

## Merit Policy

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

#### Academic Unit: **Department of Construction Management**

##### Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the department/school member on the following performance criteria: Teaching Effectiveness, Research 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). Merit committee members will review information submitted by each faculty member to assign a numerical score for each criteria using an anchored rating scale anchored with examples of expected levels (or their equivalent) of performance on the performance indicators. Merit committee members will meet as a committee to review and reach consensus on component scores for each of the relevant performance criteria using the summary form provided. The component scores may include any range of values, but they must clearly identify whether the assigned score on the criteria (e.g., teaching) reflects performance that is unacceptable, fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

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

**Exceeds expectations for merit:** Activities in area cumulatively exceed expectations and reflect a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for an individual with a given faculty rank in the department.

**Meets expectations for merit:** Activities in area cumulatively meet expectations and reflect standard levels of performance for the department.

**Fails to meet expectations for merit:** Activities in area cumulatively do not meet expectations and fall below the standard levels of performance for the department.

**Unacceptable performance:** Activities in area cumulatively are unacceptable performance for the department.

Though the Evaluation Criteria is rather prescriptive by quantifying the expected effort, the Department Merit Committee may take into account equivalent effort and productivity. The teaching/research/service scores will be based on the abundance of evidence in the performance indicators (or their equivalent) shown in the following tables.

Evaluation Rating Category	<b>TEACHING</b> Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Teaching
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quantitative student evaluations regularly exceed departmental averages for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are general positive.</li> <li>• Observations by peers indicate highest levels of excellence in the classroom.</li> <li>• Excellent syllabi preparation, class meets regularly, and regular office hours maintained for students.</li> <li>• Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are regularly introduced and evaluated; AND</li> <li>• Regular engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness.</li> </ul>	3.5 – 5.0
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quantitative student evaluations approximate departmental averages for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are general positive.</li> <li>• Observations by peers indicate high levels of performance in the classroom.</li> <li>• Good preparation of syllabi, class meets regularly, and regular office hours maintained for students.</li> <li>• Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are occasionally introduced with some assessment of their impact; AND</li> <li>• Modest engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness.</li> </ul>	2.25 – 3.5
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quantitative student evaluations are among lowest in department for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are mixed.</li> <li>• Observations by peers indicate significant opportunities for improvement.</li> <li>• Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are generally absent and rarely evaluated; AND</li> <li>• Limited or no engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness.</li> </ul>	1.5 – 2.25
Unacceptable Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unexcused absences from class with no notification.</li> <li>• Failure to provide course resources to the department as required.</li> <li>• Failure to submit final grades on time, unless extraordinary circumstances.</li> <li>• Failure to utilize professional activities/development to improve teaching effectiveness or innovative practices, if needed.</li> <li>• Failure to incorporate peer feedback to improve teaching effectiveness.</li> <li>• Documented, consistent credible student complaints across semesters.</li> <li>• Poor <u>average</u> student evaluation scores for courses taught; falling below an <u>average</u> score of 2 (on a quantitative scale from 0-5) for courses taught during the evaluation period.</li> <li>• Failure to meet generally accepted teaching obligations or other equivalent actions (i.e., timeliness and accuracy of student assessments, lack of preparedness, etc...).</li> </ul>	< 1.5

**Merit Score for Teaching (to be completed by merit committee member):** \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation Rating Category	<b>RESEARCH</b> Expected levels of accomplishment on research performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Research
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One peer-reviewed journal article or more plus two or more peer-reviewed conference papers; AND</li> <li>• High activity in grantsmanship with external funding of \$25K+.</li> </ul>	3.5 – 5.0
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One peer-reviewed journal article or two peer-reviewed conference papers; AND</li> <li>• Some activity in grantsmanship such as preparing/submitting internal or external grants; internal funding award.</li> </ul>	2.25 – 3.5
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to meet the above.</li> <li>• Evidence of efforts in scholarly works (papers in process).</li> <li>• Evidence of engagement in external academic forums.</li> <li>• Participation in graduate thesis or dissertations.</li> </ul>	1.5 – 2.25
Unacceptable Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No publications in peer reviewed paper.</li> <li>• No significant progress manuscript.</li> <li>• No peer reviewed presentations at conferences or to professional organizations.</li> <li>• No reviewing of published manuscripts/articles.</li> <li>• No published book reviews.</li> <li>• No grant proposals or grant activity, internal or external.</li> <li>• No graduate theses or dissertations.</li> </ul>	< 1.5

**Merit Score for Research (to be completed by merit committee member): \_\_\_\_\_**

Evaluation Rating Category	<b>SERVICE</b> Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Service
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chairing one or more committees at department, college, and/or university levels.</li> <li>• Membership of at least one committee at department, college, and university levels.</li> <li>• Exceptional academic advising, mentoring, and/or recruiting activities.</li> <li>• Community/professional service to one or more significant activities related to faculty appointment ; AND</li> <li>• Two or more examples of the following: service award, significant service leadership, high impact practice, or high visibility service</li> </ul>	3.5 – 5.0
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chairing one or more committees at department, college, and/or university levels.</li> <li>• Membership of at least one committees at department, college, and/or university levels.</li> <li>• Adequate academic advising, mentoring, and/or recruiting activities; AND</li> <li>• Community/professional service to at least one activities related to faculty appointment</li> </ul>	2.25 – 3.5
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Membership of one committee at department, college, and/or university levels.</li> <li>• Limited to no engagement (no advising or committees; limited attendance at faculty meetings) at departmental level;</li> <li>• No significant service participation at college, university, or professional levels; limited community engagement</li> </ul>	1.5 – 2.25
Unacceptable Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A pattern of failure to actively participate in engagement or service in program, department, college and university levels.</li> <li>• Consistent failure to attend meetings of committees to which one is assigned.</li> <li>• Lack of professional engagement in organizations such as ASEE, ASC, ASCE, ACI</li> <li>• Failure to attend to service obligations.</li> </ul>	< 1.5

**Merit Score for Service (to be completed by merit committee member): \_\_\_\_\_**

## 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 committee will be all full-time faculty members.

## Elements of the Merit Dossier

The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements: the faculty member's Professional Resume/PVF in the format as designated in the University Academic Charter, part B, section B-I.D.2, student evaluations for the review period, and any other items that the faculty member feels is relevant to the merit evaluation. The merit dossier will be cumulative with the previous calendar year performance-indicator activities highlighted.

## Calculation of Overall Merit Score

The merit committee will assign an overall merit rating using the approach described below. The overall merit score may include any number of values or rating levels, but it must clearly identify whether the overall merit rating reflects performance that exceeds expectations for merit, meets expectations for merit, fails to meet expectations for merit, or is unacceptable.

### Determining Overall Merit Score Recommendations

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

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

<b>Overall Merit Score*</b>	<b>Interpretation (assumes component performance ratings made on 5-point scale)</b>
3.5 – 5.0	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
2.25 – 3.5	Meets expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
1.5 – 2.25	Fails to meet expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
< 1.5	Unacceptable performance; No merit

*\*Although the overall merit score and their interpretation serve as a guideline for merit/no merit preliminary decision, the merit committee should also take allocation of teaching, research, and service effort into consideration when reaching the final decision. This is detailed as follows:*

- *Receipt of 'fails to meet' in two or more performance areas (teaching, research, or service) OR receipt of 'fails to meet' in either teaching or research => not eligible for merit*

Additional Academic Unit Merit Policy Information

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
<i>Faculty member 1</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>
<i>Faculty member 2</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>
<i>Next faculty member, etc.</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>

Approved by the Department of Construction Management May 17, 2017.

Wilfred H. Roudebush

Date

6/15/17

Wilfred H. Roudebush, Interim Chair

Approved:

Venu Dasigi

Date

6/15/2017

Venu Dasigi, Dean of College of Technology, Architecture, and Applied Engineering

Approved:

Rodney Rogers

Date

6/17/17

Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP