Addendum to Merit Policy

Department of Psychology

In compliance with Article 31 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, a rating of 0 = Unacceptable performance is required in our evaluation of faculty members. Annual evaluation ratings of 0 = unacceptable performance in any assigned area based on allocation of effort (e.g. teaching, research/scholarly activity, service) shall be indicative of an unsuccessful annual evaluation and may result in an "extraordinary review" of tenured faculty members by the Chair with the approval of the Dean. The purpose of the review is to determine what, if any, remediation is necessary or how to best return the faculty member to "acceptable" performance. Please refer to the Collective Bargaining Agreement (Article 14, Section 5.3) for procedures related to consequences of a rating of 0 = Unacceptable performance for NTTF members. We appreciate that a rating of Unacceptable performance for a faculty member has consequences beyond that of receiving or not receiving merit.

The following rating category tables, which include the category of unacceptable performance, replace the rating category tables in the approved Department of Psychology Merit Policy.

Evaluation Rating Category	TEACHING Examples of levels of accomplishment on teaching performance (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Teaching*
Exceeds expectations	• Quantitative student evaluations are positive (compared to relevant benchmarks). • If appropriate, observations by peers indicate high levels of effectiveness in the classroom. • Chairs multiple thesis and dissertation committees. • Serves on multiple thesis and dissertation committees. • If appropriate, additional teaching roles are undertaken (e.g., clinical supervision, undergraduate advising) and evaluated positively. • If appropriate, demonstrates effort at improving instruction through attending workshops, participating in communities of interest, and using innovative pedagogy. • Works on curriculum development. • Mentors undergraduate students (e.g., honors theses, independent studies, internships)	4 to 5
Meets expectations	• Quantitative student evaluations are average (compared to relevant benchmarks). • If appropriate, observations by peers indicate good levels of effectiveness in the classroom. • Chairs at least one thesis or dissertation committee • Serves on at least one thesis or dissertation committee. • If appropriate, additional teaching roles are undertaken (e.g., clinical supervision, undergraduate advising) and deemed to be good.	2 to 3
Fails to meet expectations	• Quantitative student evaluations are negative (compared to relevant benchmarks). • If appropriate, observations by peers indicate significant opportunities for improvement. • Does not chair thesis and dissertation committees. • Does not serve on thesis and dissertation committees. • If appropriate, additional teaching roles are not undertaken (e.g. clinical supervision, undergraduate advising) or are deemed to be in need of improvement.	1
Unacceptable Performance	• Faculty member receives decidedly negative student course evaluations (at least 75% of course evaluations recorded as "negative") across all classes taught during a review period. In addition, peer observations of teaching are negative. Finally, faculty member does not serve on graduate student committees, nor take on appropriate additional teaching roles. This criterion assumes that current course evaluation system for the Psychology Department is used. This performance criterion can be re-evaluated when there is sufficient data on student course evaluations for Psychology Department faculty to have developed evaluation bench marks using the new University-wide student course evaluation system.	0

*Insert score values on a scale that includes <u>at least</u> six numerical values, e.g., 0-5 point scale.

Evaluation Rating Category	SCHOLARSHIP Examples of levels of accomplishment on research performance (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Research*
Exceeds expectations	• Multiple peer-reviewed publications • External grant submissions and/or awards • Book chapters in high profile publications • Evidence of multiple research collaborations with students • Evidence of a highly active and on-going research program(s) (e.g., current data collections and writing projects; conference presentations) • Awarded or recognized for research contributions	4 to 5
Meets expectations	• One peer-reviewed publication • Book chapter(s) • Internal grant submissions and awards • Evidence of at least one research collaboration with student(s) • Evidence of an active and on-going research program (e.g., current data collections and writing projects; conference presentations)	2 to 3
Fails to meet expectations	• No peer-reviewed publications , book chapters , or internal or external grant submissions and awards • Minimum research program (e.g., at most 1 current data collection or writing project)	1
Unacceptable Performance	• Faculty member has listed no research published, submitted, or no demonstrated progress on research reported in the previous year and/or no new significant research initiated for the time period under consideration.	0

*Insert score values on a scale that includes at least six numerical values, e.g., 0-5 point scale.

Evaluation Rating Category	SERVICE Examples of levels of accomplishment on service performance (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Service*
Exceeds expectations	• Chairs committees at the Department, College, University, or Professional Levels • Serves on at least one committee that requires a substantial time commitment • Assumes leadership role in community service relevant to the profession • Recognized for service contributions • Serves as editor or on editorial board of peer-reviewed journal(s)	4 to 5
Meets expectations	• Serves on committees at the Department, College, University, or Professional Levels • Provides community service relevant to the profession • Reviews for academic journal(s) • Regularly attends faculty meetings	2 to 3
Fails to meet expectations	• Little participation in Department, College, University, and/or Professional-level committees • No involvement in community service relevant to the profession • Does not regularly attend faculty meetings	1
Unacceptable Performance	• Faculty member has listed no service activities (Department, College, University, or to the Profession) or evidence of service contributions for the review period under consideration.	0

*Insert score values on a scale that includes at least six numerical values, e.g., 0-5 point scale.

Approved by the Department of Psychology Faculty on May 10, 2017

Name, Chair/Director Date 5/12/17

Approved: Date 5/12/17

Name, Dean of College Name

Approved: Date 6/17/17

Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP