



Office of the Dean

Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences
Akron, OH 44325-1901

330-972-7880 Office
330-972-7222 Fax

DATE: May 2, 2007

TO: Elizabeth J. Stroble
Sr. Vice President, Provost and C.O.O.

FROM: Ronald F. Levant
Dean

RE: Merit Guidelines

The attached merit guidelines have been approved by the faculty of the Department of History on May 2, 2007.

I have approved all attached guidelines and criteria.

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

Walter L. Hays
Department Chair or Faculty Representative

5-2-07
Date

Alvin J. B.
Dean

5/2/07
Date

Paul J. Miller
Senior Vice President, Provost
and Chief Operating Officer

5/3/07
Date

**Department of History
CAC Merit Pay Guidelines**

Approved by bargaining unit on 13 December 2006

With proposed amendments after conversations with Dean Levant and Associate Dean Monroe on
21 February 2007, and e-mail discussions with Associate Dean Monroe on 27-28 February 2007

Merit weighting

(by rank and employment status in the categories of research and scholarship/teaching/service)

All tenure-stream faculty: 40/40/20

Professional Development Leave: 100/0/0 (appropriately pro-rated if PDL is less than year-long)

Fulltime instructors: 10/60/30

Fulltime lecturers: 0/100/0

N.B. These weightings will not necessarily reflect the apportionment of load.

N.B. Faculty on unpaid or sick leave will automatically receive ratings of 2 (satisfactory) in all categories for the portion of the year they are on leave. They may earn higher than a 2 for research, depending on accomplishments. The relative merit weighting for such faculty will not change.

Each autumn a three-person chair's advisory committee (CAC) shall be elected by secret ballot from all bargaining unit faculty in the department, excluding only the chair and anyone who may be on leave. No one shall serve on the CAC more frequently than every third year. The purpose of the CAC is to make recommendations to the chair on the rankings appropriate for individual faculty members' accomplishments.

Clarifications and caveats to the attached Merit Pay Guidelines

- Faculty should provide material to the chair and the CAC in order to make a case for weight assigned to accomplishments but recognize the decision of the chair (after he or she receives the recommendation of the CAC) as final arbiter of such cases as well as the determiner of the meaning and applicability of qualifiers such as "significant," "substantial," "minor," and "major," or terms such as "scholarly," "university- or college-wide," "progress," "project," and the like. It is also understood that work must be performed effectively in order for the merit to be credited. For example, a program director will not be judged meritorious merely for holding the position. The Chair must document any finding that a faculty member has not performed a task effectively. However, none of the above precludes faculty from filing grievances of their ratings under the terms of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
- While these merit guidelines aim to be inclusive of the range of professional activities of the Department of History faculty, they will inevitably omit meritorious activities. Individual faculty are thus allowed to make cases for having other activities and/or accomplishments considered.
- Texts are assumed to be single-authored unless otherwise stated; co-authored works shall be counted equally but for one less year as single-authored texts. As an exception to the above, co-authored articles or chapters appearing in books which will be counted one category down from that of single-authored articles or chapters.
- Faculty should provide material to make a case for merit to be assigned to public history projects the obvious equivalents of which are not listed, but the chair (after receiving the recommendation of the CAC) will be the final arbiter of how to weigh such accomplishments on an individual basis.
- "Years" will refer to either calendar years or academic years according to the dictates of the contract.

- Items are understood to be “or” such that any one item satisfies the requirement for the category except in cases where “and” appears in which case the item represents a minimum eligibility requirement for satisfying the criterion for that category regardless of other accomplishments.
- Unless otherwise indicated, “in the past year” is implied, “previous year” means the year just prior to the ‘past year.’
- Each itemized requirement is meant to mean “at least one.”
- Whether peer-reviewed publications appeared in electronic form or hard copy is not relevant.
- Publication refers to ‘original publication’ or “first edition” unless otherwise stated.
- During the first year in which these merit criteria are in effect, a faculty member may provide a report of meritorious activities over the last three academic years. Thereafter, ratings will be based solely on the accomplishments of the single year for which a merit raise is available.
- **While recognizing differences among fields of history, merit weighting under Research/Scholarship assumes that it is normal for an historian in a Ph.D.-granting program to publish a book every eight to ten years, and a peer-reviewed journal article every two to three years.**

Research/Scholarship

Unsatisfactory 1

Does not meet the criteria to qualify for satisfactory rating

Satisfactory 2

In order to receive a “2”, a faculty member must demonstrate progress on a significant research project. Examples of “progress” may include, but are not limited to: archival/library research, preliminary drafts of article(s), conference paper(s), essay(s) book(s), etc., submitted book proposal(s), book contract(s)

In addition, to receive a “2), a faculty member must accomplish at least one of the following:

Served as editor of a minor or regional journal or a book series
 Presented or served as a commentator on a panel at a national or regional conference
 Presented to a scholarly audience or lectured at a university other than UA
 Organized or co-organized a scholarly panel, conference, or lecture series at UA or in region
 Reviewed a scholarly book-length manuscript for a publisher
 Translated a less-than-book-length manuscript for a publisher
 Published a (previously published) scholarly work in another language
 Received an outside grant under \$1000
 Published a book review
 Published an encyclopedia entry of under 1,000 words
 Presented or served as a commentator at UA
 Served on the editorial board of a major journal
 Reviewed an article-length manuscript for a journal

Two or more of the above items plus progress on a significant research project satisfies the criteria for Meritorious (3) ranking

Three of any one kind of item plus progress on a significant research project satisfies the criteria for Meritorious (3) ranking

Meritorious 3

To receive a “3”, a faculty member must meet the requirements for a “2”, with additional accomplishments as outlined below:

Translated a book-length scholarly work for a publisher
 Gave an invited lecture or presentation to a scholarly audience at a university outside the U.S.
 Organized or co-organized a national conference
 Served as editor of a major journal

Received a minor (less than \$10K) outside grant in past 2 years
Defended or submitted a doctoral thesis in the past 2 years
Received a UA research grant
Published a review article in a peer-reviewed journal
Published an encyclopedia entry of at least 1,000 words

One of the above items satisfies the criteria for Meritorious (3) ranking.
Three or more of the above items satisfies the criteria for Outstanding (4) ranking
Four of any one kind of item satisfies the criteria for Outstanding (4) ranking

Outstanding 4

To receive a “4”, a faculty member must meet the requirements for a “2”, with additional accomplishments as outlined below:

Received a major (\$10K or more) grant in past 2 years
Published a peer-reviewed journal article of at least 7,500 words in a major (as defined by the norms of a field or subfield) journal in the past 2 years
Published a textbook or survey text in past 2 years
Edited volume of scholarly essays or primary source in past 2 years
Published a chapter or essay in a book or compendium volume in past 2 years
Published a peer-reviewed journal article of less than 7,500 words in the last year
Published a new edition of a previously published work, involving substantial revision

One of the above items satisfies the criteria for Outstanding (4) ranking.
Three or more of the above items satisfies the criteria for Extraordinary (5) ranking
Four of any one item satisfies the criteria for Extraordinary (5) ranking

Extraordinary 5

To receive a “5”, a faculty member must meet the requirements for a “2”, with additional accomplishments as outlined below

Published a scholarly book (based on original research) in past 3 years
Published a peer-reviewed journal article of at least 7,500 words in a major (as defined by the norms of a field or subfield) journal in the past year.

One of the above items satisfies the criteria for Extraordinary (5) ranking.

Teaching

Unsatisfactory 1

Does not meet the criteria to qualify for Satisfactory rating

Satisfactory 2

In order to receive a “2”, a faculty member must dependably discharge teaching duties such as issuing and following a syllabus for each course, holding regular office hours, grading and returning work, and responding to students in a timely fashion.

In addition, the faculty member must accomplish two of the following:

Participated on a peer review committee in the past two years
Taught at least one general education or service course and received average ranking on student evaluations
Attended a workshop related to teaching

Meritorious 3

To receive a “3”, a faculty member must meet the requirements for a “2”, with additional accomplishments as outlined below:

Revised existing courses to significant extent
Participated in conducting a workshop related to teaching
Presented or served as a commentator of a panel related to teaching at a minor conference
Presented public or teaching lecture at UA outside the department
Served as chair on more than one doctoral committee
Served as a co-advisor on more than three M.A. thesis committees

One of the above items satisfies the criterion for Meritorious (3) ranking
Three or more of the above satisfies the criteria for Outstanding (4) ranking

In addition to the above, **both** of the following **must be achieved** to meet the criteria for this category:

Taught one general education or service course in the past two years
Received a positive evaluation from a peer review committee in the past four years, as outlined in departmental peer review guidelines

Outstanding 4

To receive a “4”, a faculty member must meet the requirements for a “2”, with additional accomplishments as outlined below:

Contributed to research supporting program assessment/teaching
Developed and taught a new course or courses during the past 2 years
Organized graduate or undergraduate conference
Received consistent and exceptionally high ranking on student evaluations in past 2 years

One of the above items satisfies the criterion for Outstanding (4) ranking
Three or more of the above items satisfies the criteria for Extraordinary (5) ranking

In addition to the above, **both** of the following **must be achieved** to meet the criteria for this category:

Taught at least one general education or service course in the past two years
Received a positive evaluation from a peer review committee in the past four years, as outlined in departmental peer review guidelines

Extraordinary 5

To receive a “5”, a faculty member must meet the requirements for a “2”, with additional accomplishments as outlined below:

Published commentary or research related to classroom teaching
Held workshops related to teaching/pedagogical techniques
Presented or served as commentator of a panel related to teaching at a major conference

In addition to any one of the above, **both** of the following **must be achieved** to meet the criteria for this category:

Taught at least one general education or service course in the past year
Received a positive evaluation from a peer review committee in the past four years, as outlined in departmental peer review guidelines

Service

Unsatisfactory 1

Does not meet the criteria to qualify for Satisfactory rating

Satisfactory 2

In order to receive a "2", a faculty member must regularly attend department and assigned committee meetings.

And they must accomplish at least one of the following:

Served on a search committee for a tenure track hire
Served on a departmental committee
Participated in a UA hearing (e.g., student discipline)

Meritorious 3

Served on a university- or college-wide committee or advisory board
Served as liaison to the AAUP or other such major university body
Chaired a major departmental committee
Served as a minor officer for a major professional organization
Served as a major officer for a minor professional organization
Evaluated a non-UA tenure file
Chaired a search committee for a visiting instructor position

One of the above items plus meeting the requirements for a "2" satisfies the criterion for Meritorious (3) ranking.

Three or more of the above plus meeting the requirements for a "2" qualifies for Outstanding (4) ranking

Outstanding 4

Served with distinction as Associate Chair
Chaired a major departmental committee such as the Scholarship Committee, RTP, etc.
Chaired a university- or college-wide committee or advisory board (excluding hearing pool or other such committees which do not require regular participation)
Served with distinction as Director of either Graduate or Undergraduate studies
Served with distinction as Director of Humanities or Director of World Civilizations program
Served with distinction as coordinator of teacher education
Chaired a search for a tenure track hire
Served as major officer in a major scholarly organization

One of the above items plus meeting the requirements for a "2" satisfies the criterion for Outstanding (4) ranking.

Two or more of the above plus meeting the requirements for a "2" qualifies for Extraordinary (5) ranking

Extraordinary 5

See above