

The University of Akron

The Department of Classical Studies, Anthropology, and Archaeology

Guidelines for Awarding Faculty Merit Salary Increases

Approved By CSAA Faculty April, 2006

Revised and Approved by CSAA Faculty May 9, 2006

Redrafted and Approved by CSAA Faculty Dec 23, 2006

Revised and Approved by CSAA Faculty February, 2007

Table of Contents

I.	Annual Review.....	p. 2
II.	Evaluation Period.....	p. 2
III.	Evaluation Basis.....	p. 3
IV.	Teaching, Research, Service Weights.....	p. 3
V.	Evaluation Process.....	pp.4-10
	Sample Faculty Activity Report.....	p. 11
	Annual Faculty Merit Review Report... ..	pp. 12-14

Department of Classical Studies, Anthropology, and Archaeology Departmental Guidelines for Merit Review

I. Annual Review

In accordance with the collective bargaining agreement between the Akron-AAUP and the University of Akron, the department chair shall conduct an annual evaluation of every bargaining unit faculty member in accordance with these criteria. At the end of the academic year, each BUF member will complete a merit self-evaluation and submit this to the chair for review. Using the information submitted by the faculty the chair will perform an independent evaluation using the terms of this document to guide discretionary judgment.

II. Evaluation Period

- A.** The evaluation period is a rolling three-year period ending on the last day of the academic year of the most recent evaluation year. All evaluation criteria and quantitative measures apply to the total accomplishment during the evaluation period.
1. For the first (2006-2007) and second (2007-2008) years of merit raises only, each Member may elect to be evaluated on 1) the previous year's accomplishments, or 2) the previous three year's accomplishments. If option #2 is chosen, the merit score will be the average of the three years' individual scores.
 - a. For the 2006-2007 merit evaluation, the merit score will be based on either the 2005-2006 accomplishments OR the average of the merit scores for 2003-2004, 2004-2005, and 2005-2006.
 - b. For the 2007-2008 merit evaluation, the merit score will be based on either the 2006-2007 accomplishments OR the average of the merit scores for 2004-2005, 2005-2006, and 2006-2007.
 - c. For the 2008-2009 merit evaluation, the rolling average will be based on the average of the merit scores generated for 2005-2006, 2006-2007, and 2007-2008.

Thereafter, merit scores will be calculated as a rolling three-year average of accomplishments as reflected in the average of overall merit scores for each of those years.

- B. PDL and Other Leaves.** In this context, medical leave includes personal medical leave, parental leave and leave to care for a sick family member. For faculty who miss extensive periods of time due to a PDL (Professional Development Leave), a medical leave, or some other leave, they may choose the following options for providing merit application data. If the leave is for one semester, they may substitute half of the points accumulated in the previous year's merit application in any or all of the three evaluation categories (teaching, research, service) or, alternatively, their own accumulated points in any of these categories. The remainder of their merit points will be based upon their accomplishments in the remainder of the merit evaluation period, upon their return from leave. If the leave is for a full academic year, they may substitute all of the points accumulated in the previous year's merit application in any or all of the three evaluation categories (teaching, research, service) or, alternatively, their own accumulated points in any of these categories. For example, a faculty member on a semester's leave may miss all teaching and service activities, but may have engaged in considerable scholarly activity. In this example, they may choose to utilize half of the points in their previous year's merit application in teaching and service, respectively, but all of the points they generated under scholarship during the leave.

III. Evaluation Basis

Evaluation will be based on an activity report (sample attached) submitted by each faculty member at the end of the academic year; departmentally approved teaching evaluations; and peer evaluations of teaching when available. NB. Merit evaluation is understood to be a process for determining eligibility to receive a salary increase from the merit pool. These evaluations are *not intended* for use as indicators of satisfactory or unsatisfactory progress toward promotion or tenure and are *not* used as part of RTP evaluations.

There is no implication that the merit weightings will in any way reflect the load.

IV. Teaching/Research/Service Weights

- A.** Each faculty member will choose one of the following weighting schemes. The choice of weights will be submitted Friday of the second week of the previous fall semester.

The default weighting will be:

Teaching 60%, Research 30%, Service 10%

The default weighting for Instructors will be:

Teaching 70%, Research 10%, Service 20%

The following alternative weightings may be chosen with approval of the chair.

Teaching 70%, Research 20%, Service 10%.

Teaching 50%, Research 40%, Service 10%.
 Teaching 60%, Research 20%, Service 20%.
 Teaching 50%, Research 30%, Service 20%.
 Teaching 40%, Research 40%, Service 20%

If appropriate, a BUF member may request a different weighting scale than those listed above to accurately reflect his/her work. Any weighting scale other than the default weighting shall be decided in consultation with and subject to the approval of the chair.

- B. Lectureships are strictly teaching positions and the faculty member will be evaluated for merit purposes solely on the basis of teaching and teaching-related activities (such as development of new courses, substantial revisions of curricular materials, participation in ITL pedagogy workshops etc.). Service and Research will receive a weight of 0% in merit calculations.

V. Evaluation Process

- A. With regard for the mission of the department and of the university as a whole, the chair shall assign the merit scores for each faculty member according to the criteria enumerated in this document. The final overall merit score for each faculty member will be calculated using the relative weights of Teaching, Research and Service according to the formulae detailed in the collective bargaining agreement.

B. Awarding Merit Points

1. The point system is defined by the collective bargaining agreement as:
 - 1 = Unsatisfactory
 - 2 = Satisfactory
 - 3 = Meritorious
 - 4 = Outstanding
 - 5 = Extraordinary
2. The distinction between satisfactory and unsatisfactory is articulated for each area of evaluation (teaching, research and service) below. A *meritorious* rating means that you have met the satisfactory rating, plus accumulated 1 additional point. An *outstanding* rating means that you have met the satisfactory rating, plus accumulated 2 points. An *extraordinary* rating means that you have met the satisfactory rating, plus accumulated 3 additional points.
3. Final merit scores for faculty will be calculated using a 3-year rolling average (see IIA).

4. If a faculty member receives a rating of ‘satisfactory’ in any of the three categories, additional points may be added; no additional points may be earned in a category if the BUF is rated ‘unsatisfactory’.

C. Merit for Teaching

1. A satisfactory *teaching* rating (a minimum 2.0 merit points) is based on:

--you are actually showing up and teaching your assigned classes (absences excused by illness, etc. notwithstanding);

--you keep reasonable office hours and are otherwise available to students;

--and on your IDEA evaluations (or other comparable departmentally approved evaluation instrument) , in the chart of “your converted average when compared to all classes in the IDEA database,” you average in no less than the 38-44 range (the “Lower Next 20%” level).

Note: When a faculty member’s teaching load includes courses of different credit hours, the average IDEA score will be calculated using a weighted average.

A meritorious rating means that you have met the satisfactory rating, plus accumulated 1 point from the additional points below.

An outstanding rating means that you have met the satisfactory rating, plus accumulated 2 points from the additional points below.

An extraordinary rating means that you have met the satisfactory rating, plus accumulated 3 points from the additional points below.

2. Merit points for more than *satisfactory* teaching performance (points added to a score of 2.0) are determined using the following.
 - a. Innovative curriculum design/new technology: .5 pts
 - b. Development of new course: up to 2 pts
 - c. Significant redevelopment of course: .5 pts
 - d. Peer evaluation as evidence of excellence:.2 pts
 - e. Attendance at teaching workshops: .2 pts per workshop up to 1 pt
 - f. Supervision of independent studies: .5 per independent study
 - g. Successful grants for curricular development: 1-3 pts
 - h. Reader on thesis or dissertation committee/s: .5 pt per committee
 - i. Teaching awards or other special recognition (up to 2 pts depending on award and with chair’s approval)
 - j. Other: 0.5-2.0 pt at chair’s discretion.

- k. Remembering that an average IDEA score of at least 38-44 is one of the considerations for being ‘satisfactory,’ the following scale will be applied for additional recognition:

<u>Average IDEA score for all classes taught</u>	<u>additional points added</u>
45	0.2
46	.3
47	.4
48	.5
49	.6
50	.7
51	.8
52	.9
53	1.0
54	1.2
55	1.4
56	1.6
57	1.8
58	2.0
59	2.2
60	2.4
61	2.6
62	2.8
63 or over	3.0

D. Merit for Research

1. A satisfactory *research* rating (a minimum 2.0 merit points) is based on:
 - a. staying current in his/her field with active research and/or writing. For tenure-tracked faculty evidence of this will include continuing status as Graduate Faculty I (the publication of works that grant graduate faculty status will still merit additional points noted below);
 - b. the number of peer-reviewed, discipline-specific publications, including original research, review articles, book chapters, monographs, textbooks, and other instructional/research materials. Publications can be counted at either date of acceptance or date of publication, but not both. 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.
 - c. the total amount of grant support during the evaluation period;
 - d. the number of presentations (papers, talks, and posters) at professional meetings, research institutions or other venues deemed appropriate by the chair.

