

**The University of Akron  
University Libraries  
Reference Department**

**Guidelines for Awarding Faculty Merit Salary Increases**

Adopted by Reference Dept. faculty: July 14, 2006

Revised by Reference Dept. faculty: October 11, 2006

**Revised by Reference Dept. faculty: December 13, 2006**

<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
I. Philosophy	1
II. Policy Statement	1
III. Process	2
IV. The Merit Evaluation Guidelines	2
V. The Appeals Process	3
VI. Approval of the Guidelines	3
VII. Revision of the Guidelines	3

<b>Appendices</b>	<b>Page</b>
Appendix A: Article 16, Section 8 – Merit Increases	4
Appendix B: Core Job Responsibilities Checklist	6
Appendix C: Merit Guidelines Application Form w/Merit Categories and Activity Points	9
Appendix D: Chair's Evaluation Form	14
Appendix E: Merit Evaluation Criteria	16
<b>Appendix F: Aggregate Merit Worksheet for 3-Year Average</b>	<b>18</b>

Pertinent Akron-AAUP - University of Akron contract language (2005-2009):

## The University of Akron University Libraries Reference Department

### Guidelines for Awarding Faculty Merit Salary Increases

#### I. Philosophy

As a major service unit of The University of Akron, the University Libraries (UL) values excellence in service to students, faculty, and staff, as well as to all clientele, affiliated or nonaffiliated. Therefore, the UL strives to cultivate an environment of encouragement and support such that all its employees are enabled to achieve excellence in the performance of one's daily responsibilities as they relate to the delivery of service. In order to fulfill this mission, UL merit guidelines, including the weighting of categories and points awarded for accomplishments, should reflect this philosophy.

#### II. Policy Statement

A. Weighting. The Reference Department faculty opt to weight their merit categories with the following percentages: Work – 60%; Scholarship – 20%; Service – 20%.

1. Consistent with the Philosophy stated in Section 1, the Reference Department faculty
2. consider both their Work and their Service to committees as variations on our service mission.

B. Performance Evaluation Criteria: Criteria are established in Section 8 (Merit Increases) of Article 16 (Compensation) in the Akron-AAUP – University of Akron contract (2005-2009) (Appendix A). Criteria include: 1) Work/Teaching; 2) Scholarship; and 3) Service.

C. Eligibility for Merit Consideration: A faculty member will be eligible to be considered for merit if:

1. Their job performance is Satisfactory, i.e. if they achieve an overall score of 2.0 (Satisfactory) or better on the 1 to 5 merit guidelines scale. (See Appendix B/C)
2. They were a member of the faculty by the cutoff date specified in the Contract.

D. Timeframe. Faculty in the Reference Department elect to evaluate their merit accomplishments using a three-year rolling average of merit scores.

For the first (2006-2007) and second (2007-2008) years of merit raises only, each Member may elect to be evaluated on the 1) 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.

Article 16 Sections 4, 5, and 6.

Article 16.B.1  
"A three-year rolling average may be the basis for the evaluation, if appropriate."

- 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 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009.

### III. Process

#### a. The Annual Merit Review Timeline

1. The merit period runs from **July 1 to June 30**.
2. By May 15 of the year, bargaining unit faculty will submit to the Chair a relevant list of accomplishments as indicated in the guidelines below.
  - Additional materials submitted by the faculty member, in support of their application, will be due by May 15.
  - Additional materials requested by the Chair will be requested by May 22. Faculty will have 7 days to comply with this request.
3. Questions about the eligibility of particular items on a faculty member's list of accomplishments may be brought by the Chair or the Faculty member to the library-wide faculty's elected Merit Guidelines Committee. The Committee will attempt to clarify any questions **and make recommendations to the department chair**.
4. The guidelines require the Chair to apply the stated number of points for the eligible accomplishments. Fixed point categories cannot be scaled back. Variable point categories may be reviewed as follows:
  - For activities listed in the "Other Notable Accomplishments" categories, the faculty member will describe specific activities and recommend the number of points awarded. The Chair will review both their eligibility and the number of points they should earn.
5. The Chair will review the merit applications of each faculty member (See Appendix D). A report with the Chair's evaluation will be sent by the Chair to each faculty member by June 7, with a copy also forwarded to the Dean

Article 16.8.B.5  
"A bargaining unit member may appeal a merit evaluation with which they disagree to the Senior Vice President and Provost.."

### IV. The Merit Evaluation Guidelines

1. Faculty will fill out their annual merit application using the forms

Article 16.C

"An overall score is calculated, rounded to the nearest 10<sup>th</sup>, based on the relative weights assigned to teaching, scholarship, and service as specified in the department bylaws. In this calculation, the following values are assigned in each area: "unsatisfactory" = 1, "satisfactory" = 2, "meritorious" = 3, "outstanding" = 4, and "extraordinary" = 5.

Article 16. 8.B.5

Article 16.8.A

Article 16.8.A

- provided below (Appendix B/Appendix C), which are available online. The online form allows for the entering of accomplishments and the computing of point totals.
2. The eligible accomplishments for merit in the categories of teaching/work, scholarship, and service are also listed in Appendix C. Each activity is accompanied by the points it is worth, as well as any restrictions or caps on the number of points that can be accumulated for that activity.
  3. Once the points are totaled for the year for each category, they are converted into the corresponding 1 to 5 scale as required by the contract. The table for making this conversion is provided in the merit application form, and is also available in Appendix C.
  4. For faculty who miss extensive periods of work 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 (work, scholarly activity, 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 (work, scholarly activity, 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 work 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 work and service, respectively, but all of the points they generated under scholarship during the leave.

## V. The Appeals Process

After conducting the evaluations, the department chair shall send to each Member of the department's bargaining unit a copy of his or her evaluation.

Any Member who disagrees with the chair's evaluation may send a written response to the chair. This rebuttal shall be attached to the original evaluation and forwarded to the college dean for resolution. The dean shall provide a copy of his or her decision to the Member and department chair.

Merit evaluation shall not be grievable unless the bargaining unit member has been rated less than meritorious and then only as to procedural error and/or inadequate consideration in the review process. A bargaining unit member may appeal a merit evaluation with which they disagree to the Senior Vice President and Provost.

i.

#### **VI. Approval of the Guidelines**

This document, or revisions to it, must be approved by a majority of the bargaining unit library faculty in the department. After approval by the faculty, the guidelines must be approved by the department chair, the Dean, and the Senior Vice President and Provost.

#### **VII. Revision of the Guidelines**

1. At the request of a majority of bargaining unit faculty in the department, this document may be reviewed for revision.
2. A committee shall be elected by the bargaining unit faculty to undertake draft revisions.
3. New or revised merit guidelines must be approved by a majority of the bargaining unit library faculty in the department.
4. New guidelines must be approved by the Chair, Dean and Senior Vice President and Provost.

**Appendix A: Article 16, Section 8 – Merit Increases**

Section 8. Merit Increases.

A. Departmental Merit Criteria.

Each department shall formulate and adopt by majority vote of its bargaining unit members criteria for merit evaluations with specified weighting for the research, teaching, and service components. These criteria may subsequently be modified only by a majority vote of the department bargaining unit members. The department chair, dean, and the Senior Vice President and Provost must also approve these criteria.

B. Merit Review.

The department chair shall conduct an annual evaluation of every bargaining unit member in accordance with the department's bargaining unit member evaluation criteria established pursuant to Subsection (A).

1. In preparation for the chair's evaluation, all Members of the Bargaining Unit it will submit to the chair a report of their teaching, scholarship, and service during the preceding year. A three-year rolling average may be the basis for the evaluation, if appropriate. In addition to any materials required by this Agreement, by Department merit criteria, or by the department chair, bargaining unit members may include whatever material will provide evidence of successful teaching, scholarship or service.
2. For each area -- teaching, scholarship, and service -- the Chair will provide a written evaluation and assign a ranking of "unsatisfactory," "satisfactory," "meritorious," "outstanding", and "extraordinary."
3. After conducting the evaluations, the department chair shall send to each Member of the bargaining unit a copy of his or her evaluation.
4. Any Member who disagrees with the chair's evaluation may send a written response to the chair. This rebuttal shall be attached to the original evaluation and forwarded to the college dean for resolution. The dean shall provide a copy of his or her decision to the Member and department chair.
5. Merit evaluation shall not be grievable unless the bargaining unit member has been rated less than meritorious and then only as to procedural error and/or inadequate consideration in the review process. A bargaining unit member may appeal a merit evaluation with which they disagree to the Senior Vice President and Provost.

C. Merit Raise Computation.

An overall score is calculated, rounded to the nearest 10<sup>th</sup>, based on the relative weights assigned to teaching, scholarship, and service as specified in the department bylaws. In this calculation, the following values are assigned in each area: "unsatisfactory" = 1, "satisfactory" = 2, "meritorious" = 3, "outstanding" = 4, and "extraordinary" = 5.

An aggregate overall score of less than 2 points shall be considered unsatisfactory and shall disqualify the bargaining unit member from participation in the merit pool. For example, if teaching is awarded 40%, research is awarded 40%, and service is awarded 20%; the bargaining unit members receives individual scores of 2 for teaching, 2 for research, and 1 for service. The weighted scores would be .8 for teaching, .8 for research and .2 for service for an aggregate overall score of 1.8 which would disqualify the bargaining unit member from participation in the merit pool.

The merit raise  $m_i$  for an individual bargaining unit member will be determined as follows:

$$m_i = \left( \frac{p_i}{\sum_{j=1}^n p_j} \right) \times \frac{M}{2} + \left( \frac{p_i \times b_i}{\sum_{j=1}^n p_j \times b_j} \right) \times \frac{M}{2}$$

where

$M$  is the total merit pool for the Member's department,  $M = \sum_{j=1}^n b_j \times r$

$r$  is the percentage merit increase specified by the applicable contract section.

$n$  is the number of bargain unit members in the member's department.

$p_i$  is the Member's overall score rounded to the nearest 10<sup>th</sup> as specified in Subsection (B).  
 $b_j$  is the Member's base salary.  
 $p_j$  and  $b_j$  are the overall score and base salary, respectively, for all the bargaining unit members in the member's department. Here  $j$  is equal to 1,2,3, and so forth, up to  $n$ .

The merit pool will be divided into two equal parts – one part will be used to decide the merit ignoring the salary of the bargaining unit members and the other part will include the salary of the bargaining unit members. The following example illustrates the formula above:

$n = 5$   
 Salaries of: \$40,000; \$30,000; \$30,000; \$40,000; \$60,000  
 Total salaries: \$ 200,000  
 1% raise pool = \$ 2,000  
 Merit raise divided into two pools of \$1000 each

Person	Points	Percentage of total points	Amount	Person	Salary x points	Percentage of total points indexed to salary	Amount	Total
1	2.5	14%	\$140	1	\$100K	14%	\$140	\$280
2	4	23%	\$230	2	\$120K	17%	\$170	\$400
3	3	17%	\$170	3	\$ 90K	13%	\$130	\$300
4	4.5	26%	\$260	4	\$180K	26%	\$260	\$520
5	3.5	20%	\$200	5	\$210K	30%	\$300	\$500
TOTAL	17.5		\$1000		\$700K		\$1000	\$2000

**Appendix B: Core Job Responsibilities Checklist**

**Core Job Responsibilities Checklist.**

The following list of core job responsibilities is not comprehensive nor will every specific task in a single category apply to each individual.

Instructions: Please check any core job responsibility in any category (Instruction, Collection Management, Reference, Cataloging, Electronic Resources) which you have performed (check all that apply). An overall designation of Satisfactory is earned by a satisfactory performance on the preponderance of one's core duties.

**Reference/Instruction/Collection Management Librarians  
 Core Responsibilities**

<b>Instruction</b>	
	Teaches bibliographic instruction classes for upper-level courses
	Teaches bibliographic instruction classes for general education courses
	Teaches bibliographic instruction classes for outside groups, including area high school students
	Designs Web pages for individual courses and course assignments
	Designs and maintains Web pages on subject resources
	Works with faculty to integrate information literacy competencies into course assignments
	Provides user instruction for classes as requested by faculty in subject areas
	Creates instructional handouts and resource lists for students in upper-level courses
	Provides one-on-one instruction at the reference desk
	Instructs students and faculty on an individual appointment basis
<b>Collection Management</b>	
	Selects and purchases, in collaboration with faculty, appropriate library materials in respective subject areas, both through book approval plans and through firm orders
	Creates, maintains, and adjusts book approval plan profiles in respective areas in collaboration with faculty and with approval plan representatives
	Makes gift decisions
	Participates in selection of resources for collaborative statewide purchases (OhioLink, etc.)
	Creates appropriate serials collections in their areas, both electronic and in print
	Selects needed materials in other formats, notably audiovisual materials, to support classroom instruction
	Works with faculty for reserve and classroom support materials
	Monitors the budget in respective subject areas
	Deselects titles in their subject areas as appropriate
	Creates and updates collection development policies in respective subject areas
	Maintains awareness of trends in publishing, costs and availability of materials in respective subject areas
	Makes location decisions on materials in respective subject areas (whether for local or remote locations)
	Identifies damaged materials or materials requiring special treatment in respective subject areas for preservation purposes
	Makes retention decisions on serial collections
	Makes replacement decisions on lost materials
	Participates in and supports programs in academic departments for respective subject areas

	Communicates awareness of library collections to departments through communiqués and meetings with faculty liaisons/departmental faculty
	Coordinates Government Document Depository
	Participates in the curriculum review process
	Contributes to reference collection development and maintenance, encompassing both print and electronic sources

### Reference

	Provides reference and referral service at the reference desk, by appointment and walk-in, and through one or more electronic or virtual formats such as e-mail, chat, or instant messaging.
	Provides research assistance and consultation to faculty and students in respective subject areas through appointments, online chat reference, or email
	Assists patrons with basic instructional and University computer applications (e.g., WebCT, Campus Pipeline, online registration, etc.)
	Participates in basic public service computer troubleshooting and assistance
	May participate in one or more auxiliary duties, such as: Coordinate reference desk schedule; Serve as liaison to Systems Department; Coordinate new reference books/ready reference materials; Serve as liaison to Cataloging Department; Coordinate training of part-time librarians; or similar activities.
	Seeks innovative methods of enhancing and/or expanding reference services
	Continues to develop and refine reference skills by attending professional development activities such as seminars, workshops, and continuing education endeavors; maintains an appropriate current skill set

## Technical Services Librarians Core Responsibilities:

### Cataloging

	Performs original and complex copy cataloging of library or archival materials in one or more formats, including audiovisual materials (sound recordings, videorecordings, motion pictures, etc.), cartographic materials, electronic resources, graphic materials, kits, microforms, music, monographs, serials, and/or three-dimensional objects. [Note that material may fit into more than one category]
	Performs authority work with author names, series titles, subject headings, and uniform titles to provide an infrastructure for ZipLINK searching
	Provides database maintenance for the online public access catalog. Manages uncataloged materials
	Troubleshoots cataloging problems
	Participates in the development of policies and procedures for cataloging, authority control, and database management
	Answers questions of support staff
	Keeps current with and applies international, national, and local standards to ensure quality of work.
	Keeps current with and effectively applies knowledge of programs used in cataloging and other activities.
	Participates in direction of workflow within Cataloging and with other departments
	Provides documentation of activities.
	Maintains statistics for individual work activities.
	Establishes a program for implementing the use of Encoded Archival Description for publishing archival finding aids on the web

	Participates in the creation of policies and procedures for the Psychology Archives
	Assists patrons of the Psychology Archives on an "as-needed" basis

**Electronic Resources Librarian**

	Leads the University Libraries in the exploration, selection, and evaluation of electronic reference and web-based applications--including research databases, full-text resources, e-journals, e-books, and interactive user services.
	Works with library departments in assessing library needs and works collaboratively to implement and maintain electronic products and services.
	Generates, analyzes and disseminates usage statistics
	Manages licensing activity for public electronic resources
	Provides training and other instructional support to library users and library staff.
	Provides general and specialized reference service, including staffing the reference desk and providing chat/email reference
	Coordinates cataloging of electronic resources and performs routine library catalog maintenance
	Takes part in the University Libraries' information literacy program
	Contributes to collection development and management.

**Summary**

**Please check one of the following:**

	I have performed the preponderance of my core duties satisfactorily.
	I have not performed the preponderance of my core duties satisfactorily.

**Comments**

[enter comments here]
-----------------------

**Signature/Date**

Name	
Date	

**Appendix C: Merit Guidelines Application Form w/Merit Categories and Activity Points**

**Faculty Merit Guidelines Form**

TABLE 1	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Meritorious	Outstanding	Extraordinary
	1	2	3	4	5
WORK	1-12	13-24	25-36	37-48	49-Infinity
SCHOLARSHIP	1-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17-Infinity
SERVICE	1-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17-Infinity

SCORING EXAMPLE	CORE RESP. PTS.	TOTAL MERIT PTS.	TOTAL CORE+ MERIT	CATEGORY SCORE EQUIV.	CAT. SCORE %	AGGREGATE SCORE
Work	18	27	45	4	2.4	4.4
Scholarship		19	19	5	1	
Service		44	44	5	1	

Merit Application Worksheet

WORK CORE RESPONSIBILITIES OVERVIEW	POINTS AVAILABLE	Total Points	COMMENTS
<b>Faculty</b>			
Satisfactorily meets the preponderance of the minimum core functions of one's job.	Point Distribution: 18—Work		
-- Unsatisfactorily meets the preponderance of the minimum core functions of one's job.	Point Distribution: 1—Work		

WORK	POINTS AVAILABLE	TOTAL PTS	COMMENTS
Library initiative or program --Initiator, Coordinator --Participant	5 pts each 3 pts each		
Create and/or manage a tool, website, computer program, etc. to facilitate library services	6 pts each		
Secure additional funding (incl. Friends of Lib., library funding grants, excluding individual grants for research [See Scholarship])	4 pts each		
Offer workshop sessions/training to library faculty and staff	5 pts (each unique)		

Offer workshop sessions/training to university community	6 pts (each unique)		
Organize exhibits/book displays	4 pts each		
Partner with University Depts. to develop base collection for new academic programs	6 pts (each instance)		
Create finding aids for specific collections or subjects (e.g., course pages, tutorials)	4 pts.		
Eliminate backlog of certain materials to be cataloged	4 pts		
Create new name authority records and contribute the records to the national name authority database	6 pts		
Develop, edit, and/or revise departmental documentation (procedures, policies, projects)	6 pts		
Planning, implementation, and documentation of procedures or polices to streamline workflow--Internal dept use	3 pts		
Planning, implementation, and documentation of procedures or polices to streamline workflow--Cross-departmental work	5 pts		
Participation in OhioLINK Chat Reference Services	4 pts each semester		
Participation in UL Instant Messaging (IM) Reference Services	4 pts each semester		
Teaching sections of Information Tools	6 pts each semester		
Added administrative responsibilities	4 pts (each responsibility)		
Added projects (assigned by Chair, Division Head, Dean)	4 pts (each project)		
Create bibliographies or reading lists	3 pts.		
RTP mentoring	3 pts		
Receive an Award	5 pts.		
Write Accreditation Report/Site Visit	6 pts.		
Other Notable Accomplishments in Collection Mgmt. (specify)	1 to 5 pts.		
Other Notable Accomplishments in Reference (specify)	1 to 5 pts.		
Other Notable Accomplishments in Cataloging/Technical Services (specify)	1 to 5 pts.		
Other Notable Accomplishments in Professional Development (specify)	1 to 5 pts.		
Other Notable Accomplishments in Instruction or Teaching & Learning (specify)	1 to 5 pts.		
Award of Faculty Improvement Leave	15 pts per semester		

**TOTAL POINTS EARNED** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>SCHOLARSHIP – NOTE: Publications can be counted when notified of acceptance but not counted again upon publication.</b>	<b>POINTS AVAILABLE</b>	<b>TOTAL PTS</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
For new faculty in their first two years of merit evaluation, their score for Scholarship will be either their own earned score or Satisfactory (5 points), whichever is higher.			
Journal articles, Refereed	6 pts each		
Journal articles, Non-refereed	5 pts each		
Magazine/newsletter articles	4 pts each		
Edit journal/magazine issue or regular column	5 pts per year		
Conference paper	5 pts each		
Conference presentation, State	4 pts each		
Conference presentation, National	5 pts each		
Conference presentation, International	5 pts each		
Conference panel discussion member/moderator	4 pts each		
Poster session	4 pts each		
Books, Authored	8 pts each		
Books, Co-Authored	8 pts each		
Books, Edited	8 pts each		
Books, Chapter Author/Co-Author	5 pts each		
Reviews, Short	1-4 reviews = 3 pts; 5+ reviews, add 3 pts. -- Max. 6 pts per year		
Review article (1000 words plus)	4 pts each		
Blind reviewer for journal	4 pts each		
Encyclopedia entry (under 1000 words)	4 pts each		
Encyclopedia entry (1000+ words)	5 pts each		
Grants, Submitted (Any type of grant)	3 pts each		
Grants, Funded (funding individual research)	4 pts each		
Formal education, Degree	5 pts		
Formal education, Certificate	3 pts		
Formal education, Full course sequence	2 pts		
Formal education, Course	1 pt. each		
Receive an Award	5 pts each		
Other Notable Accomplishments in Scholarship (specify)	1 to 5 pts.		

**TOTAL POINTS EARNED**

\_\_\_\_\_

If a new faculty member in first 2 merit evaluations, and earned score is less than 5, adjust score up to 5.

<b>SERVICE</b>	<b>Adjusted Score POINTS AVAILABLE</b>	<b>TOTAL PTS</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
For new faculty in their first two years of merit evaluation, their score for Service will be either their own earned score or Satisfactory (5 points), whichever is higher.			
Faculty Senator	5 pts		
Faculty Senator + Executive Committee	Add 1 pt to above		
University-wide committee, task force, or pool (e.g., Well-Being, Hearing Board Pool, AAUP, etc.)	4 pts (for each committee, etc.)		
University-wide committee... + Officer	Add 1 pt to above		
Officer, position-holder, or active membership in University chapter of national/state/regional organization (e.g., AAUP, Women in Higher Education)	4 pts (for each office, etc.)		
Other substantial University service (e.g., advisor to student group, residence hall volunteer, etc.)	4 pts (for each activity, etc.)		
One-time activity (e.g., participation in student/parent welcome program)	2 pts (for each activity, etc.)		
Membership on UL committee, task force, working group	5 pts (for each committee, etc.)		
Membership on UL committee... + Officer	Add 1 pt to above		
Regional/local library or job/specialty-related organization Committee	4 pts (for each committee, etc.)		
Regional/local library or... + Officer	Add 1 pt to above		
Regional/local library or... Board	4 pts		
Regional/local library or... Conference organizer/director	3 pts		
State-wide library or job/specialty-related organization Committee	5 pts (for each committee, etc.)		
State-wide library or... + Officer	Add 1 pt to above		
State-wide library or... Board	5 pts		
State-wide library or... Conference organizer/ director	4 pts		
National/international library or job/specialty-related organization Committee	5 pts (for each committee, etc.)		
National/international library or... + Officer	Add 1 pt to above		
National/international library or... Board	5 pts		
National/international library or... Conference organizer/director	4 pts		
Mentoring (specify)	3 pts each		
Community activity or active contribution, One-time/short-duration	2 pts (for each activity, etc.)		
Community activity or active contribution, Ongoing/long-duration	3 pts (for each activity, etc.)		

Teach Library Science or Subject Course (limit of 3 courses per semester)	3 pts		
Receive an Award	5 pts.		
Other Notable Accomplishments in Service (specify)	1 to 5 pts.		

**TOTAL POINTS EARNED**

\_\_\_\_\_

If a new faculty member in first 2 merit  
evaluations, and earned score is less than  
5, adjust score up to 5

**Adjusted Score**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix D: Chair's Evaluation Form**

Faculty Member Evaluated: \_\_\_\_\_

**Core Job Responsibilities: Points**

Satisfactory on a Preponderance of Core Duties 18 pts \_\_\_\_\_

Unsatisfactory on a Preponderance of Core Duties 1 pts \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments/Suggestions for Improvement:**

**Merit Categories Points**

**WORK**

Points Adjusted for Work Categories:

- Other Notable Accomplishments in Collection Mgmt. \_\_\_\_\_
- Other Notable Accomplishments in Reference \_\_\_\_\_
- Other Notable Accomplishments in Cataloging/Technical Services \_\_\_\_\_
- Other Notable Accomplishments in Professional Development \_\_\_\_\_
- Other Notable Accomplishments in Instruction/Teaching and Training \_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

**SCHOLARSHIP**

Points Adjusted for Scholarship Categories:

- Other Notable Accomplishments in Scholarship \_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

**SERVICE**

Points Adjusted for Service Categories:

- Other Notable Accomplishments in Scholarship \_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

--

**Signature/Date**

Name	
Date	

### **Appendix E: Merit Evaluation Criteria**

The Merit guidelines in the Contract specify that faculty members are to be ranked on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being “Unsatisfactory” and 5 being “Extraordinary”. To translate the point totals to the 1 to 5 scale, use the following table:

	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Meritorious</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>	<b>Extraordinary</b>
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>WORK</b>	1-12	13-24	25-36	37-48	49-Infinity
<b>SCHOLARSHIP</b>	1-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17-Infinity
<b>SERVICE</b>	1-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17-Infinity

**Table 1.1**

The Contract guidelines are also quite specific in that the lowest score a faculty member can receive in the merit evaluation is 1 (Unsatisfactory) on the 1-to-5 scale. Thus, in the library guidelines, the lowest score faculty can receive on the point scale is 1 point. To receive merit pay, faculty must add points from this starting point and at least reach the level of Satisfactory (total 23 points in the three categories of Work, Scholarship, and Service).

**Appendix F: Aggregate Merit Work Sheet for 3-Year Average**

Aggregate Merit Worksheet, 3-Year Average

<u>YEAR</u>	Work	Service	Scholarship	
	<u>Pts</u>	<u>Pts</u>	<u>Pts</u>	
	<u>Score</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Score</u>	
				Aggregate Score _____

<u>YEAR</u>	Work	Service	Scholarship	
	<u>Pts</u>	<u>Pts</u>	<u>Pts</u>	
	<u>Score</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Score</u>	
				Aggregate Score _____

<u>YEAR</u>	Work	Service	Scholarship	
	<u>Pts</u>	<u>Pts</u>	<u>Pts</u>	
	<u>Score</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Score</u>	
				Aggregate Score _____

Rolling 3-Year Average \_\_\_\_\_