

Merit Review Process and Criteria

Educational Psychology

Approved at Department Meeting September 6, 2019

Merit reviews are an important part of the annual review process conducted by EDP, but do not represent the totality of the evaluation process. The criteria for merit are aligned with criteria for promotion, for example, but the promotion process is conducted at many levels at the University, and faculty should not assume that criteria for merit automatically equates to criteria for promotion.

Merit Review Process

1. EDP full time faculty are reviewed annually by a Merit Review Committee (MRC) assigned to each rank (full, associate, assistant professor, clinical and teaching faculty). The chair will collaborate with EDP leadership in early Fall to constitute the committee membership.
2. Members of the MRC should spend time thoroughly understanding the merit of their colleagues, and they are expected to communicate regularly with other members of the MRC to achieve consensus in ratings. The membership of the MRC committees, when feasible, should include a member of each program in EDP. The terms of the members of this committee should be staggered so that there is continuity of at least one committee member remaining on the committee in the next year.
3. Faculty can complete the merit worksheet for themselves. The goal of this self-evaluation process is to inform faculty about the issues involved in assigning merit points. The MRC will consider the self-evaluation when doing their work.
4. Faculty will be notified of their merit review scores and written feedback before the end of the semester. Faculty will then meet with the EDP Chair (required for all ranks except full professors), who will review the merit ratings and document any concerns in scores assigned by the MRC. The EDP Chair will then be responsible for contacting the merit committee chair to resolve such concerns.
5. Per University policy, the EDP Chair has discretion in the final allocation of merit.

Merit is determined using the following rubric:

Exceeds expectations:	3
Meet expectations:	2
Below expectations:	1
Unsatisfactory:	0

Weighting of Merit Points

Final point allocation for merit are weighted by rank as follows:

<u>Assistant Professor</u>	
30%	Teaching
30%	Grants
30%	Research
10%	Service

Associate and Full Professor

25% Teaching
 25% Grants
 25% Research
 25% Service

NTT Faculty (Teaching)

80% Teaching
 20% Service

NTT Faculty (Training Directors)*

50% Teaching
 50% Service

**Individualized ratings to be determined by NTT Merit Committee and Department Chair*

Teaching Merit

The following criteria will be utilized to assign merit points:

1. CIS ratings (including but not limited to overall CIS instructor/course scores) and student written comments. Typically ratings for CIS instructor are meeting expectations with scores around 4.0. CIS scores below 3.5 for instructor or course are considered below expectations.
2. Teaching across levels (i.e., does the faculty teach at the undergraduate and graduate level?; does the faculty teach both “required” vs. elective courses?).
3. Class enrollment size (graduate course minimums are 10; undergraduate course minimums are 20). To exceed expectations in this area, teaching larger numbers of students would be expected.
4. Teaching innovation (i.e., teaching a new course, significant course redesign¹, teaching awards)
5. Individual instruction² (adequate service in dissertation, thesis, masters report supervision, qualifying process, undergraduate supervision for course credit, etc.).

Merit is assessed on a 4-point scale. Overall merit scores are awarded using the following rubric:

3: Exceeds expectations: Over the three years, the faculty member meets all five expectations above

2: Meet expectations: Over the three years, four of the above criteria are routinely met

1: Below expectations: Over the three years, three of the above criteria are routinely met

0: Unsatisfactory: Over the three years, two or fewer of the above criteria are met

¹Significant course redesign earns consideration for merit only when sufficient evidence is provided, for example, the faculty worked with the Office of Innovation and Instruction over the course of a semester to put a course on-line, make it a hybrid course, etc.

²The merit committee should evaluate the faculty members’ individual instruction activity compared to other faculty at the same rank.

Research Merit

The **basic unit** for merit awards in scholarship is 1 point for each article published in a referred journal in a given calendar year.

Journal Articles

First, second, or sole authored publications by a faculty member are worth 1 point towards merit for that year. Articles in which a student(s) is first author and the faculty is a co-author are also worth 1.0 point. Research articles involving students and co-authors who are not students should be evaluated by the committee to determine whether 1 full point is warranted. A faculty who is third author or lower in author position would typically earn 0.5 points.

Books and Book Chapters

Sole or first authorship of a scholarly book is 3 points. Sole or first authorship of a textbook is 2 points and revising a textbook is 1 point. Editing a book is 2 merit points. Solo or first authorship of a book chapter is 1 point. The criteria described above for journal articles should be used for determining points for co-authoring book chapters.

Conference Presentations

Faculty presenting research at scholarly meetings in a given year receive .25 points regardless of number of presentations. Writing at least one encyclopedia entry, commentaries, book reviews, or editorials are also worth a maximum of .25 total in a given year.

Assigning Scholarship Merit Points

Recognizing that (1) many articles appear on-line well before appearing in press, and (2) Assistant Professors early in their career may wish to include in press articles as evidence of merit, assistant professors in their first three years are permitted to include “in press” articles in their publication count. **However, once counted toward merit for a given year, an article cannot be counted for merit again.**

Funding Merit

Assigning Scholarship Merit Points

Faculty are only eligible for funding merit in their role as a Principal Investigator or Co-Principal investigator. Merit points across the three years are summed and divided by 3 to obtain the faculty members' overall merit score. Funding amounts are defined by research expenditures per year, as documented by the Office of Sponsored Projects.

Zero points for not applying for or receiving external funding.

One point for applying for external (not internal) funding.

1.5 points for grant expenditures (from internal or external sources) that total less than \$50,000 in a given year.

Two points for grant expenditures (from internal or external sources) of between \$50,000-75,000 a year.

Three points for grant expenditures of greater than \$75,000 a year.

Service Merit

Merit is assessed on a 0 – 3 point scale for each year of the review, which is then averaged across the years of the review. Given the wide ranging nature of professional service and the difficulties in weighing various types of service, the MRC should consider a service rating of “2” as a starting place for a given year, and then adjust annual merit ratings downward when service is considered lacking or upward when service is particularly strong. A few caveats should be noted for rating service to merit:

1. As a general rule, when faculty receive course releases for service, duties performed as part of the release should not also be considered evidence of merit. However, the MRC should use the general guideline that one course release is equivalent to 10 hours/week of release time. Therefore, if the service activity is more extensive than provided by the release, additional merit consideration is warranted. Serving as Area Chair, for example, currently entails one course release per year, and in most cases, would be judged as deserving merit even with a course release.
2. Given that merit can be difficult to quantify, committees are encouraged to work together to carefully review each faculty members’ service merit grid and come to consensus as to that faculty’s merit rating.
3. The default rating of 2 for service should be considered the norm, and strong evidence should be required to move this rating up or down for a given faculty member.

Merit points across the three years are summed and divided by 3 to obtain the faculty members’ overall merit score. The overall score for this category is determined using the following rubric:

Zero Points. The faculty member is not active in service within the University, the community, or their profession.

One Point. There is evidence that the faculty member **participates** in some service within the University, the community, or their profession, but does not take on leadership roles or make consistent, meaningful contributions.

Two Points. Faculty member does the service described above plus takes on leadership roles in committee work, actively participates in professional organizations (program chair, membership committee) serving on editorial boards or review panels, or serving in elected roles in professional organizations.

Three Points. In addition to serving in ways that meet the service level described above, the faculty also goes “above and beyond” through service activities such as:

--Holding a significant administrative assignment in the department for which entails work beyond the scope of course releases provided.

--Chairs one or more significant university or college committees OR has been recognized for service at the university or college level.

--Serves as editor or as associate editor of one or more recognized professional journals, editor of a special issue of a journal or handbook OR chairs one or more significant committees at the regional or national level; OR serves in an elected position for a national organization relevant to the EDP.

Merit Score Sheet

Faculty Name: _____

Years Reviewed: _____ - _____

Date of Review: _____

I. Teaching rating:

Rating (overall rating across the 3-year span): _____

Comments clarifying the rating:

II. Scholarship rating:

Rating Year 1: _____

Rating Year 2: _____

Rating Year 3: _____

Comments clarifying the rating:

III. Funding rating:

Rating Year 1: _____

Rating Year 2: _____

Rating Year 3: _____

Comments clarifying the rating:

III. Service rating:

Rating Year 1: _____

Rating Year 2: _____

Rating Year 3: _____

Comments clarifying the rating:

Scoring Summary:

	Yr 1 Rating	Yr 2 Rating	Yr 3 Rating	Weight	Total
Research					
Grants					
Service					
			Rating x 3	Weight	Total
Teaching					
				Grand Total	

Summary Statement:

Include particular areas of strength and areas for growth.