<div align="center">

Merit Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

</div>

Academic Unit: Department of Visual Communication and Technology Education

Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

Merit Review Rubric

Overview

Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the department/school member on the following performance criteria: Teaching, 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). Merit committee members will review information submitted by each faculty member to assign a numerical score for each criteria using an anchored rating scale anchored with examples of expected levels (or their equivalent) of performance on the performance indicators. Merit committee members will meet as a committee to review and reach consensus on component scores for each of the relevant performance criteria using the summary form provided. The component scores may include any range of values, but they must clearly identify whether the assigned score on the criteria (e.g., teaching) reflects performance that is unacceptable, fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

The levels on each of the performance indicators should capture how the unit defines exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, failing to meet expectations for performance and unacceptable performance:

> **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, school, unit, and discipline.

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

> **Unacceptable performance for merit**: Activities in area cumulatively are unacceptable based on the standard levels of performance for the department, school, unit and discipline.

The merit committee will then assign an overall merit rating using the approach found in Section 2.5 of the merit policy. The overall merit may include any number of values or rating levels, but it must clearly identify whether the overall merit rating reflects performance that is unacceptable, fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

The following rubric will be used to evaluate faculty performance expectations in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Merit committee members will individually review the faculty member's merit dossier and provide a score in each of the areas of teaching, research, and service.

Evaluation Rating Category	TEACHING Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Teaching
Exceeds expectations for merit	• Quantitative student evaluations regularly exceed departmental averages for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are generally positive. • Observations by peers indicate highest levels of excellence in the classroom if applicable. • Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are regularly introduced and evaluated. • Regular engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness	5.5 – 7.0
Meets expectations for merit	• Quantitative student evaluations approximate departmental averages for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are general positive. • Observations by peers indicate satisfactory levels of performance in the classroom if applicable. • Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are occasionally introduced with some assessment of their impact. • Modest engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness	2.5 – 5.49
Fails to meet expectations for merit	• Quantitative student evaluations are below average in the department for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are mixed. • Observations by peers indicate significant opportunities for improvement if applicable. • Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are generally absent and rarely evaluated. • Limited or no engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness	1.0 – 2.49
Unacceptable	Showing a pattern of unacceptable behavior including any of the following (or equivalent): • One or more unexcused absences from class. • Failure to provide course resources to the department as required. • Failure to submit final grades on time, unless extraordinary circumstances. • Failure to utilize professional activities/development to improve teaching effectiveness or innovative practices, if needed. • Failure to incorporate peer feedback to improve teaching effectiveness. • Quantitative student evaluations are well below average in the department for similar courses and qualitative comments are generally negative	0.0—0.9

Merit Score for Teaching (to be completed by merit committee member): _____

Evaluation Rating Category	RESEARCH Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Research
Exceeds expectations for merit	• 2 or more peer-reviewed articles + 1 or more conference papers; • 2 or more active research projects that were not included in previous year merit submission; • high activity in grantsmanship such as preparing/submitted internal or external grants; or internal funding award; or recognition/award for research activity/accomplishments	5.5 – 7.0
Meets expectations for merit	• 1 peer-reviewed article or at least 2 peer-reviewed conference paper; • 1 or more new active research projects that were not included in previous year merit submission; • some activity in grantsmanship such as preparing/submitted internal or external grants	2.5 – 5.49
Fails to meet expectations for merit	• No peer-reviewed articles or conference papers; • no current active research projects since last year merit submission; • no active grantsmanship or clear plans for applying for internal or external funding; no recognition/ awards for research	1.0 – 2.49
Unacceptable	• No documented research plan/agenda • No documented research activity	0.0—0.9

Merit Score for Research (to be completed by merit committee member): __

Evaluation Rating Category	SERVICE Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Service
Exceeds expectations for merit	• Departmental and/or College service includes chairing or serving on at least 2 committees + active volunteer service or student advising; • University and/or professional service includes serving on at least 2 committees/activities + volunteer involvement at university level	5.5 – 7.0
Meets expectations for merit	• Departmental and/or College service includes serving on at least 1 committee + volunteer service or student advising; Or • University and/or professional service includes serving on at least 1 committee/activity + some volunteer involvement at the university or to the profession	2.5 – 5.49
Fails to meet expectations for merit	• Limited to no engagement (no advising or committees; limited attendance at faculty meetings) at departmental level; little or no significant service participation at college, university, or professional levels	1.0 – 2.49
Unacceptable	• No documented evidence of significant service activity • Documented evidence of unacceptable and/or ineffective service activity	0.0—0.9

Merit Score for Service (to be completed by merit committee member): __
SUMMARY FORM

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

Faculty Member	Merit Score for Teaching	Merit Score for Research	Merit Score for Service

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 Department Merit Committee (DMC)** shall consist of one tenured/tenure-track faculty member and one non-tenure-track faculty member from each of the two programs: LRND/LDT and VCT.

Elements of the Merit Dossier

The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements: an updated CV highlighting activities completed during the previous calendar year (and not submitted to the merit committee in previous years), student teaching evaluations from the previous calendar year, current peer evaluations on teaching, and a summary narrative statement justifying the faculty member's merit increase based on the merit review rubric. Faculty may submit additional supporting documents as appropriate.

Calculation of Overall Merit Score

Once the merit committee has reached consensus on component merit scores on each performance areas (Teaching, Research/Creative Work, and Service), the overall merit score is computed using a simple algorithm taking into account the weighted allocation of effort for each performance area:

[Teaching Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] + [Research/Creative Work Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] + [Service Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] = Overall Merit Score

The 3-year rolling average will be calculated by weighting the current year's overall merit score at 50% and the previous 2 years' overall merit scores at 25% each.

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation (assumes component performance ratings made on 7-point scale)
0.0 – 0.9	Unacceptable
1.0 – 2.49	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
2.5 – 5.49	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
5.5 – 7.0	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit

Approved by the Department of Visual Communication and Technology Education at the February 7, 2017 Faculty Meeting. Edits approved March 15, 2017.

Date __4/12/17__

Donna K Trautman, Chair of the Department of Visual Communication and Technology Education

Approved: _____ Date __4/18/17__

Venu Dasigi, Interim Dean of the College of Technology, Architecture and Applied Engineering

Approved: _____ Date __5/3/17__

Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP