

CRITERIA FOR MERIT INCREASES

Department of Art History

The department desires to maintain and further its reputation for excellence in the field of art history and believes that active participation by its faculty in research leading to publications and scholarly presentations is the primary means for achieving this goal. The department affirms that national and international recognition of its continuing contribution to scholarship in all fields is necessary in order to attract faculty and students of high quality, gain support for its program both inside and outside the University, and enrich its undergraduate and graduate teaching, both of which are very important to the departmental mission. Service is also significant in pursuit of that mission. Failure to meet departmental expectations of good teaching and service will result in no merit increase, no matter how strong the publication record.

Annual merit increases for members of the Department of Art History are designed to reflect the evaluation of the faculty member's performance in these three areas: Teaching, research, and service. Although the department does not follow a mathematical ratio in assigning importance to these areas, the following order of priority has been established.

In general, the department expects that as a matter of course faculty members will provide good teaching and service and will give evidence of continuing involvement with research. Considering that these are levels of activity normally expected of a faculty member, merit raises will not be awarded for them. Merit raises will only be awarded for distinguished or well above ordinary contributions. With regard to the order of priorities or ranking among teaching, research, and service, the department believes that good teaching and service, while expected of its faculty members, will not be a substitute for productive research and that excellence in these areas taken together, no matter how outstanding, will not be given weight equal to research and publication.

1. RESEARCH

With regard to research, emphasis is placed on the faculty member's significant contributions to national and international scholarship. Because the department conducts an active and ambitious graduate program, research will be given special recognition in merit raises, with the clear understanding that quantity will not be regarded as a substitute for quality.

Evidence of research may take various forms, including preeminently, publications, papers presented in scholarly conferences and symposia and at academic institutions and museums; fellowships and grants; prizes and awards; and reviews and citations of the faculty member's work. Greater recognition will be given in light of the selectivity involved and the national stature of the above mentioned activities and contributions. The greater the selectivity and national stature of the publication or activity, the greater the weight that will be accorded to it.

With regard to publications, publications of scholarly significance will far outweigh publications of popular or general interest, these being more in the nature of service than original scholarship. Among scholarly publications, primary merit recognition will be given to original scholarly

research published in the form of books, major exhibition catalogues, and the articles in scholarly and preferably refereed, periodicals. Substantial book reviews in such periodicals can be deemed almost as important as original articles; by the same token, such scholarly publications as annotated bibliographies and edited collections can carry significant weight, though they will not be viewed as equivalent to books of original scholarship.

It is understood, however, that in making recommendations for merit increases, the department chairperson will take into account the special exigencies and characteristics of the individual faculty member's field of specialization, rank, and seniority.

2. TEACHING

The department believes that good teaching is expected of any faculty member and should not be accorded special merit recognition unless the quality of such teaching is unusually meritorious. In stating these criteria, it is assumed that research and publication will be beneficial to the faculty member's teaching by giving freshness and currency to classroom presentations, both graduate and undergraduate. Evidence of outstanding teaching will be gleaned from written student evaluations, comments by the graduate and undergraduate student advisory committees, student options solicited by the chairperson, and observation by the chairperson of the faculty member's lectures.

2. SERVICE

With regard to service, the faculty member's contribution of an appropriate amount of service on the departmental, college, and university levels is expected. It is further expected that as faculty members move upward through the ranks and gain scholarly maturity and experience, they will make contributions to the organization and management of their scholarly disciplines on a national scale. This could include service on editorial boards, boards of directors, advisory committees, and the like. Unusually meritorious service will be recognized and reflected in merit increases. However, although service is recognized as an integral part of the faculty member's academic performance, it will not count as much as research or teaching, nor will effectiveness of service be viewed as a substitute for substantive research and good teaching.

Approved by the faculty of the Department of Art History, November 4, 1987

Metric for Merit Distribution--Department of Art History
Approved by the faculty on 12/19/2002

The following describes the formula to be applied annually by the Chair in distributing merit allocations to faculty. This formula is in accordance with the performance expectations outlined in the separate departmental Workload Policy document (herewith included), and it is to be applied in a way that is consistent with the attached Criteria for Merit Increases.

1. Each faculty member will be awarded a merit rating in each category of performance (teaching, research, service) following the completion of the annual appraisal form and the annual appraisal conference with the Chair.
2. The merit rating in each category of performance will be multiplied by the percentage of effort devoted to that category to determine the points earned by the faculty member in that category. The resulting points will then be weighted by multiplying then by 1.25 for Research, by .8 for Teaching, and by .10 for Service to determine the merit points for that faculty member. The weighted point calculation reflects the department's hierarchy of priorities, as stated in its Criteria for Merit document: "With regard to the order of priorities of ranking among teaching, research and service, the department believes that good teaching and service, while expected of its faculty members, will not be a substitute for productive research and that excellence in these areas taken together, no matter how outstanding, will not be given weight equal to research and publication."

Calculation of merit will consequently abide by the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned} r \text{ (research rating)} \times w \text{ (\% of workload)} \times 1.25 &= \text{merit points} \\ t \text{ (teaching rating)} \times w \text{ (\% of workload)} \times .8 &= \text{merit points} \\ s \text{ (service rating)} \times w \text{ (\% of workload)} \times .1 &= \text{merit point} \end{aligned}$$

For example, in a standard assessment, a faculty member who was rated 5 in all three categories, will receive for Research $5 \times .4$ (40% of workload) $\times 1.25 = 2.5$ merit points; for Teaching, $5 \times .5$ (50% of workload) $\times .8 = 2$; for Service $5 \times .1$ (10%) $\times .1 = .05$

3. The total number of points in all categories added together will then be calculated for each faculty member. In the example above, the total points earned by the faculty member is 4.55.
4. Prior to Budget Turnaround, the points accrued in all department faculty individually will be added together to yield a total of points accumulated by the faculty as whole during that year.
5. The funds in the merit pool will then be divided by the total points earned by the

whole faculty in order to determine the value of a single point.

6. Merit for the individual faculty member will be calculated by multiplying the total number of weighted points earned by that faculty member for the year times the value of a single point. Thus, if one point equals \$100 for a particular year, and the faculty member of our example has earned a total of 4.55 points that faculty member will receive a merit allocation of \$ 455.

7. The faculty member will have the opportunity to review and accept or contest the Chair's rating on the annual appraisal form. In the event that the faculty member contests the Chair's rating, the Chair will be obliged to explain the rating prior to awarding merit increases and submitting the faculty appraisal forms to the Dean.