

Merit Document
Department of Humanities

Preamble

Merit raises refer to the component of salary raises that are provided to department/school bargaining unit faculty members who meet or exceed their assigned unit performance expectations. In any given year, it is possible that all of the Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in an academic unit may be eligible for merit salary raises. Merit is calculated during spring semester based on performance during the previous calendar year. Merit salary raises are added to base salary for the ensuing fiscal year (on September 1 for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members on 9-month contracts, and on July 1 for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members on 12-month contracts).

Merit eligibility for faculty members will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations for merit in the Humanities Department in the following areas: Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service. Each faculty member will receive an overall merit score which will identify whether s/he did not meet, met, or exceeded expectations for merit. The overall merit score will include five or more categories or rating levels to allow for greater discrimination among levels of performance; each of the categories or rating levels on the overall merit score must clearly identify whether it does not meet expectations for merit, meets expectations for merit, or exceeds expectations for merit. For example, using the minimum five categories or rating levels, the following evaluation concepts would be included: 1= Does not meet expectations for merit; 2/3=Meets expectations for merit; 4/5=Exceeds expectations for merit.

Both the merit committee of the academic unit and the chair may make recommendations to the Dean for allocation of merit dollars and/or percentages. However, as provided for in Section 11.2 of Article 17 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the Dean is not bound by such recommendations and the determination of the actual merit increase is within the Dean's reasonable discretion.

1. Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations, and Calculation of Merit Scores

The merit criteria (i.e., Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service), performance indicators and expectations for the criteria, and the calculation of the component merit scores (i.e., Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service) are contained in Appendix A.

2. General Procedure for Faculty Evaluation and Score of Merit

- 2.1. Prior to the beginning of the calendar year, each faculty member will confirm his/her allocation of effort (e.g., 70/15/15 or 80/5/15 for teaching, scholarship, and service) with the chair.
- 2.2. The Humanities Department merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. The merit committee is made up of

- three members of the Department with no specifications of rank or years of service. Members are elected by the department at a department meeting. Merit committee members should have staggered terms of office so that one person will carry over term of office into the next year in order to provide continuity and experience in procedures and scoring. To safeguard the impartiality of the merit committee, individual terms should be no longer than three years. No member of the department merit committee will evaluate him/herself. An alternate member of the department (typically the most recent faculty to have completed a term on the merit committee) will serve in that capacity.
- 2.3. Faculty members who fail to submit a merit portfolio by the deadline will receive an automatic rating of “does not meet expectations” and will not be eligible for a merit salary increase or the market adjustment from the Fixed Market Pool (Article 17, section 7.1).
 - 2.4. The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements: peer and student teaching evaluations from the previous calendar year, documentation of new course materials/innovation, documentation of conference/workshop/publication/exhibition acceptance, etc. as appropriate, and completed merit review template (see Appendix A).
 - 2.5. The overall merit score will be calculated using the algorithm in Appendix B, with score rounded to the one-tenth decimal place.
 - 2.6. An academic unit may report its merit score recommendation to no greater than one-tenth decimal place (for example, a unit using 1-7 categories or rating levels may assign a score of 3.1 or 5.9 but may not assign a score of 3.15 or 5.975).
3. Significant Dates for Merit Consideration and Appeals
 - 3.1 January 31: Last date for faculty merit dossiers to be submitted to an academic unit. The merit committee of the academic unit is urged to work informally with all faculty being reviewed to resolve any factual or interpretive issues in advance of making recommendations to the chair.
 - 3.2 February 28: Academic unit faculty committee’s merit score recommendation to the chair (with copy to the faculty member).
 - 3.2 March 7: Last date for faculty members to appeal the committee’s recommendation to the chair (with copy to the committee).
 - 3.4 March 31: Chair’s merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copies to the committee and faculty members).
 - 3.5 April 7: Last date for faculty member to appeal the chair’s merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copy to the chair). The faculty member may raise in any appeal to the Dean: (i) the chair’s merit score recommendation, and (ii) only those aspects of the committee’s recommendation that the faculty member has previously raised in the faculty member’s appeal to the chair. Issues related to the committee’s recommendation not raised previously with the chair (where the faculty member either knew or through the exercise of reasonable diligence should have known) are not preserved for appeal to the Dean, shall not be reconsidered by the Dean, and shall not be the basis or grounds for any grievance by the BGSU-FA.
 - 3.6 April 30: Dean’s recommendation to the Provost. Thereafter the Provost and Dean may confer through on or about May 19.
 - 3.7 On or about May 20: Dean issues final determination regarding merit.

4 Special Circumstances

Consideration of Special Circumstances as Required by the Collective Bargaining Agreement

- 4.1.1 **Faculty Exchange Leave** (Article 21, Section II: subsection 1.7). Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consultation with the host institution.
- 4.1.2 **Leaves with Extramural Salary Paid through the University Payroll System** (Article 21, Section III: subsection 1.3) Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consultation with the sponsoring government agency or private foundation.
- 4.1.3 **Unpaid Leave - 100% time** (Article 21, Section IV: subsection 5). Faculty members will not be eligible for merit in any calendar year for which 100% unpaid leave was taken that is unrelated to Family Medical Leave. If related to Family Medical Leave, performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.
- 4.1.4 **Sick Leave** (Article 21, Section VIII: subsection 9.1). Performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated for faculty members on sick leave for 40 or more days during the calendar year.
- 4.1.5 **Parental Leave** (Article 21, Section IX: subsection 3). Unit Faculty Member who takes parental leave under this Article will only be evaluated for performance during the time in which he or she was not on parental leave (including use of sick leave in addition to parental leave). Performance expectations for merit evaluations that are expressed quantitatively shall be prorated. The Department Chair's/School Director's evaluation shall include a description of the methods used for prorating.
- 4.1.6 **Partial Unpaid Leave – 50% time** (Article 21, Section X: subsection 3.3) Faculty members will not be eligible for merit in any calendar year for which 50% unpaid leave was taken that is unrelated to Family Medical Leave. If related to Family Medical Leave, performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.
- 4.1.7 **Faculty Improvement Leave** (Article 22, Section 7.3.3) Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consideration of the report submitted to the President detailing accomplishments during the FIL.

4.2 Consideration of Other Special Circumstances

- 4.2.1 **New Faculty Hires.** New faculty members whose employment begins in the fall semester shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. Performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.
- 4.2.2 The unit's faculty advisory body may also consider special circumstances not covered in 4.1 above and make a recommendation to the unit chair or director. Such exceptional circumstances might include a leave without pay to take a short-term research appointment, a leave without pay to participate in professional development, or other leave without pay that enhances the productivity of the faculty member and the reputation of the institution.

5 Amendment of Merit Policy

The unit faculty may amend performance indicators, performance expectations, and the methods for combining this information into both component and overall merit scores at any time. Amendments to the merit policy must be approved by the Dean and Provost/SVPAA. Approved amendments to the merit policy shall not be applied retroactively in the calculation of the previous year's merit scores.

6 Additional Information

Approved by the Department of Humanities of Firelands College on March 4, 2015.



Kate Dailey, Chair

Date March 10, 2015

Approved: 

William Balzer, Dean, Firelands College

Date 3/11/15

Approved: 

Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP

Date 3/11/15

APPENDIX A

Merit Review Template: Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations, and the Calculation of Component Merit Scores

Overview

Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the department member on the following performance criteria: Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, 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). Merit committee members will review information submitted by each faculty member to make an evaluation rating on each performance indicator, providing some basis or justification of each rating where appropriate. No member of the merit committee will evaluate him/herself. An alternate from the previous years' committee will be asked to evaluate the current members.

Evaluation ratings provided for all performance indicators within each performance criteria will be combined by each member of the merit committee to reach a component rating for each of the relevant performance criteria (Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service). Merit committee members will meet as a committee to review and reach consensus on component ratings for each of the relevant performance criteria, using the summary form provided. The component ratings may include any number of values or rating levels, but they must clearly identify whether the component reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

The merit committee will then assign an overall merit rating using the approach found in Section 2.5 of the merit policy. The overall merit may include any number of values or rating levels, but it must clearly identify whether the overall merit rating reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

TEACHING/LIBRARIAN EFFECTIVENESS

Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness assignment for calendar year: _____

Pre-specified allocation of effort for Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness: ___%

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
<p>Evaluations: 2 per year, must be two different courses and cannot be a presentation given in another's course unless you are a librarian. Include copies of evaluations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent: (5 pts) • Very Good: (4 pts) • Good: (3 pts) • Fair: (2 pts) • Poor: (only 1 observer) (1 pt) • N/A 	
<p>Student Evaluations Peter Wood evaluation forms must be completed for all courses. At least 5 students must complete a Woods form for the form submission to be mandatory.</p>	<p>Rating determined by Average of Median Scores as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent [6-7]: (5 pts) • Very Good [5-5.9]: (4 pts) • Good [4-4.9]: (3 pts) • Fair [3-3.9]: (2 pts) • Poor [2-2.9]: (1 pt) 	
<p>Pedagogical Innovation, Effectiveness, Growth, and Dedication</p> <p>Evidence for indicators of pedagogical innovation, effectiveness, growth and/or dedication must be included with</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent: Sufficient evidence for 4+ indicators. (5 pts) • Very Good: Sufficient evidence for 3 indicators. (4 pts) • Good: Sufficient evidence for 2 indicators. (3 pts) 	

narratives. Examples may include but are not limited to those listed below.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fair: Sufficient evidence for 1 indicator. (2 pts) Poor: Sufficient evidence for 0 indicators. (1 pt) 	
<p>Selected Examples of Pedagogical Innovation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Innovative use of course website (i.e., podcasts, frequent content updates to reflect current events, discussion board etc.) Innovative use of course content (i.e., creative use of source material, innovative and effective in-class projects, etc.) Innovative and effective incorporation of one's own scholarly research into the classroom or student activities. The dedicated instruction of a large quantity of enrolled students (over 100 students per semester who receive official grades). Approval of new course (include blue sheet). Major changes to existing course (include examples of significant changes to course – beyond merely keeping current or up-dating textbook. Indicate intended reason for change and impact of change. Include both old and new syllabi.) Course new to individual including new topic to general topics course (describe course, benefit of course to college, work required to create course). Classes for special audiences (explain audience, circumstance, number of meetings). Independent study courses (describe course, breadth of content, number of students). Facilitating student development outside the classroom (e.g., writing recommendation letters, taking students to a local conference/ academic talk). Teaching awards. Unsolicited and non-anonymous student communications that reflect instructor's innovation, dedication, or effectiveness. Development of new library program, new online information source, library handling procedures, etc. 		

NTT Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (5) Adjustment x 1.25 = 6.25	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Ratings is 12 or above.
Generally Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (4) Adjustment x 1.25 = 5	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Ratings is 11.
Meets Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (3) Adjustment x 1.25 = 3.75	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Ratings is 10.
Generally Meets Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (2) Adjustment x 1.25 = 2.5	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Ratings is 9.
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (1) Adjustment x 1.25 = 1.25	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Ratings is below 9.

TT Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (5) Adjustment x 1.43 = 7.15	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Ratings is 12 or above.
Generally Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (4) Adjustment x 1.43 = 5.72	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Ratings is 11.
Meets Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (3) Adjustment x 1.43 = 4.29	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Ratings is 10.

Generally Meets Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (2) Adjustment x 1.43 = 2.8	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Ratings is 9.
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (1) Adjustment x 1.43 = 1.43	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Ratings is below 9.

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORK/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Pre-specified allocation of effort for Research/Creative Work: ___ %

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
Faculty should complete and submit "Appendix C: Worksheet for Professional Development/ Scholarly & Creative Work" with evidence for indicators and narratives as needed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent: Worksheet score of 10 or higher. • Very Good: Worksheet score of 8-9. • Good: Worksheet score of 6-7 • Fair: Worksheet score of 4-5. • Poor: Worksheet score under 4. 	

NTT Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Scholarship /Creative Work/ Professional Development (5) Adjustment x 20 = 100	Evaluation Rating of "Excellent" as determined by worksheet points
Generally Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Scholarship/Creative Work/Professional Development (4) Adjustment x 20 = 80	Evaluation Rating of "Very Good" as determined by worksheet points
Meets Expectations for Merit in Scholarship/Creative Work/Professional Development (3) Adjustment x 20 = 60	Evaluation Rating of "Good" as determined by worksheet points
Generally Meets Expectations for Merit in Scholarship/Creative Work/Professional Development (2) Adjustment x 20 = 40	Evaluation Rating of "Fair" as determined by worksheet points
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Scholarship/Creative Work/Professional Development (1) Adjustment x 20 = 20	Evaluation Rating of "Poor" as determined by worksheet points

TT Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description
--	-----------------------------------

Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Scholarship /Creative Work/ Professional Development (5) Adjustment x 6.67 = 33.35	Evaluation Rating of "Excellent" as determined by worksheet points
Generally Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Scholarship/Creative Work/Professional Development (4) Adjustment x 6.67 = 26.68	Evaluation Rating of "Very Good" as determined by worksheet points
Meets Expectations for Merit in Scholarship/Creative Work/Professional Development (3) Adjustment x 6.67 = 20.01	Evaluation Rating of "Good" as determined by worksheet points
Generally Meets Expectations for Merit in Scholarship/Creative Work/Professional Development (2) Adjustment x 6.67 = 13.34	Evaluation Rating of "Fair" as determined by worksheet points
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Scholarship/Creative Work/Professional Development (1) Adjustment x 6.67 = 6.67	Evaluation Rating of "Poor" as determined by worksheet points

SERVICE

Pre-Specified Allocation of Effort for Service ___ %

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
<p>Service Performance Indicators might include a range of activities that illustrate service to the College, University or Department and /or service to relevant professional organizations or the community.</p> <p>Use "Appendix D: Service Worksheet" to document service contributions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent: Serves in no less than two areas with total service points of 12 or above. • Very Good: Serves in no less than two areas with total service points of 10-11. • Good: Serves in no less that one area with total points of 6-9. • Fair: Serves in one area with total points of 3-5. • Poor. Limited evidence of service with total points below 3. • N/A Service not required of current position. 	

NTT & TT Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Service (5) Adjustment x 6.67 = 33.35	Evaluation Rating of "Excellent" as determined by worksheet points
Generally Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Service (4) Adjustment x 6.67 = 26.68	Evaluation Rating of "Very Good" as determined by worksheet points

Meets Expectations for Merit in Service (3) Adjustment x 6.67 = 20.01	Evaluation Rating of "Good" as determined by worksheet points
Generally Meets Expectations for Merit in Service (2) Adjustment x 6.67 = 13.34	Evaluation Rating of "Fair" as determined by worksheet points
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Service (1) Adjustment x 6.67 = 6.67	Evaluation Rating of "Poor" as determined by worksheet points

SUMMARY FORM

(To be completed by all members of the merit committee.):

Faculty Member	Merit Score for Teaching/ Librarian Effectiveness	Merit Score for Scholarship/ Creative Work	Merit Score for Service
Merit Committee Member 1	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>
Merit Committee Member 2	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>
Merit Committee Member 3	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>
Final score is the average of the three faculty members' scores as noted in this table. FINAL			

APPENDIX B: 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:

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

Total Merit Evaluation: To determine overall merit evaluation, compare the total of all three scores after the *contractual weighting* (based on allocation of effort) has been applied to the criteria below:

	Raw Score	Contractual Weight	Section Score
Teaching/Librarianship		80%/70%	
Professional Development		5%/15%	
Service		15%/15%	
TOTAL			

Overall Merit Score for NTTF	Overall Merit Score for TTF	Interpretation
12-15	12-15	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
6-11.9	6-11.9	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
5.9 and under	5.9 and under	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit

Appendix (C): Worksheet for Professional Development/Scholarly & Creative Work

*Throughout this appendix, please include level of the work and the audience for the work (local, state, regional, national or international)

Category	Narrative and/ or Evidence	Score: Determined by Merit Committee
Professional Organizations 1 pt each/max 3 pts	List the names of the organization to which you are a member. 1. 2. 3.	
Conference Presentation, Workshop Leader or Panel Participant. Local (3 pts) State/Regional (4 pts) National (5 pts) International (6 pts) <i>Invited presenter/leader: add 1-3 pts.)</i>	(Explain your role, include evidence of participation)	
Professional Development Activities To keep abreast of the field, such as viewing plays and exhibits, networking activities, webinars. (.5 pts) Participation in learning community (2-4 pts depending on role/responsibilities) Conference attendance (1-2 pts)		
Readings or Presentations Other than those in classrooms or at conferences: e.g. All College Book contributions) (1-3 pts)		
Publications Reprints (1 pt per work per reprint) Initial submission of peer reviewed journal article or book chapter (1 pt) Acceptance of peer reviewed journal article or book chapter (3 pts) Peer reviewed journal or book chapter (4-8 pts) Invited journal or book chapter (5-8 pts) Non-peer reviewed journal or book chapter (5 pts) Books Book Contract (3pts) Completed Chapters (3 pts/chapter) Publication (5-10 pts) Reviews of books, films, plays, records, etc. (1-5 pts) Creative Writing (poetry, short stories, creative non-fiction, theatrical production, etc.) (2-10 pts) White papers and other publications (2-4 pts)	Include copy of the publication. For publications resulting from engagement initiatives, describe extent of distribution and potential impact on audience (if known). Make note of type of journal (national, regional, peer reviewed, open access web based . . .)	

Professional/Nonprofessional Journal Editor (3 pts) Peer reviewer (2 pts)		
Web Projects (including web developer for organization) (1-10 pts)	Include intended audience (NOT potential audience), degree of involvement in technical production, design and organization, and content decisions.	
Theatrical Productions Directing (5-10 pts) Acting (3 pts) Designing: scenic, costume, light, sound (2-3 pts each) Stage Managing (3-5 pts) Dramaturgy (3 pts) Respondent (2 pts)		
Residencies & Conferences Organizing or Chair (1-3 pts) Attendance (1 pt)		
Group Art Exhibitions - Juried/Refereed Local (1 pt) Regional (2-3 pts) National (4-8 pts) International (4-10 pts) Non-juried (1-4 pts)		
Solo Exhibition – Juried/Refereed Local (2 pts) Regional (3 pts) National (4-8 pts) International (5-10 pts) Non-juried (2-5 pts)		
Awards in Exhibitions Local (1 pt) Regional (2 pts) National (3-8 pts) International (4-8 pts)		
Representation in a Gallery Local (1 pts) Regional or National (1-2 pts) International (2-3 pts)		
Honors or Awards Describe context of award (3 pts)		
Post-Degree Work/Supplemental Education (.25 pt per hr)	List academic coursework	
Research Projects Grants: Internal (2 pts) External (3 pts) Internal/External in partnership with outside agencies (community groups, schools, etc.) (2-5 pts)	Briefly describe research project, source and amount of funding	
Other	Include narrative to explain nature of scholarship/creative work and impact.	
TOTAL POINTS		

Appendix (D): Worksheet for Service

COMMITTEE PARTICIPATION	<i>List committees, semesters served, positions held and useful narrative.</i>	Score: Determined by Merit Committee
UNIVERSITY/BG CAMPUS Membership 4 pts/ semester Chair/Secretary 1 pt/semester Senate Executive Committee 3 pts/semester Include narrative to explain special circumstances of participation. Merit committee can add 1-3 points as seems appropriate.		
FIRELANDS COLLEGE Membership 3 pts/ semester Chair/Secretary 1 pt/semester Include narrative to explain special circumstances of participation. Merit committee can add 1-3 points as seems appropriate.		
DEPARTMENT Membership 2 pts/ semester Department Secretary 2 pts/semester Mentoring PT faculty 1 pt/semester Other Designated Department Roles 1 pt/semester Include narrative to explain special circumstances of participation. Merit committee can add 1-3 points as seems appropriate.		

OTHER COLLEGE SERVICE	<i>Identify the service provided and impact on the college.</i>	
<p>Administration of Programs/Directorships (i.e. Little Gallery, Writing Lab, Firelands College Theatre etc.) 2 pts/item</p> <p>Other examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special recruitment/retention work • Administrative Reports • Service Award • Participation in campus outreach/events <p>Include narrative to explain the nature and impact of service. Merit committee can award 1-5 pts per item.</p>		
PROFESSIONAL SERVICE	<i>Identify the venue for the service and the relationship to your profession.</i>	
<p>Includes such work as consulting, holding an office or providing service to a professional organization of which you are a member; serving a body of the community that directly relates to your profession/position at the College.</p> <p>Include narrative to explain the nature and impact of service. Merit committee can award 1-5 pts per item.</p>		
COMMUNITY SERVICE AND ENGAGEMENT	<i>Identify the organization, time involved and benefit provided.</i>	
<p>Includes work that may not relate specifically to your role at the College but that represents, at some level, your commitment to any larger community.</p> <p>Include narrative to explain the nature and impact of service. Merit committee can award 1-3 pts per item.</p>		

OTHER	<i>Include narrative to explain nature of service and impact.</i>	
TOTAL POINTS		