

Merit Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

Academic Unit: School of Media and Communication

Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

Overview

Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the school member on the following performance criteria: Teaching, Research/Creative Work, and Service. Each of the aforementioned criteria (e.g., teaching) will be evaluated using a number of performance indicators (e.g., quantitative student evaluations of teaching). General criteria are enumerated below. The criteria listed are meant as general guidelines for merit expectations rather than strict criteria.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to report materials fully and accurately. When issues of documentation, erroneous or incomplete information, or quality are raised, relevant information may be sought and considered.

Merit committee members will then meet as a committee to review and arrive at component scores and an overall score for each of the relevant performance criteria.

The component scores must clearly identify whether the assigned score on the criteria (e.g., teaching) reflects performance that is unacceptable, fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

Teaching

Domains used in the evaluation of teaching include: undergraduate teaching, graduate teaching, instructional development, and other contributions to student learning, and they may include teaching initiatives involving engagement/service learning.

Scholarship/Creative Work

Given that the School is a Ph.D.-granting program within a RU/H university, research productivity is expected of tenured and tenure-track faculty. It is also expected that individuals will maintain an active program of research. Therefore, taking the lead on research—as evidenced by order of authorship—is weighted more heavily than being a contributing author. (In the case of an article having multiple co-authors, order of authorship may be ignored when a note of equal contribution appears within the publication). Unless specified in an offer letter or otherwise, there is generally no research expectation on the part of instructors, lecturers, or senior lecturers. In regard to publications, indicators of quality such as impact factors, competitiveness such as blind refereed and acceptance rates, prestige, visibility and the like.

The school considers the term “creative work” to mean “creative scholarship.” Creative Scholarship comprises academic scholarship that cannot be presented or expressed effectively in traditional academic publications. It is *original*, *significant* in content and theme, *coherent*, and *complete* as an academic/artistic entity. It advances the field not only in terms of content but also presentation. When submitted for merit consideration, such artistic work must be clearly related to and arise from scholarship in media and communication. Additionally, such work must be juried, blind reviewed, or otherwise commensurately evaluated.

As with traditional research, acceptance of creative work as an important intellectual activity involves review and evaluation by peers. Contests and festivals provide one avenue for review, because they normally employ panels of expert judges to select the work that will be honored or screened. Because those outside the communication field may not understand the review process involved in these events, information about the contest or festival is important to include in the dossier. This information should include the year the festival or contest was established, the number of entries in the event (if known), the number of works selected to receive recognition or prizes, the venues in which the selection was screened, etc. If available, a copy of the evaluation criteria would also be helpful to reviewers both inside and outside the field. In addition, subsequent reviews of the work that might appear in either scholarly or popular publications could provide insight into the value of the work and should be included in the dossier. Originality of the creative scholarship is highly valued in determining the quality of creative scholarship.

Because of electronic media production format constraints, some production works in non-conventional formats are difficult to get distributed even though their high quality has been demonstrated in professional competitions. Hence the number of venues in which the production was shown should not be used as the sole criterion of the contribution of the creative scholarship. Evaluators should take this factor into consideration.

Another indication of the value of the work is the decision to distribute a creative work to the community outside the university through established commercial or public media channels. In the realm of traditional scholarship, this is akin to the selection for anthologies and is recognition of worth. These selections are generally made by a number of knowledgeable professionals at various levels, who are experienced in evaluating creative work and can readily recognize excellence, discovery, and innovation in the use of media form and the value of content for the society at large.

Generally, materials may only count in one merit review period (e.g., a manuscript accepted in one year and in press, published, or presented the next year will only count in one year). However, it is up to the faculty member’s discretion as to which year to report each item (i.e., the year accepted, the year in press, or the year of actual publication). As noted above, each year the faculty member must provide a list of materials submitted the prior year.

Given the nature of scholarly books, it is possible to consider markers of progress on books in separate years. For example, the receipt of a contract based upon a substantive proposal (e.g., draft chapters) might count one year, additional draft chapters under review might count in another year

and the publication of the book in yet a different year. Various stages of the same book may not count for more than three years.

Similarly, given the nature of creative scholarship, it should be noted that creative endeavors may be—and indeed, are intended to be—exhibited multiple times. Thus, each juried exhibition entry will be counted as one piece of creative scholarship. Thus, the same piece of creative scholarship may be counted for up to three years when it is exhibited in different juried exhibitions in those years.

General criteria follow. These are meant as guidelines to help inform evaluations for merit. A member's overall research productivity including involvement in data collection or field work and work in progress should be taken into account in making merit decisions.

Service

Service to the department, school, college, university, profession and community is critical to the overall mission of the University and is included under this category. A wide range of activities can contribute to a faculty member receiving an evaluation of meets expectations for service.

The least service expectations are placed on probationary faculty. Greater expectations of providing leadership (committee officer, policymaking, and program leadership) are placed on tenured faculty, lecturers, senior lecturers, and instructors who have had at least two EPRs (enhanced performance reviews).

Service also includes performance of any assigned administrative responsibilities including those duties handled by faculty serving as department chairs. A clear description of administrative assignments, how the assignment fits into overall workload, and specific outcomes of administrative assignments should be provided by the faculty member.

University Service

These activities include participation in departmental, school, college, or University committees including governing bodies, Faculty Association participation and leadership, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like. In reporting, service at the unit level is distinguished from broader college/university service.

Performance indicators used to evaluate university service may include:

- amount of time devoted to activities
- significance and scope of activities
- degree of active involvement
- leadership positions held

Community Service

Faculty members sometimes lend their professional expertise to collaborations with external entities that contribute to the well-being of the larger community. To be considered as service appropriate for merit considerations, such external activities must draw upon a faculty member's professional expertise. Faculty members may participate fully in civic and community life as citizens, but they need to recognize that not all such activities will be viewed as service. Service must be directly related to their professional expertise for merit consideration.

Performance indicators used to evaluate community service may include:

- relevant activities and professional contributions (e.g., a research presentation)
- degree of active involvement; significance and scope of involvement in each activity; evidence of contributions and achievements
- leadership positions held

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 may include:

- service to private or extramural funding agencies
- participation in professional associations and/or at professional meetings and conferences (e.g., moderating or chairing a panel)
- leadership positions held in professional associations
- time spent on fulfilling professional service obligations
- organization of professional conferences, symposia, and the like
- journal or conference paper reviews
- editorship or associate editorship of a professional journal

Performance Indicators

The performance indicators outlined below are illustrative, not exhaustive. Nor should they be construed as mere checklists. The merit committee will appraise the overall levels of quality and quantity of performance, engagement, and contributions that faculty members demonstrate in teaching, research, and service. The totality of evidence will inform the overall scores in each of these three domains. In addition a candidate may submit and request that the school consider any other evidence of achievement that is appropriate to his/her specific case. The following are meant as general guidelines.

TEACHING

Merit Score for Teaching: Each committee member must assign an integer from 0 to 5

EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS

5 - Meets the expectations for a score of 2 and engages in at least **three*** of the activities listed in level 3 (or equivalent).

4 - Meets the expectations for a score of 2 and engages in at least **two*** of the activities listed below in level 3 (or equivalent).

*Multiple items in the same category may count multiple times. For example, engagement in two significant professional development activities counts as two activities.

Teaching evaluations are also considered. Though quantitative scores are by no means the only factor considered in exceeding expectations, it is expected that quantitative teaching evaluations will generally be strong (typically better than a 2.0 on our 5-point scale) in order to receive a merit score of 4 or 5.

MEETS EXPECTATIONS

3 - Meets expectations for a merit score of 2 and engages in at least **one** of the activities listed (or equivalent).

- Direction of undergraduate honors project and/or thesis and/or dissertation and/or MA project that leads to student or student team publication in a scholarly journal
- Course curriculum modification or development
- Engagement in teaching-related professional development activity
- Publication of a textbook/significant revision of a textbook/chapter(s) in edited textbook
- Academic advising and/or mentoring in quality and/or numbers of undergraduate and/or graduate students (for example, more than the unit average)
- Teaching a Service Learning Course that is recognized by the BGSU office of Service Learning
- Supervision of an independent study project
- Direction of undergraduate honors project or direction of undergraduate research
- Internship supervision

Teaching evaluations shall also be taken into consideration. Though such scores are by no means the only factor considered in meeting expectations, it is expected that quantitative teaching evaluations will generally be strong (typically better than a 2.5 on our 5-point scale).

2 – Meets expectations.

Generally, receiving average student evaluation of teaching scores of 2.5 or better on the school's 5 point scale. Advising undergraduates as assigned. For graduate faculty, baseline duties also include participation in the graduate program, such as chairing or serving on graduate student committees, grading qualifying exam questions, and the like.

FAILS TO MEET EXPECTATIONS

1 – Receiving a 3 or worse on teaching evaluations on 50% of courses taught in a year period. Decidedly negative qualitative feedback from 50% of students enrolled in course (not to be confused with 50% of CONTENT being negative to protect against low response rates).

UNACCEPTABLE

0 – Receiving a 4 or worse on teaching evaluations on 50% of courses taught in a year period. Decidedly negative qualitative feedback from 75% of students enrolled in courses (not to be confused with 75% of CONTENT being negative to protect against low response rates).

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORK

Merit Score for Scholarship/Creative Work: Each committee member must assign an integer from 0 to 5
Multiple items in the same category may count multiple times. For example, two co-authored scholarly book chapters would satisfy the criteria for a score of 5.

<p>If research is part of the AOE, at a level of 40% (the typical research AOE for a graduate faculty member):</p>	<p>If research is part of the AOE, at a level of 20% (the typical research AOE for a tenured faculty member without graduate faculty status):</p>
<p>EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS</p> <p>5 - The faculty member should achieve <u>ONE</u> of the following (or equivalent) as the lead or sole author/creator**</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a full-length original article in a scholarly journal of high quality as indicated by impact factors, competitiveness (e.g., being double-blind refereed and having low acceptance rates), prestige, visibility and the like. Research in brief is typically not considered in this category. • a major scholarly book chapter as indicated by the prestige of the series or publisher (e.g., a state-of-the-art handbook chapter) • a scholarly book published by a reputable publisher. Counts as 5 only when the copy-editing is completed (i.e., galley proofs) or the book is actually published. • be a PI on a funded external research grant of any amount • be a co-PI on a funded external research grant exceeding \$50,000 or more • juried/peer reviewed creative scholarship (e.g., documentary, audio or video production) in a significant/prestigious venue <p>*For manuscripts/creative works with multiple contributors, the member may occupy any authorship position when a note of equal contribution appears within the publication.</p> <p><u>OR</u> be a less than equal contributing author to any <u>TWO</u> of the following (or equivalent)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a full-length original article in a scholarly journal of high quality as indicated by impact factors, competitiveness (e.g., being double-blind refereed and having low acceptance rates), prestige, visibility and the like. Research in brief is typically not considered in this category. • be a co-PI on a funded external research grant of any amount • a major scholarly book chapter (e.g., a state of the art handbook chapter) • a scholarly book 	<p>EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS</p> <p>5- The faculty member should achieve <u>ONE</u> of the following (or equivalent) as the lead or sole author/creator**</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a full-length original article in a scholarly journal of high quality as indicated by impact factors, competitiveness (e.g., being double-blind refereed and having low acceptance rates), prestige, visibility and the like. Research in brief is typically not considered in this category. • a major scholarly book chapter as indicated by the prestige of the series or publisher (e.g., a state-of-the-art handbook chapter) • a scholarly book published by a reputable publisher. Counts as 5 only when the copy-editing is completed (i.e., galley proofs) or the book is actually published. • be a PI on a funded external research grant of any amount • be a co-PI on a funded external research grant exceeding \$50,000 or more • juried/peer reviewed creative scholarship (e.g., documentary, audio or video production) in a significant/prestigious venue <p>*For manuscripts/creative works with multiple contributors, the member may occupy any authorship position when a note of equal contribution appears within the publication.</p> <p><u>OR</u> be a less than equal contributing author to any <u>ONE</u> of the following (or equivalent)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a full-length original article in a scholarly journal of high quality as indicated by impact factors, competitiveness (e.g., being double-blind refereed and having low acceptance rates), prestige, visibility and the like. Research in brief is typically not considered in this category. • be a co-PI on a funded external research grant of any amount • a major scholarly book chapter (e.g., a state of the art handbook chapter) • a scholarly book

OR be a sole, lead or contributing author/editor/PI/CO-PI of any ***THREE*** of the following (or equivalent):

- a double-blind, refereed publication in any subscription-based or open access scholarly journal (excluding pay-to-publish journals)
- an invited original article in a subscription-based or open access journals (excluding pay-to-publish journals)
- a funded external research grant
- a scholarly book
- a scholarly book chapter
- served as an editor of a scholarly book of original manuscripts
- have received a contract to write a scholarly book based upon a substantive proposal (e.g., draft chapters)
- have additional draft chapters of a contracted scholarly book completed for editor review
- peer reviewed paper or panel accepted for presentation, or presented at a conference
- peer reviewed conference proceedings
- a manuscript that has received a revise and resubmit status and is resubmitted
- an external grant application under review

OR be a sole, lead or contributing author/editor/PI/CO-PI of any ***TWO*** of the following (or equivalent):

- a double-blind, refereed publication in any subscription-based or open access scholarly journal (excluding pay-to-publish journals)
- an invited original article in a subscription-based or open access journals (excluding pay-to-publish journals)
- a funded external research grant
- a scholarly book
- a scholarly book chapter
- served as an editor of a scholarly book of original manuscripts
- have received a contract to write a scholarly book based upon a substantive proposal (e.g., draft chapters)
- have additional draft chapters of a contracted scholarly book completed for editor review
- peer reviewed paper or panel accepted for presentation, or presented at a conference
- peer reviewed conference proceedings
- a manuscript that has received a revise and resubmit status and is resubmitted
- an external grant application under review

EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS

4- The faculty member should have at least **one** of the following (or equivalent):

- a double-blind, refereed article in any subscription-based or open access scholarly journal (excluding pay-to-publish journals)
- a chapter in a scholarly book
- an invited journal article in any scholarly journal
- be a co-PI on a funded external research grant of any amount
- be a recipient of an internal research seed grant
- have received a contract to write a scholarly book based on a substantive proposal (e.g., draft chapters)
- have chapters (beyond initial submission) of a contracted scholarly book completed for editor review

EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS

4- The faculty member should have at least **one** of the following (or equivalent):

- a double-blind, refereed article in any subscription-based or open access scholarly journal (excluding pay-to-publish journals)
- a chapter in a scholarly book
- an invited journal article in any scholarly journal
- be a co-PI on a funded external research grant of any amount
- be a recipient of an internal research seed grant
- have received a contract to write a scholarly book based on a substantive proposal (e.g., draft chapters)
- have chapters (beyond initial submission) of a contracted scholarly book completed for editor review
- a blind peer-reviewed paper or panel accepted for presentation, or presented at a conference
- a book review
- an encyclopedia entry
- a blind peer-reviewed conference proceedings
- juried/peer reviewed creative scholarship (e.g., documentary, audio or video production) at any juried/reviewed venue

