

## Merit Policy

### Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

Academic Unit: Chemistry

#### Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

Evaluation Rating Category	<b>TEACHING/LIBRARIAN EFFECTIVENESS</b> Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Teaching
Exceeds expectations for merit	<p>Quantitative student evaluations for all courses taught are in-line with or above their historical ranges.</p> <p>Qualitative student evaluations are highly favorable.</p> <p>Multiple and/or highly substantial additional indicators of teaching effectiveness, which may include but are not limited to data-driven curricular development at either the course or program level, participation in teaching professional development activities, positive peer evaluations, and/or high teaching effectiveness as indicated by high student scores on standardized assessments in courses taught.</p>	3.5 – 5.0
Meets expectations for merit	<p>Quantitative student evaluations for all courses taught are in-line with their historical ranges.</p> <p>Qualitative student evaluations are generally favorable.</p> <p>Additional indicators of teaching effectiveness (number and significance impact score within the range), which may include but are not limited to progress towards data-driven curricular development at either the course or program level, participation in teaching professional development activities, positive peer evaluations, and/or high teaching effectiveness as indicated by high student scores on standardized assessments.</p>	2.0 – 3.4
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<p>Quantitative student evaluations for all courses taught are below average and significantly lower than their historical ranges.</p> <p>Qualitative student evaluations include a significant fraction that are generally poor and raise valid concerns with some aspects of the instruction.</p> <p>Additional indicators of teaching effectiveness are not provided.</p>	1.0 – 1.9
Unacceptable	<p>Quantitative student evaluations are repeatedly very low (&lt; 1.0 on a 0 - 4 scale) with a majority of qualitative student comments raising concerns.</p> <p>Insufficient indication of efforts made to address student concerns is provided.</p>	0-9



Performance indicators based on a 40% allocation of effort. Indicators will be scaled to reflect a particular faculty member's actual allocation of effort. For faculty with 0% allocation of effort, no score will be assigned for Scholarship/Creative Work and the overall merit score will be calculated using appropriately weighted teaching and service scores.

Evaluation Rating Category	<b>SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORK</b> Expected levels of accomplishment on scholarship performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Research
Exceeds expectations for merit	<p>Exceeding expectations for scholarship requires high productivity in both publications and grants.</p> <p>High publication productivity requires at least one publication in a high impact peer-reviewed journal.</p> <p>High grants activity requires maintenance of at least one major grant or awarding of a new major grant. Major grants are those approaching or exceeding \$100K.</p> <p>Invited talks and presentations at conferences may enhance the merit score for research.</p> <p>Research projects resulting in intellectual property disclosures or technology development or transfer may enhance the merit score for research.</p>	3.5 – 5.0
Meets expectations for merit	<p>Meeting expectations for scholarship requires submission of at least one manuscript for publication in a peer reviewed journal or submission of at least one grant proposal or significant progress toward achieving either.</p> <p>Invited talks and presentations at conferences may contribute to research expectations.</p> <p>Research projects resulting in intellectual property disclosures or technology development or transfer may enhance the merit score for research.</p>	2.0 – 3.4
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<p>Some progress on a research project or some evidence of research engagement through conference or workshop attendance.</p>	1.0 – 1.9
Unacceptable	<p>No evidence of research effort over the review period on an individual's project and no contributions to the efforts of other students and/or faculty.</p>	0-.9



Performance indicators based on a 20% allocation of effort. Indicators will be scaled to reflect a particular faculty member's actual allocation of effort.

Evaluation Rating Category	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SERVICE</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators (or their equivalent)</p>	Possible Merit Score for Service
Exceeds expectations for merit	<p>Exceeding expectations for merit requires high activity service to either the Department or University or a combination of the two.</p> <p>High activity Departmental service requires multiple service contributions such as chairing an active committee, serving effectively on several active committees, providing leadership on a major initiative, or taking on major faculty undergraduate advising responsibilities.</p> <p>High activity University service includes chairing a major university committee or providing effective service on at least two university committees.</p> <p>Service on thesis and dissertation committees for students outside the faculty member's research group.</p> <p>Significant professional service activities, such as holding office in professional societies, journal editorships, and conference organization may enhance the merit score for service.</p> <p>Leadership in multiple Community service activities related to faculty appointment may enhance the merit score for service.</p>	<i>3.5 – 5.0</i>
Meets expectations for merit	<p>Expectations for service include contributions to the Department or University.</p> <p>Departmental service expectations include effective contributions to an active committee, significant participation in a department initiative, or taking on faculty undergraduate advising responsibilities.</p> <p>University service includes effective service on an active university committee or serving as a department representative to a university initiative.</p> <p>Service on thesis and dissertation committees for students outside the faculty member's research group.</p> <p>Professional service activities, such as holding office in professional societies, journal editorships, and conference organization may enhance the merit score for service.</p> <p>Community service that includes significant activities related to faculty appointment may enhance the merit score for service.</p>	<i>2.0 – 3.4</i>
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<p>Little engagement with Department or University committees or initiatives and no faculty advising responsibilities. Professional or Community service, on their own, cannot meet the expectations for merit.</p>	<i>1.0 – 1.9</i>
Unacceptable	<p>Absence of participation on Department committees over the review period and no participation in non-committee service such as recruiting, outreach, and governance.</p>	<i>0 – .9</i>



## 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. Since clear distinctions arise between faculty with research expectations and faculty without research expectation (primarily NTTF), the department will use two committees comprised of four members from each of these groups. Committee members will be elected to staggered two-year terms with the members coming off the committee ineligible for re-election if other eligible faculty members are available.

### Elements of the Merit Dossier

The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements: a current CV and a completed Annual Faculty Record Update form. Quantitative and qualitative student evaluations will be provided to the merit committees by the Department.

### Calculation of Overall Merit Score

Overall merit scores will be calculated according to Exemplar C.

#### **Exemplar C: Weighted Allocation of Effort Algorithm**

Once the merit committee has reached consensus on component merit scores on each performance areas (Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, 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:

[Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness Merit Score \* Allocation of Effort] + [Research/Creative Work Merit Score \* Allocation of Effort] + [Service Merit Score \* Allocation of Effort] = Overall Merit Score

<b>Overall Merit Score</b>	<b>Interpretation (component performance ratings made on a 0-5 point scale)</b>
0.0 – 0.9	Unacceptable
1.0 – 1.9	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
2.0 – 3.4	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
3.5 – 5.0	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit


- See Section 2.5 in Part I about describing 3-year average calculation.





Additional Academic Unit Merit Policy Information

Approved by the Department of Chemistry on February, 15, 2016.

  
\_\_\_\_\_

Name, Chair

Date 3/2/17

Approved:   
\_\_\_\_\_

Name, Dean of College Name

Date 3/3/17

Approved:   
\_\_\_\_\_

Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP

Date 3/8/17

