Merit Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

Academic Unit: Department of Engineering Technologies

Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

Merit criteria are limited to three areas: Teaching Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service. To determine whether faculty members have failed to meet, met, or exceeded expectations for merit, a merit system should identify performance indicators and expected levels of performance for each of the relevant areas noted above. The merit system should also describe how information on the various performance indicators are combined to calculate the relevant component merit scores (i.e., Teaching Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service).

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 Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service. Each of the aforementioned criteria (e.g., teaching effectiveness) 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 may 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 effectiveness) reflects performance that is unacceptable, fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

Guidelines & Suggested Evidence for Assessing Performance and Productivity

Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the department member in the following areas: Teaching Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service.

As a result of program diversity within the Department of Engineering Technologies, considerable attention is paid to setting performance indicators for faculty merit criteria while allowing individuality seen in the four undergraduate and two graduate programs comprising the department. (Aviation Studies, Electronics and Computer Engineering Technology, Mechatronics Technology, Engineering Technology, Quality Systems, Master of Technology Management, Doctorate of Philosophy in Technology Management).

Evident Teaching Effectiveness – In all cases, student evaluations of teaching shall not constitute the sole criterion for evaluation of faculty teaching performance (CBA). Evaluation of faculty (TTF and NTTF) Teaching Effectiveness will take into account all submitted materials.

For teaching, evidence may include, but is not limited to:

a. Results of students' teaching evaluations

b. Peer teaching observations

c. Teaching awards

d. Presentations in various formats

e. Public demonstrations of teaching

f. Demonstrations of teaching, supporting letters etc.

g. Instructional development

i. Evident teaching ability measures also include: teaching; graduate teaching; instructional development; and other contributions to student learning. The department may obtain additional information from other sources to the extent that the submitted supporting materials are incomplete with respect to any of the performance indicators applied.

j. Undergraduate teaching performance indicators that can be used in the evaluation of Undergraduate teaching include: statements of teaching philosophy and pedagogy; self-evaluations of teaching effectiveness; instructional development; results of student evaluations of courses taught; peer teaching observations and evaluations; documentation of student learning outcomes (such as results of standardized assessment measures, licensure or professional examinations, and graduate follow-up studies); student enrollment ; teaching awards and distinctions; and written statements from colleagues, students, and others concerning preparedness and effectiveness in teaching.

k. Graduate teaching; It is expected that all TTF faculty also will contribute to the learning of graduate students. Based upon one's area of research expertise and its relationship to the focus of the graduate program, faculty should provide formal graduate instruction through regular courses and seminars. In addition, faculty with appropriate areas of expertise are expected to participate in the direction of theses and/or dissertations and to serve on committees of students being directed by other faculty. The indicators of teaching effectiveness identified in the Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations section of this document apply to TTF, NTTF and are also applicable to graduate instruction. However, it is understood that a faculty member with significant undergraduate responsibilities will not have the opportunity to participate at the graduate level to a great extent.

l. Instructional Development - Departmental faculties are expected to devote professional development efforts to continuously improve the curriculum as well as their own teaching methods and effectiveness. Performance indicators that are used in the evaluation of instructional development include: course outlines, syllabi, and other items that demonstrate the nature of instruction and range of courses taught; independent studies offered to students; the development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses; the development of

new labs or the improvement of existing labs, conferences and workshops attended, courses taken, participation in campus wide learning community or other professional development activities to enhance teaching skills; and innovations in the effective use of instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning.

m. Other contributions to student learning Faculty members make other contributions to student learning and development that fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction. Performance indicators that may be used to evaluate such contributions include: external financial or equipment/software support; academic advising services provided to students; guidance of students in internships, or co-operative work experiences; involvement in organizations, professional societies and activities promoting faculty-student interaction.

Professional Progress within the academic discipline and service

a. Service includes participation in departmental, college, or University committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like. University service also includes performance of any assigned administrative service responsibilities including those duties handled by faculty serving as center directors, program directors, department chairs, associate deans, etc.)

b. Evidence of ongoing contributions to the academic community

c. Scholarship as Professional Progress

d. Evident Service measures also include: participation in departmental, college, or University committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like. University service also includes performance of any assigned administrative service responsibilities including those duties handled by faculty serving as center directors, program directors, department chairs, associate deans, and the like. Performance indicators used to evaluate internal service include: records of membership and attendance at committee and organizational meetings; amount of time devoted to activities; significance and scope of activities; degree of active involvement; documentation of significant contributions; leadership positions held; professionalism and dependability in performing assignment; collegiality in working with others and sharing responsibilities; testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs, and others. Performance indicators used to evaluate administrative service include: significance and scope of assignment; amount of time devoted to assignment; evidence of collegiality in working with others; documentation of specific contributions and accomplishments; evaluations by constituents, publics served, and others.

e. External Community Service

Faculty members are encouraged to participate in engagement activities in order to lend their professional expertise to support community organizations, projects, and programs. To be considered as community service appropriate for, contract renewal, tenure, or promotion considerations, such external activities must draw upon a faculty member's expertise and must be recognized by the department, college, or University as qualifying. Performance

indicators used to evaluate external community service include: records of relevant activities and professional contributions; degree of active involvement; significance and scope of involvement in each activity; evidence of contributions and achievements; leadership positions held; professionalism and dependability demonstrated in performing activities; community awards and other recognition; written statements or testimonials, working as an unpaid expert witness, serving as an advisor for groups outside of the college, etc.

f. Professional Service

These activities include a faculty member's membership and active involvement with professional organizations connected to his/her discipline at the local, state, national, or international levels. Performance indicators used to evaluate professional service include: records of affiliations with appropriate professional associations; records of service to private or external funding agencies; attendance at professional meetings and conferences; leadership positions held in professional associations; time spent on fulfilling professional service obligations; professional recognition; organization of professional conferences, symposia, and sessions moderated that contribute to the profession.

Evaluation of Research - Performance indicators that may be used to evaluate Research include:

a. Publications/Presentations - Publications and presentations are the primary products of any research and thus central to its evaluation. These include publications (printed or electronic) in peer-reviewed journals or symposium volumes or performances/exhibitions in peer-reviewed settings, publication of books, monographs, and other publications, presentations, and performances resulting from applied research and consulting. Research should show evidence of originality and importance. The value of research is indicated by the prestige of the setting and the impact of the work on others in the discipline. Serving as reviewers for scholarly papers is another indicator of research performance.

b. Sponsored Program External Support for Research - Performance indicators include: number of grant applications submitted; agency reviewers' evaluations of the proposal; significance and scope of the project; research funds awarded; and performance of duties as investigator for funded projects.

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

Exceeds expectations
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
Activities in area cumulatively meet expectations and reflect standard levels of performance for the department, school, unit, and discipline.

Fails to meet expectations
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 Criteria

Unacceptable Performance in Research
The faculty member has established a pattern lacking the following for two consecutive academic semesters (where applicable):

- no proceedings
- no publications
- no journals
- no presentations
- no active research
- no reviewing manuscripts/articles
- no book reviews
- no presentations at conferences or to professional organizations
- no grant proposals or grant activity, internal or external
- no graduate theses or dissertations

Unacceptable Performance in Teaching
The faculty member has established a pattern lacking the following (where applicable):

- Two consecutive academic semesters of documented, consistent (i.e. documented complaints each fall and spring semester) credible student complaints.
- Two consecutive academic semesters of poor student evaluation scores for all courses taught (i.e. evaluation scores falling below a score of 2 on a quantitative scale from 0-5).
- Failure to hold scheduled class meetings and/or events, without a good faith attempt for approval from the department Chair or College Dean
- Failure to meet teaching obligations.

Unacceptable Performance in Service
The faculty member has established a pattern lacking the following (where applicable):
- Two consecutive academic semesters of failure to attend to service obligations, including consistent failure to attend meetings of committees to which one is assigned.

The merit committee will then assign an overall merit rating using the approach found in the Calculation of Overall Merit Score section 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.

Default Allocation

Unless otherwise specified, the default allocation of effort (allocation factor) for TTF and NTTF are as follows:

TTF =   50% Teaching Effectiveness, 30% Research/Creative Work, & 20% Service

NTTF =   80% Teaching Effectiveness, & 20% Service

Rating Worksheets for TTF Members:

Pre-specified allocation of Effort for teaching: _____ %

Evaluation Rating Category	**Teaching Effectiveness**	Possible Merit Score for Teaching
	Examples of accomplishments for teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent as appropriate). Note: The typical level of a faculty member's performance would be similar to the examples listed in each merit category below.	
Exceeds expectations for merit	Quantitative student evaluations regularly exceed departmental averages for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are generally positive Supervision of multiple Grad research\Thesis students Observations by peers indicate high levels of excellence in the classroom with rigorous course content Excellent syllabi preparation, class meets regularly, and office hours are made available for students Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are regularly introduced Regular engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness Exceptional academic mentoring	5.6 - 7
Meets expectations for merit	Quantitative student evaluations approximate departmental averages for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are generally positive Observations by peers indicate high levels of performance in the classroom Good preparation of syllabi, course content in generally rigorous class meets regularly, and office hours are made available to students Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are occasionally introduced Supervision of some grad research\thesis students Modest engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness Moderately involved in academic mentoring	2.6 – 5.5

Fails to meet expectations for merit	Quantitative student evaluations are among lowest in department for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are generally negative	$1.0 - 2.5$
	Observations by peers indicate significant opportunities for improvement	
	Syllabi needs improvement: and/or class does not meet regularly and/or overall course content generally not rigorous and/or office hour policies are inconsistent	
	Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are generally absent	
	Limited or no engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness	
	No graduate teaching\and or graduate research supervision	
	Limited/no academic mentoring	
Unacceptable	Two consecutive academic semesters of documented, consistent (i.e. documented complaints each fall and spring semester) credible student complaints.	$0 - 0.9$
	Two consecutive academic semesters of poor student evaluation scores for all courses taught (i.e. evaluation scores falling below a score of 2 on a quantitative scale from 0-5).	
	Failure to hold scheduled class meetings and/or events, without a good faith attempt for approval from the department Chair or College Dean	
	Failure to meet teaching obligations.	

Use the "Guidelines & suggested evidence for assessing performance and productivity" section found earlier in this document as a guide to determine score and rating category.

Allocation Factor for Faculty Member (i.e. 50%, etc.)

Merit Score for Teaching Effectiveness: _____

Score from above x allocation factor = _____ **Total Weighted Score**

Example:	**Merit Score for Teaching Effectiveness =**	**6**
	Allocation Factor =	**0.50**
	Total Weighted Score (6 * 0.50) =	**3**

Pre-specified allocation of Effort for research/creative work _____ %

Evaluation Rating Category	Research/Creative Work	Possible Merit Score for Research
	Examples of accomplishments for research/creative work indicators (or their equivalent as appropriate Note: The typical level of a faculty member's performance would be similar to the examples listed in each merit category below.	
Exceeds expectations for merit	More than one peer-reviewed journal articles, or two or more peer- reviewed conference papers/presentations More than one article in conference proceeding High activity in grantsmanship with external funding obtained National/Regional recognition\awards for research	5.6 - 7
Meets expectations for merit	One peer-reviewed journal article or one peer-reviewed conference paper; or one national/regional presentation One article in a conference proceeding Some activity in grantsmanship such as preparing/submitting internal or external grants; Internal funding award Recognition / awards for research	2.6 – 5.5
Fails to meet expectations for merit	No peer-reviewed articles or conference papers Not actively engaged in research project(s) since last year's merit submission; No active grantsmanship or clear plans for applying for internal or external funding; No recognition / awards for research No article published in conference proceedings	1 – 2.5
Unacceptable	No proceedings No publications No journals No presentations No active research No reviewing manuscripts/articles No book reviews No presentations at conferences or to professional organizations No grant proposals or grant activity, internal or external No graduate theses or dissertations	0 – 0.9

Use the "*Guidelines & suggested evidence for assessing performance and productivity*"
section found earlier in this document as a guide to determine score and rating category.

Allocation Factor for Research Creative Work (i.e. 30%, etc.)

Merit Score for Teaching Effectiveness: _____

Score from above x allocation factor = _____ **Total Weighted Score**

Example:	**Merit Score for Research Creative Work =**	**5**
	Allocation Factor =	**0.30**
	Total Weighted Score (6 * 0.50) =	**1.5**

Pre-specified allocation of Effort for service: _____ %

Evaluation Rating Category	Service	Possible Merit Score for Service
	Examples of accomplishments for service performance indicators (or their equivalent). Note: The typical level of a faculty member's performance would be similar to the examples listed in each merit category below.	
Exceeds expectations for merit	Chairing one or more committees at department college, and/or university levels Membership of more than one committee at department, college, and university levels. Exceptional mentoring, and/or recruiting activities and/or engagement in student organization(s) Community/professional service to one or more significant activities related to faculty discipline; Example(s) of the following: service award significant service leadership, high impact practice, or high visibility service	5.6 - 7
Meets expectations for merit	Membership of at least one committee at program, department, college, and/or university level. Academic advising, mentoring, and/or recruiting activities and/or engagement in student organization(s) Community/professional service to at least one activity related to faculty discipline	2.6 – 5.5
Fails to meet expectations for merit	Lack of consistent membership in committees at program, department, college, and/or university levels. Limited attendance at faculty meetings at departmental level; Limited to no involvement in mentoring or recruiting activities at college, university, or recruiting activities and/or engagement in student organization(s)	1 – 2.5
Unacceptable	Two consecutive academic semesters of failure to attend to service obligations, including consistent failure to attend meetings of committees to which one is assigned.	0 – 0.9

Use the "*Guidelines & suggested evidence for assessing performance and productivity*" section found earlier in this document as a guide to determine score and rating category.

Allocation Factor for Faculty Member (i.e. 20%, etc.)

Merit Score for Service Effectiveness: _____

Score from above x allocation factor = _____ **Total Weighted Score**

Example:	Merit Score for Service =	6
	Allocation Factor =	0.20
	Total Weighted Score (6 * 0.20) =	1.2

Department Rating Worksheet - TTF

(To be completed by the individual committee member)

Faculty Member	Total Weighted Merit Score for Teaching (0 – 7)	Total Weighted Merit Score for Research (0 – 7)	Total Weighted Merit Score for Service (0 – 7)	Total Weighted Overall Merit Score (0 – 7)	Merit Committee Reviewer Comments
Faculty member 1	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score	Total of faculty member 1 scores for Teaching, Research, and Service	
Faculty member 2	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score	Total of faculty member 2 scores for Teaching, Research, and Service	
From Examples Above	3	1.5	1.2	5.7	

The overall merit score includes four (4) categories. **Exceeds** reflects the faculty member who exceeds merit expectations as represented by an overall merit score between 5.6 -7 on the 7-point scale. **Meets** reflects the faculty member who meets but does not exceed merit expectations as represented by an overall merit score between 2.6 – 5.5 on the 7-point scale. **Fails to meet** reflects the faculty member who does not meet merit expectations as represented by an overall merit score between 1 – 2.5 on the 7-point scale. **Unacceptable** reflects the faculty member who does not meet merit expectations as represented by an overall merit score between 0 – 0.9 on the 7-point scale.

To qualify for merit a faculty member must have a minimum average weighted total score of at least 2.6 on the 7-point scale. Faculty will provide scores to the department administrative assistant who will enter the scores and complete the table below. The full calculation is outlined in the **Calculation of Overall Merit** below.

Rating Worksheets for NTTF Members:

Pre-specified allocation of Effort for teaching: _____ %

Evaluation Rating Category	Teaching Effectiveness	Possible Merit Score for Teaching
	Examples of accomplishments for teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent as appropriate). Note: The typical level of a faculty member's performance would be similar to the examples listed in each merit category below.	
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 high levels of excellence in the classroom with rigorous course content ·Excellent syllabi preparation, class meets regularly, and office hours are made available for students Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are regularly introduced Regular engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness Exceptional academic mentoring	5.6 - 7
Meets expectations for merit	Quantitative student evaluations approximate departmental averages for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are generally positive Observations by peers indicate high levels of performance in the classroom Good preparation of syllabi, course content in generally rigorous class meets regularly, and office hours are made available to students Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities arc occasionally introduced Modest engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness Moderately involved in academic mentoring	2.6 – 5.5
Fails to meet expectations for merit	Quantitative student evaluations are among lowest in department for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are generally negative Observations by peers indicate significant opportunities for improvement Syllabi needs improvement: and/or class does not meet regularly and/or overall course content generally not rigorous and/or office hour policies are inconsistent Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are generally absent Limited or no engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness Limited/no academic mentoring	1 – 2.5

	Two consecutive academic semesters of documented, consistent (i.e. documented complaints each fall and spring semester) credible student complaints. Two consecutive academic semesters of poor student evaluation scores for all courses taught (i.e. evaluation scores falling below a score of 2 on a quantitative scale from 0-5). Failure to hold scheduled class meetings and/or events, without a good faith attempt for approval from the department Chair or College Dean Failure to meet teaching obligations.	
Unacceptable		0 – 0.9

Use the "Guidelines & suggested evidence for assessing performance and productivity" section found earlier in this document as a guide to determine score and rating category.

Allocation Factor for Faculty Member (i.e. 80%, etc.)

Merit Score for Teaching Effectiveness: _____

Score from above x allocation factor = _____ **Total Weighted Score**

Example:	**Merit Score for Teaching Effectiveness =**	6	
	Allocation Factor =		0.80
	Total Weighted Score (6 * 0.50) =		4.8

Pre-specified allocation of Effort for service: _____ %

Evaluation Rating Category	Service	Possible Merit Score for Service
	Examples of accomplishments on service performance indicators (or their equivalent as appropriate as appropriate). Note: The typical level of a faculty member's performance would be similar to the examples listed in each merit category below.	
Exceeds expectations for merit	Chairing one or more committees at department college, and/or university levels Membership of more than one committee at department, college, and university levels. Exceptional mentoring, and/or recruiting activities and/or engagement in student organization(s) Community/professional service to one or more significant activities related to faculty discipline; Example(s) of the following: service award significant service leadership, high impact practice, or high visibility service.	5.6 - 7
Meets expectations for merit	Membership of at least one committee at program, department, college, and/or university level. Academic advising, mentoring, and/or recruiting activities and/or engagement in student organization(s) Community/professional service to at least one activity related to faculty discipline	2.6 – 5.5
Fails to meet expectations for merit	Lack of consistent membership in committees at program, department, college, and/or university levels. Limited attendance at faculty meetings at departmental level; Limited to no involvement in mentoring or recruiting activities at college, university, or recruiting activities and/or engagement in student organization(s)	1 – 2.5
Unacceptable	Two consecutive academic semesters of failure to attend to service obligations, including consistent failure to attend meetings of committees to which one is assigned.	0 – 0.9

Use the "**Guidelines & suggested evidence for assessing performance and productivity**" section found earlier in this document as a guide to determine score and rating category.

Weighting Factor for Faculty Member (i.e. 20%, etc.)

Merit Score for Service Effectiveness: _____

Score from above x allocation factor = _____ **Total Weighted Score**

Example:	**Merit Score for Service =**	6
	Allocation Factor =	0.20
	Total Weighted Score (6 * 0.50) =	1.2

Department Rating Worksheet – NTTF

(To be completed by the individual committee member)

Faculty Member	Total Weighted Merit Score for Teaching (0 – 7)	Total Weighted Merit Score for Service (0-7)	Total Weighted Overall Merit Score (0 – 7)	Merit Committee Reviewer Comments
Faculty member 1	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score	Total of faculty member 1 scores for Teaching, Research, and Service	
Faculty member 2	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score	Total of faculty member 2 scores for Teaching, Research, and Service	
From Example Above	4.8	1.2	5.7	

The overall merit score includes four (4) categories. **Exceeds** reflects the faculty member who exceeds merit expectations as represented by an overall merit score between 5.6 -7 on the 7-point scale. **Meets** reflects the faculty member who meets but does not exceed merit expectations as represented by an overall merit score between 2.6 – 5.5 on the 7-point scale. **Fails to meet** reflects the faculty member who does not meet merit expectations as represented by an overall merit score between 1 – 2.5 on the 7-point scale. **Unacceptable** reflects the faculty member who does not meet merit expectations as represented by an overall merit score between 0 – 0.9 on the 7-point scale.

To qualify for merit a faculty member must have a minimum average weighted total score of at least 2.6 on the 7-point scale. Faculty will provide scores to the department administrative assistant who will enter the scores and complete the table below. The full calculation is outlined in the **Calculation of Overall Merit** below.

Chair Summary Rating Worksheet (NTTF & TTF)

Faculty Merit Scoring	Total Weighted Score	Exceeds merit expectations (5.6 - 7)	Meets merit expectations (2.6 – 5.5)	Fails to meet merit expectations (1 – 2.5)	Unacceptable performance (0-0.9)
Faculty 1 Score					
Faculty 2 Score					
Faculty 3 Score					
Faculty 4 Score					
Faculty 5 Score					
Average Score					

Note: Check the appropriate category (box) for each faculty member score and for the average score.

Merit Committee Composition and the Election//Appointment Process

The Department of Engineering Technologies merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. The Merit Committee shall consist of all (BGSU-FA) Bargaining Unit Faculty Members excepting first year faculty. Tenured and TTF will review Tenured, TTF and NTTF for merit consideration while NTTF will only review NTTF for merit consideration. Faculty members that are on FIL at the time of merit review may participate in faculty merit reviews if they wish.

Elements of the Merit Dossier

The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements:

For Tenured and Tenured Track faculty the Professional Vitae for Faculty (PVF) shall be prepared in accordance with the approved standards and criteria as shown in the template, "Professional Vitae for Faculty" (see b The Professional Vitae includes activities undertaken during the review period and shall include all appropriate supporting documentation for the year under review. For NTT faculty the Professional Vitae for Faculty (PVF) shall be prepared in accordance with the approved standards and criteria as shown in the template, "Professional Vitae for Faculty". The Professional Vitae includes activities undertaken during the review period and shall include all appropriate supporting documentation for the year under review. Bargaining unit members are to highlight current year's work. The department shall provide the committee with the student evaluations. The department may also consider peer review observations of the faculty.

Professional Vitae for Faculty

This document is intended to provide a record of faculty activity for retention, tenure, promotion and merit. Although the documentation is to be cumulative, when used for merit review, the activities during the period under review should be highlighted. The accompanying supporting materials and portfolio should relate only to the period under review. When applicable, in all cases indicate the calendar year in which the activity was completed.

Name _____   Evaluation Year_____

Circle the purpose of the review (Circle as appropriate)
Retention   Merit   Promotion   Tenure

(In all categories, respond chronologically with the most recent activity at the top of the list.)
  I. Academic Degrees

Degree	Institution	Year	Major Area

  II. Academic Positions
      A. Teaching and other Academic Positions

Position	Institution	Years

      B. Administrative Positions

Position	Institution	Years

  III. Non-academic Positions
       (List all paid positions in business, industry, military, or government. Do not list minor political offices or appointments.)

Position	Institution	Years

  IV. Teaching Experiences
      A. Teaching

      1. Undergraduate Courses
         Year_____

Spring Semester		Summer Semester		Fall Semester	
Course Number	Enrollment	Course Number	Enrollment	Course Number	Enrollment

      2. Undergraduate-Graduate Courses
         (Please use the same reporting format as in 1 above)
      3. Graduate Courses

(Please use the same reporting format as in 1 above)
4. Supervision of Graduate Assistants
5. Other Teaching. (List here interdisciplinary courses, supervision of student teachers, workshops, or courses conducted to teach graduate assistants to teach or other kinds of teaching unique to a college or university setting.)

B. Research and Advising
1. Thesis/Project and Dissertations Completed. (List here those students for whom you served as a major research advisor and/or as Chair of the research or examining committee.)
2.
   a. Thesis and Project:

Name	Degree	Year	University

   Thesis/Project Title:

   b. Dissertations:

Name	Degree	Year	University

   Dissertation Title:

3. Thesis/Project and Dissertations in Progress. (List here those students for whom you are serving as a major research advisor and/or as Chair of the research or examining committee.)

   a. Thesis and Project:

Name	Degree	Year	University

   Thesis/Project Title:

   b. Dissertations:

Name	Degree	Year	University

   Dissertation Title:

4. Membership on Thesis/Project and Dissertation Completed. (List here those students for whom you served as a member of the research or examining committee.)

   a. Thesis/Project:

Name	Degree	Year	University

Thesis/Project Title:

    b. Dissertations:

Name	Degree	Year	University

Dissertation Title:

5. Membership on Thesis/Project and Dissertation in Progress. (List here those students for whom you are serving as a <u>member</u> of the research or examining committee.)

    a. Thesis/Project

Name	Degree	Year	University

Thesis/Project Title:

    b. Dissertations:

Name	Degree	Year	University

Dissertation Title:

C. Teaching Portfolio
    (Should comply with commonly accepted portfolio formats.)

V. Curriculum Development
(List courses added to the curriculum, workshops, etc.)
Courses
Workshops
Educational Materials & Innovations

VI. Professional Development
(List courses taken, workshops, improvement leaves, post-doctoral training, etc.)

VII. Academic Advising
  A. Undergraduate

Year	Number of Students Assigned

  B. Graduate

Year	Number of Students Assigned

VIII. Research Interests
(Give the specialty or specialties within your discipline in which you have high research competence(ies) and with which you prefer to be identified.)

IX. <u>Grants and Research Projects and Proposals</u>   (List the funding agency, the agency project number if known, the dates, the dollar amount of support, and the title of the project. Do not list pending applications. Any special research equipment, in kind support or travel grants should be included under this heading.)
     A. Funded
     B. Non-Funded

X.   <u>Publications or Equivalencies</u>
     (List only articles or books published. In all cases include publisher, date of publication, pages and other appropriate information.)

     A. Books
          1. Textbooks
          2. Scholarly books
          3. Anthologies and all edited texts designated as such
          4. Chapters of books
          5. Indexes and other bibliographic texts
          6. Monographs
     B. Journal Articles
          1. Refereed Articles
              a. Journals
              b. Proceedings
          2. Non-refereed Articles
              a. Journals
              b. Newsletters
              c. Miscellaneous
          3. Editorships of Journals
     C. Book Reviews
          1. Book review essays
          2. Book reviews
     D.   Abstracts
     E.   Research Reports
          1. Published
          2. Unpublished
     F. Patents Awarded
         (List patent number, date, etc.)
     G. Product or Engineering Designs
         (Describe product, company accepting design, etc.)
     H. Other (Such as Software, Video, CD ROM etc.)

XI. <u>Papers Read to Professional Societies</u>
     (In all cases include nature of the Organization, date and other appropriate information.)

     A. Invited papers
     B. Refereed papers
     C. Non-refereed papers

XII. <u>Service</u>
(In all cases include nature of the activity, date and other appropriate information.)

   A. Department
   B. College
   C. University
   D. External (Professional)
      (List only offices held or other appropriate professional service such as chairing a symposium or panel discussion.)

Research or Professional Consultantship

<u>Membership in Professional Organizations</u>

Honors and Awards
   A. Membership in Honor Societies
   B. Awards (List award, date, sponsor, etc.)

XVI. <u>Other Significant Activities</u>

*Source: <u>The Academic Charter, B -I.D. Employee Responsibilities, modified by the department.</u>

Calculation of Overall Merit Score

The Department of Engineering Technologies follows Chair Summary Rating Worksheet (NTTF & TTF) for determining overall merit sore recommendations as reflected in the section above.

Each member of the merit committee shall review the Professional Vitae for Faculty (PVF) based on the "Professional Vitae for Faculty" found in "Elements of the Dossier" section.

Refer to the Preamble section of Part I: University-Wide Processes Required by the CBA for calculation process for the faculty three-year rolling average.

> **Note: When calculating the three-year rolling average, the previous year (scale used 100 as the total) faculty member's score will be converted from the 100 base score to the 7-point scale.**

Options for Determining Overall Merit Score Recommendations

The individual component merit scores for teaching effectiveness, research/creative work, and service are combined to arrive at an overall merit score. Allocation of effort is taken into account when determining overall merit score. The overall merit may include several 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.

Additional Academic Unit Merit Policy Information

Rebuttal Provisions

Refer to Part I, section 3 of this document.

Merit Committee & Process

Each member shall review the Professional Vitae for Faculty (PVF) based on the "Professional Vitae for Faculty" found in "Elements of the Dossier" section.

Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty (TTF) evaluation is based on Teaching Effectiveness (0 -7 points), Research/Creative Work (0 -7 points), and Service (0 -7 points), considering merit score and allocation of effort, utilizing the merit form, "Department Rating Worksheet (Merit)" found in this document. Each Tenure and Tenure Track Faculty member shall review the Professional Vitae for Faculty (PVF) and supporting documentation for meeting the standards and criteria in quantity and quality before finalizing the evaluation for each reviewed faculty except himself/herself. Pertinent and helpful comments should be included on the rating worksheet. Suggested items for comment would include appropriateness of an entry in a specific category and appropriate detail of an entry.

Each member of the committee shall review the NTTF Professional Vitae for Faculty (PVF) and supporting documentation for meeting the standards and criteria in quantity and quality before finalizing the evaluation for each reviewed NTT faculty except himself/herself. Pertinent and helpful comments should be included on the rating worksheet. Suggested items for comment

would include appropriateness of an entry in a specific category and appropriate detail of an entry.

The Department Rating Worksheets (TTF or NTTF) will be delivered to the Chairperson. Using the rating worksheets of the Reviewed Faculty, the Department Chair will take all Department Rating Worksheets for all faculty members, compute the average score for each faculty member, and place on the Chair Summary Rating Worksheet.

The completed Chair Rating Worksheet (with names removed) will be delivered to the faculty member. Thus, the peer reviews will include one score from faculty and the chair will submit a second score. Both are transmitted to the Dean.

The overall merit score includes four (4) categories. Category 1 reflects the faculty member who has unacceptable performance as represented by an overall merit score of $0 - 0.9$ on the 7-point scale. Category 2 reflects the faculty member who does not meet merit expectations as represented by an overall merit score of $1 - 2.5$ on the 7-point scale. Category 3 reflects the faculty member who meets but does not exceed merit expectations as represented by an overall merit score of $2.6 - 5.5$ on the 7-point scale. Category 4 reflects the faculty member who exceeds merit expectations as represented by an overall merit score of $5.6 - 7$ on the 7-point scale. To qualify for merit a faculty member must have a minimum average weighted score of at least 2.6 on the 7-point scale.

Approved by the Department of Engineering Technologies via e-mail vote on 3/14/2017.

Approved: _____   Date $4 - 20 - 2017$

Dr. Sudershan Jetley, Interim Chair Department of Engineering Technologies, College of Technology, Architecture and Applied Engineering

Approved: _____   Date 4/20/2017

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

Approved: _____   Date 4/21/17

Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP