



The University of Akron
Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences

Date: June 2, 2021

TO: John Wiencek
Executive VP & Provost

FROM: Joseph Uργο
Acting Dean

SUBJECT: Merit Review Guidelines for the Department of Criminal Justice Studies.

The attached guidelines have been approved by the faculty of the Department of Criminal Justice Studies on May 5, 2021.

I have approved all attached guidelines and criteria.

If you concur, we ask that you also approve the guidelines and criteria.

Department Chair

Dean Buchtel College of Arts & Sciences

Exec VP & Chief Admin Officer

June 2, 2021

Date

6/2/2021

Date

08-06-2021

Date

Department of Criminal Justice Merit Review Guidelines
Approved by Faculty on May 5, 2021

Table of Contents

Article I.	Purpose
Article II.	Review Period
Article III.	Leave
Article IV.	Evaluation Basis
Article V.	Evaluation Weight
Article VI.	Evaluation Process
Article VII.	Awarding Merit Points
Article VIII.	Merit for Research and Scholarly Activity
Article IX.	Merit for Teaching
Article X.	Merit for Service
Appendix A	Merit Review Report Form

Article I. Purpose.

The purpose of the annual Faculty Merit Review is to provide feedback and evaluate how well full-time tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty have carried out their academic responsibilities across the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The review also forms the basis for determining annual merit increases.

Article II. Review Period.

Section 1.

In accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and in preparation for the department chair's annual evaluation, all members of the bargaining unit will submit to the chair a self-evaluation merit report of their scholarship, teaching, and service during the preceding academic year. The chair will use this report to guide his or her independent evaluation of merit for each faculty member. The Chair will include a written evaluation of each area (scholarship, teaching, and service) and will assign a ranking of "unsatisfactory," "satisfactory," "meritorious," "outstanding," or "extraordinary." The department chair/director shall send to each member of the bargaining unit a copy of his or her evaluation before, or simultaneously with, the submission of that report to the dean.

Section 2.

The Merit review period is based on the calendar year in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

Section 3.

Faculty members may choose to use a three (3) year rolling average as the basis for the evaluation after a minimum of two years have passed subsequent to the approval of these criteria.

Article III. Leave.

Section 1.

POL and other leaves - In this context, leave includes personal medical leave, parental leave, leave to care for a sick family member, or any other leave of absence authorized by the university.

Section 2.

Faculty members on leave, regardless of type, may participate in merit evaluations. Faculty who miss extensive periods of work due to any type of leave may choose from the following options for providing merit application data.

1. If the leave was for one semester, the faculty member may choose to be evaluated in each

of the three evaluation areas separately (scholarship, teaching, and service) using either of the following two methods:

- a. The faculty member may substitute half of the points generated in the previous year's merit application (for any or all of these areas), with the remainder of their merit points based upon their accomplishments during the merit evaluation period when they are not on leave, or
 - b. The faculty member may alternatively report the points which were generated (in any or all of these areas) throughout the merit evaluation period.
2. If the leave was for the academic year (i.e., spring and fall semesters), the faculty member may choose to be evaluated in each of the three evaluation areas separately (scholarship, teaching, and service) using either of the following two methods:
- a. The faculty member may substitute all of the points generated in the previous year's merit application (for any or all of these areas), or
 - b. The faculty member may alternatively report the points which were generated (in any or all of these areas) throughout the merit evaluation period.
3. For example, a faculty member on a semester's leave may have engaged in considerable research and scholarly activity but missed many teaching and service activities during that leave. In this example, the faculty may choose to allocate 0% to teaching and service and 100% to research and scholarly activity.

Article IV. Evaluation Basis.

Section 1.

Evaluation will be based on an activity report (sample attached) submitted by each faculty member for the academic year after departmentally approved teaching evaluations and peer evaluations of teaching are available.

Section 2.

Merit evaluation is understood to be a process for determining eligibility to receive a salary increase from the merit pool or as otherwise indicated in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). These evaluations are not intended for use as indicators of satisfactory or unsatisfactory progress toward promotion or tenure and are not used as part of RTP evaluations.

Article V. Evaluation Weight.

Section 1.

Faculty members shall be responsible for providing notice of the evaluation weight to be assigned to each area of evaluation. The notice shall be part of the merit evaluation materials submitted to the chair.

Section 2.

The default weighting for tenured and tenure-tracked faculty will be: Scholarship 30%; Teaching 60%; and Service 10%.

Tenured and Tenure-Track faculty members may alternatively choose any of the following weightings:

1. Scholarship 40%, Teaching 40%, and Service 20%
2. Scholarship 40%, Teaching 50%, and Service 10%
3. Scholarship 30%, Teaching 50%, and Service 20%
4. Scholarship 20%, Teaching 60%, and Service 20%
5. Scholarship 20%, Teaching 70%, and Service 10%

Section 3.

Weighting scales and merit activities for Non-Tenure Track faculty shall be governed by the requirements contained in their most recent letter of appointment as provided for in the collective bargaining agreement.

The default weighting for Non-Tenure Track faculty is:
Teaching 70%, Research 0%, Service 30%

Alternatively, Non-Tenure Track faculty engage in Research may elect the following weighting:
Teaching 70%, Research 10%, Service 20%

Section 4.

Faculty members may choose a weighting scale other than one listed above if appropriate to evaluate their work. Nonstandard weighting scales shall be decided in consultation with and subject to the approval of the chair and agreed upon before the start of the period under review.

Article VI. Evaluation Process.

Section 1.

The Chair shall assign merit scores of "unsatisfactory," "satisfactory," "meritorious/" "outstanding," or "extraordinary" in each of the three areas (scholarship, teaching, and service) to each faculty member according to the criteria set forth in this document. The merit score for each category will be calculated using the relative weights for scholarship, teaching, and service according to the formulae set forth above.

Section 2.

The merit raise computation will be determined by the CBA.

Section 3.

Any faculty member earning an overall average merit evaluation of less than satisfactory is not eligible to participate in the merit pool.

Article VII. Awarding Merit Points.

Section 1.

The merit scale for each category under the Criminal Justice evaluation process correlates with the scale set forth in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and is as follows:

- 5 = Extraordinary
- 4 = Outstanding
- 3 = Meritorious
- 2 = Satisfactory
- 1 = Unsatisfactory

Section 2.

The distinction between satisfactory and unsatisfactory is articulated for each area of evaluation (scholarship, teaching, and service) below.

An unsatisfactory rating means the faculty member has not met the minimum standard and is worth 1 point.

A satisfactory rating means the faculty member has met the minimum standard of satisfactory which is 2 points.

A meritorious rating means that the faculty member has accumulated 1 additional point beyond the satisfactory rating of 2 points.

An outstanding rating means that the faculty member has accumulated 2 additional points beyond the satisfactory rating of 2 points.

An extraordinary rating means that the faculty member has accumulated 3 or more additional points beyond the satisfactory rating of 2 points.

Section 3.

The final merit scores for faculty will be calculated either annually or by using a 3-year rolling average. (See Article II., Section 2.)

Section 4.

Evaluation is structured as a two-step process. A faculty member must receive an initial rating of satisfactory in a category in order to be eligible to receive additional points in the category. No additional points may be earned in a category if the faculty member is rated as unsatisfactory in that category.

Section 5.

If maximums are not provided it is assumed that faculty may earn additional points for multiple items within a sub-category.

Section 6.

The maximum points that may be earned in any category is 5.0 points.

Section 7.

New faculty who are tenure-track are not expected to carry a normal service load in their first years, when their priorities are teaching and establishing a record of research. Therefore, for the first 2 years that a tenure-track faculty member is evaluated for merit, he or she will either receive a satisfactory merit score (of 2 points) for service or his or her actual earned score which is greater.

Section 8.

Items in any list below may only earn points once and are limited by any maximums provided. For example, if a faculty member received 2 points for a peer-reviewed publication in the first of the two-step process here, she cannot also claim 2 points for that same publication in the second phase.

Article VIII. Merit for Research and Scholarly Activity

Section 1.

Faculty members in the Department of Criminal Justice strive for excellence of research and scholarly activity in many diverse ways.

Activities in the following categories are classified as research and scholarly activities. Only those categories specified in this academic unit guideline are to be considered for merit (and not all categories are required of all faculty).

1. Scholarship and/or creative activity as appropriate to the academic unit including activities in the discipline, in the scholarship of teaching and learning, and interdisciplinary activities.
 - a. Publications;
 - b. Presentations, scholarly and creative;
 - c. Grant funding and/or development activity that focuses on the advancement of knowledge in the discipline (which may include the scholarship of teaching and learning) and that is intended to lead to scholarly output;
2. Professional development;
3. Professional recognition;
4. Other research and scholarly activities as specified in this academic unit guideline.

Section 2.

Evaluation of research and scholarly activity is structured as a two-step process. A faculty member must receive an initial rating of satisfactory in this category in order to be eligible to receive additional points in this category. No additional points may be earned in this category if the faculty member is rated as unsatisfactory in this category.

Evidence of satisfactory activity may include any one or more of the following: A publication, earning or continuing appointment as a member of the Graduate Faculty, a new advanced degree (MA/MS/JD or higher) or a new professional certificate, or any combination of the list included below so as to attain a minimum of 2 points.

An unsatisfactory rating means that the faculty member has failed to attain the minimum of 2 points in this section.

A satisfactory rating means that the faculty member has met the minimum of 2 points.

A meritorious rating means that the faculty member has met the satisfactory rating and has accumulated 1 additional point from the activities below.

An outstanding rating means that the faculty member has met the satisfactory rating and has accumulated 2 additional points from the activities below.

An extraordinary rating means that the faculty member has met the satisfactory rating and has accumulated 3 additional points from the activities below.

Section 3.

Merit points for more than satisfactory performance of research and scholarly activity (points added to the satisfactory score of 2 points) are determined using the following lists:

Major Scholarly Activity

a.	Peer-reviewed article published in a professional journal	2 points, per article
b.	Book authorship, published in print or electronically (points may be claimed for each of 2 years}	2-4 points, per book
c.	Successful external grant or funding for peer- reviewed research proposals	1-3 points (per item)
d.	Successful external SOTAL grant or funding for peer-reviewed SOTAL research proposals	1-3 points (per item)
e.	A new advanced degree (JD/MA or higher)	2 points (per degree
f.	Textbook authorship (points may be claimed for each of 2 years)	2 points (per item)

Minor Scholarly Activity

a.	Running a scholarly workshop (e.g., OCCJE, ACJS, etc.)	2 points (max. 2 pts.)
b.	Book chapters, technical reports, monographs, government reports, professional written opinions, non-peer-reviewed articles, documented original research articles, and other forms of documented professional presentations (to scholarly or practitioner audiences) where the presentation combines a review of relevant literature and original research. reviews any of which may be intended to lead to publication, authorship of new editions of books or textbooks, translations of a books within the field, revision of entire manuscripts, or other instructional or research written materials (maximum of 3 points)	1 point (per item)
c.	Prizes, awards, or other special scholarly or professional recognition (depending on the award and with the chair's approval, maximum of 2 points)	0.5-2 pts. (per item)
d.	Editor, co-editor for a discipline's or SOTAL journal (per journal annually, not for each edition, maximum of 1 point)	0.5-1 point
e.	Submission of a research or SOTAL grant proposal (per proposal): Internal: 0.2-0.5 point External: 0.5-1 point	0.2-1 point
f.	A new certification within a professional field (max. 1 annually)	1 point
g.	Role of Director of institute or research group (max. 1 annually)	1 point
h.	Submission of contract proposal (i.e., commercial development in the field) which is intended to lead to scholarly output	0.5 point (per proposal)
i.	Election to office in a professional research society/group	0.5 point (max. 0.5 pt.)
9.5	Member of institute or research group	0.5 point
k.	Development activity that focuses on the advancement of knowledge in the discipline or SOTAL which is intended to lead to scholarly output	0.5 point (max. 0.5 pt.)
l.	Major presentation of a professional workshop to peers	0.5 point each (max. 2 pts.)
m.	Participation in multi-investigator proposals/grants/initiatives for special programs, instruments, educational initiatives, etc.	0.2 point each (max 0.5 pt.)
n.	Favorable peer-review of research or SOTAL grant proposal	0.2 point (per grant)
o.	Book reviews or encyclopedia articles {maximum of 1 point}	0.2 point (per item)
p.	Earning CLEs or CEUs (max. 2 points)	0.2 point (each)

q.	Minor presentation - scholarly or creative and related to the field (paper, talk, panel, poster, etc.) in a scholarly or professional meeting (e.g., OCCJE, ACJS, OACP, IACP NSF, IACA, etc.), (max. 1 point)	0.2 point (each)
r.	Software/media development related to the field which brings credit to the department or university (per product, max. 1 point)	0.2 point
s.	Discretionary points are available to the chair when faculty activities are not clearly captured by the above sub - categories. (max. 3 points)	

Section 4.

Notes pertaining to publications and other scholarly output:

For articles and other publications, the primary criterion for determination of the publication's quality will be peer-review, with secondary criteria also considered such as the depth of the article.

Where ranges of scores are given, articles which are peer-reviewed or published in peer-reviewed professional or scholarly journals or contexts or which are complex will be considered as more highly ranked and receive more points {i.e., a 'major' publication} while articles without peer-review, or articles that are less complex will be lower ranked and receive fewer points (i.e., a 'minor' publication). However, since these are not the only or most reliable indicators of quality, and because we do not wish to discourage publication in other contexts, faculty members may present other evidence supporting a higher ranking for an article or other scholarly work. The department chair will exercise discretionary power in deciding whether or not to accept the argument.

Articles that appear in conference proceedings should not be counted independently, *prima facie*, as faculty receive merit credit for these with the conference presentation. (This would be considered an example of 'double-dipping'.)

Publications may be counted at either the date of acceptance or the date of publication, but not both. The faculty member's success in publications is measured by the official promise to publish the work, and the length of time it takes for the publisher to get the work into print is not under the faculty member's control. The faculty member must provide a dated proof of acceptance if the acceptance date is used.

Article IX. Merit for Teaching.

Section 1.

Faculty members in the Department of Criminal Justice demonstrate excellence of teaching in many diverse ways.

Activities in the following categories are classified as teaching activities. Only those categories specified in this academic unit guideline are to be considered for merit (and not all categories are

required of all faculty).

1. Effective instruction as evidenced by student and/or peer evaluations and by documented participation in assessment of learning outcomes;
2. Activities related to the advising and mentoring of students;
3. Activities related to the scholarship of teaching and learning, including
 - a. the use of innovative teaching techniques;
 - b. curriculum development and/or revision;
 - c. program development and revision;
4. Activities related to accreditation;
5. Grant activity that focuses on student learning, teaching training, or 'action research' and that is not intended to lead to scholarly output;
6. This academic unit guideline does not require the submission of student comments. Samples of student comments may be included as supplementary evidence of teaching effectiveness;
7. Other teaching activities as specified in this academic unit guideline.

Section 2.

Evaluation of teaching activity is structured as a two-step process. A faculty member must receive an initial rating of satisfactory in this category in order to be eligible to receive additional points in this category. No additional points may be earned in this category if the faculty member is rated as unsatisfactory in this category.

The minimum requirement for a score of satisfactory in teaching (valued at 2 points) for all faculty members is to fulfill his or her teaching obligation of the courses assigned as defined by University Rules and attain a minimum combined-average or annual score of a minimum of 2.0 on a 5.0 scale on the faculty evaluations completed by students.

An unsatisfactory rating means that the faculty member has failed to fulfill his or her teaching obligation of the courses assigned or failed to attain this minimum score of the faculty evaluations completed by students, subject to the notes below.

A satisfactory rating means that the faculty member has met the minimum requirements and has earned 2 points as a result.

A meritorious rating means that the faculty member has met the satisfactory rating and has accumulated 1 additional point from the activities below.

An outstanding rating means that the faculty member has met the satisfactory rating and has accumulated 2 additional points from the activities below.

An extraordinary rating means that the faculty member has met the satisfactory rating and has accumulated 3 additional points from the activities below.

Section 3.

Merit points for more than satisfactory teaching performance (points added to the satisfactory score of 2 points) are determined using the following lists:

a.

	Effective instruction as evidenced by the results of standardized departmental student evaluations. The following additional points will be awarded for a more than satisfactory combined-average-annual score of 2.0 based on a 5.0 scale: A combined-average-annual score > 3.0 on a 5.0 scale A combined-average-annual score > 3.5 on a 5.0 scale A combined-average-annual score > 4.0 on a 5.0 scale A combined-average-annual score > 4.5 on a 5.0 scale	0.5 pts. 0.75 pts. 1 pt. 1.25 pts.
b.	Successful grants for curricular development	1-3 points
c.	Development (2 pts), co-development (1 pt.), of a newly developed and approved course curriculum	2 points
d.	Teaching awards or other special recognition of teaching excellence (depending on the award and with the chair's approval)	0.2-2 pts.
e.	Assignment as the primary faculty advisor to advise and mentor students (annual points depending on time involvement)	1-2 points
f.	Teaching an overload (per semester)	1 point
g.	Revision or co-revision, of an existing course, newly approved for change of mode	1 point
h.	Preparation by the faculty member of a newly taught course (including teaching a course online for the first time, 1 pt. per course, per mode)	1 point
i.	Effective instruction as evidenced by documented participation/leadership in assessment of learning outcomes (participation -0.2 point, taking the lead in assessment -1 pt., per academic year)	0.2-1 pt.
j.	Effective instruction as evidenced by documentation of a positive peer evaluation (max. 1 pt.)	0.5 pt. each
k.	Supervision of independent studies (per independent study)	0.5 pt.

I.	Implementation of innovative curriculum design/techniques/technology (such as the use of clickers, online testing, teleconferences, intelligent agents, specialized distance learning techniques, innovative teaching techniques, or any documented development activities related to the improvement of teaching (or greater student learning), or greater student retention, but not intended to lead to scholarly output, etc., max. of 2 pts.)	0.5 pt. each
m.	Other participation in activities related to curriculum/program development/revision {such as active collaboration, preparation of proposals, significant redevelopment of the methodology of how a course is taught, etc. - max 1 pt.)	0.5 pt.
n.	Grant activity that focuses on student learning, teacher training, or 'action research' which is not intended to lead to scholarly output.	0.5 pt.
o.	Effective instruction as evidenced by positive written or digital feedback provided by an individual student. {max of 1 point)	0.2 pt.
p.	Activities related to the sharing of advising and mentoring of students	0.2 pt. (annually)
q.	Attendance at teaching workshops (per workshop, max. of 1 point)	0.2 pt.
r.	Guest lecturing (per instance, up to 1 point)	0.2 pt.
s.	Discretionary points are available to the chair when faculty activities are not clearly captured by the above sub-categories. (max. 3 points)	

Section 4.

Notes regarding evaluation of teaching activities:

Faculty must request that students complete the standardized departmental faculty evaluation for each class during the fall and spring semesters. It is acknowledged that faculty cannot force students to complete these evaluations.

Standardized departmental faculty evaluations have two components: "Faculty Evaluation" and "Background Questions" (e.g., 'I had a strong desire to take this course,' 'The textbook was useful,' or 'Other instructional materials were useful'). Background questions that are included in these evaluations are not to be included when computing the combined-average-annual scores.

In lieu of evaluations, faculty may report any combination of activities from the list included below so as to attain the minimum number of 2 points for a satisfactory rating. In this circumstance, the failure to then attain the minimum of 2 points in the area of teaching would

result in an unsatisfactory rating in teaching while attaining the minimum of 2 points would result in a satisfactory rating in teaching.

Article X. Merit for Service.

Section 1.

Faculty members in the Department of Criminal Justice demonstrate excellence in providing service to their department, college, university, and communities in many diverse ways.

Activities in the following categories are classified as service activities. Only those categories specified In this academic unit guideline are to be considered for merit (and not all categories are required of all faculty).

1. Participation in professional organizations, including leadership positions;
2. Service to the University;
3. Service to the college and/or department/school;
4. Service to the community (must be discipline related service);
5. Grant activity that does not have a scholarly research of teaching component.

Section 2.

Evaluation of service activity is structured as a two-step process. A faculty member must receive an initial rating of satisfactory in this category in order to be eligible to receive additional points in this category. No additional points may be earned in this category if the faculty member is rated as unsatisfactory in this category.

The minimum requirement for a score of satisfactory in Service for all faculty members is based on attaining a minimum of 2 points from any combination of the list included below. A pattern of failure to perform this minimum amount of service results in a rating of unsatisfactory.

An unsatisfactory rating means that the faculty member has failed to attain the minimum of 2 points in this section.

A satisfactory rating means that the faculty member has met the minimum of 2 points.

A meritorious rating means that the faculty member has met the satisfactory rating and has accumulated 1 additional point from the activities below.

An outstanding rating means that the faculty member has met the satisfactory rating and has accumulated 2 additional points from the activities below.

An extraordinary rating means that the faculty member has met the satisfactory rating and has accumulated 3 additional points from the activities below.

Section 3.

Merit points for more than satisfactory teaching performance (points added to the satisfactory score of 2 points) are determined using the following lists:

a.	Executive committee officer of Faculty Senate, Akron- AAUP, or member of the Akron-AAUP Negotiating Committee, etc.	3 points
b.	Prizes, awards, or other special recognition for service-related activities, depending on the award and with the chair's approval.	1-2 points each
c.	Departmental official such as lab manager, sub- discipline chair, committee or task force chair or co- chair, search committee chair or co-chair, thesis or dissertation chair/co-chair/reader, assessment coordinator, faculty advisor/co-advisor for a departmental student organization, etc. (points dependent on time on task -for example thesis reading member earns 0.5 pt., dissertation chair earns 2 pts.)	0.5-2 points each
d.	Other Akron-AAUP Service Committee or departmental liaison	1 point each
e.	Activities related to public relations or promotion of department, college, or university including media and speaking requests from University Communications and Marketing.	0.2-1 point
f.	Chair or co-chair of a college, university, or community committee or task force	1 point each
g.	Membership on department, college, university, or search committee or task force, or service to other units within the university setting (Examples: 0.5 pt. for serving as an advisor for an Honor's Project, 1 point for significant committee work such as the Criminal Justice Steering Committee, Faculty Senate's Curriculum Review Committee, the UA Faculty Research Committee, or serving as Faculty Senator.) Note: Faculty may choose points either for the various leadership/chair roles or the member role (but not both).	0.5-1pt. each
h.	Service to the program or department which is intended to promote the growth of the program or recruitment of students such as Student Visit Days, retention activities, student extra-curricular outings, event planning such as arranging for seminars or extra- curricular speakers, developing program materials, preparation of bulletin boards, etc. (Minor activities such as Student Visit Days - 0.1 pt. each; activities involving more time commitment - 0.2-1point each, max. of 1 point annually.)	0.1-1 point

i.	Leadership or membership role on a local, state, regional, or national professional/educational/civic organization (0.2 pt. for membership, 0.5 pt. for leadership, max of 1 point for any combination)	0.2-1 point
j.	Holding an appointed or elected public office that is discipline related such as a public safety services commission appointed by a mayor, school safety task force as designated by a Board of Education, etc. (points depending each on time involvement, max. of 1 point)	0.2-1 point
k.	Discipline related service to the profession or community including but not limited to non-research related professional panels or talks, review of manuscripts and proposals for trade or professional journals, participation in professional organizations, committees, or panels (max. of 1 point annually)	0.5 per instance
l.	Testifying before legislative or congressional committees or task forces or consulting work (whether paid or unpaid, max 1 point)	0.5 pt. per instance
m.	Grant activity that does not have a scholarly research or teaching component.	0.5 pt.
n.	Serving as a Marshall (0.5 pt.) or Faculty representative (0.2 pt.) at Graduation	0.2-0.5 pt. per service
o.	Discipline-related outreach service to the community including but not limited to involvement in service organizations, social agencies, and cultural societies, service to governmental agencies, talks at K-12 schools, other activities that promote quality K-12 education, development of internship opportunities, recruitment events off-campus, etc. (max of 1 point for any combination)	0.2 point each
p.	Discretionary points are available to the chair when faculty activities are not clearly captured by the above sub-categories. (max. 3 points)	

Department of Criminal Justice Studies
Annual Merit Review Report

Name: Date: Period Under Review:	Approved weighting for this review: Scholarship: Teaching: Service: Requested weighting for next year's review (if different): Scholarship: Teaching: Service:
--	---

Using your completed Activity Report list all the activities and achievements below and indicate the points generated that you feel should be awarded for each activity or achievement in the 'Faculty Points' column. Attach the Activity Report and any other documentation you deem appropriate.

RESEARCH – Major Scholarly Activity			
Activity	Guideline #	Faculty Points	Chair Points
RESEARCH - Minor Scholarly Activity			
Activity	Guideline #	Faculty Points	Chair Points
TOTAL			

Teaching Activities			
Activity	Guideline #	Faculty Points	Chair Points
TOTAL			

Service Activities			
Activity	Guideline #	Faculty Points	Chair Points

TOTAL			