

Merit Document
Department of Musicology/Composition/Theory
(approved 2/6/15)

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 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 by 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., 50/30/20 for teaching, scholarship, and service) with the chair.
- 2.2. The department merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. The MUCT Merit Committee shall consist of Faculty Bargaining Unit Members with one representative each from ethno/musicology, composition,

and theory who will serve three-year, staggered terms. To the extent possible, untenured faculty will not be asked to serve on this committee.

- 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 known as Professional Annual Report (PAR) must include a list of activities for the calendar year (not the academic year) under the categories Research, Teaching, Service as listed in Appendix C, D & E. First-year faculty should list activities that have occurred during their employment at BGSU (August-December).
 - 2.4.1. PARs should be one to three pages in length in a 12-point font. This limit should encourage a focus on what’s important and limit the amount of work involved in preparing it.
 - 2.4.2. A brief justification of the significance of any accomplishment may be included.
 - 2.4.3. Faculty must show clearly the significance of items listed, by indicating such criteria as
 - peer-reviewed or not
 - premiere of composition (date, city, venue) or subsequent performance
 - committee chair or member
 - thesis advisor or reader
 - 2.4.4. Administrative appointments should be included in PARs with (as appropriate) a list of significant accomplishments that were completed during the appointment.
 - 2.4.5. Include “Above & Beyond” information as appropriate.
- 2.5. All full-time faculty members submit a PAR to the MuCT Department Secretary on January 31 (see section 3 below for significant dates for merit consideration and appeals).
 - 2.5.1. On February 1, the Department Secretary copies the PARs and places them in faculty mailboxes. Using professional judgment, faculty mark ratings directly onto one another's forms, providing a numerical score (0-7, see below) for each of the three areas of research, teaching, and service. If you feel that any of your ratings require explanation, feel free to pencil in a few comments. Do not evaluate yourself. Rating scale:
 - 7 means “exceptional merit”
 - 6 means “very high merit”
 - 5 means “high merit”
 - 4 means “medium high merit”
 - 3 means “average merit”
 - 2 means “medium low merit”
 - 1 means “low merit”
 - 0 means “no merit”
 - 00 mean “no merit materials submitted, therefore no merit”

Faculty are encouraged to use the scale well and not bunch their ratings.
 - 2.5.2. Ratings for first-year faculty will be a minimum of 3 for teaching, research, and service, so as not to disadvantage them. The MUCT Merit Committee will make sure this has been done.
 - 2.5.3. Do not consider allocation of effort when evaluating the PARs. The MuCT Merit Committee will consider allocation of effort as part of it deliberations.
 - 2.5.4. Ratings of research, teaching, and service should judge accomplishments at face value. There should be no relativity regarding opportunity for accomplishments and no devaluing of accomplishments for which a person received either load credit or remuneration. For

instance, those with administrative appointments will have greater opportunity for service. Their service is not to be adjusted because they had so much more opportunity than others. By the same token, those with administrative appointments will have less opportunity to teach. Their teaching ratings are not to be adjusted to compensate for having had less opportunity than others. Similarly, although NTTF will not be assigned expectations in the area of research (creative work) or service, their efforts should be judged without reference to allocation of effort.

- 2.5.5. Faculty return the packet of forms with their ratings to the MuCT Department Secretary by the announced deadline.
- 2.5.6. MuCT Department Secretary forwards ratings returned by faculty to the Merit Committee shortly after the announced deadline.
- 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

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.

February 28: Academic unit faculty committee's merit score recommendation to the chair (with a copy to the faculty member).

March 7: Last date for faculty members to appeal the committee's recommendation to the chair (with a copy to the committee).

March 31: Chair's merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copies to the committee and faculty members).

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 considered by the Dean, and shall not be the basis or grounds for any grievance by the BGSU-FA.

April 30: Dean's recommendation to the Provost. Thereafter the Provost and Dean may confer through on or about May 19.

On or about May 20: Dean issues final determination regarding merit.

4. Special Circumstances

4.1. 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

Additional guidelines and helpful information are provided in Appendix F.

In the department of musicology/composition/theory, eligibility for Merit requires merit scores that meet expectations in all areas (i.e., Teaching, Research/Creative Work, and Service) as appropriate for a faculty member's allocation of effort.

Approved by the Department of Musicology/Composition/Theory at the February 6, 2015 Department Meeting



Gene S. Trantham, Chair

Date 2/13/15

Approved:



Jeffrey Showell, Dean of College of Musical Arts

Date 2-13-2015

Approved:



Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP

Date 2/27/15

APPENDIX A

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

Merit criteria are limited to three areas: Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service. To determine whether faculty members have failed to meet, met, exceeded or greatly exceeded expectations for merit, a merit system should identify performance indicators and expected levels of performance for each of the relevant areas noted above. The merit system should also describe how information on the various performance indicators are combined to calculate the relevant component merit scores (i.e., Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service).

Overview

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/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 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 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 performance:

Greatly exceeds expectations for merit: Activities in area cumulatively greatly exceed expectations and reflect a clear and highly significant level of accomplishment beyond the level of "exceeds expectations" for an individual with a given faculty rank in the department, school, unit, and discipline.

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, school, unit, and discipline.

Meets expectations for merit: Activities in area cumulatively meet expectations and reflect standard levels of performance for the department, school, unit, and discipline.

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, school, unit, and discipline.

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.

Evaluation Rating Category	TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Teaching*
Greatly exceeds expectations for merit	<i>Because of the diverse disciplines in our department, we use the professional judgments of the entire department to generate numerical values (see Section 2.5 above)</i>	5.6 – 7.0
Exceeds expectations for merit	<i>Because of the diverse disciplines in our department, we use the professional judgments of the entire department to generate numerical values (see Section 2.5 above)</i>	3.6 – 5.5
Meets expectations for merit	<i>Because of the diverse disciplines in our department, we use the professional judgments of the entire department to generate numerical values (see Section 2.5 above)</i>	1.0 – 3.5
Fails to meet expectations for merit	Quantitative student evaluations are below 2.0. Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are generally absent. Limited or no engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness	0 – .9

*Insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 1-5point scale.

Merit Score for Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness

(to be completed by merit committee member): _____

Evaluation Rating Category	SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORK Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Research*
Greatly exceeds expectations for merit	<i>Because of the diverse disciplines in our department, we use the professional judgments of the entire department to generate numerical values (see Section 2.5 above)</i>	5.6 – 7.0
Exceeds expectations for merit	<i>Because of the diverse disciplines in our department, we use the professional judgments of the entire department to generate numerical values (see Section 2.5 above)</i>	3.6 – 5.5
Meets expectations for merit	<i>Because of the diverse disciplines in our department, we use the professional judgments of the entire department to generate numerical values (see Section 2.5 above)</i>	1.0 – 3.5
Fails to meet expectations for merit	Faculty member does not complete any of the criteria listed in Appendix C (e.g., publications, presentations, performances, grants, citations, awards, residences)	0 – .9

*Insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 1-5point scale.

Merit Score for Research (to be completed by merit committee member): _____

Evaluation Rating Category	SERVICE Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Service*
Greatly exceeds expectations for merit	<i>Because of the diverse disciplines in our department, we use the professional judgments of the entire department to generate numerical values (see Section 2.5 above)</i>	5.6 – 7.0
Exceeds expectations for merit	<i>Because of the diverse disciplines in our department, we use the professional judgments of the entire department to generate numerical values (see Section 2.5 above)</i>	3.6 – 5.5
Meets expectations for merit	<i>Because of the diverse disciplines in our department, we use the professional judgments of the entire department to generate numerical values (see Section 2.5 above)</i>	1.0 – 3.5
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<i>Faculty member does not complete any of the criteria listed in Appendix E (e.g., service to the profession, to the university, to the college, to the department, to the community)</i>	0 – .9

*Insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 1-5point scale.

Merit Score for Service (to be completed by merit committee member): _____

SUMMARY FORM

(to be completed with agreement reached by all members of the merit committee):

Faculty Member	Merit Score for Teaching Effectiveness	Merit Score for Research/Creative Work	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>

Appendix B

Options for Determining Overall Merit Score Recommendations

The individual component merit scores for teaching/librarian effectiveness, research/creative work, and service are combined to arrive at an overall merit score. Allocation of effort is taken into account when determining overall merit score. The overall merit may include five or more values or rating levels than five, but it must clearly identify whether the overall merit rating reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

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:

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

Below is an example using our 7-point scale

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation (assumes component performance ratings made on 7-point scale)
0 – .9	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
1.0 – 3.5	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
3.6 – 5.6	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
5.6 – 7.0	Greatly exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit

APPENDIX C -- Theory Research:

Address the following scholarly activities, as applicable:

PUBLICATIONS (include complete bibliographic citations and length)

- Books and monographs authored
- Books edited
- Critical editions of music
- Book chapters (refereed)
- Articles in refereed journals
- Articles/essays in professional publications (e.g., encyclopedias, Festschriften, anthologies; something with a lesser review stage or no review)
- Liner Notes and Program Notes
- Review essays
- Reviews: books, CDs, DVDs/films
- Published Reviews of your work
- Editing
- Translations

PRESENTATIONS (include if abstracts are reviewed or not, or if presentation is invited; also include if presentation is individual or shared, or if you serve as part of a panel or roundtable)

- International
- National
- Regional/local

PERFORMANCES (differing from and larger-scale than community-service performances; these include ensemble directing)

- International
- National
- Regional/local

GRANTS (include level and significance; you may include grants applied for but not received)

COMPLETED FIELD OR ARCHIVAL RESEARCH (specify project)

CITATIONS OF YOUR WORK (provide full bibliographic information and page number[s] of publication)

CONFERENCE SESSIONS ORGANIZED (specify conference and work)

HONORS AND AWARDS (include level of significance)

APPENDIX C -- Musicology and Ethnomusicology Research:

Address the following scholarly activities, as applicable:

PUBLICATIONS (include complete bibliographic citations and length)

- Books and monographs authored
- Books edited
- Critical editions of music
- Book chapters (refereed)
- Articles in refereed journals
- Articles/essays in professional publications (e.g., encyclopedias, Festschriften, anthologies; something with a lesser review stage or no review)
- Liner Notes and Program Notes
- Review essays
- Reviews: books, CDs, DVDs/films
- Published Reviews of your work
- Editing
- Translations

PRESENTATIONS (include if abstracts are reviewed or not, or if presentation is invited; also include if presentation is individual or shared, or if you serve as part of a panel or roundtable)

- International
- National
- Regional/local

PERFORMANCES (differing from and larger-scale than community-service performances; these include ensemble directing)

- International
- National
- Regional/local

GRANTS (include level and significance; you may include grants applied for but not received)

HONORS AND AWARDS (include level of significance)

CONFERENCE SESSIONS ORGANIZED (specify conference and work)

COMPLETED FIELD OR ARCHIVAL RESEARCH (specify project)

CITATIONS OF YOUR WORK (provide full bibliographic information and page number[s] of publication)

APPENDIX C -- Composition Research and Creative Activities:

In all categories, entries should be weighted in the following manner (most meritorious to least):

- International
- National
- Regional

Include title, date, location, and performers at your discretion.

List whether performances are juried or solicited.

Premiere Performances

- Do not list completed compositions that have not been premiered

Repeat Performances of Compositions

Radio Broadcasts

Grants

Awards/Honors

Presentations/Papers Given

- Include title, location and date

Residencies

- Include location and dates

Juries/Adjudication (should reside under service)

Performance

- Performing one's own compositions
- Other (instrumental performance, conducting, sound diffusion, etc.)

Publications (include complete bibliographic citations and length)

- See list of items under PAR Guidelines for Theory Research & PAR Guidelines for Musicology

Other

APPENDIX D -- Teaching:

1. List all courses taught during the calendar year including:
 - Course number and title
 - Numerical evaluations
 - “Above & Beyond” information as applicable

2. List all completed graduate and doctoral thesis/dissertation committee responsibilities. Indicate status as chair, member, reader, etc.

3. List other teaching as appropriate including:
 - Independent studies (completed)
 - Honors projects (completed), listing status as chair or member.
 - Guest teaching (list course and topic)
 - Collegium direction
 - List non-required performances if not performing
 - Literature edited for performance

4. List any major student accomplishments. Clearly describe how the accomplishments are specifically a result of your teaching.

5. List teaching awards (careful not to list twice under research heading.)

6. Address any major/significant adjustments to/improvements to courses (restructuring content, procedures, etc.). Include the following information as applicable:
 - BGSU and/or CMA learning outcomes produced
 - Employing collaborative work among students to enhance learning
 - Employing new techniques to promote active learning
 - Developing new strategies for addressing different learning styles
 - Developing new ways of teaching (not merely materials)
 - Employing technology in new/innovative ways to enhance learning

7. List other activities that promote teaching. Examples include:
 - Attending conferences where you don’t present and don’t serve as an officer
 - Participating in learning communities or workshops

APPENDIX E -- Service:

SERVICE TO THE PROFESSION

Service on professional societies' committees or boards (specify position [chair, director, member, etc.], term, responsibilities, if not self-evident)

Conferences: attendance as session chair or committee member (provide specific information on duties performed if not self-evident)

List nominations for professional offices

Editing others' work (journals, newsletters, etc., NOT essay collections or editions, see under "Research")

Pre-publication reviews (of textbooks, monographs, etc.)

SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY (specify chair, member, term, describe duties briefly as needed)

SERVICE TO THE COLLEGE (specify chair, member, term, describe duties briefly as needed)

SERVICE TO THE DEPARTMENT (specify chair, member, term, describe duties briefly as needed, include coordinatorships and duties as needed)

N.B. List concerts produced or performed (such as ArtsX, playing for a banquet, etc), as well as non-research presentations or written documents (i.e. pre-concert lectures, workshops, program notes, etc.) for the campus/college/department in the above categories.

Student recruitment

Exam grading (i.e. placement exams, doctoral exams)

SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

(include teaching through Creative Arts Program;
collegium or personal performances presented at community organizations
(or nursing homes, etc.),
presentations given to community organizations)

APPENDIX F – Additional Guidelines and Helpful Information:

1. Publications **ABOUT** a person but not written **BY THEM** should be listed under awards/honors.

2. List under service
 - pre-publication reviews
 - editing other people's work. An exception would be an edited essay collection organized by the individual faculty member, whose vision will prevail over the entire project and who, in many cases, will contribute a chapter (this is appropriate to research).

3. It is OK To List
 - a. Nominations for awards (without winning)
 - b. Student accomplishments, especially of those who have graduated several years ago
(Faculty may include student awards/accomplishments on PARs if the work recognized was completed while the student was enrolled at BGSU, if the faculty member had significant, direct, and documentable involvement in the production of that work, and if a brief statement about the nature of the award is included.)
 - c. Faculty development—attending conferences, workshops; enrolling in special classes
(If you attend a conference or workshop and do nothing [you're not an officer, you do not present], then list under "development" [teaching]; if you attend and do many things, then list once in the appropriate category [research or service]).

4. DO NOT LIST
 - Works in Progress—examples include:
 - submitted items (no confirmation of publication yet)
 - forthcoming (confirmed for publication in the future)
 - thesis-in-progress
 - writing letters of recommendation
 - attending Music Discovery Day
 - attending the Dean's retreat
 - attending a retirement dinner
 - attending graduation
 - social-professional activities, such as giving a reception for guests to the college
 - making yourself available by email and in person to your students
 - tracking the number of email exchanges you might have with your students