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DEFINITIONS:

Merit: 1. Superior quality or worth; excellence.

1. Demonstrated ability or achievement: promotions based on merit alone.


Academic year: Beginning on the first day of the first summer session and concluding with the day prior to the first day of the following year’s first summer session.

Unsatisfactory: Number of points faculty member presents in each area in order to achieve school director’s value of “1” (See table below each merit area)

Satisfactory: (Number of points faculty member presents in each area in order to achieve school director’s value of “2”) (See table below each merit area)

Meritorious: (Number of points faculty member presents in each area in order to achieve school director’s value of “3”) (See table below each merit area)

Outstanding: (Number of points faculty member presents in each area in order to achieve school director’s value of “4”) (See table below each merit area)

Extraordinary: (Number of points faculty member presents in each area in order to achieve school director’s value of “5”) (See table below each merit area)

A. Departmental Merit Criteria

1. This school shall formulate and adopt faculty criteria for merit evaluations by majority vote of bargaining unit faculty. These current criteria were adopted by majority vote of the school bargaining unit faculty on October 25, 2006. Any subsequent modifications may be accomplished through a majority vote of the school bargaining unit faculty. The School director, dean, and Senior Vice President and Provost must also approve these criteria.

2. The default weighting adopted by bargaining unit faculty will be: Teaching 60%, Research 30%, Service 10%. However, each faculty member, including probationary faculty members, may elect to choose a different weighting scale to accurately reflect his/her work of the academic
year. The weighting scale must include a minimum of 10% for each category, except for college lecturers who are %100 teaching. This alternate scale shall be decided in consultation with the chair, and with the faculty member providing a rationale. The initial decision about the weighting scale shall be made at the beginning of the academic year, prior to the second Friday of Fall semester, or two weeks after the approval of the initial guidelines, whichever is later.

When probationary faculty members select individual weightings, they should do so with consideration of issues relating to progression toward tenure/promotion. In semesters or years when a faculty member is on leave (e.g., Professional Development Leave or sick leave), he/she will not have taught or performed normal service, but may have research to show for merit evaluation for that period. In such cases, when the faculty member is evaluated for merit for that year, under the categories of Teaching and Service he/she will receive either a “satisfactory” (2) or his/her actual earned score, whichever is higher. If a faculty member is on research leave, it is possible to double the scores for service and teaching for the previous semester. For example, if the faculty member works on research during a Fall semester professional development leave, there will be no numbers for teaching and service. In this case, it is possible to double the numbers for teaching and service earned during the spring semester.

B. Merit Review

The school director shall conduct an annual evaluation of every bargaining unit faculty member in accordance with this school’s adopted criteria.

1. In preparation for the school director’s evaluation, all members of the bargaining unit will submit to the director a report of their teaching, scholarship, and service from the preceding academic year. The bargaining unit faculty member may include, in addition to any materials required by the union agreement, whatever material will provide evidence of successful teaching, scholarship, or service.

2. Merit materials will be considered on an annual basis. The initial evaluation will cover the first academic year prior to the adoption of the current guidelines. Each subsequent year’s evaluation would be based upon the previous academic year.

3. Publications can be counted at either date of acceptance or date of publication, but not both. This is to reflect that the faculty member’s success is measured by the official promise to publish his/her work, and the length of time it takes for the publisher to get the work out is not under the faculty member’s control. The faculty member must provide a dated proof of acceptance, subject to verification. And if the work is not subsequently published, the faculty member will have the merit points earned for its acceptance deducted from the appropriate year’s merit evaluation.

4. Points system: A maximum of 5 points can be accumulated in each category, according to Article 16, “Compensation”, section 8. B. 2, the school director will provide a written evaluation and assign a ranking of "Unsatisfactory" = 1, "satisfactory" = 2, "meritorious" = 3, "outstanding" = 4, and "extraordinary" = 5. While the bargaining unit member may present their case using the following schema, the school director shall assign the ranking from 1-5 to each area of teaching scholarship, and service.
I. Scholarship
A satisfactory rating means that you are advancing the body of knowledge in your field as described below. Evidence of this will be maintenance of at least graduate faculty category 1 status. For the first 2 years (academic years 2005-2007), if this status is not already met, the faculty member will merit as “satisfactory” if he/she submits drafts of articles showing a significant degree of progress towards this status. The publication of works that grant graduate faculty status will still merit the additional points noted below. In our school, scholarship can be represented by research, development, and innovative and creative works. The bargaining unit faculty member shall use these points values and make his/her case presentation to the school director.

Additional points:
Publications:
Books (authored, edited, translated, electronic): 2-3 pts
Articles (qualitative and quantitative): 2-3 pts
Book reviews: .5 pt
Local & state presentations at conferences, colloquia, universities: .5 pt
National & international presentations at conferences, colloquia, universities: 1 pt
Editor, co-editor for journal: 2 pts
Reviewer for a refereed journal: .5 pts per article reviewed
Articles submitted to conferences or journals: 5-1 pt
Running subjects for research study/data collection, unfunded: .5 pt
Writing applications for grants: 1-3 pts
Product development and/or dissemination: 1-3 pt
Award of grants: 3-4 pts
Professional organizations: Leadership positions/Committee work: .5-4 pts
Developing & establishing community internships/fellowships: 1-3 pts
Managing community internship/fellowships: 1-3 pts
Generation of other academic and creative work such as publication of treatment materials, computer programs, etc. 1-3 pts.
Other: .5 up to 3 pts at the discretion of the department chair

Points accumulated in Scholarship correspond to the ranked values below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory=1</th>
<th>Satisfactory=2</th>
<th>Meritorious=3</th>
<th>Outstanding=4</th>
<th>Extraordinary=5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>12+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Teaching
A satisfactory rating means having met the minimum standards for “satisfactory” (9 points or higher) as defined below. Certain items below may be counted as meritorious if performed without load hour assignments as made by the dean and school directors as outlined in University rule 3359-20-032 B.2.3.b.i.A-E. (value=1 point)

Additional points: course evaluations

- Teaching evaluations are assessed by student evaluations.
- Teaching evaluation points are accumulated for each and every class.
- Administration evaluations are assessed by peer and student evaluations.
- Purchased time for research is evaluated in the following manner: The argument for merit will be made by the faculty member. Merit points are awarded by the school director.

Points accumulated in Teaching correspond to the ranked values below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory=1</th>
<th>Satisfactory=2</th>
<th>Meritorious=3</th>
<th>Outstanding=4</th>
<th>Extraordinary=5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-8</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>21+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional points:
Course evaluations: Class by Class
The median score for each didactic class will be counted as follows:
Question #33: Median scores in the 4.5-4.99 range for a course: 1 pt
Question #33: Median scores in the 5.0-5.99 range for a course: 2 pt
Question #33: Median scores in the 6-7 range for a course: 3 pts
Peer evaluations or unsolicited letters as evidence of excellence: .5 pt
Supervision of independent studies: .5 pt per independent study
Documented attendance at teaching workshops: .5-1 pt
New course development: 1.5 pt
Significant redevelopment of course: .5 pt
Guest lecture/speaking in other classes or departments: .5 pt
Innovative teaching methods (e.g., innovative use of new technology): .5-1 pt
Teaching/Clinical overload per semester: 1 pt
Teaching awards: variable pts. depending on award
Documented attendance at teaching seminars/workshop: .2 pts per workshop, up to 1 pt
Presentation at local teaching at teaching seminars/workshop: .5-1 pt
Honors Project advisor: 1 pt
Honors Project reader: .5 pt
Additional teaching responsibilities (e.g., teaching an additional class for faculty members who are on professional development leave or for those who are promoted to another position and/or leave during the school year): .5–1 pt
Other: . up to 3 pts at the discretion of the department chair
III. Service to University, College, Department, Community:
A satisfactory rating means that you regularly attend department meetings and contribute as a member of necessary department committees (unless excused for legitimate reason); that you take care of your share of student advising, that you take your turn attending graduation, and that you take your turn representing the department at state and/or national conventions. The following may be counted as meritorious if performed without load hour assignments as made by the dean and school directors as outlined in University rule 3356-20-032 B. 2. 3.e.i. and f.i

Additional points:
Department Committee chair: 1 pt
Department Committee member: .5 pt
College or University Committee member: .5 pt
College or University Committee chair: 1 pt
Executive committee officer of Faculty Senate: 2 pts
Executive committee officer of Akron-AAUP, etc.: 2 pts
Akron-AAUP departmental liaison: .5 pt
Member of Faculty Senate: 1 pt
Review of graduate applicants: .5 pt
Representing dept at student recruitment events: .1 per instance -up to 1 pt
Maintaining website components: .5-1.5 pt
Unpaid community service project: .5-1 pt
Developing service-related community internships: 1 pt
Library liaison: .5 pt
Student organization advisor: 1 pt
Professional organizations: Leadership positions/Participation: .5 up to 2 pts
Other (e.g. KASA explanations, multimedia work for faculty, service above and beyond required duties to fill department needs such as service for faculty members who are on sabbatical during the year): .5- up to 3 pts at the discretion of the department chair

Each of the three categories includes the option of “other” to cover any relevant work not anticipated in these guidelines. In this and other cases where variable points are available, the faculty member will request the point value he/she believes is fair and explain why.

Points accumulated in Service correspond to the ranked values below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory=1</th>
<th>Satisfactory=2</th>
<th>Meritorious=3</th>
<th>Outstanding=4</th>
<th>Extraordinary=5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1-2.5</td>
<td>2.6-4</td>
<td>4.1+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>