

Department of Chemistry Merit Criteria and Merit Review

Approved by Chemistry Faculty, February 16, 2006

Revised and approved by Chemistry Faculty, April 13, 2006

Draft changes by D Perry September 6, 2006

Extensively redrafted and approved by the chemistry faculty November 14, 2006

- I. In accordance with the Contract between the Akron-AAUP and the University of Akron Administration (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. The *evaluation period* is a rolling three-year period ending 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. All evaluation criteria and quantitative measures apply to the total accomplishment during the evaluation period.
 - A. For faculty on Professional Development Leave (PDL), the evaluation period is unchanged. Teaching and service evaluations are based on those activities during the time the member was not on leave. Since a PDL is intended to have a net positive impact on faculty research, research evaluation is the same as for members who were not on leave.
 - B. For faculty who have used extended sick leave during the evaluation period, the beginning of the evaluation period will be set at an earlier date so that the length of the evaluation period is increased by the duration of the sick leave. It is the faculty member's responsibility to ask the chair for an extended evaluation period before submission of their activity reports and then to submit an activity report for the period agreed upon with the chair. In this context, sick leave includes personal sick leave, parental leave and leave to care for a sick family member.
- III. The *data* on which the merit evaluations are based will include the following for each bargaining unit faculty member:
 - A. Faculty activity reports covering the *evaluation period* (example attached), due by the last day of the academic year.
 - B. IDEA Reports, Chemistry Department *Additional Questions*, and student comments from each of the courses taught during the *evaluation period*.
 - C. Peer evaluation of teaching when such information is available.
 - D. For probationary faculty, retention reviews from the *evaluation period*. Note that merit reviews are *not intended* as an indication of satisfactory or unsatisfactory progress toward promotion or tenure and are *not* used as part of RTP evaluations.
- IV. The *criteria* for regular faculty for determining merit recommendations are
 - A. Teaching
 1. The following criteria should be considered:
 - a. Classroom professionalism (e. g., promptness, courtesy, appropriate testing and

- grading methods, preparation, course syllabi and similar matters)
 - b. Teaching quality and effectiveness
 - c. Availability to students for counseling and advising
 - d. Course development and innovation
 - e. Inter- and intra-departmental teaching efforts
 - f. Direction of masters theses, doctoral dissertations, and undergraduate research
 - g. Service on doctoral committees
 - h. Preparation of cumulative exams
 - i. Management of graduate assistants
2. The minimum requirements for a score of *satisfactory* (2) for teaching are
- a. Good classroom professionalism,
 - b. Competent teaching in the graduate program as assigned, including where applicable, cumulative exams, service on doctoral committees, and direction of master's theses and doctoral dissertations,
 - c. An average IDEA score of $S \geq 2.0$ (IDEA 5-Point Scale). For this purpose, S is computed according to the following algorithm: The adjusted scores for "3. Overall Excellence of Teacher" are averaged over all courses taught during the evaluation period to get S3. Likewise, the adjusted scores for "4. Overall Excellence of Course" are averaged to get S4. Then $S = (S3+S4)/2$. Although IDEA adjusts the scores to account for class size and level, UA Chemistry data still show a positive correlation of adjusted scores with course level. Therefore the chair may make further adjustments to S as necessary to ensure fairness and to account for extenuating circumstances.
3. The chair will use discretion to assign higher teaching scores including *meritorious* (3), *outstanding* (4), and *extraordinary* (5). For example a score of *meritorious* (3) might be given for one additional indicator of quality teaching, such as of $S \geq 3.0$, exceptional course development or innovation, exceptional teaching effectiveness, excellent direction of research students, etc. *Outstanding* (4) might be given for $S \geq 4.0$ or for multiple additional indicators of quality teaching. *Extraordinary* (5) might be awarded for $S \geq 4.5$ or for a college or university level teaching award.

B. Scholarship

1. The following measures of the quantity of scholarship activity should be considered:
 - a. Level of graduate faculty status
 - b. Number of peer-reviewed publications, including original research, patents, review articles, book chapters, monographs, textbooks, and other instructional/research materials
 - c. Total amount of external support during the evaluation period including grants, contracts, and patent royalties
 - d. Number of presentations (papers, talks, and posters) at professional meetings,

- universities, and industrial organizations.
2. Measures of the quality of scholarship that reflect an external evaluation of the scholarship should be also considered. Note that the invitations listed in these quality measures are included because the invitation reflects an external evaluation of the research; the activities themselves might be considered service activities.
 - a. Awards and prizes for research
 - b. Journal editorships, editorial boards, etc.
 - c. Invitations to organize symposia, conferences, etc.
 - d. Funding of peer-reviewed research proposals
 - e. Invitations to speak at major research conferences, including national meetings, Gordon Research Conferences, etc.
 - f. Invitations to speak at major research institutions.
 - g. The total number of citations to the faculty member's research during the evaluation period.
 - h. Favorable peer review of research proposals
 - i. Invitation to serve or election to an office in a professional research society.
 - j. Participation in multi-investigator proposals for special programs, instruments, educational initiatives.
 3. Any faculty activities that reflect the scholarship of teaching and learning may be included in the appropriate categories above.
 4. The minimum requirement for a score of *satisfactory* (2) for scholarship is a record of scholarship necessary to maintain graduate faculty II status.
 5. The chair will use discretion to assign higher scholarship scores including *meritorious* (3), *outstanding* (4), and *extraordinary* (5). For example, a score of *meritorious* (3) might be given for a greater number of publications and presentations than required for Graduate Faculty II status, or for external research funding, or for invitations to speak at major conferences or research institutions, or for an invitation to organize a major symposium, or for membership on an editorial board. A score of *outstanding* (4) might be given for two or more of the above, or for a journal editorship, or for an exceptionally large grant. A rating of *extraordinary* (5) might be given for a major research award or for 4 or more exceptional quality measures.

C. Service

1. Service criteria include
 - a. Ability to relate positively and productively with students and colleagues
 - b. Demonstration of professional ethics and responsibility
 - c. Service to the department, college, and university on curricular and extracurricular matters, including involvement in departmental affairs and active participation on committees

- d. Service to the community including: involvement in service organizations, social agencies and cultural societies, service to governmental agencies, and talks and scientific demonstrations at K-12 schools, judging science fairs, and other activities that promote quality K-12 education.
 - e. Service to the profession including professional presentations, review of manuscripts and proposals, and participation in professional organizations.
2. The minimum requirement for a score of *satisfactory* (2) for service is the satisfaction of items *a* and *b* in the preceding list plus conscientious involvement in one or more activities from in *c* as assigned.
 3. The chair will use discretion to assign higher service scores including *meritorious* (3), *outstanding* (4), and *extraordinary* (5). For example, a score of *meritorious* (3) might be given for effective participation in especially active committees ((c) above), or for significant activities from (d) or (e) above. A score of *outstanding* (4) might be given when there is a sufficient number of activities to qualify for meritorious and the faculty member has also demonstrated effective leadership and made a major time commitment. Examples include service as chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum or Graduate Admissions committees. A score of *extraordinary* (5) might be given for a major campus, civic, or professional service award, or for otherwise exceptional service.

V. Merit Procedures for Regular Faculty

- A. For probationary tenure-track faculty and for tenured faculty, *variable weights* will be used to reflect an individual faculty member's activities in teaching, scholarship and service. The *weights* may be adjusted by agreement between the chair and the faculty member concerned within the following sliding scale:
 - teaching in the range 25% to 65%,
 - scholarship in the range 25% to 65%, and
 - service in the range 10% to 50%.

The default *weights* for teaching, scholarship and service are 40%, 40%, and 20%. The default *weights* will apply if such an agreement is not reached by the second Friday of the Fall semester. The chair has the final authority to make decisions regarding the *weights*. There is no implication that the *weights* reflect that actual distribution of the faculty member's load during the evaluation period. For probationary tenure-track faculty, the *weights* may be set only once during the pre-tenure period.
- B. Based on an evaluation of the *data* according to the *criteria* listed in sections III and IV of this document, the department chair will assign each faculty member a score in the range 1.0 to 5.0 for each of the areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. With regard for the mission of the department and of the university as a whole, the chair shall use discretionary judgment in assigning the merit scores for each faculty member. The relative *weights* will be used to calculate the overall merit score for each faculty member according to the formulae detailed in the Contract.

VI. Merit Procedures for Instructors

- A. For instructors, the *weights* of teaching, scholarship and service are 70%, 10%, and 20% respectively, unless specified otherwise in the initial letter of offer.

- B. The *criteria* for teaching and for service are those given in section IV of this document. The *criteria* for scholarship are:
1. Activities that help to keep the instructor current in his/her field of specialization, including:
 - a. Any of the measures of scholarship listed in section IV.B.1.
 - b. Regular attendance at the chemistry seminar series.
 - c. Attendance at professional meetings, conferences, and workshops.
 2. The minimum requirements for a score of *satisfactory* (2) are 1 publication, or 1 conference presentation, or attendance at 2 conferences, or consistent attendance at the Chemistry Seminar, or any other activity that in the judgement of the chair will keep the instructor current in his/her field of specialization.
 3. The chair will use discretion to assign higher scholarship scores including *meritorious* (3), *outstanding* (4), and *extraordinary* (5). For example, a score of *meritorious* (3) might be assigned for 2 of the items listed for a score of *satisfactory*, and *outstanding* (4) might be assigned for 3 or more from that list. A score of *extraordinary* (5) might be assigned if the instructor has enough publications for graduate faculty II status.
- C. The department chair will evaluate each instructor using the *data* described in section III of this document and will assign a score in the range 1.0 to 5.0 for each of the areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. With regard for the mission of the department and the university as a whole, the chair shall use discretionary judgment in assigning the merit scores for each instructor. The relative *weights* will be used to calculate the overall merit score for each instructor in accordance with the formulae in the Contract.

VII. Merit Procedures for Lecturers

- A. For lecturers the *weights* of teaching, scholarship and service are 100% for teaching and 0% for scholarship and service.
- B. The *criteria* for teaching are those given in section IV of this document.
- C. The department chair will evaluate each lecturer using the *data* described in section III of this document and will assign a score in the range 1.0 to 5.0 for teaching. With regard for the mission of the department and the university as a whole, the chair shall use discretionary judgment in assigning the merit scores for each lecturer. The *weights* will be used to calculate the overall merit score for each lecturer in accordance with the formulae in the Contract.

VIII. 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.

Department of Chemistry
Faculty Activity Report for Merit Review
Academic Years 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05
(Example)

1. **Name**
2. **Publications 2002-05**(*authors, title, journal, volume, complete pagination, year*)
 - a. In print
 - b. Accepted or in press
 - c. Sued
3. **Grants and Contracts** (*agency, agency award number, title, total amount, total period, account number, budget amounts, number of students supported in each year*).
 - a. Grants first awarded in 2002-05 (*include internal awards, seed money, matching grants*)
 - b. Grants active during 2002-05 but awarded prior to 2002
 - c. Grants with probable 2005 start dates
 - d. Contracts awarded in 2002-05
4. **Proposals submitted** (*agency, title, amount, number of students budgeted, status = pending/funded/declined.*)
 - a. Proposals submitted in 2002-05
5. **Presentations and Seminars at Meetings, Universities and Corporations** (*include authors, presenter underlined, title, place, date, talk/poster*)
 - a. Invited
 - b. Contributed
 - c. Short Courses
 - d. Other Meetings Attended
6. **Reviews**
 - a. Papers (*journal and number of papers*)
 - b. Proposals (*agency and number of proposals*)
 - c. Books (*number*)
7. **Patents** (*inventors, title, assignee, patent no., date*)
 - a. Invention disclosures
 - b. Patent applications
 - c. Patents granted
8. **Teaching**
 - a. Courses taught by semester
 - b. Teaching innovations
 - c. Ph.D. and M.S. committees
 - d. Undergraduate research students
9. **Service**
 - a. Departmental Service
 - b. University, College Service
 - c. Service to the Profession
 - d. Community Service and Outreach
 - e. Consulting (*list companies, publishers, etc.*)
10. **Ph.D. and M.S. Graduates** (*student name, degree, and thesis/dissertation title*)
11. **Other notable achievements and awards**