Merit Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

Academic Unit: Library Teaching & Learning, University Libraries

Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

Merit criteria are limited to three areas: Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/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 is combined to calculate the relevant component merit scores (i.e., Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/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: Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Work, and Service. Each of the aforementioned criteria (e.g., instruction services) will be evaluated using a number of performance indicators (e.g., quantitative student evaluations of teaching). Merit committee members (all LTL Bargaining Unit Faculty 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 of performance on the performance indicators. Merit committee members will submit component scores to Merit Coordinators who will calculate the average score for each faculty member to arrive at the final component score.   The component scores may range in value from 0 to 5 and will clearly identify whether the assigned score on the criteria (e.g., instruction services) reflects performance that is unacceptable, fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

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

Librarian Effectiveness
Due to a wide variety of assigned professional functions, activities and responsibilities, librarian effectiveness is evaluated according to a comprehensive set of relevant criteria including, but not limited to: teaching activities such as library instruction, credit courses, individual reference and consultation services, research clinics, and local training workshops; liaison responsibilities for instruction, collection development/management (e-resources/print) and the institutional repository; outreach activities; preservation activities; cataloging and metadata creation; and leadership responsibilities for coordinators. As some positions necessitate service on particular committees and task forces, service of this type will be evaluated as Librarian Effectiveness.

The following criteria apply to all librarians within LTL as appropriate to each individual position description and Allocation of Effort. Faculty members shall be evaluated separately for each area (Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Work, & Service).

The adverb "effectively" refers to both the overall success in conveying appropriate information and building appropriate skills, and demonstrable effort in attaining such success. Thus, a faculty member may demonstrate the effectiveness of their library instruction with evidence showing success (e.g. student comments on evaluations, assessment results, peer reviews of teaching by colleagues), and (if needed) with evidence showing the kind and

quality of effort they have made (e.g. e-mails sent to faculty offering instruction services, a portfolio of teaching materials, a discussion of special problems faced).

Evaluation Rating Category	**LIBRARIAN EFFECTIVENESS** **Expected levels of accomplishment on librarian effectiveness performance indicators in the six areas below**	Possible Merit Score for Librarian Effectiveness*
Reference Services	Provides in-person and virtual reference service, when appropriate to position responsibilities, including but not limited to the Jerome Library Research & Information Desk, including evening and weekend shifts as assigned.	
Exceeds expectations for merit	In addition to requirements under Meets Expectations, exceptional performance can be demonstrated by one or more of the following: • Routinely picks up extra reference responsibilities as needed for illness or unexpected absences. • Routinely provides exceptional reference assistance by: following up with students when off the desk; assisting other librarians with difficult patron questions; locating resources beyond student expectations; and using subject knowledge not commonly possessed by colleagues. • Routinely assists with troubleshooting e-resources problems outside of desk hours. • Researches and recommends new reference e-resources for subscription/purchase. • Takes a leadership role in a project or activity related to reference services.	*3.5 – 5.0*
Meets expectations for merit	• Arrives on time and completes assigned shifts or makes arrangements for a substitute. • Is prepared for desk shifts (i.e. Read RefBlog & emails) • Shares reference service information with colleagues and Information Desk Assistants. • Is prepared for (having read materials supporting agenda items), attends, and contributes to reference and departmental meetings. • Effectively responds to reference questions received via the IM service. • Effectively responds to in person reference questions received at the Research and Information Desk • Effectively responds to reference questions received via personal email and/or telephone. • Effectively teaches students how to find, use, and evaluate sources as appropriate during reference transactions. • Makes appropriate referrals to other UL personnel, service points & collections. • Meets deadlines for departmental projects/requests for feedback and makes substantive contributions. • Provides oversight (training & monitoring) of Information Desk Assistants while at the desk to help ensure excellent service. • Participates in special departmental projects and activities related to reference services.	*1.5 – 3.4*

	• Participates in selection and collection maintenance of print and digital reference materials.	
Fails to meet expectations for merit	• Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations for merit at an acceptable level, but demonstrates minimal provision of reference services required for overall acceptable job performance.	*1.0 – 1.4*
Unacceptable performance	• The submitted evidence does not demonstrate an acceptable level of provision of reference services across the merit review period, or no evidence is submitted.	*0 – 0.9*
Instruction Services	Participation in teaching activities, when appropriate to position responsibilities, including, but not limited to library instruction; individual research appointments and consultation services; local training workshops; instructor of record responsibilities; student advising; and dissertation/thesis advising.	
Exceeds expectations for merit	In addition to requirements under Meets Expectations, can be demonstrated by one or more of the following: • Develops innovative teaching strategies for use in instruction sessions • Demonstrates commitment to student/participant learning through regular substantive assessment and responds to opportunities for improvement. • Develops new relationships with departmental faculty, leading to new collaborations. • Instructor of record for a credit-bearing course. • Assumes additional instructional responsibilities as needed.	*3.5 – 5.0*
Meets expectations for merit	Acceptable performance is typically demonstrated by the following: • Reaches out to department faculty regularly to inform them of library services and resources. • Provides effective library instruction to assigned departments or constituencies. • Collaborates with classroom faculty to develop a meaningful library instruction experience. • Develops effective instructional materials. • Participates in library instruction initiatives and programs such as Individual Research Appointments, Graduate Student Orientation. • Being prepared for (having read materials supporting agenda items), attending, and contributing to Instruction meetings.	*1.5 – 3.4*
Fails to meet expectations for merit	• Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations for merit at an acceptable level, but demonstrates minimal participation in instruction services (such as conducting IRAs or classroom instruction) required for overall acceptable job performance.	*1.0 – 1.4*
Unacceptable performance	• The submitted evidence does not demonstrate an acceptable level of participation in teaching activities across the merit review period, or no evidence is submitted.	*0 – 0.9*
Campus Engagement	Active involvement in academic activities throughout the university. Building relationships and partnering with classroom faculty in a wide variety of ways. Performance indicators within campus engagement will frequently overlap with performance indicators for other criteria within Librarian Effectiveness as well as within Service and Scholarly/Creative Work.	

Exceeds expectations for merit	In addition to requirements under Meets Expectations, can be demonstrated by one or more of the following: • Pursuing development of new, or strengthening existing, liaison relationships or proactively working to adjust collections to departmental needs. • Collaborating with faculty on academic endeavors (e.g. jointly creating a new LibGuide [substantial content]; establishing a new online journal in ScholarWorks; co-authoring a journal article; embedding a library presence within a Canvas course shell). • Providing information and materials for promotion of new and existing e-resources for librarian use. • Leading a faculty learning community.	*3.5 – 5.0*
Meets expectations for merit	Acceptable performance is typically demonstrated by the following: • Carries out liaison responsibilities in assigned teams, such as Instruction, Collection Development, ScholarWorks, or Digital Initiatives. • Subject team liaison responsibilities might include: responding to research and library queries and requests from faculty; maintaining established faculty relationships; attending departmental meetings and functions; informing faculty of new library resources and services; responding to requests for materials acquisition. • Additional engagement activities might include: participating in a faculty learning community; attending campus activities and events; participating in UL outreach and promotion efforts.	*1.5 – 3.4*
Fails to meet expectations for merit	• Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations for merit at an acceptable level, but demonstrates minimal campus engagement activity for an overall acceptable job performance.	*1.0 – 1.4*
Unacceptable performance	• The submitted evidence does not demonstrate an acceptable level of engagement in academic activities/building relationships throughout the university across the merit review period, or no evidence is submitted.	*0 – 0.9*
Collection and E-Resources Management	Participation in activities related to collection development and management of print and electronic resources, when appropriate to position responsibilities.	
Exceeds expectations for merit	In addition to requirements under Meets Expectations, can be demonstrated by one or more of the following: • Makes substantive contributions to the annual review of electronic resources. • Maintains an awareness of resources relevant to the needs of departments within assigned subject teams and recommends for further review as appropriate. • Completes or participates in a project related to the improvement of evaluation of library collections and/or e-resources. • Researches and recommends new e-resources for subscription/purchase.	*3.5 – 5.0*
Meets expectations for merit	Acceptable performance is typically demonstrated by the following: • Participates in the annual review of electronic resources. • Contributes to the ongoing review of recommended resources.	*1.5 – 3.4*

	• Communicates faculty resource needs to the collection development team. • Assists with collection management projects as needed and meets established deadlines. • Oversees the set-up of new electronic resources. • Gathers and optimizes feedback based on new features for electronic resources.	
Fails to meet expectations for merit	• Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations for merit at an acceptable level, but demonstrates minimal activity for overall acceptable job performance.	*1.0 – 1.4*
Unacceptable performance	• The submitted evidence does not demonstrate an acceptable level of participation in collection management activities across the merit review period, or no evidence is submitted.	*0 – 0.9*
Collaboration & Communication		
Exceeds expectations for merit	In addition to requirements under Meets Expectations, can be demonstrated by the following: • Promotes/establishes new, or strengthens existing, collaborations within the UL, the University, the community, and/or the OhioLINK consortium	*3.5 – 5.0*
Meets expectations for merit	Acceptable performance is typically demonstrated by the following: • Professional and effective interaction and collaboration with library faculty, staff, student assistants, and users.	*1.5 – 3.4*
Fails to meet expectations for merit	• Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations for merit at an acceptable level, but demonstrates minimal activity for overall acceptable job performance. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, inability to work effectively with colleagues.	*1.0 – 1.4*
Unacceptable performance	• The submitted evidence does not demonstrate an acceptable level of collaboration or communication with others across the merit review period, or no evidence is submitted.	*0 – 0.9*
Professional Development/ Continuous Improvement		
Exceeds expectations for merit	In addition to requirements under Meets Expectations, can be demonstrated by one or more of the following: • Regularly contributes to the improvement of departmental and library services, including through the incorporation of new technologies and software applications. • Regularly improves effectiveness with knowledge gained from professional development activities and assessment.	*3.5 – 5.0*
Meets expectations for merit	Acceptable performance is typically demonstrated by the following: • Seeks to improve library services in relation to the goals and practices of LTL, UL, the University and the needs of users (e.g. attends workshops, views webinars, attends conferences). • Actively learns new skills and technology; is aware of emerging trends in specialization; adheres to national standards • Reads professional blogs, e-mail lists, literature, etc.	*1.5 – 3.4*

Fails to meet expectations for merit	• Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations for merit, but participates in minimal professional development needed for overall acceptable job performance.	*1.0 – 1.4*
Unacceptable performance	• The submitted evidence does not demonstrate an acceptable level of participation in professional development activities across the merit review period, or no evidence is submitted.	*0 – 0.9*
Program Coordinators	In addition to the items in the previous list, the librarian effectiveness of coordinators will be evaluated on the following criteria, as appropriate to specific position descriptions:	
Exceeds expectations for merit	• Develops and implements new programs and policies or significantly improves existing programs to enhance the unit's service and work effectiveness. • Successfully advocates for the unit/function, leading to a significant program enhancement. • Manages resources and operations of the unit/function in an exceptionally effective manner.	*3.5 – 5.0*
Meets expectations for merit	• Maintains and assesses existing programs, policies, and procedures to continue and enhance the unit's service and work effectiveness • Advocates for the unit/function and represents concerns to others within the department, UL and University • Manages resources and operations of the unit/function in an effective manner.	*1.5 – 3.4*
Fails to meet expectations for merit	• Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations for merit, but demonstrates minimal program coordination efforts that are required for acceptable job performance.	*1.0 – 1.4*
Unacceptable performance	• The submitted evidence does not demonstrate an acceptable level of program coordination across the merit review period, or no evidence is submitted.	*0 – 0.9*

*Insert score values on a scale that includes <u>at least</u> six numerical values, e.g., 0-5 point scale.

Merit Score for Librarian Effectiveness* (to be completed by merit committee member): ____ (0 - 5.0)

*All components of Librarian Effectiveness should be considered in determining the overall Librarian Effectiveness Score. The following chart can be used (if desired) in assisting committee members in making this determination. The final score should not necessarily be a straight average of the components. This chart will not be turned into merit coordinators.

Component Scores:
Reference Services: _____
Instruction Services: _____
Campus Engagement: _____
Collection and E-Resources Management: _____
Collaboration & Communication: _____
Professional Development/Continuous Improvement: _____
Program Coordinators (if applicable): _____
Additional Responsibilities (if applicable) as listed in individual position descriptions: _____

Scholarly/Creative Work

The faculty member has met the criteria for scholarly/creative work as listed below. Faculty members should maintain a record of their scholarly /creative work that addresses the performance indicators used for evaluation.

Evaluation Rating Category	SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE WORK Expected levels of accomplishment on scholarly/creative work performance indicators (or the equivalent as determined by the chair and merit committee)	Possible Merit Score for Scholarly/ Creative Work
Exceeds expectations for merit	Completes one or more of the following or completes one item from Meets Expectations and one of the following: • publishes a professional academic book; • publishes a professional textbook; • publishes a professional article in a peer-reviewed academic journal; • publishes a chapter in a professional academic book; • presents two peer-reviewed sessions at state, regional or national conferences; • obtains an external grant of $2,000 or more; • edits a book, journal issue, or entire journal; • serves as a grant reviewer/evaluator beyond the local level; • receives an award or recognition for exceptional scholarly products.	*3.5 – 5.0*
Meets expectations for merit	Completes at least two of the following: • organizes a conference or conference session; • chairs a panel; • serves as manuscript reviewer; • presents a poster session; • delivers a local lecture or presentation on ongoing research; • engages actively in ongoing research and writing (has a research plan); • presents at a conference; • publishes a professional article beyond the local level; • submits a grant application or secures a grant; • publishes a book review; • submits an academic article or book chapter for review.	*1.5 – 3.4*
Fails to meet expectations for merit	• Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations for merit (two from the list), but completes one activity from the list meeting minimal requirements for acceptable performance.	*1.0 – 1.4*
Unacceptable performance	• The submitted evidence does not demonstrate an acceptable level of scholarly/creative work across the merit review period, or no evidence is submitted.	*0 – 0.9*

Merit Score for Scholarly/Creative Work (to be completed by merit committee member): _____ (0 - 5.0)

Service

The faculty member has given evidence of substantive service to University Libraries, BGSU or the profession at the local, state, national or international level. In presenting their records of service and contributions, faculty members should include examples of service which address the performance indicators used for evaluation. Faculty members are encouraged to lend their professional expertise to support community organizations, projects, and programs. However, for external community service to be considered for reappointment, 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

Evaluation Rating Category	SERVICE Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators (or the equivalent as determined by the chair and merit committee)	Possible Merit Score for Service*
Exceeds expectations for merit	• Takes a leadership role in an important aspect of college or university governance or organization; for example, chairs a committee that rewrites and implements changes in general education. • Takes a leadership role in a state or national professional organization, or functions in a central capacity in the publication of a professional journal. • Serves on multiple committees that produce significant products and/or makes significant contributions.	*3.5 – 5.0*
Meets expectations for merit	• Serves on a committee at the department, college, university, state, national, or international level. • Chairs a committee at the department, college or university level. • Takes a leadership role in some aspect of university work (e.g. leading an assessment activity for the department). • Performs some community or professional service related to professional expertise (e.g. catalogs a special library collection).	*1.5 – 3.4*
Fails to meet expectations for merit	• Does not satisfy the requirements for merit, but demonstrates minimal service contributions such as serving on a committee but failing to attend meetings or participate in any significant way in the work of the committee.	*1.0 – 1.4*
Unacceptable performance	• The submitted evidence does not demonstrate an acceptable level of service contributions to UL, BGSU, or the profession at large across the merit review period or no evidence is submitted.	*0 – 0.9*

Insert score values on a scale that includes at least six numerical values, e.g., 0-5 point scale.

Merit Score for Service (to be completed by merit committee member): _____ (0 - 5.0)

Merit Committee Composition and the Election//Appointment Process

The departmental merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member (See Merit Evaluation Sheet, p. 11). The merit committee will consist of all Bargaining Unit Faculty within Library Teaching & Learning (LTL). Additionally, there will be two members who will serve as coordinators of the merit process for the merit year. This responsibility will rotate in alphabetical order. Each coordinator will serve a staggered two-year term. Bargaining Unit Faculty Members, in this set of procedures, will refer to both tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty members in the Department of Library Teaching and Learning, unless otherwise stated.

Elements of the Merit Dossier

The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements:
- Annual Data Outline
- Position Description
- Allocation of Effort (only if the Allocation is different than the standard 70% Librarian Effectiveness, 20% Scholarly/Creative Work and 10% Service) A copy of the official letter approving the adjusted Allocation of Effort should be included.
- Documentation of Special Circumstances (See section 4 in Merit Policy, Part I). Include type of circumstance, length of time taken & dates.
- Copies of (or links to) publications during the calendar year.

The Bargaining Unit Faculty Member submits sufficient copies for each committee member to the merit coordinators and will also give two copies of each of these documents to the department chair, one of which will be forwarded to the Dean of University Libraries.

The Merit Coordinators will ensure that each Committee Member receives a set of LTL Merit Criteria & Performance Indicators Rubric & Merit Evaluation Sheets for each of the other LTL faculty members (see below). Each Bargaining Unit Faculty Member will use the LTL Merit Criteria & Performance Indicators Rubric to complete a Merit Evaluation Sheet for each of the other Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in LTL, assigning a score from 0 to 5 for each criterion (Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Work, and Service), using the associated performance indicators to guide the scoring. Before finalizing the Merit Evaluation Sheets, the merit committee as a whole will meet informally to discuss any factual or interpretive issues in advance of submitting evaluations. Completed Merit Evaluation Sheets will be submitted as instructed by the Merit Coordinators.

A Bargaining Unit Faculty Member who does not complete and submit an LTL Merit Evaluation Sheet *for each of the other LTL Bargaining Unit Faculty Members is considered to not meet expectations for merit.* The Merit Coordinators are responsible for reporting this to the Chair of the Department of Library Teaching and Learning. An exception to this policy for cases of extended illness or other exceptional reasons will be determined by the Chair.

Calculation of Overall Merit Score

The overall merit score will be calculated by the Merit Coordinators using the Weighted Allocation of Effort Algorithm. Allocation of effort is taken into account when determining overall merit score. Final merit scores will range between 0 and 5, with a score of 0 indicating Unacceptable Performance; 1 – 1.4 indicating Does Not Meet Expectations; 1.5 – 3.4 indicating Meets Expectations, and 3.5 – 5 indicating Exceeds Expectations. Should a majority of faculty reviewers (50%+1) rate an individual as 0 in any area of allocation, the merit coordinators will indicate a score of 0 for that area of allocation.

- The merit coordinators will submit merit scores to LTL Bargaining Unit Faculty Members using the LTL Faculty Merit Individual Ranking Summary form found on page 12. The merit coordinators will transmit merit scores using the LTL Faculty Merit Individual Ranking Summary form as well as the LTL Faculty Merit Summary Report (on page 13) to the LTL chair.
- The LTL Chair will independently evaluate LTL Bargaining Unit Faculty Members following the LTL Merit Criteria & Performance Indicators Rubric Sheets (on pages 2-8) and the weighted Allocation of Effort Algorithm (see below). LTL Chair will inform each Bargaining Unit Faculty Member of their evaluation from the Chair.

The LTL Chair and Merit Coordinators will ensure that all forms used in the merit process are submitted to the UL Dean's Office to be held in compliance with the applicable record retention policy.

Determining Overall Merit Score Recommendations

The individual component merit scores for librarian effectiveness, scholarly/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 a greater number of values or rating levels than seven, 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.

Once the Merit Coordinators have averaged the component merit scores received from each committee member to arrive at the final "consensus" score, the overall merit score is computed using a simple algorithm taking into account the weighted allocation of effort for each performance area and adjusted for special circumstances if applicable. The overall merit score for the current year will then be averaged with the annual score from the previous two years to arrive at the three-year average. The three-year average score will be used to determine merit recommendations. Merit Coordinators should ask the Chair for previous two years "consensus" scores. These scores will be submitted to the Dean, along with the Chair's annual merit report.

Allocation of Effort Algorithm
[Librarian Effectiveness Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] + [Scholarly/Creative Work Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] + [Service Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] = Overall Merit Score

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation
0 – 0.9	Unacceptable performance
1.0 – 1.4	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
1.5 – 3.4	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
3.5 – 5.0	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit

Additional Academic Unit Merit Policy Information

This form is to be completed by each merit committee member for each merit candidate. Completed forms are given to Merit Coordinators.

LTL FACULTY MERIT EVALUATION SHEET

Evaluatee: _____

Allocation of Effort: _____

Merit Score:

Librarian Effectiveness _____

Scholarly/Creative Work _____

Service _____

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation
0 – 0.9	Unacceptable performance
1.0 – 1.4	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
1.5 – 3.4	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
3.5 – 5.0	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit

This form is to be completed by Merit Coordinators. Each individual faculty member receives a copy of their own form. The LTL Chair receives a copy for each faculty member.

LTL FACULTY MERIT INDIVIDUAL RANKING SUMMARY

Name of Faculty Member: _____

Merit Year: _____ Overall Merit Score*: _____

	Librarian Effectiveness	**Scholarly/ Creative Work**	**Service**
Final Averaged Scores	*Insert score (average of evaluators' scores)*	*Insert score (average of evaluators' scores)*	*Insert score (average of evaluators' scores)*
Evaluator #1	*Insert numerical score*	*Insert numerical score*	*Insert numerical score*
Evaluator #2	*Insert numerical score*	*Insert numerical score*	*Insert numerical score*
Evaluator #3	*Insert numerical score*	*Insert numerical score*	*Insert numerical score*
Evaluator #4	*Insert numerical score*	*Insert numerical score*	*Insert numerical score*
Evaluator #5	*Insert numerical score*	*Insert numerical score*	*Insert numerical score*

Overall Merit Score	**Interpretation**
0 – 0.9	Unacceptable performance
1.0 – 1.4	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
1.5 – 3.4	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
3.5 – 5.0	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit

* Overall Merit Score Calculated by using Weighted Allocation of Effort Algorithm

Three Year Average Merit Score: _____

Current Year	One Year Ago	Two Years Ago	Three Year Average

This form is to be completed by Merit Coordinators and Submitted to LTL Chair.

LTL FACULTY MERIT SUMMARY REPORT

Faculty Name	Current Year	One Year Ago	Two Years Ago		Three Year Average

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation
0 – 0.9	Unacceptable performance
1.0 – 1.4	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
1.5 – 3.4	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
3.5 – 5.0	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit

Approved by the Department of Library Teaching and Learning

Robert Snyder
Robert Snyder (Jan 4, 2022 10:05 EST)

Date 01/04/2022

Name, Chair

Approved: *Sara A. Bushong*
Sara A.Bushong (Jan 4, 2022 10:15 EST)

Date 01/04/2022

Name, Dean of College

Approved: *Joe B. Whitehead, Jr*
Joe Whitehead (Jan 6, 2022 20:50 EST)

Date 01/06/2022

Name, Provost/ Senior VP