## Merit Policy

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

**Academic Unit: School of Intervention Services**

### Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

#### Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators/Expectations, and the Calculation of Component Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Rating Category</th>
<th>TEACHING Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)</th>
<th>Merit Score for Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations for Merit</td>
<td>- Quantitative student evaluations average of all courses equal to or exceeding 4.20 on a 5-point scale AND - High level of involvement in other teaching activities, including 5 or more indicators delineated in “Meets Expectations for Merit” section</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations for Merit</td>
<td>- Quantitative student evaluations average of all courses equal to or exceeding 4.00 on a 5-point scale AND - High level of involvement in other teaching activities, including 4 or more indicators delineated in “Meets Expectations for Merit” section</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations for Merit</td>
<td>- Quantitative student evaluations average of all courses equal to or exceeding 3.70 on a 5-point scale AND - High level of involvement in other teaching activities, including 3 or more indicators delineated in “Meets Expectations for Merit” section</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Meets Expectations for Merit | - Quantitative student evaluations average of all courses is at least 3.50 on a 5-point scale AND - Involvement in other teaching activities, including 2 indicators of teaching effectiveness listed below:  
  - Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities (provide evidence of activities, evaluations and/or peer observations).  
  - Engagement in professional development related to teaching effectiveness (include explanation of how it was incorporated into current teaching)  
  - Teaching Awards and Distinctions  
  - Development of New Courses (Provide copy of EDHD course modification proposals and new syllabi)  
  - Curriculum Modification of Existing Courses (provide copy of EDHD course modification proposals and new syllabi) substantive changes or changes to multiple courses  
  - Academic Advising (quantity of students and quality of advising are considered; provide evidence through student testimonials and/or coordinator or director letters of support)  
  - Student Professional Development Activities of substantial value (e.g. a full-day student career day, a series of extracurricular seminars, an exhibition, etc.; provide evidence)  
  - Integration of Teaching Initiatives, involving Engagement/Service Learning (provide description and evidence of the events)  
  - Participation in a learning community, tech boot camp, etc. (provide evidence of outcomes)  
  - Grants to support teaching activities (not travel grants)  
  - Study abroad and extended student trips off campus | 2 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Rating Category</th>
<th>RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK</th>
<th>Possible Merit Score for Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations for merit</td>
<td>• Two peer-reviewed publications (Provide copies) OR • One peer-reviewed publication AND either (a) one Book/Book Chapter or (b) one External Grant Submitted/Funded (i.e., Two items total; Provide copies)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations for merit</td>
<td>• One peer-reviewed publication (Provide copy) OR • One Book/Book Chapter (Provide copy) OR • One External Grant Submitted/Funded (Provide copy).</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations for merit</td>
<td>• A combination of three or more of the items listed below.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations for merit</td>
<td>• A combination of two of the following items: • Internal Research Grant, funded (excluding travel grants) • Internal Research Grant, submitted (excluding travel grants) • Published Symposia • Published Book Review in a peer-reviewed journal • Invited Presentations, International, National, or Regional Conferences • Refereed Presentation or Poster at International, National, or Regional Conferences • Abstract published in conference proceedings or peer-reviewed journals (if not</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Rating Category</td>
<td>Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)</td>
<td>Possible Merit Score for Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations for Merit</td>
<td>The faculty member demonstrates significant service involvement at the program, school, college, university, and/or professional levels. At least 5 committees or committee-comparable activities are required. Examples of recognized service at each level are described in the “Meets Expectations for Merit” section below. Overall contributions should be considerably above the merit level.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations for Merit</td>
<td>The faculty member demonstrates significant service involvement at the program, school, college, university, and/or professional levels. At least 4 committees or committee-comparable activities are required. Examples of recognized service at each level are described in the “Meets Expectations for Merit” section below. Overall contributions should be considerably above the merit level.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations for Merit</td>
<td>The faculty member demonstrates meaningful service involvement at the program, school, college, university, and/or professional levels. At least 3 committees or committee-comparable activities are required.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations for Merit</td>
<td>The faculty member demonstrates meaningful service involvement at the program, school, college, university, and/or professional levels. At least 2 committees or committee-comparable activities are required. Examples of recognized service at each level are described below: Profession Member of Committees, Task Forces, Boards Chair of Committees, Task Forces, Boards (implies higher level of engagement than a committee member) Officer Positions in Professional Associations (Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer, etc.) Conference Planning Professional Recognition/Awards Service to Government Agency Expert Testimony Moderator/Respondent of Conference Sessions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Permanent member of a journal editorial board (not ad hoc reviewer; indicate manuscripts reviewed this year)
Reviewing Manuscripts (list journal(s) and number reviewed this year)
Reviewing Grants (list agency or organization, grant program, number reviewed, etc.)
Reviewing Conference Abstracts (list conference(s) and number reviewed, etc.)
National Grant Panels
Media Appearances at national and regional level (regional like Midwest)
Other
• Program/School
  Committees, Task Forces (e.g., Search Committees, Standing Committees)
  Chair of, Task Forces, Boards, etc. (implies higher level of engagement than a committee member)
  Assigned Administrative Duties* (e.g. Graduate Coordinator, Program Director)
  Supervision of Student Clubs, Organizations, and Activities
  Recruitment and Retention
  Other
• College/University/Community
  Committees, Task Forces
  Chair of Committee
  Other

* Community service must be related to faculty’s professional area.

| Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit | The faculty member demonstrates little to no service involvement at the program, school, college, university, and/or professional levels. Examples of recognized service at each level are described above in the meets expectation section. | 1 |
| Unacceptable | • No service at all • No materials were submitted. | 0 |

Merit Score for Service (to be completed by Personnel Committee members): X

Merit Committee Composition and the Election/Appointment Process

The School of Intervention Services Personnel committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. The committee consists of four members. At least one representative must come from each program area. At least two members of the committee must be tenured faculty. The representatives are elected by all school faculty. Members to serve a two-year term; two positions are elected each year.

Elements of the Merit Dossier

The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements:
• Title page, including name, rank, percentage allocation of effort for each of area of evaluation (e.g., 60% Teaching, 20% Research, 20% Service for TTF; 80% Teaching, 20% Service for NTTF), and merit year
• Updated CV with highlighted activities during the previous calendar year (not submitted to the merit committee in previous years)
• Teaching section
• Self-filled table of meritorious achievements in TEACHING during the previous calendar year (see template below; include indicators necessary for the merit score sought)
• Quantitative student teaching evaluations from the previous year (see template in Appendix D) and all original evaluations provided by the college/university
• Evidence of achievement for each item for which merit credit is sought
• If using the category "Other" in your summary, include a narrative to explain your case

• Research section (TTF only)
  • Self-filled table of meritorious achievements in RESEARCH during the previous calendar year (see template below; include indicators necessary for the merit score sought)
  • Evidence of achievement for each item for which merit credit is sought (e.g., copies of publications or any other proof of achievement)
  • If using the category "Other" in your summary, include a narrative to explain your case

• Service section
  • Self-filled table of meritorious achievements in SERVICE during the previous calendar year (see template below; include indicators necessary for the merit score sought)
  • Evidence of service may include meeting minutes, letters from committee chairs/committee members/journal editors indicating service during the current merit year
  • If using the category "Other" in your summary, include a narrative to explain your case

Calculation of Overall Merit Score

Once the merit committee has reached consensus on component merit scores in each performance area (Teaching, 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. The algorithm is as follows:

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

In addition to this algorithm, the final merit score must adhere to additional criteria indicated below in \(^{a,b}\).

| Exceeds Expectations for Merit \(^b\) | 3.3 – 5.0 |
| Eligible for Merit | |
| Meets Expectations for Merit \(^e\) | 2.0 – 3.2 |
| Eligible for Merit | |
| Fails to Meet Expectations Recommendation for No Merit | 0.2 – 1.9 |
| Unacceptable | < .2 |

\(^a\) Each category (Teaching, Research/Creative Work, and Service) is calibrated on its own scale (0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5).
\(^b\) Merit is calculated on a 0 – 5 scale with 5 being the highest merit.
Tenure track/tenured faculty (TTF) are rated in all three areas while non-TTF are rated in teaching and service only.

To achieve "Exceeds Expectations for Merit," a faculty member needs to score 4 in two or more categories.

To achieve "Meets Expectations for Merit," the applicant has to achieve meritorious level of 2 in each required category.

Three-year Rolling Average:
The three-year rolling average for merit will be determined by calculating the average of the overall merit score for the current plus two prior years. This average will be correlated to the appropriate merit score as detailed on the Determination of Overall Merit Score Recommendation table above.

Additional Academic Unit Merit Policy Information

Self-Filled Table of Meritorious Achievements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHING</th>
<th>Merit Score for Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Quantitative student evaluations average of all courses are __, exceed __ on a 5-point scale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High level of involvement in other teaching activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof for all achievements is in CV and in the TEACHING section of the merit binder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Merit Score for Teaching (to be completed by Personnel Committee members):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORKS</th>
<th>Merit Score for Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A combination of two of the following items:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof for all achievements is in CV and in the RESEARCH section of the merit binder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Merit Score for Research (to be completed by Personnel Committee members):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>Merit Score for Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At least ____ committees or committee-comparable activities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof for all achievements is in CV and in the SERVICE section of the merit binder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Merit Score for Service (to be completed by Personnel Committee members):

Table for Quantitative Student Evaluation Scores
School of Intervention Services Merit Policy For the Definition of Unacceptable Rating

**NTTF Members**

In place of APRs and EPRs, the annual merit review process shall serve as the annual evaluation for NTTF Members in year seven and beyond. Annual evaluation ratings higher than Unacceptable in all assigned areas, based on a BUFM's allocation of effort, shall indicate a successful annual evaluation.

An Unacceptable rating in teaching is defined as quantitative student evaluation average of all courses below 3.2 on a 5-point scale, major flaws and problems in the faculty’s teaching, or no materials turned in for review.

Unacceptable rating in service is defined as 0 merit score based on no documented service or no materials turned in for review.

**TTF Members**

An Unacceptable rating in teaching is defined as quantitative student evaluations average of all courses below 3.2 on a 5-point scale, major flaws and problems in the faculty’s teaching or no materials turned in for review.

An Unacceptable rating in research is defined as 0 merit score is based on no evidence of scholarship or not materials were submitted.

An Unacceptable rating in service is defined as 0 merit score is based on no documented service or no materials turned in for review.

Unacceptable Rating Definition Approved December 7, 2106 by the faculty of SIS.
Approved by the School of Intervention Services at the Month, Date, Year Faculty Meeting

Name, Chair/Director

Approved: ___________________________ Date ______________

Name, Dean of College Name

Approved: ___________________________ Date ______________

Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP

3/15/17
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