<p>MEETS EXPECTATIONS</p> <p>3- The faculty member should generally have at least ONE of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A peer reviewed conference paper • a book review • an encyclopedia entry • be a co-PI on a funded external research grant of any amount • a peer reviewed conference proceeding 	<p>MEETS EXPECTATIONS</p> <p>3 - The faculty member should have ONE of any of the items below AND provide evidence of significant additional progress toward a tangible research outcome beyond the prior year (e.g., data collection, footage, IRB approval).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a manuscript submitted for review (even if rejected) • an external grant application under review (even if rejected) • a conference paper submitted for review (even if rejected) • submission of creative scholarship (even if rejected)
<p>MEETS EXPECTATIONS</p> <p>2- The faculty member should provide evidence of significant progress toward a tangible research outcome beyond the prior year (e.g., data collection, footage) AND at least ONE of any of the following (or equivalent):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a manuscript submitted for review (even if rejected) • an external grant application submitted (even if rejected) • a non-refereed conference paper, panel or workshop, or presentation given or accepted. 	<p>MEETS EXPECTATIONS</p> <p>2- The faculty member should generally have at least ONE of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a manuscript submitted for review (even if rejected) • an external grant application submitted (even if rejected) • a non-refereed conference paper, panel or workshop, or presentation given or accepted.
<p>FAILS TO MEET EXPECTATIONS</p> <p>1- Negligible research activity. The faculty member should provide evidence of significant progress toward a tangible research outcome beyond the prior year (e.g., data collection, footage, papers submitted to conference, but rejected, IRB approval)</p>	<p>FAILS TO MEET EXPECTATIONS</p> <p>1- Negligible research activity. The faculty member should provide evidence of significant progress toward a tangible research outcome beyond the prior year (e.g., data collection, footage, IRB approval)</p>
<p>UNACCEPTABLE</p> <p>0- No research activity.</p>	<p>UNACCEPTABLE</p> <p>0- No research activity.</p>

SERVICE

Merit Score for Service - each committee member must assign an integer from 0 to 5

EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS

5- Though it is recognized that not everyone can attend all events, regular attendance at faculty meetings and some participation at department, school, college and university events (e.g., preview days, award ceremonies, commencement and the like) are baseline expectations.

Plus:

- Participation in at least one recognized, continuing service activity (or equivalent) in the department, school, college, university, profession or community (community service must be related to discipline).
- Plus, participation in at least three additional recognized, continuing service activities (or equivalent) in the department, school, college, university, profession or community (community service must be related to discipline).

For NTTF, a leadership role in one additional recognized, continuing service activity in the department, school, college, university, profession or community related to their discipline may fulfill this criterion

For tenured faculty members, leadership roles in committee work, professional service or programs are expected.

Individuals with graduate faculty status should have evidence of active involvement with professional organizations connected to their discipline at the local, state, regional, national or international level.

EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS

4- Though it is recognized that not everyone can attend all events, regular attendance at faculty meetings and some participation at department, school, college and university events (e.g., preview days, award ceremonies, commencement and the like) are baseline expectations.

Plus:

- Participation in at least one recognized, continuing service activity, such as an ongoing committee or equivalent, in the department, school, college, university, profession or community (community service must be related to discipline).
- Plus participation in at least two additional recognized, continuing service activities in the department, school, college, university, profession or community related to their discipline, or the equivalent.

For tenured faculty members, leadership roles in committee work, professional service or programs are expected.

Individuals with graduate faculty status should have evidence of active involvement with professional organizations connected to their discipline at the local, state, regional, national or international level.

MEETS EXPECTATIONS

3- Though it is recognized that not everyone can attend all events, some participation in department, school, college, university, professional or community (as related to the discipline) service events (e.g., preview days, award ceremonies, commencement and the like) is expected.

Plus:

- Participation in at least one recognized, continuing service activity, such as an ongoing committee or equivalent, in the department, school, college, university, professional or community (as related to the discipline).
- Plus participation in at least one additional recognized, continuing service activities in the department, school, college, university, profession, or community related to their discipline, or the equivalent.

MEETS EXPECTATIONS

2- Though it is recognized that not everyone can attend all events, some participation in department, school, college, university, professional or community (as related to the discipline) service events (e.g., preview days, award ceremonies, commencement and the like) is expected.

Plus:

- Participation in at least one recognized, continuing service activity, such as an ongoing committee or equivalent, in department, school, college, university, professional or community (as related to the discipline) service events (e.g., preview days, award ceremonies, commencement and the like) is expected.

FAILS TO MEET EXPECTATIONS

1- Though it is recognized that not everyone can attend all events, some participation in department, school, college, university, professional or community (as related to the discipline) service events (e.g., preview days, award ceremonies, commencement and the like) is expected.

