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I. In accordance with the Contract between the Akron-AAUP and The University of Akron Administration (nka “the Contract”), the department chair shall conduct an annual evaluation of every bargaining unit faculty member to determine recommendations for merit increases in salary.

II. It is the intent of the faculty of the Department of Public Service that all definitions, processes, timelines and criteria for college lecturers and instructors herein shall be consistent with “the Contract”. Any ambiguities or inconsistencies shall be interpreted and resolved in conformity with “the Contract”. The enumerated merit criteria set forth herein shall also be applicable to college lecturers and instructors covered by “the Contract”.

For faculty who so choose, the “evaluation period” shall be a rolling three-year period, consisting of an average or cumulative report of said period. The evaluation period shall end on the last day of the academic year of the most recent evaluation year. The academic year is defined in “the Contract” in article 16, section 8, subsection B, item 1. Faculty shall choose the “evaluation period” upon submission of the evaluation report for the current academic year to the chair (and any chair requested documentation of activities) for the current year and the two preceding years. Each faculty member shall indicate the percentage weight for each category to be utilized for the review, no later than the second Friday of the Fall semester. The chair shall have final authority for review of said weightings. It is understood that only ‘ratings’ and not ‘weightings’ can be appealed to the dean. The faculty member shall submit a “merit report” form (& any chair requested documentation of activities) for the current academic year.

For faculty not opting for the three year rolling average, their merit evaluation and recommendations for salary increase shall be based on an annual merit review. Each faculty member shall indicate the percentage weight for each category to be utilized for the annual review, no later than the second Friday of the Fall semester. The chair shall have final authority for review of said weightings. It is understood that only ‘ratings’ and not ‘weightings’ can be appealed to the dean. The faculty member shall submit a “merit report” form (& any chair requested documentation of activities) for the current academic year.

“Merit Report” forms shall be completed by the faculty and submitted to the department chair no later than the last instructional day of the spring semester of the current academic year.

The available range for said “weighting criteria” shall be:

- Teaching: 60 – 70%
- Service: 20 – 30%
- Research and Scholarly Activity: 10 – 20%


The department shall have a default weighting to be applied should faculty not make a request prior to the deadline of the second Friday of the Fall semester. Said default weighting shall be:

Teaching 60%
Service 20%
Research/Scholarly Activity 20%

In addition, for all probationary faculty in the department the weighting shall be:

Teaching 70%
Service 15%
Research/Scholarly Activity 15%

Point system: A rating of Unsatisfactory shall be valued at: 1 point
A rating of Satisfactory shall be valued at: 2 points
A rating of Meritorious shall be valued at: 3 points
A rating of Outstanding shall be valued at: 4 points
A rating of Extraordinary shall be valued at: 5 points

A. Faculty on Professional Development Leave (PDL) shall be eligible for the standard, contractually agreed upon across the board pay increase if the faculty's performance has been rated at an aggregate rating of "satisfactory" during the prior three academic years (average score over three years) and a "satisfactory" report (chair's discretion) is filed with the department chair and provost in a timely fashion (prior to July 1st). In addition, for merit purposes, faculty on PDL throughout all or part (i.e. one or two semesters) of the academic year shall be eligible for a merit salary increase if the required report summarizing the work conducted on said leave is filed with the department chair and provost in a timely fashion (prior to July 1st) and the department chair assesses the report as indicating the completed work to be either meritorious, outstanding or extraordinary. The definition of meritorious, outstanding or extraordinary shall be determined by the faculty and chair, in consultation with the dean or associate dean of Summit College, at the time said faculty applies for PDL.

B. When the PDL is for only one semester, the standard merit criteria shall apply to said faculty during the semester said faculty member was not on PDL.

III. For full time, tenure track faculty, reappointment, tenure and promotion shall be based on departmental and college guidelines for RTP. Automatic reappointment is not a consideration in the Department of Public Service. A non-tenured faculty member who fails to earn a "satisfactory" rating on all three merit performance categories may or may not be recommended for retention, conditional retention, or non-retention depending on the discretion of the departmental retention committee, department chair, dean, provost and Board of Trustees. A faculty member earning a "satisfactory" rating on all three merit performance categories may or may not be recommended for retention, conditional retention or non-retention depending on the discretion of the departmental retention committee, department chair, dean, provost and Board of
Trustees. Faculty who earn ratings of meritorious, outstanding or extraordinary for purposes of merit salary increases, will continue to be subject to the departmental RTP guidelines and may or may not be recommended for tenure or promotion pursuant to the discretion of the departmental RTP committee and department chair in reviewing said faculty’s performance in light of the department RTP guidelines.

To be eligible for the standard contractual across the board salary increase, the faculty member must earn an aggregate rating of "satisfactory". Once faculty have met the minimum threshold of a satisfactory rating, the "point system" and "weighting criteria" shall be factored in to determine the faculty eligibility for a merit increase based on a satisfactory, meritorious, outstanding or extraordinary work performance for the period under review. The chair shall evaluate each faculty using the data referenced in part IV below and assign a score of 1.0 – 5.0 for each of the areas: teaching, service and research/scholarly activity. The relative "weights" assigned each category will be used to calculate the overall merit score for each faculty in accordance with the formulae in the contract.

IV. Criteria for Determining Merit Recommendations: Rating points in each area defined below are accumulated on a three-year rolling average for those faculty choosing a three-year rolling average; rating points in each area defined below are accumulated annually for those faculty choosing annual review.

