

Statement on 2004 Merit Scores
Department approved 1/21/2005

The policy for this year is an amended version to the policy of 2002. The text of that policy, listed below, remains the same for this year. What has changed is the point structure. In particular, as per the faculty meeting of 1/21/2005, there is now no cap on the number of merit points that can be assigned to research, teaching, or service activities. In addition, the “other merits” for each category (research, teaching and service) now ranges from 0.5 to 6.

Statement on 2002 Merit Scores

This committee composed the following members Arvind Verma [Chair], Roger Levesque and Dennis Rome. The committee followed the guidelines provided in the statements of previous merit committees but made small modifications as described in this report. It was felt that there are a number of issues that cannot be resolved by the committee and needs full faculty deliberation. As reiterated in previous years, this committee also feels that on a number of points the criteria for merit points needs urgent re-evaluation.

The committee felt that credit should be given in the year when the book is *published* and the grant is *received*. It was felt that the acceptance of a manuscript by the publisher is not the final step for it usually takes considerable time before the manuscript is finally published. The committee further felt that grants are significant achievements and will be counted under the research category even if these have been earned for developing new courses or to support teaching initiatives. The committee also feels that for each area of activity- Research, Teaching and Service the base score of “4” should not be automatic but should reflect “normal” functions. In many documents submitted to the committee it was felt that these functions have either not taken place or have not been reported. Therefore, in the absence of any other information the committee found it difficult to assign these base points and have proceeded accordingly.

Research

The committee, following previous decisions assigned a base of “4” points as evidence of “normal” research functions. To earn this score the committee examined evidence of tangible activities in terms of publications, acceptance, submissions, presentations of papers at conferences etc. The merit points were thereafter assigned according to the following scores:

Research Activity	Score
Book	3
Edited Book	1.5
Dissertation Book	2
Journal Article [refereed]	1
Journal Article [non-refereed]	0.5
Grant Award [external]	2
Grant Award [internal]	0-1
Final Report on a grant	0.5-1.5

Review Essay	0.5
Book Chapter	0.5
Other Merits	0.5-6

There was no occasion to use the “Other merits” criteria which was intended to cover a variety of other research activities, such as book reviews etc. not mentioned above.

Teaching

The committee, following previous decisions assigned a base of “4” points as evidence of “normal” teaching functions. To earn this score the committee examined evidence of tangible activities in terms of courses taught, supervision of undergraduate and graduate students etc. A “normal” teaching load was taken to be 4 courses as in previous years. Successful completion of dissertations at the graduate levels was rewarded with one point for being the chair and 0.5 for being a member of the dissertation committee. The merit points were thereafter assigned according to the following scores:

Teaching Activity	Score
Thesis and Dissertation Completion’s	0.5-1
Intensive Writing Sections	0.5
New Course Developments	0.5
Associate Instructor Training	1
Teaching Publications	1
Other Merits	0.5-6

The “other merits” was considered in terms of teaching awards, service on a large number of dissertation/MA committees, supervision of graduate students etc.

Service

The committee, following previous decisions assigned a base of “4” points as evidence of “normal” service functions. To earn this score the committee examined evidence of tangible activities in terms of work on departmental, university and external committees.

The “other merits” was awarded for work on review of journal articles/books, serving on editorial boards of journals, participation in organizations, etc. Just as in previous years, the committee attempted to make an overall assessment rather than assign a point here and there.

To recognize the importance of departmental service and the variation in effort demanded by departmental committee assignments, this year’s committee awarded extra service points for departmental committee assignments that are especially demanding, either by nature or because of special circumstances (e.g., Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee).

Service Activity	Score
Normal Committee Service	4
Service on Time Consuming Committees	0.5-6
Other Merit	0.5-6