UNACCEPTABLE

0- No participation in service activities at department, school, college, university, or professional levels.

Merit Committee Composition and the Election//Appointment Process

The merit committee is composed of four faculty members: one **tenured** faculty member is elected from each of the three departments and one NTTF faculty member elected by all full-time NTTF faculty members in the school. Terms are for two years, staggered such that the committee is composed of two newly elected members and two returning members. Individuals may serve more than one term. The department chairs may not be members of the merit committee.

The committee shall elect a chair from the returning members. It is the responsibility of the committee chair to organize meetings, collect and compile scores and inform individuals and the director of the scores on teaching, research, and service as well as the composite score.

Elements of the Merit Dossier

1. Updated vita in BGSU format with merit activities highlighted.
2. College Annual Faculty Update Record (AFR) and any materials required by the college. (Reminder: the AFR should report all activity completed during the previous calendar year, regardless of whether an activity counts toward merit.)
3. The faculty member reports their allocation of effort (AOE) and a list of research accomplishments to be considered for merit. For each item listed, the faculty member should indicate **the type of work** (e.g., conference paper, scholarly book chapter, double-blinded refereed journal article etc.) and the **status of the work** (e.g., in press, under review). The faculty member may also choose to include quality indicators such as impact factors, rejection rates and the like. The member must provide appropriate documentation for research items (e.g., letter of acceptance, copy of page of conference program, etc.). Items without appropriate documentation will not be considered.
4. Optional Commentary and Optional Materials. If some activities or outcomes require more explanation than the vita or AFR provides, the faculty member **MAY** attach brief explanatory narratives for any category. Also, the faculty member may submit supplemental teaching materials.
5. **The prior year's list of research accomplishments that were considered for merit in the previous year, as in most cases an item can only be counted once.**
6. **All student evaluations of teaching for the review period. These materials shall be added to the candidates' materials by the director to complete the dossier.**

Calculation of Overall Merit Score

All committee members will, independently, provide a score of 0 to 5 in the areas of teaching and service. Only the tenured members will provide a score on research. In the case of a conflict of interest, (e.g., a spouse) a faculty member will recuse him/herself from that specific case and the remaining committee members will provide scores. Similarly, committee members will not provide scores for themselves.

After scores have been assigned, the committee will meet to discuss scores. Based on the discussion, individual committee members may choose to change scores. It is not necessary, however, for the committee to reach a consensus on the scores. After discussion and revision of scores (if any), the merit committee chair will compile the overall score in the format indicated below. That is, all scores in each category are averaged and that average is then multiplied by the AOE.

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

$$[\text{Teaching Merit Score} * \text{Allocation of Effort}] + [\text{Research/Creative Work Merit Score} * \text{Allocation of Effort}] + [\text{Service Merit Score} * \text{Allocation of Effort}] = \text{Overall Merit Score}$$

For example, in the case of a faculty member whose allocation of effort is 40 percent teaching, 40 percent research and 20 percent service:

	Teaching (.40)	Research (.40)	Service (.20)	Overall Merit Score
Score by CM 1	5	3	2	
Score by CM 2	5	3	1	
Score by CM 3	4	4	3	
Score by CM 4	5	3	2	
Average score	4.75	3.25	2	
AOE Multiplier	.4 * 4.75	.4 * 3.25	.2 * 2	
AOE Score	1.9 +	1.3+	0.4	3.6 (Exceeds Expectations)

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation
0.0 - .9	Unacceptable
1.0 - 1.4	Does not 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

The three year rolling average score will be calculated by averaging the current and last two years' overall merit scores.

Additional Academic Unit Merit Policy Information

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to report materials accurately. Committee members may seek clarification or additional information if needed. Faculty members have some discretion as to when to submit publications for merit. For example, a faculty member may choose to report a journal article upon acceptance or when published.

Approved by the Department/School of Media and Communication on February 1, 2017



Date March 3, 2017

Laura Stafford, Director

Approved:



Date 3/9/17

Name, Dean of College Name

Approved:



Date 3/15/17

Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP