grant, award, fellowship, or prize;</li> <li>• review of a composition, performance, or recording in a respected publication;</li> <li>• completed an invited national or regional residency (3 or more activities at one location);</li> </ul>	4–6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an original composition or a scholarly book chapter authored or co-authored, published by a reputable publisher;</li> <li>• a full-length, peer-reviewed or invited article in any reputable journal;</li> <li>• organized a juried scholarly panel at a national conference (SCI National, SEAMUS, College Music Society, etc.) or highly selective regional conference (for example, SCI Regional, Electronic Music Midwest, etc.);</li> <li>• four to five of the items listed under "meets expectations for merit" (the same type of activity may be repeated, provided that the content changes—for example, two different conference presentation will count as two items).</li> </ul>	
Meets expectations for merit	<p>The faculty member should receive five performances of their original compositions plus achieve <i>one</i> of the following (or equivalent):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a regional or national radio broadcast;</li> <li>• a juried presentation or participation on a juried scholarly panel;</li> <li>• invited presentation or participation on a scholarly panel;</li> <li>• a scholarly book, recording, or concert review published in a reputable journal;</li> <li>• a scholarly blog post (hosted by a professional organization) or other short-format publication (for example, New Music Box, I Care if You Listen etc.);</li> <li>• a discipline-related publication or presentation aimed at a general audience (including, for example, program notes or liner notes or pre-performance lectures);</li> <li>• received university-level or external grant support for publication and/or research;</li> <li>• discipline-related performing or conducting (yours or someone else's work).</li> </ul>	2-3
Fails to meet expectations for merit	Evidence of work in progress toward a tangible research/creative work outcome beyond the prior year's efforts or evidence of on-going impact of previous work. This might include: articles, book proposals or conference proposals submitted but not yet accepted or submitted but rejected, in-progress work initiated, professional workshops or conferences attended, citations of previous work, or equivalents.	1
Unacceptable	No evidence of productivity, work in progress, or scholarly engagement.	0

## SERVICE

TTF are expected to attend department/faculty meetings and to engage in service to the profession, to the institution (at the university, college, department and/or area level), and/or to the community. Service to the community must relate to the faculty member's professional activity. NTTF have no service requirement but are expected to attend department/faculty meetings.

The performance indicators shown below are meant as guidelines to help inform holistic evaluations for merit, not as fixed checklists. Our department recognizes that service activities will vary in the amount and duration of work involved, as well as in prestige, and should be weighted accordingly. Although our performance indicators focus on ongoing activities (such as serving on committees or executive/editorial boards or as coordinators), we also recognize the value of service commitments that are not ongoing, including (but not limited to) pre-publication reviews, external promotion and tenure reviews, competition adjudication, chairing conference sessions, grading placement and qualifying exams, and special projects/ad hoc committees assigned by the Chair, Dean, etc. Faculty members should use their professional judgment in determining the equivalence of shorter-term service activities to ongoing commitments. Service activities for which a faculty member received load credit should not be considered when calculating their service merit score.

Evaluation Rating Category	<b>SERVICE</b> Expected levels of accomplishment in service—performance indicators	Possible Merit Score for Service
Greatly exceeds expectations for merit	Demonstrates active involvement in five or more service activities, as listed under "Meets expectations," or equivalent (e.g., fewer than five service activities but significant leadership work).	7-9
Exceeds expectations for merit	Demonstrates active involvement in three to four service activities, as listed under "Meets expectations," or equivalent (e.g., fewer than three service activities but significant leadership work).	4-6
Meets expectations for merit	Demonstrates active involvement in one to two of the following service activities (or equivalents):  <b>Professional service</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leadership positions held in societies (officers, committee memberships, conference organizers)</li> <li>• Journal editor/editorial board member</li> <li>• Pre-publication reviews (articles, textbooks, monographs)</li> <li>• Grant reviews</li> <li>• Promotion/tenure reviews</li> <li>• Competition adjudication</li> <li>• Session chair at conference</li> </ul> <b>Internal and institutional governance/service</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee chair or secretary: university, college, department</li> </ul>	2-3



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elected/appointed committee member: university, college, department</li> <li>• Administrative position (for which load credit has not been received)</li> <li>• Area coordinator (for which load credit has not been received)</li> <li>• Student organization advisor</li> <li>• Recruitment activities</li> <li>• Special projects assigned by Dean/Chair.</li> <li>• Concerts produced or performed (e.g. ArtsX)</li> <li>• Non-research presentations or documents (pre-concert lectures, workshops, program notes, etc.) for the campus/college/department</li> </ul> <p>Community service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discipline-related presentations or documents (pre-concert lectures, workshops, program notes, etc.) for the community, if not listed under research/creative work</li> <li>• Teaching/mentoring at Toledo School for the Arts, or through the Creative Arts Program, or equivalent</li> <li>• Ensemble or personal performances presented at community organizations</li> <li>• Discipline-related committee or board memberships (arts councils, for example, or equivalents)</li> </ul>	
Fails to meet expectations for merit	Meets baseline expectations of attendance at college and department meetings, and contributes appropriately to departmental/area programmatic and recruitment activities.	1
Unacceptable	Repeated unexcused absences from or failures to perform assigned duties associated with service obligations (committee meetings, faculty or department meetings, recruitment events, etc.).	0

### Merit Committee Composition and the Election/Appointment Process

The department merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. The MUCT Merit Committee shall consist of four BUFMs with one tenured or tenure-track representative each from ethno/musicology, composition, and theory and one non-tenure-track representative from any area. Representatives will be elected by the department's BUFMs and will serve two-year staggered terms, such that two members are new and two are returning.

### Elements of the Merit Dossier

The submitted merit dossier known as Professional Annual Report (PAR) must include: a list of activities for the performance period under the categories Research/Creative Work, Teaching, and Service; a statement of allocation of effort (typically 40/40/20 for TTFs and 0/100/0 for NTTFs; and a statement of workload assignment (out of 9 credit hours/semester for TTFs and 12

credit hours/semester for NTTFs) indicating the number of hours allocated to teaching and to administrative appointments.

PARs should be one to three pages in length in a 12-point font. This limit should encourage a focus on what is important and limit the amount of work involved in preparing it.

A brief justification of the significance of any accomplishment may be included.

Faculty must show clearly the significance of items listed by indicating such criteria as

- peer-reviewed or not
- premiere of composition (date, city, venue) or subsequent performance
- committee chair or member
- thesis advisor or reader

Administrative appointments should be included in PARs with (as appropriate) a list of significant service obligations and accomplishments that were completed as part of the appointment and an indication of load credit received for the appointment, if applicable.

Include "Above & Beyond" information as appropriate.

#### Calculation of Overall Merit Score

All BUFMs submit a PAR to the MUCT Department Secretary by the university's deadline.

The Department Secretary copies the PARs and places them in BUFM mailboxes. Using professional judgment to evaluate accomplishments against the performance indicators given in the appropriate tables above, faculty mark ratings directly onto one another's forms, providing a numerical score (0–9) for each of the three areas of teaching, research/creative work, and service. If a faculty member believes that any of the ratings they have assigned require explanation, brief comments may be written directly on the PAR. Faculty will not evaluate their own PAR.

Faculty return the packet of forms with their ratings to the MUCT Department Secretary by the announced deadline.

MUCT Department Secretary forwards ratings returned by faculty to the Merit Committee shortly after the announced deadline.

Merit committee members will meet as a committee to review the BUFMs' ratings and their averages, and to reach consensus on component scores for each of the relevant performance criteria. As part of their deliberations, the merit committee may adjust averaged component scores if they believe an individual's accomplishments have been over- or under-valued. These component scores will be reported using the summary form provided.

### SUMMARY FORM: Component Scores

(to be completed with agreement reached by all members of the merit committee)

Faculty Member	Merit Score for Teaching Effectiveness	Merit Score for Research/Creative Work	Merit Score for Service
<i>Faculty member 1</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>
<i>Faculty member 2</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>
<i>Next faculty member, etc.</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>

The merit committee will then assign an overall merit rating calculated as follows:

The individual component merit scores for teaching, research/creative work, and service are combined to arrive at an overall merit score.

The overall merit score is computed using a simple algorithm taking into account the weighted allocation of effort for each performance area:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & [\text{Teaching Merit Score} * \text{Allocation of Effort}] + \\
 & [\text{Research/Creative Work Merit Score} * \text{Allocation of Effort}] + \\
 & [\text{Service Merit Score} * \text{Allocation of Effort}] = \\
 & \text{Overall Merit Score}
 \end{aligned}$$

As part of their deliberations, the merit committee may adjust overall merit scores if they believe an individual's accomplishments have been over- or under-valued. These component scores will be reported using the summary form provided.

**SUMMARY FORM: Overall Merit Score**

(to be completed with agreement reached by all members of the merit committee)

Faculty Member	Teaching Merit Score * Allocation of Effort (.40 for TTF, 1.00 for NTTF)	Research/ Creative Work Merit Score * Allocation of Effort (.40 for TTF, 0 for NTTF)	Service Merit Score* Allocation of Effort (.20 for TTF, 0 for NTTF)	Overall Merit Score (sum of columns 2, 3, and 4)
<i>Faculty member 1</i>	<i>Insert component score * allocation of effort</i>	<i>Insert component score * allocation of effort</i>	<i>Insert component score * allocation of effort</i>	<i>Total Score</i>
<i>Faculty member 2</i>	<i>Insert component score * allocation of effort</i>	<i>Insert component score * allocation of effort</i>	<i>Insert component score * allocation of effort</i>	<i>Total Score</i>
<i>Next faculty member, etc.</i>	<i>Insert component score * allocation of effort</i>	<i>Insert component score * allocation of effort</i>	<i>Insert component score * allocation of effort</i>	<i>Total Score</i>

Overall merit scores will be interpreted as follows:

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation (assumes performance ratings made on a 9-point scale)
7.0–9.0	Greatly exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
4.0–6.9	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
2.0–3.9	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
0–1.9	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit or to submit a PAR; Recommendation for no merit

Merit recommendations will be based on a rolling three-year average of individual faculty members' overall merit scores. For faculty without scores from one or two of the previous years (new hires or Faculty Administrators returning to BUFM status), the committee will use the two-year average or single overall merit score, as applicable.

Approved by the Department of Musicology, Composition and Theory (MUCT) on May 5, 2017.

Nora Engebretsen Date 5/9/17  
Nora Engebretsen, Chair

Approved: William Mathis Date 6/23/17  
William Mathis, Interim Dean of the College of Musical Arts

Approved: John M. Fisher Date 8/10/18  
Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP  
Provost, Interim