

Department of Cultural, Gender, and Global Studies
Merit Document: Approved 4/13/2015

I. Rationale

1. The three traditional components of merit evaluation, scholarship, teaching and service will be given equal weight in calculating merit.

2. For each of the three components of merit, faculty will be evaluated using the following criteria:

Does not meet expectations

Meets expectations

Exceeds expectations

3. This document provides broad definitions and guidelines for calculating merit in scholarship, teaching, and service, as well as examples of profiles that would fall into each category (does not meet, meets, exceeds). Please refer to appendices A-C for lists of activities/accomplishments in each area to be considered when determining merit.

4. To be considered for merit, a faculty member must submit a one to two page bulleted-item summary of accomplishments that are entered in the current annual report and may include items from the annual reports of the two previous years. The faculty member must be prepared to submit documentation that is appropriate to support the claims for merit, if it is not included in the annual report. The performance record and claims for merit should be evaluated by the Chair, where appropriate, in the context of a three-year composite profile of performance.

5. This document applies to merit evaluation of full-time faculty in the DCGG. The application of these guidelines to part-time faculty or to faculty with joint appointments should be stated explicitly in contractual arrangements or Memoranda of Understanding.

6. Each criteria [Does Not Meet, Meets, Exceeds] in each category [Scholarship, Teaching, Service] will be awarded points:¹

Does not meet expectations: 0 points

Meets expectations: 1 point

Exceeds expectations: 2 points

See section III for the relation of these points to an overall merit increase.

¹The points are NOT assigned to individual activities; rather, the point values are assigned to the ranges as indicated.

II. Criteria

1. Criteria for Merit in Scholarship. For the purposes of this document, scholarship is defined as participation in the professional conversations within a field, contribution to a field of study, advancement and professional abilities of a professor in his/her field of expertise.

NOTE language from current CGG P&T document:

For purposes of this document, scholarship shall be considered to include research, creative activity, community outreach and clinical work.

DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS [0 POINTS] – Minimal to no research or professional development activity. Evidence might include, no peer-reviewed publications, no ongoing research projects underway.

MEETS EXPECTATIONS [1 POINT]– Research production is as expected, with the understanding that expectations for instructors vs. tenure track faculty are different. A point of reference for tenure-track faculty with a 3-3 teaching load is the university-defined benchmark of two peer-reviewed published articles each three years (cf. CAS Guidelines for Reassigned Time). Ongoing projects should be taken into consideration, as a book-length project or documentary film may take many years of preparation², for example.

EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS [2 POINTS]– Research production exceeds expectations; examples for tenure-track faculty could be a single-author or edited book published, 2 or more peer-reviewed articles published in a year, or equivalent alternative forms of peer reviewed publication or research, in addition to professional development activities and participation in professional organizations. This could also include receiving a highly competitive or prestigious national-level grant.

***See appendix A for a suggested (though not comprehensive) list of accomplishments deserving of merit in scholarship.**

2. Criteria for Merit in Service. For the purposes of this document, service is defined as coordination of, contribution to, and/or collaboration with organizations, from the departmental to international, whose missions include the development, implementation, promotion, governance, and assessment of professional activity, broadly conceived.

DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS [0 POINTS] —Minimal to no service contributions. Examples might include: Little or no participation in departmental committees or meetings; no evidence of professional service.

MEETS EXPECTATIONS [1 POINT]– Service contributions meet expectations. This includes attendance and active participation in faculty meetings and serving on two departmental /program committees with multiple meetings in a year.

² Alternative forms of peer reviewed publication and research, such as media (CDs, videos) and online publications (websites, online journals) should also be taken into consideration.

EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS [2 POINTS] – Service contributions exceed expectations. Such service might include chairing one or more departmental committees with a heavy workload in a given year (i.e. searches or policy revisions), demonstrable service activities in excess of course release, establishing and leading a new study abroad program, serving on the board or in an official position for one or more organizations, serving on the editorial board of a professional journal.

***See appendix B for a suggested (though not comprehensive) list of accomplishments deserving of merit in service.**

3. Criteria for Merit in Teaching. For the purposes of this document, teaching is defined as the measurable performance of faculty in instructing and advising students, successfully providing and developing academic programs and curricula, and the ongoing cultivation of knowledge, skills, and execution of all elements of effective education, using demonstrated methods and practices.

DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS [0 POINTS] – Minimal commitment to teaching. This may be evidenced by routinely cancelling classes, poor peer evaluations, pattern of student complaints regarding teaching effectiveness or misconduct, or uniformly poor teaching evaluations, with the understanding that student evaluation should not be taken as a sole indicator of teaching performance.

MEETS EXPECTATIONS [1 POINT]– The teaching commitment is as expected. The faculty member is teaching at least a 3-3 load, and teaching evaluations are close to the departmental average. This also includes meeting assigned advising duties.

EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS [2 POINTS] – Contributions in the area of teaching exceed expectations. It is assumed that faculty at this level have taught a reasonable (3-3) teaching load and that their evaluations on the whole exceed the departmental average. Indications of an exceptional commitment to teaching might include, chairing one or more MA thesis/exam committees/HON thesis; heavy advising load; recognized excellence in advising (such as the College advisors award); winning a university, regional or national teaching award, or undertaking two or more “above average” activities (e.g. teaching an overload and developing/teaching a new course).

***See appendix C for a suggested (though not comprehensive) list of accomplishments deserving of merit in teaching.**

III. Merit Allocation Calculation

Activity corresponding to each scholarship, service, teaching will be awarded a basic number of points:

Does not meet expectations: 0 points
Meets expectations: 1 point
Exceeds expectations: 2 points

The average score of the points across scholarship, service and teaching will be used to determine merit raise for each individual faculty member. An average score (meets expectations in all categories) would be '1' ($1+1+1=3/3=1$)

e.g. Professor Y has the following breakdown for calendar year 2014

Scholarship: Meets expectations [1]

Service: Exceeds expectations [2]

Teaching: Meets expectations [1]

$1+2+1 = 4/3 = 1.3$ point average across all categories (for overall performance total)

This 1.3 point overall average would correspond to an above average merit increase for calendar year 2014, according to the guidelines set above.

Total merit increases should then reflect the point values in appropriate increases based on the merit allocation in any given year.

In calculating merit awards, the chair must have the flexibility to determine the appropriate allocation given the funding situation in any given year. The chair determines, for example, where the cut-off is in a given year (do the 1.3's and above receive merit?). Alternatively, the chair may fractionate the total allocation to give everyone some merit, if there is enough in the allocation.

Appendix A: Activities deserving merit in scholarship

- Publishing or having in press scholarly or creative books or equivalent work in other media including performance, video, Internet, visual art, etc. that have received peer review.
- Publishing or having in press journal articles or creative writing or works in other media that have received peer review.
- Publishing or having in press book chapters or essays in books of collected essays that received peer review.
- Principal investigator or co-PI on funded significant external grants or fellowships that received peer review.
- Invited presentations to a national or international academic forum
- Having one's work the subject of journal articles, books or book chapters, or works in other media that have received peer review
- Editing scholarly or creative books or comparable work in other media that require peer review
- Editing scholarly or creative journals or comparable work in other media of that require peer review at international, national or regional significance
- Receipt of awards in recognition of scholarship requiring peer review
- Performing substantial community outreach that involves applying results from peer-reviewed scholarship
- Performing substantial clinical services that are being assessed as scholarly activities.

Appendix B: Activities deserving merit in service

ASU

- Participation in Department, College or University Committees
- Activities that support the existence and/or appreciation of diversity among faculty, students and staff
- In-house ASU publication
- Advising honor societies, clubs, etc.
- Attending university guest lectures and asking students to attend

Off-campus

- Leadership position in professional organizations / societies
- Serving as manuscript reviewer for scholarly or creative journals
- Participation in community oriented non-credit bearing educational activities such as lectures, radio and television appearances, symposia and colloquia, etc.
- Providing professionally based citizen service to the community, such as serving on boards, commissions, etc., either within or without area of specialized professional expertise
- Organizing and hosting professional board meetings
- Sponsoring scholarly or pedagogical meetings
- Publishing book reviews

Appendix C: Activities deserving merit in teaching

- Strong peer evaluation
- Strong student evaluations; student letters of support
- Receipt of teaching / advising awards
- Designing new courses / syllabi revisions
- Participating in collaborative teaching activities including team teaching / service learning / community based research
- Mastery of substantial new material and integrating that material into departmental coursework and teaching
- Involvement in curriculum development
- Service on graduate thesis / Honor's thesis committees at Appalachian or other institutions
- Integrating one's own research and scholarship into courses
- Participating in workshops / seminars at ASU or off-campus dedicated to improving pedagogy / classroom techniques
- Providing Guest Lectures in colleague's classes
- Coordinating independent study / internships