Definitions:

TEACHING:

Unsatisfactory teaching shall be defined as: An overall average of all course evaluations with 25% of student ratings between 1.0 and 2.9*, substantive complaints filed by students with the department chair, numerous class cancellations (what constitutes "numerous" is at the chair’s discretion) not pre-approved by the department or mandated by the university or failure to maintain office hours.

Satisfactory teaching shall be defined as: An overall average of course evaluations with 75% of student ratings at or above 3.0*, infrequent student complaints about the individual faculty member, no evidence of a lack of faculty responsiveness to student feedback (chair’s discretion), and maintains a minimum of four office hours per week.

Meritious teaching shall be defined as: An overall average of course evaluations with 85% of student ratings at or above 3.5*, rare expression of concern or complaints by students against faculty, and maintains a minimum of five office hours per week.

Outstanding teaching shall be defined as: An overall average of course evaluations with 85% of student ratings at or above 4.0*, no reasonable complaints by students against faculty (unreasonable complaints shall not be held against faculty; chair’s
discretion regarding reasonable/unreasonable), and maintains a minimum of six office
hours per week.

Extraordinary teaching shall be defined as: An overall average of course evaluations
with 85% of student ratings at or above 4.5*, no reasonable complaints by students
against faculty, chair’s discretion regarding reasonable/unreasonable), and maintains
a minimum of eight office hours per week.

(note: * Denotes standard course evaluations used by Summit College. “Background
questions” shall not be factored into the merit ratings).

At the time course evaluations are presented to students for completion, faculty shall
not be present in the classroom. Faculty shall refrain from engaging in behavior or
statements regarding course evaluations, in the presence of students, which could be
deemed an effort to influence students’ ratings from a fair, objective assessment of
the faculty performance. Public Service faculty agree the time to influence student
ratings comes during the semester through our efforts to provide them with high
quality instruction. Extraneous comments to students by faculty regarding course
evaluations shall be avoided.

Mitigating circumstances: At the chair’s discretion, mitigating circumstances
resulting in a lower than normal student rating for a faculty member may be taken
into consideration when “special circumstances” (i.e. experimental instructional
techniques, new courses, multiple preparations beyond the norm, etc) occur in a given
semester.

SERVICE:

Unsatisfactory service shall be defined as: A failure of faculty to actively participate
on at least one departmental and one college committee and complete at least one of
the activities/functions enumerated in H.4.a-z of the Public Service Departmental
Guidelines for ARTP (appendix A, attached hereto and made a part hereof).
Satisfactory service shall be defined as: Faculty actively involved in at least one
departmental and college committee and at least one of the activities/functions
enumerated in the departmental guidelines under H.4.a-z (appendix A).

Meritorious service shall be defined as: Faculty actively involved in a combined total
of at least five activities/functions consisting of departmental and/or college
committees and/or any of the functions/activities enumerated in the departmental
guidelines under H.4.a-z (appendix A).

Outstanding service shall be defined as: Faculty fulfillment of meritorious criteria set
forth above, and, service as a committee chair at the college level, or as chair of a
search committee or other committee of significance (chair’s discretion re. definition
of “significance”) at the departmental level, or other outstanding service performed
(chair’s discretion regarding such other outstanding service).
Extraordinary service shall be defined as: Faculty actively involved in a combined total of eight of the following: departmental and/or college level committees and/or activities/functions enumerated in departmental guidelines H-1, a-z (appendix A) and served as chair of a college wide committee or performed other extraordinary service at the college level (chair’s discretion regarding such other extraordinary service).

RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY:

Unsatisfactory performance shall be defined as: A failure of faculty to present to the department chair evidence of research conducted or scholarly activity.

Satisfactory performance shall be defined as: Faculty presenting to the department chair evidence of research conducted (and results thereof) “or” evidence of scholarly activity. Satisfactory scholarly activity shall be defined as faculty attending at least two continuing education seminars, “or” professional conferences, “or” training seminars related to improved classroom performance “or” technology improvement in an academic year.

Meritorious performance shall be defined as: Faculty presenting to the department chair evidence of significant research (and results thereof) (chair’s discretion regarding “significant research”) “or” significant scholarly activity. Significant scholarly activity shall be defined as faculty meeting satisfactory performance as noted above; and additionally, presenting a paper or conducting a continuing education seminar before a group of one’s professional peers (i.e. members of one’s profession or general field of expertise).

Outstanding performance shall be defined as: Faculty fulfilling meritorious criteria as noted above; and additionally, presenting evidence to the department chair of having published results of one’s research; “or” at least two paper presentations “or” conducting two continuing education seminars to one’s colleagues in one’s profession in an academic year.

Extraordinary performance shall be defined as: Faculty fulfilling outstanding criteria as noted above; and additionally, has received professional recognition such as non-teaching awards/honors, “or” presented an additional paper presentation or conducted an additional CEU training seminar (i.e. total of four), “or” presents “other evidence” of additional research or scholarly activity of similar substance (chair’s discretion) to the preceding criteria set forth in this paragraph.

PROCEDURE: Each academic year each full time member of the department faculty shall complete a “Merit Review Form” (aka MRF form) (Appendix B, attached hereto and made a part hereof) and submit it to the department chair for purposes of merit review and salary adjustment consideration on or before May 1st at the end of the academic year. The chair shall then interview said faculty member to discuss the information submitted on the MRF form. The chair shall then complete, sign and date
an MRF Rating form (appendix C, attached hereto and made a part hereof), forwarding a copy to the faculty under review.

V. Appeals pertaining to merit scores may be made according to the conditions and procedures in the Contract, article 16, section 8, subsection B, paragraphs 4 and 5.

APPENDIX A

Departmental Guidelines for ARTP
Public Service Technology
Adopted April 2007

A. The purpose of these procedures are for reappointment, tenure, and promotion is to promote a process at the University of Akron that is fair, consistent, and faculty-driven. The procedures are designed to define the guidelines under which the bargaining unit members will be working, and to define the procedures and evaluative measures that are part of the process. All reappointment, tenure, and promotion recommendations are seen as a serious measure of the progress of the bargaining unit member and shall serve as clear benchmarks of and suggestions for future progress. The Department supports Summit College in its steps to reach those ends by:

1. Providing comprehensive career education and information to those students who are seeking careers in the public service.
2. Designing career education programs geared not only to specific professions, but also to the development of the student as a whole person, sensitive to the needs, values and worth of their clients as human beings in a multi-cultural society.
3. Maintaining liaison between the College and the community and between the College and those University components which provide education for those of our students whose scholastic goals extend beyond Summit College.
4. Sharing the tasks of counseling and advising students.
5. Focusing our teaching skills on the student as the central figure in our work.
6. To encourage the professional development of Public Service faculty.

B. Because teaching is the foundation of the departmental mission, the department places its greatest emphasis on the effectiveness and quality of teaching in criteria for merit, reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

Professional and scholarly activity is required. The scholarship of teaching and learning is of equal merit to discipline-based professional activities. Publication is not required of faculty in Summit College, but is an additional measure which can be used to demonstrate professional and scholarly activity.

Service, both to the institution and the community, is required. Service to the community is the area of faculty performance which shall receive the least emphasis for purposes of merit or reappointment, tenure, and promotion. In the area of community service, activities related
to the candidate's area of expertise and which bring recognition to the university are considered to be more important than other activities.

The faculty member shall exhibit academic and professional conduct in a manner consistent with guidelines set by professional societies and the university.

The expectations for teaching effectiveness, professional and scholarly activity, service, and leadership increase each year and with each successive rank. Attainment of the minimum requirement is only the starting place for consideration. Surpassing the minimum is expected. Attainment of minimum standards shall not ensure a positive recommendation. At each level, candidates who meet the minimum requirements are eligible for consideration, but meeting the minimum requirements does not assure reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

C. Within this Department, the Juris Doctor shall be considered a terminal degree.

D. The departmental criteria for initial appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion, as identified in this document, are consistent with the faculty manual, college criteria, and the Collective Bargaining Agreement. If a discrepancy should arise, the college, University rules, and the Collective Bargaining Agreement supersede department guidelines.

E. Guidelines, procedures, processes, and timelines for initial appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion are identical to those outlined in the college document.

F. The department will permit, by a simple majority vote of the members present and voting, an individual who has not attended all meetings but has otherwise substantially met the participation standards to vote. Similarly, the department will permit absentee ballots in extenuating circumstances for persons who have participated in the majority of deliberations. A simple majority of committee members present and voting will be required for acceptance of absentee ballots. The reason or reasons for the exceptions to the participation rule shall be included in the committee recommendations.

For the purpose of reappointment, tenure, and promotion for the bargaining unit member, a simple majority vote in the affirmative, at the minimum, is necessary for adoption. Academic unit guidelines may determine individual unit requirements for a minimum affirmative vote beyond a simple majority. When there is a tie vote, the motion is rejected. While it is the duty of every member who has an opinion on a question to participate in these important deliberations, to arrive at an informed opinion, and to express it by his or her vote; he or she cannot be compelled to do so. He or she may prefer to abstain from voting, fully realizing that the effect is the same as if he or she voted on the prevailing side. Abstentions are not counted in the number of votes cast and are considered blank ballots. However, they are included in the report. For example, a vote of three positive, one negative and seven abstentions represents a seventy-five percent positive vote and would be reported: three positive, one negative, seven abstentions.

G. Criteria for Initial Employment at the Rank of Assistant Professor
To be considered for initial employment at the rank of assistant professor, an individual shall have an earned master’s degree from an accredited institution of higher education in a discipline relevant to his/her teaching field or a Juris Doctor (for applicable positions) and teaching experience. The candidate will also have a minimum of two years employment related to one’s area of specialization with evidence of continuing accomplishment and increasing responsibility. During the interview process, candidates who are finalists will be required to teach a mini-class attended by the Search Committee and other interested Department faculty. The candidate must also meet the criteria established by the search committee.

H. Criteria for Reappointment for Assistant Professors

1. For reappointment, faculty shall demonstrate high quality teaching and competence in their area of specialization. (See H-2) Candidates must demonstrate professional and scholarly activity. (See H-3) Service to the department, college, university, and community is required. (See H-4) Professional conduct, as specified in the university guidelines, is required.

   For candidates for reappointment whose initial appointment begins during the fall semester, the candidate’s file will not include the materials required in H-2, H-3, and H-4; their files will contain only the materials required in H-6. Thereafter, candidates shall demonstrate progress toward tenure and promotion in each successive reappointment year. The Reappointment Committee shall, in its recommendations, inform candidates who are not making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion of the improvements expected.

2. Teaching effectiveness includes, but is not limited to, mastery of the subject matter, availability to students, and ongoing course development and innovation. For the criteria of teaching effectiveness, the candidate for reappointment shall:

   a. demonstrate a pattern of satisfactory ratings for all courses on the college student evaluation of teaching instrument (80% or more “Yes” responses on the new instrument or mean scores of 4.0 or better on the old instrument);

   AND

   b. develop a portfolio of course materials (syllabi, student assignments, tests) demonstrating ongoing course development and multiple preparations.

In addition, candidates shall submit at least one of the following:

   a. supervisory or peer classroom evaluations;
   b. open-ended surveys soliciting student comments or other student ratings instruments;
   c. documentation of teaching awards/nominations;
   d. pre-test/post-test demonstrations of student outcomes or documentation of student success in subsequent courses;
e. documentation of the development of a new course or innovation in the mode of
delivery or innovations in instructional methods;
f. letters from students and alumni;
g. documentation of weekend teaching or innovative scheduling to meet student needs;
h. documentation of team-teaching and/or participation in Learning Communities;
i. samples of student work which document student learning or teaching innovations;
j. documentation of course innovations related to new textbook adoption;
k. documentation of accessibility to students through study or help sessions, or use of a
website;
l. documentation of student teacher supervision;
m. documentation of guest lecturing; OR
n. other evidence of teaching effectiveness as selected by the candidate.

3. For the criteria of professional and scholarly activity, the candidate shall demonstrate
professional development by attending or presenting at:

a. a minimum of one local/state/regional/national/international conference in the
discipline

OR

a minimum of one local/state regional/national/international workshop or conference
on the scholarship of teaching/learning or innovative technologies for teaching or
instructional methods or student retention

AND

b. demonstrate professional activity by membership in a minimum of one professional
organization.

In addition, candidates shall submit documentation of at least one of the following
activities:

a. authorship of a book, monograph, book chapter, journal or magazine article;
b. software/media development, software review or book review including pre-
publication review for publishers;
c. non-refered materials including conference proceedings;
d. invited papers or presentations;
e. articles in or editing newsletters in the discipline of the scholarship of
teaching/learning;
f. development of a custom-published textbook;
g. ongoing research (discipline-based or the scholarship of teaching/learning);
h. professional recognition such as awards, honors;
i. additional or advanced degrees or certifications or pursuing additional coursework,
CEUs or training sessions;
j. serving as a paid consultant or providing training workshops;
k. participating in professional organizations including holding office or serving on committees, or organizing conferences or consulting to organizations;
l. serving on accrediting bodies or serving on professional task forces;
m. submission of grant proposals or grant awards or fellowships;

n. participation in the Carnegie Teaching Academy or the SoTAL Symposium;
o. attendance/presentation at additional conferences in the discipline;
p. attendance/presentation at additional workshops or conferences on the scholarship of teaching or innovative technologies for teaching or instructional methods or student retention;
q. membership in additional professional organizations; OR
r. other evidence of professional and scholarly activity as selected by the candidate.

4. For the criteria of service, the candidate shall actively participate on a minimum of one department AND one college committee AND submit documentation of a minimum of one of the following:

a. chairing departmental committees;
b. serving in a leadership capacity for a program;
c. assisting with curriculum development or revision;
d. mentoring new or part-time faculty;
e. chairing college committees;
f. planning or conducting in-house workshops;
g. participating in or planning student recruitment and retention projects;
h. participating in work force development projects or Tech/Prep initiatives;
i. serving as a marshal at graduation;
j. serving on or chairing university committees/task forces;
k. serving on Faculty Senate;
l. serving as an advisor for registered student organizations;
m. serving on search committees at the departmental, college, or university levels;
n. participating in articulation efforts;
o. participating in local, state, or national civic organizations;
p. serving on the board for non-profit agencies;
q. applying academic expertise in the local, state, or national community without pay or profit;
r. volunteering for non-profit agencies;
s. appearing as an expert witness;
t. speaking at or collaborating with area schools;
u. editing newsletters for civic organizations and non-profit agencies;
v. testifying before legislative and congressional committees;
w. participating in economic or community development activities;
x. holding public office;
y. serving on additional departmental/college committees or task forces; OR
z. other evidence of service as selected by the candidate.

5. The candidate for reappointment shall be evaluated under the departmental criteria in effect at the time of the candidate's official appointment date. If criteria have been
revised since the initial appointment date, the candidate shall have the option to choose the original or amended criteria under which he/she shall be reviewed. Once a choice is made, the candidate may not reverse his or her decision. However, the candidate may choose each time criteria are revised and are approved by the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost. It is the responsibility of the candidate to inform the committee in the letter of intent which criteria set the candidate has selected.

6. Candidates for reappointment during the first year shall submit to the department chair, no later than the Friday of the third week after the date of initial appointment, a letter of intent. Candidates for reappointment during the first year shall submit to the committee chair, by the second Friday of the fall semester, his/her file. The candidate's file should contain the following:
   a. written permission for authorized persons to view the file;
   b. a current vita;
   c. copies of syllabi for all courses being taught

I. Criteria for Associate Professor and Tenure

1. To be considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and/or tenure, individuals shall have at least an earned master's degree from an accredited institution of higher education in a discipline relevant to his or her teaching field and a minimum of two years of service at The University of Akron at the rank of Assistant Professor. The candidate shall demonstrate a record of teaching excellence and competence in his or her area of specialization. (See I-2) Additionally, the candidate shall demonstrate a record of service to the department, college, university, and community as well as professional and scholarly activity beyond that reached at the time of attainment of present rank. (See I-3 and I-4) Both the breadth and quality of activity will be assessed. Professional conduct, as defined in the university guidelines, is required.

2. Teaching effectiveness includes, but is not limited to, mastery of the subject matter, availability to students, and ongoing course development and innovation. For the criteria of teaching excellence, the candidate for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor shall:
   a. demonstrate a pattern of satisfactory ratings for all courses on the college student evaluation of teaching instrument (90% or more “Yes” responses on the new instrument, or means scores of 4.1 or better on the old instrument);

   AND

   b. develop a portfolio of course materials (syllabi, student assignments, tests) demonstrating ongoing course development and multiple preparations.

In addition, candidates shall submit at least three of the following:
a. supervisory or peer classroom evaluations;
b. open-ended surveys soliciting student comments or other student ratings instruments;
c. documentation of teaching awards/nominations;
d. pre-test/post-test demonstrations of student outcomes or documentation of student success in subsequent courses;
e. documentation of the development of a new course or innovation in the mode of delivery or innovations in instructional methods;
f. letters from students and alumni;
g. documentation of weekend teaching or innovative scheduling to meet student needs;
h. documentation of team-teaching and/or participation in Learning Communities;
i. samples of student work which document student learning or teaching innovations;
j. documentation of course innovations related to new textbook adoption;
k. documentation of accessibility to students through study or help sessions, use of a website, or volunteer tutoring in the Learning Resource Lab;
l. documentation of student teacher supervision;
m. documentation of guest lecturing; OR
n. other evidence of teaching effectiveness as selected by the candidate.

3. For the criteria of professional and scholarly activity, the candidate for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor shall demonstrate a record of professional development and scholarship through the following activities. Candidates shall:

a. have presented at a minimum of one local/state/regional/national/international conference in the discipline;

AND

b. have attended or presented at a minimum of one local/state/regional/national or international workshop or conference on the scholarship of teaching and learning or innovative technologies for teaching or instructional methods or student retention;

AND

c. have attended or presented at one additional local state/regional/national or international conference in the discipline or in the categories listed in 1.3.b. above;

AND

d. hold membership in a minimum of one professional organization.

Beyond the above requirements, candidates may choose a combination of the following to document a minimum of two additional professional and scholarly activities:
a. authorship of a book, monograph, book chapter, journal or magazine article;
b. software/media development, software review or book review including pre-
publication review for publishers;
c. non-refereed materials including conference proceedings;
d. invited papers or presentations;
e. articles in or editing newsletters in the discipline or on the scholarship of
  teaching/learning;
f. development of a custom-published textbook;
g. ongoing research (discipline-based or the scholarship of teaching/learning);
h. professional recognition such as awards, honors;
i. additional or advanced degrees or certifications or pursuing additional
j. coursework, CEUs, CLEs, or training;
k. serving as a paid consultant;
i. presenting a training workshop;
j. appearing as an expert witness;
k. participating in professional organizations including holding office or serving on
   committees or organizing conferences or consulting to organizations;
l. submission of grant proposals or grant awards or fellowships;
m. participation in the Carnegie Teaching Academy or the SoTAL Symposium;

n. attendance/presentation at additional conferences in the discipline;
o. attendance/presentation at additional workshops or conferences on the
   scholarship of teaching/learning or innovative technologies for teaching or
   instructional methods or student retention;
p. membership in additional professional organizations; OR
q. other evidence of professional and scholarly activity as selected by the candidate.

4. For the criteria of service, the candidate for tenure and/or promotion to Associate
Professor shall actively participate on a minimum of one departmental AND one college
committee AND submit documentation of a minimum of three of the following,
including at least one public service activity:

a. chairing departmental committees;
b. serving in a leadership capacity for a program;
c. assisting with curriculum development or revision;
d. mentoring new or part-time faculty;
e. chairing college committees;
f. planning or conducting in-house workshops;
g. participating in or planning student recruitment and retention projects;
h. participating in work force development projects or Tech/Prep initiatives;
i. serving as a marshal at graduation;
j. serving on or chairing university committees/task forces;
k. serving on Faculty Senate;
l. serving as an advisor for registered student organizations;
m. serving on search committees at the departmental, college, or university levels;
n. participating in articulation efforts;
o. participating in local, state, or national civic organizations;
   p. serving on the board for non-profit agencies;
   q. applying academic expertise in the local, state, or national community without pay or profit;
   r. volunteering for non-profit agencies;
   s. speaking at or collaborating with area schools;
   t. editing newsletters for civic organizations and non-profit agencies;
   u. testifying before legislative and congressional committees;
   v. participating in economic or community development activities;
   w. holding public office;
   x. serving on additional departmental/college committees or task forces; OR
   y. other evidence of service as selected by the candidate.

5. While individuals may be considered for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor after two years of service at The University of Akron, years of service do not assure tenure and/or promotion. It should be noted that tenure only, tenure/promotion to Associate Professor, or promotion to Associate Professor before the sixth year of service will be the exception rather than the rule. More than two years of service will typically be needed for candidates to demonstrate a sustained record of performance. It is recommended candidates carefully consider the levels and quality of their contributions prior to making application for tenure and/or promotion in a shortened time period.

6. Candidates must be considered for indefinite tenure not later than the fifth year in a professorial rank. For candidates seeking early tenure, the department tenure committee shall vote to determine whether the candidate may apply for early tenure. Candidates may apply for early tenure only once. Should tenure be denied, the candidate shall complete the probationary period before making reapplication for tenure and promotion. The department may consider years of service or tenure at an institution of higher education other than the University of Akron in deciding to permit candidates to apply for early tenure.

7. Except in rare and compelling circumstances, faculty who hold the rank of assistant professor shall be awarded promotion to associate professor only if they are granted tenure at the same time.

8. In those rare and compelling circumstances when promotion to associate professor does not occur during the tenure year, the candidate shall be evaluated under the departmental criteria in effect either at the time of the candidate’s initial appointment, or at the time of the candidate’s tenure, or criteria in effect five years prior to the candidate’s application for promotion, whichever is most recent. Candidates applying for promotion to associate professor only shall submit, by final day of the spring semester, a letter of intent to the department chair. Effective March 2003, the letter must include names the candidate wishes to have considered for the pool of external reviewers.
9. The candidate for tenure shall be evaluated under the departmental criteria in effect at the time of the candidate’s official appointment date. If the criteria have been revised since the date of initial appointment, the candidate shall have the option to choose the original or amended criteria under which he/she shall be reviewed. Once a choice is made, the candidate may not reverse his or her decision. However, the candidate may choose each time criteria are revised and approved by the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost. The candidate shall submit, by the last day of the spring semester, a letter of intent to the department chair for consideration for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor. The letter must indicate by which criteria the candidate chooses to be evaluated. Effective March 2003, the letter of intent must include names the candidate wishes to have considered for the pool of external reviewers.

10. Candidates for tenure/promotion to Assistant Professor, tenure only, or promotion to Assistant Professor only shall be subject to external review (effective 2003) and college-wide review (effective 2002).

11. To be considered for initial employment at the rank of associate professor, an individual shall meet the preceding criteria based on equivalent service at other institutions of higher education and the criteria established by the search committee.

A. Criteria for Professor

1. The rank of professor shall be for individuals who clearly demonstrate superior qualifications. For promotion to the rank of professor, the department requires the candidate, since the attainment of present rank, to demonstrate continuing, significant, and sustained:

a. teaching excellence (See J-2)
b. professional and scholarly activity beyond that reached at the attainment of the present rank (See J-3)
c. service to the department, college, and university and community beyond that reached at the attainment of the present rank (See J-4)
d. leadership, preferably at the university level. (See J-4)

Both the breadth and quality of activity will be assessed. Professional conduct, as defined in the university and college guidelines, is required.

2. Teaching effectiveness includes, but is not limited to, mastery of the subject matter, availability to students, and ongoing course development and innovation. For the criteria of teaching excellence, the candidate for promotion to Professor shall:

a. demonstrate a pattern of satisfactory ratings, for all courses in alternate semesters, on the college student evaluation of teaching instrument (94% or more “Yes” responses on the new instrument or mean scores 4.2 or better on the old instrument)

AND
b. develop a portfolio of course materials (syllabi, student assignments, tests)
demonstrating ongoing course development and multiple preparations.

In addition, candidates shall submit, since the attainment of present rank, at least four of the following:

a. supervisory or peer classroom evaluations;
b. open-ended surveys soliciting student comments or other student ratings instruments;
c. documentation of teaching awards/nominations;
d. pre-test/post-test demonstrations of student outcomes or documentation of student success in subsequent courses;
e. documentation of the development of a new course or innovation in the mode of delivery or innovations in instructional methods;
f. letters from students and alumni;
g. documentation of weekend teaching or innovative scheduling to meet student needs;
h. documentation of team-teaching and/or participation in Learning Communities;
i. samples of student work which document student learning or teaching innovations;
j. documentation of course innovations related to new textbook adoption;
k. documentation of accessibility to students through study or help sessions, use of a website, or volunteer tutoring in the Learning Resource Lab;
l. documentation of student teacher supervision;
m. documentation of guest lecturing; OR
n. other evidence of teaching effectiveness as selected by the candidate.

3. For the criteria of professional and scholarly activity, the candidate for promotion to Professor, since the attainment of present rank, shall:

a. have presented at a minimum of two of either local/state/regional/national or international conferences in the discipline OR local/state/regional/national or international workshops or conferences on the scholarship of teaching and learning or innovative technologies for teaching or instructional methods or student retention OR a combination of both;

AND

c. have attended or presented at a minimum of one additional conference or workshop as listed above in J3.a;

AND

d. hold membership in a minimum of two professional organizations.

In addition, candidates shall submit documentation of least four of the following:
a. authorship of a book, monograph, book chapter, journal or magazine article;
b. software/media development, software review or book review including pre-
publication review for publishers;
c. non-referenced materials including conference proceedings;
d. invited papers or presentations;
e. articles in or editing newsletters in the discipline or the scholarship of
teaching/learning;
f. development of a custom-published textbook;
g. ongoing research (discipline-based or the scholarship of teaching/learning);
h. professional recognition such as awards, honors;
i. additional or advanced degrees or certifications or pursuing additional coursework;
j. serving as a paid consultant or presenting training workshops;
k. participating in professional organizations including holding office or serving on
   committees or organizing conferences or consulting to organizations;
l. serving on accrediting bodies or serving on professional task forces;
m. submission of grant proposals or grant awards or fellowships;
n. participation in the Carnegie Teaching Academy or the SoTAL Symposium;
o. attendance/presentation at additional conferences in the discipline;
p. attendance/presentation at workshops or additional conferences on the scholarship of
teaching and learning or innovative technologies for teaching or instructional methods
or student retention;
q. membership in additional professional organizations; OR
r. other evidence of professional and scholarly activity as selected by the candidate.

4. For the criteria of service and leadership, the candidate shall have chaired a minimum of
one departmental and one college committee AND have served on at least one university
committee (standing, ad hoc, Faculty Senate, search) since the attainment of present
rank. The candidate shall submit documentation of a minimum of six of the following:
a. chairing additional departmental committees;
b. serving in a leadership capacity for a program;
c. assisting with curriculum development or revision;
d. mentoring new or part-time faculty;
e. serving on or chairing additional college committees or task forces;
f. planning and conducting in-house workshops;
g. participating in or planning student recruitment and retention projects;
h. participating in work force development projects or Tech/Prep initiatives;
i. serving as a marshal at graduation;
j. serving on or chairing additional university committees/task forces;
k. serving on Faculty Senate in addition to service on other university committees;
l. serving as an advisor for registered student organizations;
m. serving on additional search committees at the departmental, college, or
   university levels;
   n. participating in articulation efforts;
o. participating in local, state, or national civic organizations;
p. serving on the board for non-profit agencies;
q. applying academic expertise in the local, state, or national community without pay or
1. volunteering for non-profit agencies;
2. appearing as an expert witness;
3. speaking at or collaborating with area schools;
4. editing newsletters for civic organizations and non-profit agencies;
5. testifying before legislative and congressional committees;
6. participating in economic or community development activities;
7. holding public office;
8. serving on additional departmental, college, or university committees; OR
9. other evidence of service as selected by the candidate.

5. Candidates may apply for promotion to professor after two years of service at The University of Akron at the rank of Associate Professor. Promotion to professor, however, will be granted only under exceptional circumstances if the candidate applies before the fifth year of service at the rank of Associate Professor. More than two years of service will typically be needed for candidates to demonstrate a record of leadership and sustained excellence in teaching, professional and scholarly activity, and service. It is recommended candidates carefully consider the levels and quality of their contributions prior to making application for promotion in a shortened time period.

In accordance with Article F, Section 6, lacking three(3) eligible department bargaining unit faculty to form the RTP Committee, the department chair, in consultation with the candidate(s), shall recommend a college bargaining unit faculty member to serve on the committee. If there is no agreement, the dean, in consultation with the candidate(s), shall appoint from the eligible bargaining unit faculty of the college or university community.

6. Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor shall be subject to external review (effective 2003) and college-wide review (effective 2002).

7. For initial employment at the rank of professor, individuals shall meet the preceding criteria based on equivalent service at another institution of higher education and any additional criteria established by the search committee.

J. External review

1. The department shall create and maintain a pool of potential reviewers sufficient to guarantee three letters of external review. The candidate, the tenure and/or promotion committee, the department chair and/or the dean may provide names of potential reviewers.

2. The candidate shall be apprised of the names submitted to the committee. The committee shall select at least one of the reviewers submitted by the candidate. The committee chair shall solicit the external reviews from the selected reviewers.

3. External reviewers will be provided with a summary of the departmental criteria and the following materials from the candidate’s file:
a. a current vita
b. a narrative statement by the candidate addressing the meeting of departmental criteria and previous Faculty Activities Summaries
c. copies of most recent syllabi
d. a sample of a lecture or lesson selected by the candidate
e. a sample of an exam or student assignment selected by candidate

The committee will also provide a list of specific questions the reviewer should consider in making his/her assessment of the candidate's performance.
Appendix B

MERIT REVIEW FORM

Name: ______________________  Academic year reviewed: ______________

TEACHING:
I believe my performance in the area of teaching should be rated as ____________ for the following reasons:

SERVICE:
I believe my performance in the area of service should be rated as ____________ for the following reasons:

RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY:
I believe my performance in the area of research/professional development should be rated as ____________ for the following reasons:

Signed by ______________________  Date: ____________
Appendix C
MRF Rating Form:
Name of faculty under review: __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHING:</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1 pt.) Comments:</th>
<th>Satisfactory (2 pts.) Comments:</th>
<th>Meritorious (3 pts.) Comments:</th>
<th>Outstanding (4 pts.) Comments:</th>
<th>Extraordinary (5 pts.) Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As department chair, I rate the faculty performance as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(note: faculty weighted this area at ____ %)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As department chair, I rate the faculty performance as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(note: faculty weighted this area as ____ %)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH and/or SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As department chair, I rate the faculty performance as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(note: faculty weighted this area as ____ %)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature of department chair: __________________________ Date: ____________
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Dukes, J. Thomas

From: Boal, John M
Sent: Monday, July 02, 2007 4:45 PM
To: Jalbert, Michael J
Cc: Licata, David Anthony; Bennett, Richard L; Willett, Stacy Lynn; Millhoff, Patricia A; Myers, Mary E; Dickie, Jill L; Jones, Dwayne Keith; Gerhardt, Sabine Emmanuelle; Mumper, John; Wallace, Patricia A
Subject: Re: Mert Guidelines

Ok Mike we have a majority that agrees that “final authority for review” means that the chair has final say on a faculty member’s weightings.
So I guess it’s a go. We’ll see what happens.

John

John M. Boal, CIP
Associate Professor
Criminal Justice Technology
Summit College
The University of Akron
(330) 972-7768
NA 152   SPI 82
Dukes, J. Thomas

From: Jalbert, Michael J  
Sent: Monday, July 02, 2007 8:30 PM  
To: Dukes, J. Thomas  
Subject: RE: PUBLIC SERVICE MERIT CRITERIA6.15.doc  
Attachments: Re: Merit Guidelines

Tom, I have received confirmation (attached) that the bargaining unit of Public Service have agreed by the requisite majority that "final authority for review" means that the chair has final say on a faculty member's weightings.

I await signed copies. Thanks.

Mike

From: Dukes, J. Thomas  
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2007 1:44 PM  
To: Jalbert, Michael J  
Subject: RE: PUBLIC SERVICE MERIT CRITERIA6.15.doc

Thanks, Mike, as always; I look forward to hearing from you. Tom

Thomas Dukes, Ph. D.
Associate Provost for Policies, Procedures, and Reviews
Professor of English
Buchtel Hall 106
The University of Akron
jtdukes@uakron.edu

From: Jalbert, Michael J  
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2007 1:37 PM  
To: Dukes, J. Thomas  
Subject: RE: PUBLIC SERVICE MERIT CRITERIA6.15.doc

Understood. I have forwarded your comments to the faculty and will advise.

Mike

From: Dukes, J. Thomas  
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2007 1:15 PM  
To: Jalbert, Michael J  
Subject: RE: PUBLIC SERVICE MERIT CRITERIA6.15.doc

Mike, these will be approved with the understanding that "final authority for review" means that the chair has final say on a faculty member's weightings. Tom

Thomas Dukes, Ph. D.
Associate Provost for Policies, Procedures, and Reviews
Professor of English
Buchtel Hall 106
The University of Akron
jtdukes@uakron.edu

7/3/2007
From: Jalbert, Michael J  
Sent: Monday, June 25, 2007 4:16 PM  
To: Dukes, J. Thomas  
Subject: RE: PUBLIC SERVICE MERIT CRITERIA6.15.doc  
Importance: High

Tom, attached Merit Guidelines from the department of Public Service that have been approved by a majority of bargaining unit faculty. The changes requested by you (see below) have been made. Also please note that under Section IV the faculty have (by the requisite majority) added some language under Service. All changes have been approved. If these pass muster please advise.

Thanks.

Mike

From: Dukes, J. Thomas  
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2007 1:33 PM  
To: Jalbert, Michael J  
Subject: RE: PUBLIC SERVICE MERIT CRITERIA6.15.doc

Thanks, Mike. T

Thomas Dukes, Ph. D.  
Associate Provost for Policies, Procedures, and Reviews  
Professor of English  
Buchtel Hall 106  
The University of Akron  
jtdukes@uakron.edu

From: Jalbert, Michael J  
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2007 11:31 AM  
To: Dukes, J. Thomas  
Subject: RE: PUBLIC SERVICE MERIT CRITERIA6.15.doc

Okay.

Mike

From: Dukes, J. Thomas  
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2007 11:28 AM  
To: Jalbert, Michael J  
Subject: RE: PUBLIC SERVICE MERIT CRITERIA6.15.doc

No, make the changes as indicated in Roman numeral II, just leave the numeral itself alone. Also, make the changes in IV. Best, T

Thomas Dukes, Ph. D.  
Associate Provost for Policies, Procedures, and Reviews  
Professor of English  
Buchtel Hall 106  
The University of Akron  
jtdukes@uakron.edu

From: Jalbert, Michael J  
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2007 11:25 AM  
To: Dukes, J. Thomas

7/3/2007
Subject: RE: PUBLIC SERVICE MERIT CRITERIA6.15.doc

So, let me get this straight... the only change would be the language in Section IV. —right?

Mike

From: Dukes, J. Thomas
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2007 11:17 AM
To: Jalbert, Michael J
Subject: RE: PUBLIC SERVICE MERIT CRITERIA6.15.doc

You're right, the roman number II should remain where it was and not be struck; that was an "oops." I owe you a drink. T

Thomas Dukes, Ph. D.
Associate Provost for Policies, Procedures, and Reviews
Professor of English
Buchtel Hall 106
The University of Akron
jtdukes@uakron.edu

From: Jalbert, Michael J
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2007 11:12 AM
To: Dukes, J. Thomas
Subject: RE: PUBLIC SERVICE MERIT CRITERIA6.15.doc

CAPS

Mike

From: Dukes, J. Thomas
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2007 11:00 AM
To: Jalbert, Michael J
Subject: FW: PUBLIC SERVICE MERIT CRITERIA6.15.doc

Mike, please see the attached. Note the deletion of Roman Numeral II (not the section, just the numeral) (THAT THROWS ALL SECTIONS OUT OF SYNC—RIGHT? SO WE SHOULD RENUMBER ALL?). Note the change also to "old" IV (I WILL PASS IT ON FOR REVIEW). I really think this should do it. Very best, Tom

Thomas Dukes, Ph. D.
Associate Provost for Policies, Procedures, and Reviews
Professor of English
Buchtel Hall 106
The University of Akron
jtdukes@uakron.edu