

MERIT POLICY

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

I. GENERAL POLICY

1. Department merit will be based on performance in teaching, scholarly activity, and service. A faculty member seeking merit should be prepared to demonstrate his/her effectiveness in these areas in the Annual Report (See Guidelines Nos. 4, 5, 6)
2. The Executive Committee will have the primary responsibility for making recommendations on department merit. It will review all Annual Reports (unless a faculty member specifically requests that his/her report not be reviewed) to ensure that no department member deserving consideration for merit is overlooked.
3. The Executive Committee will elect a coordinator from its membership. The coordinator will be responsible for instituting the following review procedure:
 - a. Each member of the Executive Committee will review the Annual Report and supporting materials for each applicant for merit.
 - b. Each member of the Executive Committee will rate each applicant's performance in the separate categories of teaching, scholarly activities, and service (See Guidelines, No. 1). The rating in each category will be as follows:
 - 1 = outstanding
 - 2 = very good
 - 3 = satisfactory
 - 4 = weak, needs improving
 - 5 = inadequate job performance
 - c. Each member of the Executive Committee will compile an overall rating of each merit applicant. In this rating, greatest emphasis will be placed on teaching effectiveness. The percentage weight assigned to each category will be as follows:
 - 50%-- Teaching
 - 30%--Scholarly Activity
 - 20%--Service

The overall rating will be obtained by applying the following formula:
(Teaching Rating x .5) + (Scholarly Activity Rating x .3) + (Service Rating x .2) = Overall Rating.

- d. The coordinator will then collect the overall ratings from each member of the Executive Committee and compute the average overall rating for each merit applicant. These results will be discussed by the committee (See Guidelines No. 2). After discussion, time will be allowed for each member of the committee to rate the applicants a second time. These results will again be averaged by the coordinator. If significant differences of opinion exist, the coordinator may require additional discussion and ratings. If no consensus can be reached, a majority vote will determine the committee's overall rating for each applicant.
- e. Each member of the Executive Committee will then use the average overall ratings to assign each applicant to one or more of the following categories—only applicants assigned to Level One Merit are eligible for consideration for Level Two Merit; only applicants assigned to Level Two Merit are eligible for consideration for Level Three Merit (See Guidelines No. 1):

NO MERIT--Insufficient evidence of the applicant's effectiveness has been presented or the overall rating of teaching, scholarly activity, and service indicates important deficiencies in performance during the review period.

LEVEL ONE MERIT--The overall rating of teaching, scholarly activity, and service indicates general effectiveness in performance during the review period.

LEVEL TWO MERIT--The overall rating of teaching, scholarly activity, and service indicates outstanding performance during the review period.

LEVEL THREE MERIT--The overall rating of teaching, scholarly activity, and service indicates exceptional performance during the review period.

- f. The coordinator will collect the results and report on the collective decisions of the committee. If, after a general discussion, significant differences persist, the coordinator will make a sincere effort to resolve them and reach a consensus (See Guidelines No. 2). If necessary, a majority vote will determine the assignment of an applicant to a category.
- g. Once the meritorious applicants have been identified, the Executive Committee will determine how available funds will be allocated. If a

consensus cannot be reached, the coordinator will resolve the issue by majority vote.

- h. The coordinator will report the results to the chair and the entire department. The coordinator will also provide the chair with a brief justification for ranking of each applicant.
4. A faculty member wishing to appeal a decision of the Executive Committee on departmental merit must, within seven working days after the results are revealed, present a written statement, explaining the nature of the appeal, to the chair. The chair will then arrange for a meeting of the Executive Committee to hear the appeal. The faculty member making the appeal may appear before the committee, if he/she desires. The Executive Committee will then deliberate and make a written response, in which the issues in the written/oral appeal are addressed and a decision on the appeal is indicated, to the faculty member and the chair. The chair may accept or reject the decision of the committee. If the decision is rejected, the chair must provide a written justification to the committee. If the matter is not resolved by the committee or the chair to the satisfaction of the faculty member, an appeal may be made to the dean.

II. GENERAL GUIDELINES

1. A member of the Executive Committee may not evaluate or rate himself/herself.
2. A member of the Executive Committee must be absent during the discussion of his/her evaluation and rating.
3. Non-teaching related activities for which release time has been granted should not figure into the rating process, unless such activities are beyond expectations.
4. To demonstrate effectiveness of teaching, faculty members are encouraged to include information relating to any or all of the following items (not necessarily in order of importance). If faculty members have other evidence of teaching effectiveness not included in this list, they are welcome to include it as well.
 - a. Student evaluations—with written comments on standard departmental questions
 - b. New courses developed
 - c. Innovations in regular courses
 - d. Special projects for classes
 - e. New technology used in classes

- f. Course syllabi
 - g. Direct work with students (advising, directing independent studies projects, supervising thesis work, etc.)
 - h. General course load –graduate and undergraduate
 - i. Participation in professional development activities related to teaching
5. To demonstrate effectiveness of scholarly activity, faculty members are encouraged to include information relating to any or all of the following items (not necessarily in order of importance):
- a. Publications—merit recommendations for publishing activity will be based primarily upon works which appeared in print during the appropriate review period.
 - b. Forthcoming publications
 - c. Ongoing research
 - d. Scholarly papers
 - e. Book reviews
 - f. Participation in scholarly meetings (discussants, chairs, panel members, etc.)
 - g. Participation in professional faculty development meetings (conferences, workshops, seminars, etc.)
 - h. Active membership in professional organizations
6. To demonstrate effectiveness of service activity, faculty members are encouraged to include information relating to any or all of the following items:
- a. University service—all major service for the department, college, and/or university, including some indication of the time and work requirements of the assignments (A university committee is not necessarily more valuable than a department committee).
 - b. Community service—professionally related community activities (lectures in public school classrooms, work with in-service workshops, political/historical commentaries to local organizations, etc.) are to be weighed more than other types of community service.

7. No quotas will be established for assigning applicants to merit categories and no fixed percentages will be assigned for the allocation of merit funds to various levels. However, it is intended that most merit awards and most of the merit funds will be assigned to Level One Merit. Assignments to Level Two Merit and Level Three Merit will be made only when and if applicants are clearly deserving.
8. In general, greatest weight will be given to activities directly related to promoting the discipline of history and the specific goals of the department, college and university.

Adopted by department, December 10, 1993; modified by departmental vote, January 21, 1994. Lat revised September 14, 2010.