Salary Policies and Procedures
Department of Elementary Education
2012 - 2013

PURPOSE

The purpose of the salary plan for the Department of Elementary Education is to ensure just distribution of all salary monies available to the subunit in keeping with University salary policy. The plan shall be consistent with appropriate University and College guidelines and regulations, while protecting the interests of all salary subunit members.

POLICY

Base Component
The base component, comprised of 30% of salary adjustment funds, is awarded for competently performing the professional duties for which the individual is employed and qualifies the faculty member to share in the salary adjustment dollars to be distributed in equal percentages based upon the previous year's salary. To meet this base component, a faculty member must have minimum of: 40 points in Performance in Major Assignment; 35 points in Professional Productivity & Growth; and 25 points in Service to the University & Profession for a total base component of 100.

Merit Component
"Merit," as used in this document, refers to professional performance which is above and beyond that level of the excellence normally expected from every faculty member in the Department of Elementary Education, and which has contributed significantly to the quality of departmental performance and the achievement of departmental goals.

The merit component will be comprised of the remaining 70% of salary adjustment funds. Merit is determined according to the departmental point schedule (as described within Procedures). Faculty members will qualify for Merit if the resultant total number of points reaches or exceeds 130 points.

PROCEDURES

1. All faculty members must submit an annual report in a standardized format arranged and prepared as specified in Appendix A. Failure to adhere to the standardized format, as determined by a majority vote of Salary Committee members, will result in the disqualification of the **report for the merit process**. Activities described in the report are to cover only the period from March 1 to the end of the following February.

2. All reports submitted by faculty members will be distributed to and evaluated by the Departmental Salary Committee, of the Department of Elementary Education.

3. Each member of the Salary Committee will read each report. As committee members review the reports, it may be necessary to consult with faculty members for clarification purposes. If clarification or documentation is necessary, the Chairperson for the Salary Committee will make the request in writing or electronically. Within three business days of the request, the   faculty

1

member must provide the documentation/clarification or show evidence of efforts to gain this documentation. Failure to do so will result in the disqualification of the report from the merit process. In the event a faculty member has load credit for a category not described in the "Performance in Major Assignment" rubric, a member of the Salary Committee will meet with the faculty member to determine criteria for that load assignment, and it will be added to the rubric.

4. The Committee will meet to discuss each person's report and will determine a total score by combining the weighted score earned in the "Performance in Major Assignment" rubric, with the total points earned in the "Professional Productivity and Growth" and "Service to the University and Profession" sections on the Merit Evaluation Form. When an item on a report is not listed in the Salary Document, including those listed as "Other," the committee members will discuss which item it is most like and assign points accordingly. Individual members of the Salary Committee may not participate in, nor be present for, nor vote, in consideration of their own reports.

   In order to receive merit pay, a minimum total of 130 points must be earned. These points must be distributed, as follows, among the 3 areas: a minimum of 50 points in Performance in Major Assignment; a minimum of 45 points in Professional Productivity & Growth; and a minimum of 35 points in Service to the University & Profession. In the event that no faculty member earns 130 points with the correct distribution, the salary adjustment dollars allocated to merit pay will be returned to the College.

5 The faculty members will be ranked from high to low according to the total number of points earned by their annual reports. Faculty members achieving the required base component score will qualify to share in the salary adjustment dollars to be distributed in equal percentages based upon the previous year's salary. Faculty members qualifying for merit will receive a portion of the allocated merit component based on the number of points earned by the faculty member. The dollar value of this portion will be determined by dividing the total money available within the merit allocation on a percentage basis.   Calculations will be conducted as follows: The total points for all candidates will be added and each candidate's points will be divided by the total number of points for all candidates to determine the proportion (or percent) of merit money awarded to each candidate.

Sample (using #s from our document): 167 + 223 + 265 = 655

> 167 divided by 655 = 25.4 %
> 223 divided by 655 = 34.0 %
> 265 divided by 655 = 40.4 %

Individual feedback will then be provided to each applicant regarding ranking and proportion of merit money to be awarded. Individuals may request a meeting with the Salary Committee Chair for further clarification of merit decisions.

PROCEDURES FOR APPEAL OF MERIT DECISIONS

1.   A Salary Appeals Committee shall be a duly elected body determined by the voting membership of the department prior to submission of the merit reports. The committee, which will review any forthcoming appeals, will be made up of three regular faculty members who are not currently serving on the Salary Committee.

2.   The bases for appeal of a merit decision are as follows:

   a.   Evidence of clerical errors in the tabulation or computation of ratings and rankings

   b.   Evidence of failure to follow established departmental procedures outlined in the adopted salary document and official departmental notices.

3.   The steps for appealing a merit decision shall be as follows:

   a.   A person who wishes to appeal a merit award must present a letter explaining the grounds for appeal to the Departmental Chairperson of the Salary Appeals Committee within ten working days from the date of the letter of notification of the merit letter.

   b.   The Departmental Chairperson of the Salary Appeals Committee will disseminate a copy of the letter to the members of the Appeals Committee. The chair will have available the salary documents for the Appeals Committee to review prior to a hearing.

   c.   The Salary Appeals Committee will set a time for a hearing within fourteen working days after receiving an appeal letter from the Departmental Chairperson.

   d.   At the appeal hearing, the following procedures shall be followed:

      i.   Only the concerned parties named below shall be present throughout the proceedings ii-vii.

ii.   The appellant shall have a maximum of twenty (20) minutes without interruption to present his/her case.

iii.   Immediately following the appellant's presentation, the Salary Appeals Committee shall have a maximum of fifteen (15) minutes to question the appellant.

iv.   Immediately following the first questioning period, the salary chairperson (or designee) shall have a maximum of twenty (20) minutes without interruption to present the committee's case.

v.   Immediately following the chairperson's (or designee's) presentation, the Salary Appeals Committee shall have a maximum of fifteen (15) minutes to question the chairperson (or designee).

i.   Following the presentations and questioning periods, both parties [the chairperson (or designee) and appellant] shall have a maximum of ten (10) minutes each to react to the presentation. The appellant shall react first.

vii.   After all parties have been heard, the Salary Appeals Committee shall have a   maximum of twenty (20) minutes to question all presenters.

e.   After the Salary Appeals committee hearing, the appeals committee will respond to the appellant with a decision within ten working days.

f.   If the appeal is denied, the appellant may then appeal to the departmental chairperson.

g. If the appeal is approved, salary adjustments will be made in accordance with the policy outlined in the Faculty and Professional Personnel Handbook, 4.9, page 144.

Sample Evaluation

Faculty Member A

Committee Voting:

Performance in Major Assignment score	65
Professional Productivity and Growth score	30
Service to the University and Profession score	72
Total Points	167

Faculty Member B

Committee Voting:

Performance in Major Assignment score	60
Professional Productivity and Growth score	91
Service to the University and Profession score	72
Total Points	223

Faculty Member C

Committee Voting:

Performance in Major Assignment score	71
Professional Productivity and Growth score	84
Service to the University and Profession score	110
Total Points	265

Merit Calculations

Calculations of Merit Based on Three Faculty Members:

Faculty Member A: 25.4% of merit money pool

Faculty Member B: 34% of merit money pool

Faculty Member C: 40.4% of merit money pool

Appendix A

Annual Report Format

Name

March 1, 20-- to February 28, 20—

I.   Performance in Major Assignment

i.   Major Assignments

For each semester within the merit year, indicate the number of hours allocated to your major assignment and the total number of hours assigned. In addition, indicate the total number of hours in your major assignment with respect to the total number of hours assigned for the merit year under consideration with the corresponding percentage of major assignment to total hours.

For example:

> Spring, 2010: 9 of 12 hours
> Summer, 2010: 6 of 9 hours
> Fall, 2010: 9 of 12 hours
> Total Major Assignments: 24 of 33 hours (73%)

A. Teaching

Base Component (Required Documentation)

1. Describe your major assignment for the merit year being submitted for consideration (March 1 to the end of the following February). Indicate the mean rating for the items in each of the categories listed below for three classes. Give the category number, followed by the mean rating of the items in that category (see Appendix C).

> #1   Instructor Evaluation (Six items)
> #2   Course Evaluation (Five items)

For example:

	C#1	C#2
EDEL 400	4.88	4.74

Merit (Required Additional Documentation)

1. Describe use of technology in the classroom.
2. Describe course improvements made.
3. Include peer/chair reviews in the folder you submit.
4. Describe how you incorporated diversity issues throughout your courses.

B. PDS Work

Base Component (Required Documentation)

1. List PDS-L Evaluation scores.

Merit (Required Additional Documentation)

1. Describe professional development activities for teachers/student teachers in PDS.

2. Describe time commitment and dissemination of knowledge (newsletter, School Board meetings, PTO).

C. Student Teaching
Base Component (Required Documentation)

1. For student teacher supervision, indicate the mean ratings received from student teachers, and from supervising teachers, in each of the three categories evaluated (Professional Qualities, Professional Skills, and Managerial Skills). In the event, mean ratings are not available, provide documentation of this outcome and provide all student comments submitted through the evaluation process.

Merit (Required Additional Documentation)

1. Describe contact with the student teachers and cooperating teachers including visits and feedback.
2. Describe seminars or meetings held with students.
3. Describe any modeling of teaching that was done.
4. Describe resources that were provided to meet the needs of student teacher.

D. Special Assigned Leave
Base Component (Required Documentation)

1. Submit copy of final report.
2. Describe which objectives that were stated in application were met.

Merit (Required Additional Documentation)

1. Give evidence that Special Assigned Leave activities/results were presented to Elementary Education faculty and/or disseminated to entities outside the department.

E. Program Development
Base Component (Required Documentation)

1. Describe activities associated with Program Development.

Merit (Required Additional Documentation)

1. Obtain recommendation of Chairperson of the Elementary Education Department documenting satisfactory performance of activities.

F. Program Area Leader
Base Component(Required Documentation)

1. Document meetings held (i.e. meeting minutes).

Merit (Required Additional Documentation)

1. Describe how you fostered collegiality among faculty.
2. Describe opportunities that were provided for faculty to develop professionally (presentations, consulting, book discussions, etc.)
3. Describe how information was shared with faculty regarding department, college, state, and national initiatives.

    4. Describe any new projects that were initiated for Program Area or department.

G. Director of Doctoral Programs
Base Component (Required Documentation)
    1. Document duties completed within the performance of this assignment.

Merit (Required Additional Documentation)
    1. Describe communication with potential and current doctoral students.
    2. Describe attempts to seek out ways to recruit doctoral students.

A. Project and/or Grant Work
Base Component (Required Documentation)
    1. Document completed work for project or grant.

Merit (Required Additional Documentation)
    1. Describe any areas in which work exceeded what was proposed.

ii. <u>Awards for Teaching</u>
Describe the award indicating whether it would be classified as international/national, regional/state, or local.

I. Professional Productivity and Growth

<u>Format for Publications</u>
List published professional publications (Indicate those refereed with an *) in the order below. Manuscripts that are accepted or in-press may be listed and should include documentation of status (but may not then appear in other merit year applications). Include in each citation the classification (research or practitioner/conceptual), tier, and the readership level, when applicable.

<u>For example</u>:
3. *Edmunds, K. & Tancock, S. (2003). Incentives: The effects on the reading motivation of fourth-grade students. Reading Research & Instruction, 42, (2), 17-38 (Research, Tier 3)

Tier	Acceptance Rate	Points
1	<10%	10
2	10%-20%	6
3	>20%	3

A. Writing
    1. Article (research) in refereed journal, international/national, sole author
    2. Article (research) in refereed journal, international/national, first author
    3. Article (research) in refereed journal, international/national, co-author
    4. Article (research) in non-refereed journal, International/national

5. Article (research) in refereed journal, state
6. Article (research) in non-refereed journal, state
7. Article (practitioner/conceptual) in refereed journal, international/national, sole author
8. Article (practitioner/conceptual) in refereed journal, international/national, first author
9. Article (practitioner/conceptual) in refereed journal, international/national, co-author
10. Article (practitioner/conceptual) in non-refereed journal, International/national
11. Article (practitioner/conceptual) in refereed journal, state
12. Article (practitioner/conceptual) in non-refereed journal, state
13. Book, new or revised, sole author, major publisher, scholarly
14. Book, new or revised, sole author, major publisher, practical
15. Book, new or revised, co-author, major publisher, scholarly
16. Book, new or revised, co-author, major publisher, practical
17. Book, new or revised, sole author,   minor publisher, scholarly
18. Book, new or revised, sole author, minor publisher, practical
19. Book, new or revised, co-author, minor publisher, scholarly
20. Book, new or revised, co-author, minor publisher, practical
21. Chapter or monograph, sole author
22. Chapter or monograph, co-author
23. Book review for refereed national journal
24. Conference proceedings paper
25. Professional newsletter
26. Professional column

B. Papers and Presentations
List professional presentations made within the merit year (Indicate those refereed with an *).

1. Keynote speaker, international/national conference
2. Refereed presentation, intntl./nat. conf.
3. Keynote speaker, regional/state conference
4. Refereed paper, regional/state conference
5. Non-refereed presentation a conference
6. Paper presented at other conference
7. Keynote speaker, local conference
8. Local presentation (no stipend)

C. Editorial Activities
List Editorial Activities.
1. Editor

1. Book Editor, new or revised
2. Editor/Co-Editor of nat. professional journ.
3. Associate editor of national refereed journ.
4. Editor of state professional journal
5. Associate editor of state journal
6. Editor of Newsletter
    1. International/National
    2. State/Regional
    3. Local
7. Guest Editor (single issue) for nat. journal
8. Guest editor of state journal
9. Guest Reviewer, national journal
2. Editorial Board Member
    1. International/National
    2. State/Regional
3. Manuscript reviewer, major publisher
4. Review for federal agency
5. Review for grant proposals

D. Grants
List grants received. Indicate competitive grants with an asterisk. Use the following format for grants:

*Project Co-Director (with L. Mullen) *TLC: Technology Learning Circles.* Funding Agency, Coca-Cola Foundation, 1999 ($25,000).

Grant Value	Points – Funded
< or = $1000	3
> $1,000 and < or = $5,000	6
> $5000 and < or = $15,000	10
> $15,000 and < or = $25,000	12
> $25,000 and < or = $50,000	15
> $50,000 and < or = $75,000	20
> $75,000 and < or = $100,000	25
> $100,000	30
Each additional $100,000	5

E. Professional Growth Activities
F. Award for Professional Productivity
G. Other

II. **Service to the University and Profession**
Please note for what portion of a semester you served as a sub for another faculty member. For semester-long subs, a portion of the points will be awarded
I. **BSU Service**

A. Chair, University Committee
B. Vice-Chair, University Committee
C. Secretary, University Committee
D. Chair, College Committee
E. Vice-Chair, College Committee
F. Secretary, College Committee
G. Chair, Departmental Committee
H. Secretary, Departmental Committee
I. Member, University Committee
J. Member, College Committee
K. Member, Departmental Committee
L. Mentor, Business Fellows
M. Mentor to other faculty member

II. **Other Service to the Department**
A. Chair, Doctoral Committee
B. Dissertation Director
C. Member, Doctoral Committee
D. Member, Masters Thesis Committee
E. Honors Project Advisor
F. Direct Independent Study
G. Program Development (without load credit)
 1. Initiate new program
 2. Develop new course
 3. Direct existing program --(Germany, EDEL-O, Jamaica)
 4. Major course revision through iLearn Institute
H. Other

III. **Professional Service (International, National, Regional, State, Local)**
A. Conference Work (all levels)
 1. Planning Committee
 2. Proposal Reviewer
 3. Volunteer/Facilitator/Moderator
B. Office in Professional Association
 1. International/National
 2. Regional/State
 3. Local
C. Member of Committee, Professional Assn.
 1. International//National
 2. Regional/State
 3. Local
D. Awards for Service
 1. International/National

2. Regional/State
3. Local

E. Consulting

1. International/national/state/local

F. Other

Appendix B
Annual Report/Merit Evaluation Form

Performance in Major Assignment

BASE COMPONENT	55	40	25
Teaching	All categories reflect averages between 4.6-5.0.	All categories reflect averages between 4.0-4.5.	Categories reflect averages that are predominately 3.0 and below.
PDS Work	PDS-L Evaluation average is 4.0 or higher	PDS-L Evaluation average is 3.5 or higher	PDS-L Evaluation average is 3.0 or higher
Student Teaching	Positive evaluations from student teachers and cooperating teachers	Average or mixed evaluations by student teachers and cooperating teachers.	Low student teaching and cooperating teacher evaluations
Special Assigned Leave	Copy of report is submitted. Evidence is provided that all objectives were met as stated in application.	Copy of report is submitted. Evidence is provided that most objectives were met as stated in application.	Copy of report is not submitted. Evidence that objectives were met is not provided.
Program Development	Provides excellent evidence of performance of duties/activities.	Provides evidence of performance of duties/activities.	No evidence of performance of duties/activities.
Program Area Leader	Meets at regularly scheduled times and additional times as needed	Meets at regularly scheduled times	Does not meet at regularly scheduled times; often cancels meetings
Director of Doctoral Programs	Provides excellent evidence of performance of duties/activities	Provides evidence of performance of duties/activities	No evidence of performance of duties/activities
Project and/or Grant Work	Conscientiously completes work for project or grant; goes "above and beyond" what is required	Meets deadlines and work assignments for grant or project	Does not meet deadlines or complete work assignments for grant or project
TOTAL POINTS			
BASE COMPONENT SCORE (Total points divided by # of selected areas)			

MERIT DOCUMENTATION	25	15	5
Teaching	Exemplary use of technology in classroom is documented. Continual course improvement (which is over and above technology) is described. Peer/chair reviews are exemplary. Incorporates diversity issues throughout courses taught.	Proficient use of technology integration in the classroom is documented. Some evidence of course improvement (which is over and above technology) is described. Peer/chair reviews are consistently good. Introduces diversity issues in some courses taught or occasionally addresses diversity is all courses.	Limited integration of technology in the classroom is documented. Limited evidence of course improvement (which is over and above technology) is described. Peer/chair reviews are negative. Does not show any evidence of incorporating diversity in courses taught.
PDS Work	Evidence of exemplary professional development activities for teachers/student teachers in PDS Evidence of exemplary time commitment and dissemination of knowledge (newsletter, School Board mtgs., PTO)	Evidence of satisfactory professional development activities for teachers/student teachers in PDS Evidence of satisfactory time commitment and dissemination of knowledge (newsletter, School Board mtgs., PTO)	Lack evidence of quality professional development activities for teachers/student teachers in PDS Lacks evidence of adequate time commitment and dissemination of knowledge (newsletter, School Board mtgs., PTO)

Student Teaching	Frequent contact with the student teachers and cooperating teachers including consistent visits and feedback
	
	Seminars or meetings held when appropriate that cover the needs of student teachers
	  Modeling of teaching
	  behaviors when appropriate
	  and if needed.
	
	  Provision of a variety of
	  resources that meet the
	  needs of student teacher.
		Contact with student teachers and cooperating teachers including feedback.
		
		Infrequent seminars or meetings held.
		
		Indirect discussion of teaching strategies and approaches.
		
		Some but not many resources are made available.
			Infrequent contact and lack of consistent feedback.
			
			Minimal contact with student teachers
			
			No or very little discussion of how to improve teaching
			
			Little or no resources made available

Special Assigned Leave	Special Assigned Leave activities/results are presented	Special Assigned Leave activities/results are	Special Assigned Leave activities/results are not

	for Elementary Education faculty and disseminated to external entities.	disseminated to Elementary Education faculty or external entities.	shared with Elementary Education faculty or external entities.
Program Development	Provides a letter from the Chairperson of the Elementary Education Dept. documenting exemplary completion of activities.	Provides a letter from the Chairperson of the Elementary Education Dept. documenting satisfactory completion of activities.	Does not include a letter of recommendation from the Chair of the Elem. Ed. Dept.
Program Area Leader	Fosters collegiality among faculty Regularly provides opportunities for faculty to develop professionally (presentations, consulting, book discussions, etc.) Regularly shares information with faculty regarding department, college, state, and national initiatives Regularly initiates new projects for Program Area or department	Maintains positive relationships with faculty Occasionally provides opportunities for some faculty to develop professionally Occasionally shares information with faculty regarding department, college, state, and national initiatives Occasionally initiates new projects for Program Area or department	Makes no effort to foster collegial relationships Does not provide opportunities for faculty to develop professionally Does not share information with faculty regarding department, college, state, and national initiatives Rarely initiates new projects for Program Area or department
Director of Doctoral Programs	Communicates regularly and often with potential and current doctoral students Seeks out ways to recruit doctoral students	Communicates regularly with potential and current doctoral students Responds to inquiries from prospective doctoral students	Spends little time communicating with potential or current doctoral students Is sporadic in response to doctoral program inquiries
Project &/or Grant Work	Conscientiously completes work for project or grant; goes "above and beyond" what is required	Meets deadlines and work assignments for grant or project	Does not meet deadlines or complete work assignments for grant or project
AWARDS FOR TEACHING	International/National		10
	Regional/State		6
	Local		4
MERIT SCORE (Total divided by # of selected areas)			
BASE COMPONENT SCORE (from above)			

FINAL SCORE FOR PERFORMANCE IN MAJOR ASSIGNMENT			

Professional Productivity and Growth

I. Publications

Tier	Acceptance Rate	Points
1	<10%	10
2	10%-20%	6
3	>20%	3

WRITING			
1		Article (research) in refereed journal, international/national, sole author	30 +Tier
2		Article (research) in refereed journal, international/national, first author	25 + Tier
3		Article (research) in refereed journal, international/national, co- author	20 + Tier
4		Article (research) in non-refereed journal, international/national	5
5		Article (research) in refereed journal, state	5 + Tier
6		Article (research) in refereed journal, state	3
7		Article (practitioner/conceptual) in refereed journal, international/national, sole author	25 + Tier
8		Article (practitioner/conceptual) in refereed journal, international/national, first author	20 + Tier
9		Article (practitioner/conceptual) in refereed journal, international/national, co-author	15 + Tier
10		Article (practitioner/conceptual) in non-refereed journal, international/national	5
11		Article (practitioner/conceptual) in refereed journal, state	5 + Tier
12		Article (practitioner/conceptual) in non-refereed journal, state	3
13		Book, new or revised, sole author,	30

		major publisher, scholarly	
14		Book, new or revised, sole author, major publisher, scholarly	20
15		Book, new or revised, co-author, major publisher, scholarly	25
16		Book, new or revised, co-author, major publisher, practical	15
17		Book, new or revised, sole author, minor publisher, scholarly	12
18		Book, new or revised, sole author, minor publisher, practical	10
19		Book, new or revised, co-author, minor publisher scholarly	6
20		Book, new or revised, co-author, minor publisher, practical	5
21		Chapter or monograph, sole author	15
22		Chapter or monograph, co-author	10
23		Book Review for refereed national journal	5+Tier
24		Conference Proceedings Paper	5
25		Professional Newsletter	3
26		Professional Column	3
PAPERS and PRESENTATIONS			
1		Keynote speaker, international/national conference	20
2		Refereed presentation, international/national conference	15
3		Keynote speaker, regional/state conference	10
4		Refereed paper, regional/state conference	5
5		Non-refereed presentation a conference	5
6		Paper presented at other conference	5
7		Keynote speaker, local conference	5
8		Local presentation (no stipend)	1 point each (up to 12)
EDITORIAL ACTIVITIES			
1		Book Editor, new or revised	25
2		Editor/Co-Editor of nat. professional journal	30
3		Associate editor of national refereed journal	20
4		Editor of state professional	10

		journal	
5		Associate editor of state journal	7
6a		Editor of Newsletter – International/National	8
6b		Editor of Newsletter – State/Regional	6
6c		Editor of Newsletter – Local	2
7		Guest Editor (single issue) for nat. journal	10
8		Guest editor of state journal	5
9		Guest Reviewer, national journal	2
10a		Editorial Board Member – International/National	10
10b		Editorial Board Member – State/Regional	5
11		Manuscript reviewer, major publisher	3
12		Review for federal agency	2
13		Review for grant proposals	2
GRANTS			
	< or = $1000		5
	> $1,000 and < or = $5,000		7
	> $5000 and < or = $15,000		10
	> $15,000 and < or = $25,000		12
	> $25,000 and < or = $50,000		15
	> $50,000 and < or = $75,000		20
	> $75,000 and < or = $100,000		25
	> $100,000		30
	Each additional $100,000		5
PROFESSIONAL GROWTH ACTIVITIES			
			Up to 3
AWARD FOR PROFESSIONAL PRODUCTIVITY			
	International/National		10

	Regional/State		6
	Local		4
OTHER			
Final Score – **Professional Productivity & Growth**			

Service to the University and Profession

BSU SERVICE (for semester long subs, a portion of the points will be awarded)		
A	Chair, University Committee	10
B	Vice-Chair, University Committee	9
C	Secretary, University Committee	8
D	Chair, College Committee	8
E	Vice-Chair, College Committee	7
F	Secretary, College Committee	6
G	Chair, Departmental Committee	6
H	Secretary, Departmental Committee	5
I	Member, University Committee	5
J	Member, College Committee	3
K	Member, Departmental Committee	2
L	Mentor, Business Fellows	2
M	Mentor to other faculty member	2
OTHER SERVICE TO THE DEPARTMENT		
A	Chair, Doctoral Committee	6
B	Dissertation Director	5
C	Member, Doctoral Committee	4
D	Member, Masters Thesis Committee	4
E	Honors Project Advisor	2
F	Direct Independent Study (no reimbursement)	2
G	Student Teaching Interviews	2
H1	Initiate new program (without load credit/reimbursement)	10
H2	Develop new course	3
H3	Major course revision through iLearn Institute	3
H4	Direct existing program (Germany, EDEL-O, Jamaica)	8
I	Other	1 point each (up to 5)
PROFESSIONAL SERVICE (International/National/Regional/State/Local)		
A1	Conference Planning Committee	5
A2	Conference Proposal Reviewer	4
A3	Volunteer/Facilitator/Moderator	1 - 2
B1	Office in Professional Organization – International/National	10
B2	Office in Professional Organization – Regional/State	8
B3	Office in Professional Organization – Local	6
C1	Member of Committee Professional Organization – International/National	8
C2	Member of Committee Professional Organization – Regional/State	6

C3	Member of Committee Professional Organization – Local	4
D1	Award for Service – International/National	10
D2	Award for Service – Regional/State	6
D3	Award for Service – Local	4
E	Consulting – International/National/State/Local	1 each up to 10
F	Other	
Final Score – SERVICE TO UNIVERSITY & PROFESSION		

FINAL SCORES	Performance in Major Assignment	
	Professional Productivity & Growth	
	Service to the University & Profession	
ANNUAL REPORT TOTAL POINTS		

Based on my (our) evaluation of the performance of this faculty:

_____   We recommend this faculty member for merit consideration.

_____   We do not recommend this faculty member for merit consideration.

Appendix C
Student Evaluation for Face-to-Face and Online Courses

Instructor Evaluation	1: Strongly Disagree	2: Disagree	3: Neutral	4: Agree	5: Strongly Agree
My instructor explains the course objectives clearly.					
My instructor explains course content clearly.					
My instructor uses effective examples and illustrations.					
My instructor is respectful when I have a question or comment.					
My instructor provides feedback that helps me improve my performance in the class.					
My instructor is available for consultation (e.g., after class, email, office hours, or by appointment).					
Please provide any additional written comments on the faculty's strengths and weaknesses.			*(Comment box)*		
Course Evaluation	1: Strongly Disagree	2: Disagree	3: Neutral	4: Agree	5: Strongly Agree
This course has clear objectives.					
This course is effective in meeting its objectives.					
This course has assignments related to the objectives of the course.					
This course has a clear grading system.					
This course broadens my perspective and/or knowledge.					
Please provide any additional written comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the course. You may comment on such things as the use of assignments, text(s), exercises, exams, etc.			*(Comment box)*		

Appendix D
Peer Evaluation of Online Courses

Course:
Instructor:
Reviewer:
Date:

1. **Content**
   - How does the content of the course reflect the course's title, description, and objectives?
   - How does the content of the course address current research and best practices for the topics covered?
   - How does the instructor access issues of diversity as part of the content?

2. **Communication**
   - Does the instructor provide good communication via announcements, use of the discussion board, syllabus, and/or course calendar?
   - How does the instructor foster communication among students through the discussion board, live chats, and/or small-group work?

3. **Teaching Strategies**
   - Does the instructor offer a variety of learning opportunities, assignments, and projects?
   - What forms of media are used to foster student learning, make learning interesting, and motivate students to learn (i.e. Power Points, Internet sites, readings, online texts, videos, transcripts, interviews, surveys, case studies)?
   - How does the instructor use grouping modes to foster learning, communication, and collaboration?

4. **Organization**
   - Is the organization of and navigation through online materials simple and user-friendly?
   - Are multiple access points provided for instructional and informational support?
   - Is there a predictable lesson/module format that allows students to work efficiently through learning activities?

5. **Assessment**
   - How does the instructor provide clear assessment information (i.e. rubrics)?

6. **Summary**
   - What is the overall impression of the quality of the instruction given in this course?

7. **Recommendations**
   - What suggestions or recommendations could be given to this instructor to improve this course?

Appendix E
Peer Evaluation of Face-to-Face Courses

Course:
Instructor:
Reviewer:
Date:

1. **Content**
   - How does the content presented reflect the course's title, description, and objectives?
   - What is the content being taught within the lesson?
   - How does the content address current research and best practices for the topics covered?
   - How does the instructor access issues of diversity as part of the content?

2. **Communication**
   - How does the instructor communicate with the students?
   - How does the instructor foster communication among students through the questioning techniques and/or small-group work?

3. **Teaching Strategies**
   - What teaching strategies were used by the instructor?
   - What forms of media were used to foster student learning, make learning interesting, and motivate students to learn (i.e. Power Points, Internet sites, readings, online texts, videos, transcripts, interviews, surveys, case studies)?
   - What methods of grouping students were used by the instructor within this lesson?
   - What materials were used to support instruction?

4. **Organization (Changed from current which listed Preparation/Organization as #5)**
   - Was the instructor organized and prepared for class? How was this exhibited?
   - Was the pacing of the activities appropriate for the content being presented?

5. **Assessment (Not listed on current)**
   - How did the instructor assess understanding within instruction?

6. **Summary**
   - What is the overall impression of the quality of the instruction this class?

7. **Recommendations**
   - What suggestions or recommendations could be given to this instructor to improve this class?