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Because teaching is the foundation of the departmental mission, the Department of Applied General and Technical Studies (AGTS) places its greatest emphasis on the effectiveness and quality of teaching in criteria for merit. For merit, teaching will be weighted at 70% for probationary faculty and ranging from 60% to 70% for tenured faculty.

Research and Scholarly Activity is required. The scholarship of teaching and learning are of equal value to discipline-based professional activities. Publication is not required of faculty in the College of Applied Science and Technology, but it is a measure that can be used to demonstrate professional and scholarly activity. For merit, professional and scholarly activity will be weighted at 15% for probationary faculty and ranging from 10% to 30% for tenured faculty.

Service, both to the institution and the community, is required. For merit, service to the institution and community will be weighted at 15% for probationary faculty and ranging from 10% to 30% for tenured faculty.

The default weight for tenured faculty will be teaching 70%, research and scholarly activity 15%, and service 15%. Tenured faculty may choose a weighting scale other than the default weight in consultation with and subject to the approval of the department chair within the ranges given in these guidelines no later than the Friday of the second week of fall semester of the current academic year. Tenured faculty may change their weightings in extenuating circumstances after the Friday of the second week of fall semester with the approval of the chair, dean, and provost. If no weighting choice is specified or agreed upon by the week two fall semester deadline, the default weight will be used.

Non-tenure-track (NTT) bargaining unit faculty whose most recent letter of appointment requires only full-time teaching duties will be evaluated using the same merit criteria for teaching contained in this document for tenure-track faculty, and the total number of points for merit (up to the maximum number of points permitted) will be worth 100% of the faculty member’s merit score.

In addition to their teaching accomplishments, required for submission as part of the annual merit self-assessment reports, all NTT faculty may submit evidence of service and/or research and scholarly activity in their annual merit self-assessment reports even if such activities are not assigned in their most recent letter of appointment. Credit for such additional activities shall be awarded in the same fashion as for tenure-track faculty per these merit evaluation guidelines but cannot be substituted for evaluation of any service and/or professional and scholarly activity duties assigned in the letter of appointment. However, if submitting non-required activities would result in a lower overall merit score, it is recommended that the NTT faculty member should not submit them for merit.
Merit for NTT faculty submitting teaching and either service or research and scholarly activity accomplishment shall be weighted at a minimum of 60 percent teaching and a minimum 10 percent for the remaining area. Merit for NTT faculty submitting accomplishments for all three areas shall be weighted at a minimum of 60 percent teaching and a minimum of 10 percent for each of the remaining areas.

The criteria and guidelines in this document also are applicable to college lecturers and instructors in AGTS. Merit for college lecturers shall be weighted at 100% teaching effectiveness. Merit for instructors shall be weighted at teaching 80%, research and scholarly activity 10%, and service 10%.

A maximum of five points can be accumulated in each category: teaching, research and scholarly activity, and service. The point system will be as follows: 1 to 1.99 points = Unsatisfactory (ineligible for merit); 2 to 2.99 points = Satisfactory (eligible for merit); 3 to 3.99 points = Meritorious; 4 to 4.99 points = Outstanding; 5 points = Extraordinary. The chair of the department will assess each faculty member's activities summary and review point totals for each category as so indicated by the faculty member on his or her merit evaluation form. Faculty shall maintain the right of appeal in this regard to the dean of the college who shall make the final determination. Using the formula as outlined in the bargaining agreement, the aggregate weighted score must exceed or be equal to 2.0 for a faculty member to be eligible for merit.

Exceptional situations may occur. For example, in semesters or years when faculty members are on leave (e.g., PDL or sick leave), they will not have taught or performed normal service but may have professional and scholarly activity to show for merit evaluation for that period. In such cases, when faculty members are evaluated for merit for that year, under the categories of teaching and service they will receive either their prior year score or their last three-year average, whichever is higher. If faculty members are on leave for one semester of the year, then this policy will apply for that semester only and these points will be averaged with the points earned during the other semester(s) of work.

Activities for the current 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) will be considered for the area of teaching effectiveness; activities for the previous three academic years will be considered only for the areas of (a) research and scholarly activity, and (b) university, college, departmental, and community service. The same activity may not be listed more than once. The year(s) in which each activity occurred shall be identified along with the activity.

Faculty will submit a Faculty Merit Form to the department chair no later than two weeks after they are notified by e-mail that spring semester evaluations are in.

If the department chair decides to approve the faculty member's Faculty Merit Form, he or she shall send an affirmative response in writing (both hard copy and e-mail) to the faculty member no later than two weeks after Faculty Merit Forms are due.
If the department chair decides not to approve the faculty member's Faculty Merit Form (including but not limited to activities, activity point totals, and PDL point totals), the following process will commence:

1. The department chair will send a written and e-mailed response to the faculty member no later than three weeks after Faculty Merit forms are due. The department chair's response will indicate his or her reason(s) for declining each item of disagreement in the faculty member's Faculty Merit Form.

2. The faculty member will send a written and e-mailed response of rebuttal no later than one week after receiving the department chair's e-mailed response. If the faculty member fails to respond to the department chair within the allotted time, the chair's decision shall stand.

3. If the faculty member responds to the department chair within the allotted time, both written documents (from the faculty member and the department chair) shall be forwarded by the department chair to the dean of the college who shall make the final determination no later than one week after receiving the two responses.

**Teaching**

Up to two (2) points based on the college's approved student evaluations for all sessions of the previous academic year will count towards merit as evidence of teaching effectiveness. All student evaluations shall be attached to a faculty member's merit evaluation form. Scores for the evaluations will be based on the following criteria:

90% of "X" scores on the college's approved student evaluations are in the 4.5 to 5.0 range (or the highest category), excluding Questions #13 ("I had a strong desire to take this course."), #14 ("The textbook was useful.") and #15 ("The other instructional materials were useful.") (2 points); 80% of "X" scores on the college's approved student evaluations are 4.0 or higher, excluding Questions #13, #14, and #15 (1.5 points); 80% of "X" scores on the college's approved student evaluations are 3.5 or higher, excluding Questions #13, #14, and #15 (1 point); and 80% of "X" scores on the college's approved student evaluations are 3.0 or higher, excluding Questions #13, #14, and #15 (.5 point).

Up to three (3) points based on the following documented items will count towards merit as evidence of teaching effectiveness:

1. Peer or supervisory classroom/teaching performance evaluations (.25 point);

2. Assessment of learning outcomes such as pre-test/post-test demonstrations of student performance, or documentation that demonstrates student success (.5 point);

3. Effective collaboration with part-time faculty, graduate and/or learning assistants, student teacher, staff, when applicable (.5 point);

4. Three or more preps for fall or spring semester (.25 point per semester);
5. Departmental teaching award (.5 point) and university, college, or external awards (1 point each);

6. Flexible teaching assignments to meet student needs (.25 point each semester);

7. Participation in innovative teaching initiatives, such as but not limited to team teaching, the Learning Communities Program, and the Learning Assistants Program (.5 point);

8. Course innovations, making substantial changes to an existing course or a series of courses (1 point each);

9. Accessibility to student's beyond regular office hour meetings through study or help sessions, building a custom Web site or making substantial changes to an existing custom Web site for a course, or volunteer tutoring in a University tutoring site (.5 point);

10. Guest lecturing (.25 point);

11. Creating a new course and having it approved, developing an on-line course and having it approved, or distance learning teaching (1 point each);

12. Attending events sponsored by the Talking About Teaching Committee and the Professional Development Committee (.25 point each);

13. Other evidence related to this area selected by the faculty member including commercialization. (.25 to 1 point each).

Research and Scholarly Activity

The following documented items can be submitted by faculty as evidence of the quality of research and scholarly activity, including activities in the discipline and the scholarship of teaching and learning:

1. Discipline-related or scholarship of teaching/learning (non-self-published) publications including books, monographs, book chapters, journal or magazine articles (2 points each);

2. Presentations, scholarly and creative, at local, state, regional, national, or international conference in the discipline (1 point for each local and state; 1.5 points for each regional; 2 points for each national and international);

3. Presentations at local, state, regional, national, or international workshops or conferences on the scholarship of teaching/learning or innovative technologies for teaching or instructional methods or student retention (1 point for each local and state; 1.5 points for each regional; 2 points for each national and international);

4. Participating in professional organizations including holding office (1 point each), participation on committees or organizing conferences for professional organizations (.75 point each), attending conferences (.5 point each);
5. Software or media development related to one's discipline and/or teaching (1 point each);

6. Software or book reviews including pre-publication reviews for publishers; reviewing articles for refereed journals (.5 point each);

7. Invited papers or presentations (1.25 point for each local and state; 1.75 points for each regional; 2.25 points for each national and international);

8. Articles in or editing newsletters in the discipline or the scholarship of teaching and learning (1 point each);

9. Development and initial use of a custom-published textbook (1 point) or significant revisions to an established custom-published textbook (.5 point);

10. Ongoing research—non-grant/fellowship, discipline-based or the scholarship of teaching/learning (1 point);

11. Professional recognition such as non-teaching awards, honors (1 point for each local and state award/honor; 1.5 points for each regional award/honor; 2 points for each national and international award/honor);

12. Additional or advanced degrees (1 point), certifications (.5 point), or taking additional coursework (.5 point for each course) that enhance teaching;

13. Consulting or providing training workshops (.5 point each);

14. Participating on accrediting bodies or professional task forces (.5 point each);

15. Member of editorial board (1.5 points each);

16. Submission of grant proposals, articles in journals, etc. (.5 point each) or work on grant and/or fellowship activities (1 point each);

17. Attending events sponsored by ITL (.25 point each);

18. Other evidence related to this area selected by the faculty member including commercialization. (.25 to 1 point each).

University, College, Departmental, and Community Service

The following documented items may be submitted by faculty as evidence of university, college, departmental, and community service:

1. Chairing (.2 point each) and participating (.1 point each) on departmental committees, and chairing (.5 point each) and participating (.25 point each) on departmental ad hoc committees;

2. Supervision of laboratories (.5 point);
3. Assisting with the accrediting process for other departments (.25 point);
4. Participation in general education or university course/program reviews (.5 point);
5. Serving as the lead faculty for area (1 point);
6. Assisting with curriculum development or revision for other departments (.25 point);
7. Mentoring new or part-time faculty (.5 point);
8. Chairing (1 point each) or participating (.5 point each) on college committees and college ad hoc committees;
9. Conducting in-house workshops or service to a student organization or department (.5 point each);
10. Participating in student recruitment and retention projects (.5 point);
11. Participating in work force development projects or Tech/Prep initiatives (.5 point);
12. Serving as a marshal at graduation (.25 point);
13. Chairing (1.5 points each) or participating on (1 point each) university committees/task forces and university ad hoc committees;
14. Serving on Executive Committee of Faculty Senate (1.5 points) or serving as member on Faculty Senate (1 point);
15. Serving as a member of the AAUP negotiating team (1.5 points);
16. Participating as an advisor for registered student organizations (1 point each);
17. Chairing (2 points each) or participating on (1 point each) a search committee at the departmental, college, or university levels;
18. Participating in articulation efforts (.5 point);
19. Participating in local, state, or national civic organizations (.5 point);
20. Participating on the board for agencies or organizations (.5 point each);
21. Applying academic expertise in the local, state, regional, or national community without pay or profit (.5 point);
22. Appearing as an expert witness (.5 point);
23. Speaking at or collaborating with area schools (.5 point);
24. Editing newsletters for civic organizations and agencies or organizations (.5 point);
25. Testifying before legislative and congressional committees (1 point);

26. Participating in economic or community development activities (.5 point);

27. Other evidence related to this area selected by the faculty member (.25 to 1 point each).

The merit criteria for the Department of Applied General and Technical Studies must be formally approved by a majority of the bargaining unit faculty of the unit. The Department Chair, Dean, and the Senior Vice President and Provost shall also formally approve the guidelines before they become effective. A majority vote of the bargaining unit faculty and approval of the chair, dean, and senior Vice-President and Provost are required to change the guidelines.