

Arts and Administration Program Merit Policy

Version 2.1 (April 14, 2014)

Purpose

This policy outlines the Arts and Administration Program's procedures for determining and assigning merit raises, when available.

1. Full Inclusion

All AAD faculty members who are eligible for inclusion in a given merit process will be given full consideration and opportunity to demonstrate individual merit. Neither merit consideration nor merit scores will be affected by an individual's FTE.

2. Merit Differentiation

It is understood that all faculty are valuable members of the Arts and Administration Program and each faculty member plays a key role in achieving program goals. Merit Differentiation is used strictly as a means to differentiate between varying degrees of excellence within the department. It is noted that although the Merit Differentiation criteria are similar, and in some cases parallel, to the Promotion and Tenure criteria, that the processes themselves are separate and distinct. Furthermore, the rigor applied during the Merit Differentiation process is far less than the rigor applied during the Promotion and Tenure process, and therefore, ratings received as part of Merit Differentiation are not necessarily indicative measures of how an individual faculty member rates for purposes of Promotion and Tenure.

Differentiation is established through an evaluation of merit material against a standard rubric in the appropriate departmental Merit Score Sheet.

3. Comparative Evaluation

Comparative Evaluation is provided by sorting all faculty members into Merit Tiers based upon scores from the Merit Score Sheets.

4. Faculty Self-Assessment and Submissions

The following documents will be submitted and/or completed by designated parties. Except for reasons of legitimate and unavoidable extenuating circumstances, the following documents must be completed to be eligible for inclusion in any merit increases:

- 4.1. **Merit Self-Evaluation** – Faculty will complete and submit the appropriate Merit Self-Evaluation Form.
- 4.2. **Activity Report** – Faculty will complete and submit the Activity Report most relevant to their position.
- 4.3. **Current CV** – Faculty will submit a Current Curriculum Vitae.
- 4.4. **Student Teaching Evaluations** – Student teaching evaluations for all courses instructed by each faculty member in the time period of the evaluation will be compiled by the Arts and Administration Program administrative staff.
- 4.5. **Peer Teaching Evaluations** – When available, peer teaching evaluations completed during the time period of the evaluation will be collected by the Arts and Administration Program administrative staff.

5. Criteria and Factors

- 5.1. **Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty** – Criteria are provided in the AAD TTF Merit Score Sheet
- 5.2. **Non-Tenure Track Faculty** – Criteria are provided in the AAD NTTF Merit Score Sheet

6. Consideration of Individual Professional Responsibilities and Contributions

Consideration of Individual Professional Responsibilities and Contributions is provided for by differentiated merit criteria for different position types. A weighted average of scores in each area of Teaching, Research, and Service relative to the prominence of each area in a faculty member's job description, determine a faculty member's final merit score.

7. Evaluation of Accomplishments

7.1. **Clarity and Transparency** – Merit Score Sheets include clear and unambiguous metrics by which faculty members can demonstrate meritorious contribution to the department, including how those metrics translate into the relative scores that ultimately determine an individual's merit increase. Only the integers 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 will be used as an assigned merit score for research, teaching, or service, although the weighted total score received by a faculty member may include percentages.

7.2. **Types of Merit Score Sheets** – One of the following Merit Score Sheets will be used as appropriate:

Tenured Associate and Full Professor Merit Score Sheet
Tenure-Track Assistant Professor Merit Score Sheet
Career NTTF Score Sheet
Adjunct Instructor Score Sheet

7.2.1 – In the spring 2014 Merit Review, a working version of two merit score sheets will be used as appropriate: Merit Score Sheet for TTF Faculty and Merit Score Sheet for NTTF Faculty. These two merit score sheets will be further modified and refined as the four score sheets listed above for future rounds of merit review.

7.3. **Collegial and Consultative** – The AAD Merit Review Committee will consist of three Core Faculty members including, the Program Director, one TTF, and career NTTF. The committee is only formed and active when a merit process is engaged by the Provost. The TTF and NTTF members will self-nominate during an open faculty meeting. Both members are approved by a simple majority vote of Core Faculty. If nominees fail to come forward or a simple majority vote is not reached for either position, the Program Director may either directly appoint an appropriate representative or seek faculty approval to exclude the position from the upcoming merit process.

The AAD Program Director will collect merit self-evaluations, activity reports, updated CVs, student teaching evaluations, and peer teaching evaluations. The Merit Review Committee (MRC) will evaluate these compiled materials and complete the appropriate Merit Score Sheet for each faculty member and determine merit tier scores. In order to ensure integrity, members of the MRC will recuse themselves from input and discussion regarding their own merit scores. If the MRC does not provide

input as required by the timeline for completing the merit review process, the AAD Program Director's decision regarding individual merit scores will be the final scores submitted to the AAA Dean.

- 7.4. **Selection of Tier Scores** – The Program Director, in consultation with the AAD Faculty Advisory Committee (the Merit Review Working Group in spring 2014) will evaluate final scores and determine where there are meaningful breaks in the scores that can be used to establish ranges for final Merit Tiers. All individuals with scores within the established ranges will receive the same consideration for merit increase as other individuals in the same tier.
- 7.5. **Final Assignment of Tier Increases** – The Program Director, in consultation with the AAD Faculty Advisory Committee (Merit Review Working Group in spring 2014) and using guidance provided by the Associate Dean for Finance, will determine appropriate raise percentages or amounts to be applied in each tier, and submit those raise percentages as recommendations to the AAA Dean. The AAA Dean will consider those recommendations in determining the final merit increase amounts for each tier. Merit increase amounts for each tier will be provided as dollar amount lump sums as this is viewed to be the most equitable approach to rewarding equal merit. Faculty contracted at less than 1.0 FTE will receive a merit salary increase proportional to their contracted position.
- 7.6. **Participation** – If the AAD Faculty Advisory Committee is unable to participate in the process outlined in 7.3, 7.4, or 7.5 for any reason, they will provide the AAD Program Director with a set of Guiding Principles which will be used to aid the AAD Program Director and AAA Associate Dean for Finance in providing final recommendations to the Dean by the required due date.

7.6.1 Guiding Principles will be provided in writing and in sufficient enough time to accommodate timelines mandated by the Provost and/or Dean. In the absence of written Guiding Principles, the Program Director will informally consult with faculty before providing final recommendations.

8. Review Periods

Unless otherwise established by the requirements of a specific merit process, the following standard review periods will be used in evaluating Teaching, Research and Service:

Teaching – The 12 months directly preceding the merit review process.
Research – May consider up to a maximum of 60 months in order to establish, assess, and account for a documented significant body of work, with emphasis given to work that has been active within the prior 24 month period directly preceding the merit review process.
Service – The 12 months directly preceding the merit review process.

9. Merit Tiers

The final merit scores will be sorted into a minimum of two Merit Tiers based on the overall differentiation of the Merit Scores. Tiers may include any of the following:

Does Not Meet Expectations (1.0): Has not demonstrated the minimum standards required to qualify as Provisionally Meets Expectations. This Merit Tier is ineligible for merit increase, although there is no mandate for a minimum number of faculty members to be classified into this Merit Tier. Classification into this Merit Tier qualifies as “Does Not Meet” per the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Provisionally Meets Expectations (2.0): Has demonstrated minimum standard required to qualify as Meets Expectations, but has not demonstrated a level of meritorious contribution equal to the level of other peers in the Meets Expectations category. Classification into this Merit Tier qualifies as “Meets Expectations” per the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Meets Expectations (3.0): Has clearly demonstrated standards required to qualify as Meets Expectations, but has not demonstrated a level of meritorious contribution high enough to qualify for Exceeds Expectations. Classification into this Merit Tier qualifies as “Meets Expectations” per the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Exceeds Expectations (4.0): Has clearly demonstrated standards required to qualify as Exceeds Expectations, but has not demonstrated a level of meritorious contribution high enough to qualify for Highest Expectations. Classification into this Merit Tier qualifies as “Exceeds Expectations” per the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Highest Expectations (5.0): Has clearly demonstrated standards required to qualify as Highest Expectations. Classification into this Merit Tier qualifies as “Exceeds Expectations” per the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Testing - The 12-monthly tests include the most recent process
Results - The results are available in 60 minutes in order to
social and economic and account for a significant amount of the
with various types of work that have been done within the 12
months period during the past year process
Results - The 12-monthly tests include the most recent process

2. Test Data

The test data will be used for a number of purposes. The first is to
establish a baseline of the test data. This will allow us to
compare the test data against the baseline data.

The test data will be used for a number of purposes. The first is to
establish a baseline of the test data. This will allow us to
compare the test data against the baseline data.

The test data will be used for a number of purposes. The first is to
establish a baseline of the test data. This will allow us to
compare the test data against the baseline data.

The test data will be used for a number of purposes. The first is to
establish a baseline of the test data. This will allow us to
compare the test data against the baseline data.

The test data will be used for a number of purposes. The first is to
establish a baseline of the test data. This will allow us to
compare the test data against the baseline data.

The test data will be used for a number of purposes. The first is to
establish a baseline of the test data. This will allow us to
compare the test data against the baseline data.