- e. Measures of the quality of research that reflect an external evaluation of the research should be also considered.
 - 1. Awards and prizes for research
 - 2. Journal editorships, editorial boards, etc.
 - 3. Funding of peer-reviewed research proposals
 - 4. Favorable peer review of research proposals
 - 5. Election to an office in a professional research society
 - 6. Participation in multi-investigator proposals for special programs, instruments, educational initiatives.
 - f. Any faculty activities that reflect the research of teaching and learning may be included in the appropriate categories above.
2. The minimum requirement for a score of *satisfactory* (2) for research for all faculty members is based on staying current in his/her field. For tenure-tracked faculty evidence of this will include continuing status as Graduate Faculty I.

A meritorious rating means that you have met the satisfactory rating, plus accumulated 1 point from the additional points below (or started at unsatisfactory and accumulated 2 additional points).

An outstanding rating means that you have met the satisfactory rating, plus accumulated 2 points from the additional points below (or started at unsatisfactory and accumulated 3 additional points).

An extraordinary rating means that you have met the satisfactory rating, plus accumulated 3 points from the additional points below (or started at unsatisfactory and accumulated 4 additional points).

3. Merit points for more than *satisfactory* research performance (points added to a score of 2.0) are determined using the following:
- a. Book (authored, edited, translated, electronic): 1-4 pts for each of two years
 - b. Textbook 1-2 points
 - c. Articles/book chapters/technical reports: 1-2 pts per article, maximum 3 pts total
 - d. Book reviews: 0.2-1 pts
 - e. Prizes, awards or other special recognition: 0.5-2.0 pts depending on award and with chair's approval
 - f. Submission of research grant proposal:
 - Internal; .2-.5
 - External: .5 -1.0 pt
 - g. Submission of contract proposal: .5 pt
 - h. Submission of grant toward scholarship of teaching: .5 pt
 - i. Successful external grant: 1-3 pts

- j. Successful external grant toward scholarship of teaching: 1-3 pts
- k. Reviewing article for peer-reviewed journal: 0.2-0.5 pt
- l. Director of institute or research group: 1 pt
- m. Participation in scholarly workshop (e.g., NEH/NSF/NIH etc. seminars): .5-1 pt
- n. Running a scholarly workshop (e.g., NEH/NSF/NIH etc., seminars): 2 pts
- o. Member of institute or research group: .5 pt
- p. Editor, co-editor for discipline's journal: 0.5-1 pt
- q. Other: 0.5-2.0 pts at chair's discretion

Notes Pertaining to Publications:

- i. Articles appearing in conference proceedings do not count, *prima facie*, as independent publications, as one receives merit credit for these with the conference presentation.
- ii. More points will be awarded for higher quality publications, fewer points for lower quality publications. For articles, the primary criterion for determining publication quality will be by acceptance rate for the journal in which the article is published. Journals having an acceptance rate of 25% or lower will be considered highly ranked, journals having an acceptance rate of 26% – 50% will be considered middle-ranked, and journals with acceptance rates above 50% will be considered lower ranked. However, since journal ranking is not the only or most reliable indicator of quality, and because we do not wish to discourage publication in Open Access journals (many of which are still becoming established), faculty members may present other evidence supporting a higher ranking for an article (perhaps the article has provoked responses, or has been heavily cited, or was specially commissioned, and so forth). The department chair will exercise discretionary power in deciding whether or not to accept the argument.

E. Merit for Service

- 1. A satisfactory *service* rating (a minimum 2.0 merit points) is based on:
 - a. the ability to relate positively and productively with students and colleagues;
 - b. demonstration of professional ethics and responsibility;
 - c. regular attendance at department meetings and contribution as a member of all necessary department committees (unless excused for legitimate reason);

- d. a fair share of student advising; and
- e. a regular turn attending graduation and representing the department in BCC (A pattern of failure to attend the meetings of any committee one is a member of signals a deficiency in service.).
- f. Note that non-tenure track BUF members are, in some cases, precluded from University and College service opportunities, such as participation on BCC. Such cases will not be used to diminish a merit score for these members.

A meritorious rating means that you have met the satisfactory rating, plus accumulated 1 point from the additional points below.

An outstanding rating means that you have met the satisfactory rating, plus accumulated 2 points from the additional points below.

An extraordinary rating means that you have met the satisfactory rating, plus accumulated 3 points from the additional points below.

2. Merit points for more than *satisfactory* service performance (points added to a score of 2.0) are determined using the following.
 - a. Innovative curriculum design/new technology: .5 pts
 - b. Department official (coordinator of student advising, lab manager, subdiscipline section chair, etc.) committee chair: .5 - 2 pts
 - c. University or College committee chair: 1 pt
 - d. Departmental, College or University Committee member: .5 pt
 - e. Executive committee officer of Faculty Senator, Akron-AAUP, etc.: 3 pts
 - f. Other Akron-AAUP service committee: 1 pt
 - g. Akron-AAUP departmental liaison: .5 pt
 - h. Prizes, awards or other special recognition—1-2 pts depending on award and with chair's approval
 - i. Guest speaking in other departments: .2 pt per instance, up to 1.0 pt
 - j. Student Advising: .5 pt
 - k. Public relations for Department: .5 pt
 - l. Maintaining department website: 1 pt
 - m. Representing department at Roundup, Major's Mosaic, etc., .1 per instance, up to .5
 - n. Honors Project advisor: .5 pts
 - o. Honors Project reader: .2 pts
 - p. Discipline-related service to the community including: involvement in service organizations, social agencies and cultural societies, service to governmental agencies, and talks at K-12

- schools, and other activities that promote quality K-12 education:
.2 – 1 pts
- q. Service to the profession including non-research related professional presentations, review of manuscripts and proposals, and participation in professional organizations, committees or panels: .5 – 1 pts
 - r. Other: .5-2.0 pts at chair's discretion

Note Pertaining to New Faculty:

- i. New BUF faculty who are tenure-track generally carry a lighter service load in their first years when their priorities are teaching and establishing a record of research. Therefore, for the first 2 years that a tenure-track faculty member is evaluated for merit, he/she will receive either a “satisfactory” merit score (2) or his/her actual earned score, whichever the Chair deems most appropriate.

Classical Studies, Anthropology and Archaeology Faculty Activity Report for Merit Review

(Sample)

1. Name

2. Publications *(authors, title, journal, volume, complete pagination, year)*

- a. In print
- b. Accepted or in press

3. Grants and Contracts *(agency, agency award number, title, total amount, total period, account number, budget amounts).*

- a. Grants first awarded during evaluation period *(include internal awards, seed money, matching grants)*
- b. Grants active during evaluation period but awarded prior to beginning of that period
- c. Grants with probable 2006 start dates
- d. Contracts awarded during evaluation period

4. Proposals submitted *(agency, title, amount, number of students budgeted, status = pending/funded/declined.)*

- a. Proposals submitted during evaluation period

5. Presentations and Seminars at Meetings and/or Universities *(include authors, presenter underlined, title, place, date, talk/poster)*

- a. Invited
- b. Contributed
- c. Other Meetings Attended

6. Reviews

- a. Papers *(journal and number of papers)*
- b. Proposals *(agency and number of proposals)*
- c. Books *(number)*

7. Teaching

- a. Courses taught by semester
- b. Teaching innovations
- c. Ph.D. and M.S. committees
- d. Undergraduate research students/independent studies

8. Service

- a. Departmental Service
- b. University, College Service
- c. Service to the Profession
- d. Community Service and Outreach
- e. Other Consulting *(list publishers, agencies, other etc.)*

9. Other notable achievements and awards

Total Scores from previous pages:

Teaching _____ **Research** _____ **Service** _____

Calculate Final Merit Score:

Teaching Points (min 1.0, max 5.0) _____ X Teaching Weight _____ = _____

Research Points (min 1.0, max 5.0) _____ X Research Weight _____ = _____

Service Points (min 1.0, max 5.0) _____ X Service Weight _____ = _____

TOTAL MERIT SCORE: Faculty calculation _____

TOTAL MERIT SCORE: Chair's evaluation _____

Notes:

- 1. Each Faculty member completes this form (minus IDEA scores if unavailable)**
- 2. Merit requests and supporting materials are submitted to the chair, who will review and approve and add appropriate points for IDEA scores.**
- 3. This is your self-evaluation; the Chair may come up with different numbers depending on various factors. If you disagree with the Chair's evaluation see the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 16, section 8 B, items 3, 4, and 5.**