Merit Document
Department of Communication Sciences & Disorders

Preamble

Merit raises refer to the component of salary raises that are provided to department bargaining unit faculty members who meet or exceed their assigned unit performance expectations. In any given year, it is possible that all of the Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in an academic unit may be eligible for merit salary raises. Merit is calculated during spring semester based on performance during the previous calendar year. Merit salary raises are added to base salary for the ensuing fiscal year (on September 1 for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members on 9-month contracts, and on July 1 for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members on 12-month contracts).

Merit eligibility for faculty members will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations for merit in the department in the following areas: Teaching, Research/Creative Work, and Service. Each faculty member will receive an overall merit score which will identify whether s/he did not meet, met, or exceeded expectations for merit. The overall merit score will include seven or more categories or rating levels to allow for greater discrimination among levels of performance; each of the categories or rating levels on the overall merit score must clearly identify whether it does not meet expectations for merit, meets expectations for merit, or exceeds expectations for merit.

1. Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations, and Calculation of Merit Scores

The merit criteria (i.e., Teaching, Research/Creative Work, and Service), performance indicators and expectations for the criteria, and the calculation of the component merit scores (i.e., Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service) are contained in Appendix A.

2. General Procedure for Faculty Evaluation and Score of Merit

2.1. Prior to the beginning of the calendar year, each faculty member will confirm his/her allocation of effort (e.g., 50/30/20 for teaching, scholarship, and service) with the chair.
2.2. The department merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. A Merit Committee of three tenure-track faculty members will be formed via faculty vote. NTTF faculty may not serve on the committee but are eligible to vote on its membership.
2.3. Each faculty member submits a complete merit dossier to the merit committee by January 31st (if a weekend, the next business day). Faculty members who fail to submit a merit portfolio by the deadline will receive an automatic rating of "does not meet expectations" and will not be eligible for a merit salary increase or the market adjustment from the Fixed Market Pool (Article 17, section 7.1).
2.4. The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements: for each area of teaching, research, and service a portfolio must be created as a single PDF file to be uploaded to a secure website. Below is a description of what counts in each of these areas and how to prepare the portfolio:

EVALUATION OF TEACHING:

The Department values teaching and student learning. The Department's student learning outcomes emphasize demonstration of specific knowledge in the discipline; the ability for students to learn to analyze, synthesize and evaluate information; the ability to apply critical thinking and analysis to issues in the profession; and to observe and critically evaluate clinical work. Teaching and learning is manifested in a variety of activities both internal and external to the university. Teaching effectiveness by faculty is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the University. Achievement in this area is of critical importance to the Department's evaluation of faculty members who are under review for merit, reappointment, promotion, or tenure. Beginning in the first year of a teaching appointment, faculty must create and maintain an up-to-date teaching portfolio that contains written records pertaining to their teaching. The portfolio will be used by reviewers as the primary source of information for the evaluation of teaching. The department may obtain additional information from other sources to the extent that the information contained in a teaching portfolio is incomplete with respect to any of the domains or performance indicators applied.

This section of the Merit document for Communication Sciences and Disorders provides the following information: 1) what is considered to be included in teaching activities; 2) how teaching activities are evaluated and indicators of successful teaching; and 3) how to compile a teaching dossier to provide evidence of successful teaching.

1) Teaching activities that faculty may engage in (not all activities would be engaged in by all faculty). *The evaluation of teaching will consider an overall profile of the faculty member's teaching assignments, as well as any additional activities documented in the teaching portfolio as evidence of teaching performance.*

Classroom instruction:

- lecture courses (1000-7000 level)
- seminars, special topics classes, workshops
- laboratory instruction

Non-classroom instruction:

- direct clinical instruction (clinical supervision)
- engagement/outreach activities such as service learning
- directed studies or research for undergraduate students
- directed studies or research for graduate students
- direction of undergraduate senior or honors projects
- participation on graduate thesis/dissertation committees
- direction of theses and dissertations

Curriculum/teaching enhancement activities

- guest-lecturing in existing departmental courses and courses in other University departments
- developing new departmental course offerings
- participating in workshops, programs, or evaluation procedures devoted to improving teaching effectiveness
- maintaining clinical certification through appropriate continuing education

2) Success Indicators for Teaching:

A portfolio documenting successful teaching must be submitted by faculty under review. Indicators of teaching performance include, but are not limited to, the below-listed domains. A pattern of successful performance is expected to be demonstrated across the domains; teaching will not be evaluated solely on the basis of student ratings of teaching effectiveness.

- Teaching philosophy statement.
  Success indicators:
  - Teaching philosophy includes information about how the faculty member designs and develops courses; how the faculty member makes instructional improvements; how the faculty member uses effective, innovative strategies to enhance student learning and educational outcomes.
- Student evaluations, both quantitative and qualitative, of courses & clinical teaching
  Success indicators:
  - Quantitative evaluations of teaching that are higher are evidence of better performance.
  - Over time, quantitative evaluations of teaching show a general tendency to improvement or, if at a consistently higher level of performance, are stable.
  - Qualitative student evaluations show a preponderance of neutral or positive remarks.
- Written peer evaluation of courses and/or supervision. Peer evaluation may include the following: review of teaching portfolio and course materials; live observation; videotaped observations.
  Success indicators:
  - Peer evaluations are largely positive; specific examples of how the faculty member is fostering student learning and furthering the academic mission of the department are clearly present.
- Record of efforts towards ongoing improvement of teaching.
  Success indicators:
  - Response to ongoing (student/peer/chair) feedback regarding teaching, as documented in the portfolio
  - Faculty member's analysis of data from student and peer evaluations shows evidence of reflective practice, including an identification of areas where improvement might be needed and plans for making those improvements.
  - Evidence is presented that improvement plans from past self-evaluations have been implemented and their results evaluated.
  - Record of efforts to incorporate innovation in teaching
  - Development and execution of new course offerings/workshops
  - Integration of new information and developments in area
  - Use of readings and assignments reflecting contemporary developments
  - Participation in learning communities, workshops, or working groups dealing with pedagogy
  - Participation in continuing education activities and/or professional/scholarly educational events re: teaching content area, with subsequent integration of new information into teaching.

- Involvement in the scholarship of teaching and learning.

- Record of successful mentorship of students in non-classroom environments
  Success indicators:
  - Documented success in clinical teaching
  - Record of success in mentoring students in a variety of non-classroom environments, including but not limited to undergraduate research, service learning and engagement activities, thesis and dissertation committee membership, thesis and dissertation direction

In addition to materials submitted in the portfolio, teaching evaluation regarding whether a faculty member meets expectations shall also consider whether the faculty member adheres to accepted standards of professional behavior in meeting his/her responsibilities to students, including but not limited to the following:

- Faculty member is available to students, holding regular weekly office hours, and making accommodations to meet with students at other times as needed and within reason. Legitimate student requests for assistance during regular business hours are attended to within a reasonable span of time (48 hours). The faculty member monitors email, voice mail, and on-line course management software regularly.
- The faculty member complies with university policies, including equal access and approved accommodations for individuals with disabilities, and academic honesty.
- The faculty member provides feedback on student performance on a regular basis throughout the semester.

Faculty members undergoing Merit Review must prepare and submit a teaching portfolio to the Department Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee. This will be uploaded electronically to a secure website; pdf format is preferred.

The teaching portfolio must include at a minimum the following elements:

1. Teaching philosophy.
2. A list of courses taught during the preceding 12 months, with enrollment data. For clinical teaching, a list of numbers of students supervised per semester.
3. A list of other instructional activities.
4. Student ratings of teaching effectiveness, quantitative and qualitative, for all courses taught, and for any clinical teaching assignments, during the preceding 12 months.
5. Self reflection/analysis of performance based on student ratings and any other factors the faculty member wishes to include.
6. For faculty with a clinical teaching assignment, documentation of continuing education and how it pertains to the faculty member's clinical teaching.

The faculty member may also include other information he or she believes will assist in documenting/evaluating his or her teaching effectiveness. However copies of student ratings and raw data from teaching evaluations should not be included—such data must be summarized.

Teaching will be evaluated according to the Teaching Rubric, in Appendix A of this document.

EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP:

In general, the domain of "research and scholarship" includes designing and implementing research and disseminating research findings. Examples of research and other creative endeavors include: articles in peer-reviewed journals; developing grant proposals for submission to external funding agencies; books; book chapters; monographs; presentations to professional societies; development of intellectual property (copyrights, patents, trademarks, or tangible research) with possible commercialization; development of professional resources/materials, which might include (but not be limited to) such activities as continuing education presentations for a clinical audience, or development of published clinical resources for assessment and/or intervention.

Faculty members may engage in a range of scholarly and professional activities that result in products such as those listed above. In accord with the standards of scholarly work prevalent in our discipline, articles appearing in peer-reviewed journals are given strong emphasis in assessing the overall productivity of a faculty member's scholarship. Receipt of funding from external agencies is also an indicator of highly respected scholarly productivity and quality. Scholarly books and book chapters that receive peer review would also be strong indicators of scholarly success/quality. Inventions and patents, licensing, and commercialization of the fruits of scholarly efforts are significant quality indicators.

Examples of activities and quality indicators:

- Designing and Implementing Research and Other Creative Works
    - Funding: Actively pursues support from private, University-level, state, and national funding sources. Funding proposals include: preparation, submission, and approval of the requests.
        - *Examples:* research projects, training grants, equipment grants, external contracts
        - *Success indicators:*
            - Successful receipt of external funding as Principle Investigator, Co-Principle Investigator, Co-Investigator, or Consultant
            - Size of award
            - Grant score
            - Consistent record of submitting proposals for external funding
    - Development/preparation of external research settings: Engaged with external sites/partners to gain access to appropriate research populations and/or settings and/or equipment to carry out planned research program.
        - *Examples:* identifying and developing successful relationship with data collection site
        - *Success indicators:*
            - Develops needed relationships to further research efforts
            - Partnerships and collaborations lead to grant proposals, publications, and/or presentations.

- Development and maintenance of a research laboratory: uses start-up funds and any other available sources to set up and run a functional laboratory appropriate to faculty member's research plans.
  - *Examples:* reviews needed equipment choices; completes needed purchases during the start-up period; completes needed training in use of equipment; develops overall functional lab with staff trained to use it
  - *Success indicators:* lab equipment is used successfully in projects; lab forms an integral part of active research program

- Recruiting, training & supervising research assistants.
  - *Examples*: recruits master's and doctoral students who are able to work in the lab; recruits undergraduate volunteers; trains GA's in research protocols
  - *Success indicators:* assistants are able to perform needed tasks; lab productivity in presentations and publications enhanced by use of trained assistants

- Development of collaborations, such as those with departmental colleagues, university colleagues, and colleagues external to the university in order to co-prepare research proposals, co-author research papers and presentations, and develop and maintain external and/or internal research programs.

  - *Examples*: Liaisons established with other departments or institutions
  - *Success indicators:* co-authored grants, publications, presentations; membership on graduate student committees of research collaborators from outside the department
  - NOTE: Co-authorship is not seen as a negative in reviewing publications of faculty in CDIS, given the highly collaborative and labor-intensive nature of our work. Co-authorship with students and with collaborators is viewed positively. Overall as a scholar matures, it is expected that his or her work show evidence of scholarly independence, originality, and leadership, for tenure and promotion. Such independence can be demonstrated in a variety of ways but is most easily demonstrated by first-authored publications.

- Dissemination of Research and Other Creative Works
  - *Examples:*
    - Publication of research articles and abstracts in peer-reviewed journals
      - *Indicators of success:*
        - Numbers of articles published;
        - Quality indicators of publication vehicle, including but not limited to: journal ranking; citation index for article; rates of article acceptance in journal; prestige in discipline
    - Dissemination of creative works other than original research
      - *Indicators of success*
        - Numbers of articles published
          - Peer-reviewed
          - Non-peer reviewed
        - Same quality indicators as above
    - Presentations at professional meetings (international, national, regional)

- *Indicators of success*
  - Numbers of presentations
    - Whether peer-reviewed and if so, what is acceptance rate for conference and type of presentation (e.g., posters accepted at higher rate than talks at ASHA)
  - National and international most highly valued
- Invited lectures and keynotes (international, national, regional)
  - *Indicators of success*
    - Numbers of presentations
    - National and international most highly valued

- Intellectual property and commercialization
  - *Examples:*
    - Inventions
      - *Indicators of success*
        - Disclosed and discussed with University personnel
    - Patents
      - *Indicators of success*
        - Evaluated, applied for, analyzed for market, granted
    - Commercialization
      - *Indicators of success*
        - Licenses granted
        - Deliverables created and sold
        - Other successful commercialization

Procedure for Merit Evaluation:

Faculty members with allocation of effort to research must prepare and submit a research portfolio to the Department Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee. This will be submitted electronically to a secure website; pdf format is preferred. Evaluation will be based on the faculty member's allocation of effort to research; those with a greater allocation of effort to research will be expected to show evidence of proportionately more research quality indicators, as defined above. NTTF without allocation of effort to research but who engage in research may also submit a research portfolio, at their discretion.

The research portfolio must include:

1. Research statement, outlining and explaining faculty member's program of research over the past 12 months as well as goals and projected timelines for research activities.
2. CV, highlighting any of the above-listed elements that are indicators of research success.
3. For any indicators of research success not in the CV, a listing and narrative description of these elements should be appended.

Faculty may submit any additional supporting materials they believe will improve the documentation of their scholarship (e.g., awards and recognitions) with their portfolios. If they prefer, faculty may choose to develop an annotated/bulleted version of the relevant portions of their CV, rather than submitting a highlighted version, for clarity.

Research will be evaluated according to the Research Rubric, in Appendix A of this document.

EVALUATION OF SERVICE:

In general, "service" refers to making significant contributions to the governance and operation of the Department, College, University, and the profession, through participation in local, state, national, and international professional organizations. Additionally, assistance to the local community through consultative service and outreach is a recognized and valued type of service provided by faculty. Service duties included for consideration for evaluation purposes must have some relation to a faculty member's professional roles. Service is a significant and necessary aspect of the work assignment of all faculty and will be evaluated based on the effectiveness and types of the faculty member's service experiences.

Types of service activities:
Service activities that faculty may engage in (not all faculty will be involved in all activities), include, but are not limited to:

Service activities for the Department, College, and University:

- Service as chair or member on Departmental committees
- Service as chair or member on College and University committees
- Service to the clinic, including participation in marketing efforts
- Participation in departmental and clinic decision-making and policy formation
- Interdisciplinary service activities such as provision of consultative or clinical services to other departments and interdisciplinary programs
- Advising of professionally related student organizations
- Academic advising of students
- Consulting for the clinic outside of regular clinical teaching assignments
- Participation in recruitment events, such as Preview Day, President's Day, student visits, and interviews of prospective doctoral students

Service activities for the professions:

- Participation in the governance of state, national, and international professional organizations
- Chair or member of boards or committees of state and national professional organizations
- Editing and reviewing for scholarly journals
- Elected officer of professional societies
- Accreditation site visit teams for professional organizations or external review teams for universities and colleges
- Reviewing for private or government grants competitions

Service activities for the external community:

- Clinical outreach service
- Provision of clinical services to the community via the Department's speech, language, and hearing clinics

- Community health fairs
- Consultation with school personnel
- Technical assistance to schools, health care facilities, state institutions, etc.
- Consultations with physicians or other professionals
- Consumer education, via such avenues as community lectures, media interviews, and answering inquiries from the public
- Service to consumer advocacy organizations and support groups for those with communication disorders

Success Indicators for Service:

Service record of activities:

Success indicators:

- Minimum expectations:
  - Evidence of successful student advising
  - Regularly participates in department governance and service, as assigned.
  - Participates in other service, if assigned.
- Additional service for Enhanced Performance Evaluation (at least *one example from below list* must be present in EPR portfolio):
  - Participates in university service
  - Takes leadership role in department, college, or university service
    - NOTE: leadership may be formal, as in chairing a committee, but other, less formal leadership activities would be acceptable as well, such as proposing and helping to carry out a new clinical initiative
  - Serves the broader community via outreach or consulting
  - Participates in regional, national, or international service to the profession

Procedures for Evaluation of Service:

Faculty members undergoing Merit Review must prepare and submit a service portfolio to the Department Chair and the Faculty Evaluation Committee. This will be uploaded electronically to a secure website; pdf format is preferred.

The service portfolio must include at a minimum the following elements:

1. A list of service activities for the past 12 months, as defined above.

In addition, a faculty member may include a self reflection/analysis of service activities; this is encouraged if engaged in a particularly heavy workload committee. Faculty may at their discretion also include any other information they believe will assist in documenting/evaluating their service effectiveness.

Service will be evaluated according to the Service Rubric, in Appendix A of this document.

2.5. The Merit Committee will take into consideration each faculty member's allocation of effort in determining a merit score for each area; NTTF lacking allocation of effort to research need not be evaluated in this area, however if they are doing research even though not assigned, they can request evaluation of such efforts. TTF faculty with different allocations of effort to research must be evaluated with this differential in mind; those with lesser allocations of effort to research have lower expectations for productivity than those with greater allocations of effort to research. In no case will a faculty member be deemed to have earned merit if any one the areas of teaching, research, or service has been assigned a score of 0--Does Not Meet Expectations. NOTE: NTTF who lack allocation of effort to research but who are nonetheless involved in it may request that they be evaluated for research. Because zero allocation of effort to research indicates that no expectation for research exists, faculty members may not be deemed "not to meet" expectations if quality is not deemed sufficiently high to merit a score. In making this determination, the Merit Committee should use the same standards as applied to other research portfolios for evaluating research quality. If research is considered to be of sufficient quality, the NTTF may earn *one* extra point for this additional effort.

The Merit Committee will determine a score for each relevant section of the document; the overall merit score will be based on the scores for the relevant sections (Teaching, Research, & Service for TTF; Teaching & Service for NTTF). Using the scores for each section, an overall a total merit score will be derived, as detailed in Appendix A.

2.6. An academic unit may report its merit score recommendation to no greater than one-tenth decimal place (for example, a unit using 1-7 categories or rating levels may assign a score of 3.1 or 5.9 but may not assign a score of 3.15 or 5.975).

3. Significant Dates for Merit Consideration and Appeals

January 31: Last date for faculty merit dossiers to be submitted to an academic unit.

The merit committee of the academic unit is urged to work informally with all faculty being reviewed to resolve any factual or interpretive issues in advance of making recommendations to the chair.

February 28: Academic unit faculty committee's merit score recommendation to the chair (with a copy to the faculty member).

March 7: Last date for faculty members to appeal the committee's recommendation o the chair (with a copy to the committee).

March 31: Chair's merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copies to the committee and faculty members).

April 7: Last date for faculty member to appeal the chair's merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copy to the chair). The faculty member may raise in any appeal to the Dean: (i) the chair's merit score recommendation, and (ii) only those aspects of the committee's recommendation that the faculty member has previously raised in the faculty member's appeal to the chair. Issues related to the committee's recommendation not raised previously with the chair (where the faculty member either knew or through the exercise of reasonable diligence should have known) are not preserved for appeal to the Dean, shall not be considered by the Dean, and shall not be the basis or grounds for any grievance by the BGSU-FA.

April 30: Dean's recommendation to the Provost. Thereafter the Provost and Dean may confer through on or about May 19.

On or about May 20: Dean issues final determination regarding merit.

4. Special Circumstances

4.1. Consideration of Special Circumstances as Required by the Collective Bargaining Agreement

4.1.1. **Faculty Exchange Leave** (Article 21, Section II: subsection 1.7). Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consultation with the host institution.

4.1.2. **Leaves with Extramural Salary Paid through the University Payroll System** (Article 21, Section III: subsection 1.3) Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consultation with the sponsoring government agency or private foundation.

4.1.3. **Unpaid Leave - 100% time** (Article 21, Section IV: subsection 5). Faculty members will not be eligible for merit in any calendar year for which 100% unpaid leave was taken that is unrelated to Family Medical Leave. If related to Family Medical Leave, performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.

4.1.4. **Sick Leave** (Article 21, Section VIII: subsection 9.1). Performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated for faculty members on sick leave for 40 or more days during the calendar year.

4.1.5. **Parental Leave** (Article 21, Section IX: subsection 3). Unit Faculty Member who takes parental leave under this Article will only be evaluated for performance during the time in which he or she was not on parental leave (including use of sick leave in addition to parental leave). Performance expectations for merit evaluations that are expressed quantitatively shall be prorated. The Department Chair's/School Director's evaluation shall include a description of the methods used for prorating.

4.1.6. **Partial Unpaid Leave – 50% time** (Article 21, Section X: subsection 3.3) Faculty members will not be eligible for merit in any calendar year for which 50% unpaid leave was taken that is unrelated to Family Medical Leave. If related to Family Medical Leave, performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.

4.1.7. **Faculty Improvement Leave** (Article 22, Section 7.3.3) Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consideration of the report submitted to the President detailing accomplishments during the FIL.

4.2. Consideration of Other Special Circumstances

4.2.1. **New Faculty Hires.** New faculty members whose employment begins in the fall semester shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. Performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.

4.2.2. The unit's faculty advisory body may also consider special circumstances not covered in 4.1 above and make a recommendation to the unit chair or director. Such exceptional circumstances might include a leave without pay to take a short-term research appointment, a leave without pay to participate in professional development, or other leave without pay that enhances the productivity of the faculty member and the reputation of the institution.

5. Amendment of Merit Policy

The unit faculty may amend performance indicators, performance expectations, and the methods for combining this information into both component and overall merit scores at any time. Amendments to the merit policy must be approved by the Dean and Provost/SVPAA. Approved amendments to the merit policy shall not be applied retroactively in the calculation of the previous year's merit scores.

6. Additional Information: N/A.

Approved by the Department of Communication Sciences & Disorders at the January 26, 2015 Faculty Meeting

Lynne Hewitt, Chair — Date: January 26, 2015

Approved: Marie Huff — Date 2/11/15

Marie Huff, Dean of College of Health & Human Services

Approved: — Date 2/27/15

Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VPAA

APPENDIX A
Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations, and the Calculation of Component Merit Scores

Overview

Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the department member on the following performance criteria: Teaching, Research, 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 make an evaluation rating on each performance indicator, providing some basis or justification of each rating where appropriate.

Evaluation ratings provided for all performance indicators within each performance criteria will be combined by each member of the merit committee to reach a component rating for each of the relevant performance criteria (Teaching, Research, and Service). Merit committee members will meet as a committee to review and reach consensus on component ratings for each of the relevant performance criteria, using the summary form provided. The component ratings may include any number of values or rating levels, but they must clearly identify whether the component reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

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 fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

Teaching Rubric

Faculty name:

Allocation of effort to teaching: ____%

Teaching assignment for calendar year :

Success Indicators	Evaluation Guidelines	Narrative justification
Quantitative ratings	• Excellent (*ratings generally in the good to outstanding range*) • Good *(ratings generally in the good range)* • Fair *(ratings generally in the fair to good range)* • Poor *(ratings generally in poor to fair range)*	
Student open-ended feedback—based on a representative sampling and overview of themes and comments.	• Highly positive • Positive • Neutral • Negative • Not included in portfolio	
Peer reviews	• Excellent • Good	

	• Fair • Poor • N/A*	
Teaching improvement/Analysis of teaching performance (incl. teaching philosophy statement)	• In depth, thoughtful, shows improvement where needed, involvement in improvement activities • Thoughtful analysis, implementation for efforts to improve; involvement in improvement activities • Some analysis and awareness of need to improve; plans for involvement in improvement activities • Limited analysis; no evidence of needed improvement efforts under way; no planned involvement in improvement activities • No analysis of teaching performance	
High impact learning activities**	• High level of activity—2 or more • Moderate level of activity—1 • Training to incorporate high impact activities (e.g., learning community participation) • No high impact activities	
Non-classroom teaching/teaching in addition to work assignment***	• Very high level of activity—3 or more with leadership roles • High level of activity—2 or more, OR 1 with leadership role • Moderate level of activity—1, no leadership role • No involvement in non-classroom instruction • N/A	
Other ****	Evaluation of additional evidence submitted shows evidence for: • Superior • Good • Fair • Poor	

	Performance in teaching and teaching-related activities	
Committee overall judgment	• Exceeds expectations—preponderance of ratings are in the highest categories OR preponderance of ratings are in the upper-middle categories with one aspect rated as truly exceptional • Meets expectations—preponderance of ratings are in the middle to upper middle categories • Does not meet expectations—preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories	

* Non-tenured faculty on the tenure track, and NTTF who are going up for an Enhanced Performance Evaluation, should submit peer evaluations; anyone else may request peer evaluations, but these are not typically expected.

**Service learning; undergraduate research; active learning; novel approaches to teaching (e.g. innovative clinical teaching)

***Thesis and dissertation direction; honors project direction; graduate student mentoring; guest lecturing; clinical teaching/consulting other than assigned supervision; peer mentoring. Any other activities relating to non-classroom instruction. For NTTF, this may be scored N/A if no opportunities to participate exist.

***Other evidence for effectiveness, including: student performance/success; pedagogical leadership activities/mentoring; teaching awards; active engagement in continuing education to support teaching effectiveness; successful development of new course(s); or any other evidence of effectiveness submitted by the faculty.

TEACHING SCORE RUBRIC

Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description	Narrative justification
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Teaching (6-7)	Preponderance of ratings are in the highest categories OR preponderance of ratings are in the upper-middle categories with one aspect rated as truly exceptional	
Meets Expectations for Merit in Teaching (3-5)	Preponderance of ratings are in the middle to upper middle categories	
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Teaching (0-2)	Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories	

Research Rubric

Name:

Allocation of effort to research (if none, do not score):

***IMPORTANT**: Allocation of effort to research must be taken into account when applying this rubric.* Baseline expectation is for a 40% allocation of effort to research. For those with less, scores in a given category may be adjusted upwards to reflect achievement despite limited release time for research. For those with substantially more, committee to consider revising expectations upwards, EXCEPT in the case of release time for new faculty on the tenure track who are just getting their programs of research off the ground.

For collaborative efforts, explain your role so committee can evaluate your relative contribution.

Success Indicators	Evaluation Guidelines	Narrative justification
Research & Scholarly Dissemination 1. Peer-reviewed papers accepted* 2. Books and book chapters 3. Non-peer reviewed papers 4. Manuscripts under review 5. Peer-reviewed presentations, selective conferences OR invited presentation, national or international 6. Peer-reviewed presentations, less selective conference 7. Invited presentations (regional/local)	• Superior. 4+ examples, with at least 2 from category 1 OR 3+ examples in top 2 categories • Excellent. 4+ examples, with at least one from category 1 OR 2 examples in category 1. • Very good. 3 examples, at least 1 of which is from categories 1-4. • Good. 2 examples from any of categories 2 through 7. • Fair. 1 Example. • Poor. No activity to report. NOTE: Multiple examples in one category are considered positively in overall evaluation.	
Research funding** 1. Significant external grant activity (for example, award of external grants, $25K and up; may be claimed in multiple years for multiple year grants) 2. Awarded external grant, <$25K 3. Awarded internal grant, $5K and up 4. Awarded internal grant, <$5K 5. Applied for category 1 grant 6. Applied for category 2	• Superior. Category 1. • Excellent. Category 2 or 3. • Very good. Category 4, 5, and/or 6 • Good. Category 7 or 8 • Fair. Category 9 or 10 • No activity.	

grant 7. Applied for category 3 grant 8. Applied for category 4 grant 9. Plan for applying for external funding 10. Plan for applying for internal funding		
Ongoing research 1. Project being written for peer-reviewed publication 2. Project being written for peer-reviewed conference presentation 3. Project in data analysis 4. Project in data collection 5. Project in development (e.g., HSRB protocol in preparation or pilot work being planned)	• Excellent. Category 1 activity reported and at least 1 from categories 2-4. • Good. 2 activities reported, from 2-4. • Fair. 1 activity reported, from 2-5. • Poor. No activity. NOTE: The committee is directed to recognize that some projects may change status over the course of the year; the faculty member should make clear their research trajectory. The intent is not to penalize anyone for moving projects to dissemination and making this category null in consequence. The committee can consider overall number and stages of development of projects in its overall assessment.	
Research infrastructure	• Good. A clear pattern of multiple activities to develop a functioning lab or project, including setting up &/or learning new equipment, software, &/or procedures, recruiting and training lab assistants, devising successful protocols. Evidence presented of benchmarks met (e.g., purchase of start up equipment and training in its use). • Adequate. Some activities, as listed above, either lesser in extent or somewhat less clear in terms of evidence presented. • Poor. Expected benchmarks not met*** (e.g., failure to develop a functioning lab during start up period) • N/A. Lab is at high performance already with no need for development OR research not conducted in a lab environment.	
Intellectual property	• Superior. Significant ongoing work leading to intellectual property, with clear evidence of outcomes achieved (e.g., patent application file, copyright registered for the university, or licensing agreement signed) • Good. Some evidence of work leading to	

	the above. • N/A. NOTE: Most will be scored here. This category is **not** to be scored except for those who have relevant activities.	
Other ****	Evaluation of additional evidence submitted shows evidence for: • Superior • Good • Fair • Poor Performance in research and scholarship. If no additional evidence available for review, note "N/A"	
Committee overall judgment	• Exceeds expectations—preponderance of ratings are in the highest categories OR preponderance of ratings are in the upper-middle categories with one aspect rated as truly exceptional • Meets expectations—preponderance of ratings are in the middle to upper middle categories • Does not meet expectations—preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories	

*The committee will consider information on the selectivity of journals in making its overall evaluation. A faculty member who meets the quantity measure for a given rating may be rated in a lower category based on information regarding selectivity and rigor of outlets. The committee will provide details in its narrative justification. Co-authorship in and of itself is not a negative for papers that are not first-authored; role on a project can be considered by the committee in its evaluation.

**Activities as PI most highly ranked, but subcontracts, consultancy, and other collaborative efforts resulting in funding are eligible to be considered in categories 1 and 2.

***This rating not to be applied if circumstances beyond the control of the researcher pertain (e.g., failure of manufacturer to deliver, unforeseen technical difficulties impede success despite best efforts, etc.). Researcher may explain such circumstances and if reasonable the committee should not score this section.

****Other. Any evidence the faculty member wishes to include as evidence of scholarly achievement can be evaluated here. Examples include but are not limited to: awards and recognitions for research activities (editor's awards, university recognition, fellowship in professional and scholarly societies); substantial service that is scholarly in nature (e.g., editorship of journals, invitations to participate in reviewing activities); publications in highly selective venues or invitations to keynote at prestigious conferences; outstanding mentorship of students in research (may overlap with teaching but if relevant may be included in scholarly portfolio).

RUBRIC FOR TOTAL RESEARCH SCORE

Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description	Narrative justification
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Research (6-7)	Preponderance of ratings are in the highest categories OR preponderance of ratings are in the upper-middle categories with one aspect rated as truly exceptional	
Meets Expectations for Merit in Research (3-5)	Preponderance of ratings are in the middle to upper middle categories	
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Research (0-2)	Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories	

Service Rubric

Faculty name:

Allocation of effort to service:

NOTE: *Expectations for level of service increase with rank and years in rank. Acceptable minimum performance for pre-tenure faculty will not be acceptable minimums for senior faculty. Faculty member baseline allocation of effort to service to be 10%; heavier allocation will have higher expectations. Service in categories where not expected can be counted towards exceeding expectations (e.g., pre-tenure faculty involved in university service).*

Success Indicators	Evaluation Guidelines	Narrative justification
Faculty member fulfills advising duties	• Acceptable. Is regularly available, provides appropriate advising for student success. • Unacceptable. Fails to be available (based on clear evidence of one or more of the following: does not hold regular office hours; refuses to schedule advising appointments when requested; fails to respond to emails); and/or regularly fails to provide appropriate advising (rating must be based on clear evidence that students are disadvantaged by wrong information) • N/A. No advising responsibilities.	
Participation in department service	• Superior. Attends faculty meetings, supports student recruitment events, participates successfully in 3 or more committees/activities AND/OR chairs 1 heavy responsibility committee. • Excellent. Attends faculty meetings, supports student recruitment events, participates successfully in 2 or more committees/activities. • Good. Attends faculty meetings, supports student recruitment events, participates successfully in 1 committee. • Fair. Record of attendance at faculty meetings is inconsistent, &/or does not support student recruitment events. Participates in 1 committee, minor role. • Poor. Fails to meet standards for "fair" rating as listed above. • N/A*	
College and university service.	• Superior. Participates in 2 or more college or university committees/efforts with a leadership role in one. • Excellent. Participates in two college or university committees/efforts OR chairs one OR participates in exceptionally heavy workload committee (e.g., HSRB).	

	• Good. Participates in at least one college or university committee/effort with significant workload. • Fair. Participates in one college or university committee with minimal workload. • Poor. No college or university service. OR • N/A Service not required in early years on tenure track. OR not required of NTTF.	
Service to the profession	• Superior--High level of activity—3 or more activities, and a leadership role • Excellent. 3 or more activities OR leadership role in 1. * • Good. 2 activities. • Fair. 1 activity. • Poor. No service to the profession.** OR • N/A. Service to the profession not expected.	
Community service	• Superior--High level of activity—3 or more activities, plus leadership role(s) • Excellent. 3 or more activities. • Good. 2 activities. • Fair. 1 activity. • Poor. No service to the community.** OR • N/A. Service to the community not expected.	
Other ***	Evaluation of additional evidence submitted shows evidence for: • Superior • Good • Fair • Poor Performance in service.	
Committee overall judgment	• Exceeds expectations—preponderance of ratings are in the highest categories OR preponderance of ratings are in the upper-middle categories with one aspect rated as truly exceptional • Meets expectations—preponderance of ratings are in the middle to upper middle categories • Does not meet expectations—preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories	

*For pre-tenure and tenure-track faculty, ratings in the "excellent" category would be considered unusual and potentially deserving of high merit.

* *For pre-tenure faculty, N/A is appropriate if nothing reported in this category. For tenured faculty, at least one activity in either professional service or community service is a minimum expectation. If submitting in one but not the other, tenured faculty may be rated "N/A" in the area not selected for service.

***Other evidence for effectiveness submitted by the faculty member to be rated here, including but not limited to: awards for service; unusual amount of service for rank/years in rank; exceptional leadership and/or unique projects with high impact; high visibility in state and national service, etc. Faculty should provide sufficient information so that the committee can determine what the role was that the faculty member played.

RUBRIC FOR TOTAL SERVICE SCORE

Merit Score (point allocation)	**Definition**	**Narrative justification**
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Service (6-7)	Preponderance of ratings are in the highest categories OR preponderance of ratings are in the upper-middle categories with one aspect rated as truly exceptional	
Meets Expectations for Merit in Service (3-5)	Preponderance of ratings are in the middle to upper middle categories	
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Service (0-2)	Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories	

SUMMARY FORM

The merit committee takes allocation of effort into consideration when holistically combining their consensus ratings for teaching, research, and service to arrive at an overall merit score.

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation
1 – 2	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
3 – 6	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
7 – 9	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit