Merit Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

Academic Unit: Department of Public and Allied Health

Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations
Merit criteria are limited to three areas: Teaching/Librarian 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/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service).

Overview
Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the PAH 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
Teaching Effectiveness assignment for calendar year: _____
Pre-specified allocation of effort for Teaching: 60 %

Using the minimum five rating levels, the following evaluation concepts would be included: Less than 1 = Unacceptable performance; 1 = Does not meet expectations for merit; 2/3 = Meets expectations for merit; 4/5 = Exceeds expectations for merit.

To **meet** departmental expectations in Teaching, faculty should demonstrate applicable activity in all of the following ways.

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (Circle One)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (Evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
Undergraduate Teaching *Quantitative ratings* of teaching effectiveness. A total student evaluation average (on a 4-point scale) of all courses taught in the calendar year.	• Exceeds expectations (3.4 or higher on a 4-point scale) • Meets expectations (2.8 or higher on a 4-point scale) • Does not meet expectations (less than 2.8 on a 4-point)	
Undergraduate Teaching *Qualitative ratings* of teaching effectiveness. Documentation of successful student learning outcomes (such as medium to high scores on standardized assessment measures, licensure or professional examinations, positive reports from the adjunct faculty of affiliated clinical sites).	• Positive • Neutral • Negative	
Graduate Teaching A total student evaluation average (on a 4-point scale) of all courses taught in the calendar year.	• Exceeds expectations (3.4 or higher on a 4-point scale) • Meets expectations (2.8 or higher on a 4-point scale) • Does not meet expectations (less than 2.8 on a 4-point scale)	
Graduate Teaching Participation in the direction of theses and/or dissertations, or membership on graduate committees. Graduate Faculty status.	• Exceeds expectations—2 or more activities • Meets expectations—1 activity • Does not meet expectations—no activity	
Additional contributions to student learning • Independent studies offered to students above typical workload	• Exceeds expectations—3 or more activities • Meets expectations—2 activities	

• The development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses • Innovations in the effective use of instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning • Participation in curriculum review or development of master syllabi • Integration of service learning activities • Academic advising services provided to students • Effective guidance of students in clinical settings, internships, or co-operative work experiences • Participation in University, College, or Department projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning; and other pedagogical activities that contribute to effective teaching	• Does not meet expectations—1 or less activity	

Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Teaching (4-5)	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 Innovative teacher; provides leadership in instructional development
Meets Expectations for Merit in Teaching (2-3)	Preponderance of ratings are in the middle to lower middle categories Meets obligations well
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Teaching (1)	Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories Minimally meets expectations for performance but not to the level deserving of merit Substandard and ineffective teacher

"Unacceptable" Performance (less than 1)	A pattern of quantitative average teaching evaluations of less than 2 on a 4-point scale (where 1=strongly disagree and 4=strongly agree) across courses, over the past performance period

Merit Score for teaching (to be completed by merit committee member): ____

Research
Pre-specified allocation of effort for Research: 30 %

There are differing levels of importance, academic depth, and prestige associated with the various types of Research that are recognized by the Department. A two-tiered model is used to categorize faculty research activities. Research will be evaluated using the minimum five rating levels, the following evaluation concepts would be included: 1 = Does not meet expectations for merit; 2/3 = Meets expectations for merit; 4/5 = Exceeds expectations for merit. To meet departmental expectations in Research, faculty should demonstrate applicable activity in all of the following ways.

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (Circle One)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (Evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
Tier 1 1. Peer reviewed publications (or acceptance letter) of submissions in journals or symposium. 2. Publication or submission of books, monograms, and review articles. 3. Successful procurement of external grant (Principal Investigator) To qualify, each publication must be peer-reviewed and have an ISBN or ISSN number or be published by the federal government. Some of the factors that may be considered in addition to the number of scholarly products	Exceeds Expectations- Two activities in Tier 1, and at least two additional activities from any tier. Meets Expectations- One activity in Tier 1 or three activities in Tier 2. Does not meet expectations- No activity in Tier 1 or fewer than three activities in Tier 2 Notes: • Grants: performance of duties as principal investigator carry more weight than co-principal investigator for funded projects.	

include, but are not limited to: a) the quality of publication outlets, b) leadership roles on projects that produced scholarly products, c) order of authorship, and d) the impact of specific research designs (e.g., ethnographic, qualitative, and/or longitudinal) that may reasonably elongate publication time-lines on particular research projects.	• Funded grants are more highly regarded than unfunded research proposals.	
Tier 2 • Presentations at national or international meetings sponsored by professional societies or organizations recognized for their leadership in the discipline. • Peer-reviewed abstracts published in journals and proceedings of leading societies within the discipline. • Unfunded research proposals. • Research funds awarded. • Digital products such as software provided they are published and distributed by a recognized vendor. • Presentations at state or regional meetings sponsored by professional societies or organizations recognized for their		

leadership in the discipline. • Professional and/or Non-Professional development activities on and off campus • Local presentations • Community outreach with evaluation component		

Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Research (4-5)	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 Clear line of inquiry and established research program, meaningful integration and application
Meets Expectations for Merit in Research (2-3)	Preponderance of ratings are in the middle to lower middle categories Active scholarship
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Research (1)	Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories Minimally meets expectations for performance but not to the level deserving of merit Limited or no research program
"Unacceptable" Performance (less than 1)	No documented/discernible research or scholarly activity in any of the areas of scholarship (publications, presentations, grant submissions, or other activities), as described in this document over the past performance period.

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

Service
Pre-Specified Allocation of Effort for Service 10 %

Service will be evaluated using the minimum five rating levels, the following evaluation concepts would be included: 1 = Does not meet expectations for merit; 2/3 = Meets expectations for merit; 4/5 = Exceeds expectations for merit.

To meet departmental expectations in Service, faculty must demonstrate active involvement in a minimum of two-three internal service activities and active involvement in one-two external service activities.

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (Circle One)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (Evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
Internal • Appointment/election and service on Departmental Committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like. • Appointment/election and service on College Committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like • Appointment/election and service on University Committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like • Special projects by assignment from Chair or Dean • Evidence of contributions to the recruitment and retention of undergraduates and/or graduates, and placement of graduates (as appropriate). • Serve as faculty advisor to student club or organization • Serve and actively participate on faculty search and/or annual symposium planning committees	Exceeds expectations - active involvement in four or more internal service activities (examples are not all inclusive) Meets Expectations - active involvement in a minimum of two-three internal service activities. Does not meet expectations - active involvement in one or fewer internal service activities.	
External/Professional Service • Participation in agency boards of directors or advisory boards • Organization of professional conferences, symposiums, etc. • Peer review for academic journals and/or reviewer for extramural funding agencies	Exceeds expectations - active involvement in more than two external service activities (examples are not all inclusive) Meets Expectations - active involvement in a one-two external service activities.	

	Does not meet expectations – no involvement in any external or professional service activities	
• Participation in activities that enhance one's profession (e.g. licensure activities, professional supervision, etc.) • Membership and active involvement with professional organizations connected to his/her discipline at the local, state, national, or international levels		

Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Service (4-5)	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 (2-3)	Preponderance of ratings are in the middle to lower middle categories
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Service (1)	Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories Minimally meets expectations for performance but not to the level deserving of merit
"Unacceptable" Performance (less than 1)	A pattern of failure to provide internal and/or external/professional service over the past performance period and/or a persistent pattern of failing to follow through or complete service commitments

Merit Score for Service (to be completed by merit committee member): ___

SUMMARY FORM
(To be completed with agreement reached by all members of the merit committee):

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

Merit Committee Composition and the Election//Appointment Process

The department merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. The three members need to represent each of the disciplinary units (FN, MLS and PH) and be department full time faculty for at least 2 years. At least one member must be tenured. The committee members will be elected by the department full time faculty.

All department faculty members must submit a copy of their PAH Annual Merit Portfolio to the Chair. The Chair will notify department faculty members of the deadline for submission of the Annual Merit Portfolio.

Elements of the Merit Dossier

The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements: updated CV, related activities completed during the previous calendar year (and not submitted to the merit committee in previous years), and student teaching evaluations from the previous calendar year.

Calculation of Overall Merit Score

A 5-point scale is used for merit evaluations. Ratings of less than 2.0 are not considered for merit. Ratings of 2.0 or greater are considered for merit. A description of how the overall merit score is calculated is provided below.

The individual component merit scores for teaching, research, 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.

A three-year rolling average is used to determine merit-based salary increases. Merit score for the current review period is averaged with the merit scores from the previous two merit periods.

The Department uses the following method to evaluate faculty for merit.
1. A 5-point scale is used for merit evaluations. Ratings less than 2.0 are not considered for merit Ratings 2.0 or greater are considered for merit
2. Merit Committee submits individual ratings for Teaching, Research/Creative Work and Service for each PAH full-time faculty member.
3. The final scores of each category are multiplied by the PAH Allocation of Effort percentages (for TTF: 60% teaching, 30% research/creative, 10% service) (for administrative responsibilities: 40% teaching, 30% research/creative, 10% service, 20% administration) (for NTTF: 80% teaching and 20% service). Percentages for faculty with alternative Allocations of Effort will be adjusted.

4. Scores from each category are added together for the Total Individual Merit Score. A faculty member falling below 3 points in any category is disqualified from receiving merit no matter how high their Total Individual Merit Score.
5. Individual Merit Score recommendations are compiled by the Chair and forwarded to the Dean.
6. The Dean informs each faculty member of his or her Total Individual Merit Score.

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation
1	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
2-3	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
4-5	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit

Annual Merit Portfolio
The Annual Merit Portfolio should contain the following elements in each of the three components (Teaching, Research, and Service) from the past calendar year. The merit portfolio should contain only information based on the preceding calendar year of work (not three year rolling averages).

Teaching Component of Portfolio
1. Teaching philosophy.
2. A list of courses taught over the past calendar year, with enrollment data. For clinical teaching, a list of numbers of students supervised per semester.
3. A list of other instructional activities.
4. Student rating summary sheets for all courses taught, and for any clinical teaching assignments, over the past calendar year.
5. Self-reflection/analysis of performance based on student ratings and any other factors the faculty member wishes to include.

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.

Research Component of Portfolio
1. Research statement, outlining and explaining faculty member's program of research over the past calendar year 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.

Service Component of portfolio
1. Service philosophy.

2. A list of service activities and frequency of meeting for the past calendar, as defined above.
3. Self-reflection/analysis of service activities, including annual goals.

Faculty may also include any other information they believe will assist in documenting/evaluating their service effectiveness.

Evaluation procedure

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.

The Merit Committee is charged with evaluating portfolios submitted by Bargaining Unit members and transmitting a Merit Score for each, with a written rationale and an overall recommendation for merit salary raise, to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will conduct an independent Merit evaluation.

Evaluations of Teaching, Research, and service

The Merit Committee will evaluate the Research/Creative Work of each continuing faculty member and submit their recommendations to the Chair as prescribed below.

1. Study PAH Annual Merit Portfolios of all continuing full-time faculty
2. Produce 3 independent sets of ratings for Teaching, Research/Creative Work and Service for each continuing full-time faculty member that has submitted a Merit Portfolio
3. The Merit Committee rates each full-time faculty member on a 5-point scale. Scores of 4 and higher are considered to exceed expectations. The Merit Committee does not produce percentages or dollar figures.
4. No composite ratings are produced by the Merit Committee
5. Each committee member forwards his/her ratings to the Chair.
6. The Chair uses the Merit Committee findings as described in the Evaluation Process for Merit below.

Consideration for Varying Allocations of Effort

The Chair must inform the Merit Committee in writing of any faculty members who are assigned an allocation of effort differing from the normal percentages. Likewise, members of the Merit Committee must take these variances into consideration in their evaluations.

Additional Academic Unit Merit Policy Information
None

Approved by the Department of Public and Allied Health on 4/9/2017 via electronic vote.

_____   Date 4 / 11 / 2017
Name, Chair/Director

Approved: _____   Date 4 / 11 / 2017
Name, Dean of College Name

Approved: _____   Date 4 15 / 17
Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP