Merit Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

Academic Unit: Humanities, Firelands

Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

APPENDIX A
Merit Review Template: Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations, and the Calculation of Component Merit Scores

Overview
Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the department member on the following performance criteria: Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service. Each of the aforementioned criteria (e.g., teaching) will be evaluated using a number of performance indicators (e.g., quantitative student evaluations of teaching). Merit committee members will review information submitted by each faculty member to make an evaluation rating on each performance indicator, providing some basis or justification of each rating where appropriate. No member of the merit committee will evaluate him/herself. An alternate from the previous years' committee will be asked to evaluate the current members.

Evaluation ratings provided for all performance indicators within each performance criteria will be combined by each member of the merit committee to reach a component rating for each of the relevant performance criteria (Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service).Merit committee members will meet as a committee to review and reach consensus on component ratings for each of the relevant performance criteria, using the summary form provided. The component ratings may include any number of values or rating levels, but they must clearly identify whether the component reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

The merit committee will then assign an overall merit rating using the approach found in the calculation of overall merit score section of the merit policy. The overall merit may include any number of values or rating levels, but it must clearly identify whether the overall merit rating reflects performance that is unacceptable, fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

TEACHING/LIBRARIAN EFFECTIVENESS

Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness assignment for calendar year: _____

Pre-specified allocation of effort for Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness: ___%

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
Evaluations: 2 per year, must be two different courses and cannot be a presentation given in another's course unless you are a librarian. Include copies of evaluations.	• Excellent: (5 pts) • Very Good: (4 pts) • Good: (3 pts) • Fair: (2 pts) • Poor: (only 1 observer) (1 pt) • N/A	
Student Evaluations Peter Wood evaluation forms must be completed for all courses. At least 5 students must complete a Woods form for the form submission to be mandatory.	Rating determined by Average of Median Scores as follows: • Excellent [6-7]: (5 pts) • Very Good [5-5.9]: (4 pts) • Good [4-4.9]: (3 pts) • Fair [3-3.9]: (2 pts) • Poor [2-2.9]: (1 pt)	

Pedagogical Innovation, Effectiveness, Growth, and Dedication Evidence for indicators of pedagogical innovation, effectiveness, growth and/or dedication must be included with narratives. Examples may include but are not limited to those listed below.	• Excellent: Sufficient evidence for 4+ indicators. (5 pts) • Very Good: Sufficient evidence for 3 indicators. (4 pts) • Good: Sufficient evidence for 2 indicators. (3 pts) • Fair: Sufficient evidence for 1 indicator. (2 pts) • Poor: Sufficient evidence for 0 indicators. (1 pt)	

Selected Examples of Pedagogical Innovation

1. Innovative use of course website (i.e., podcasts, frequent content updates to reflect current events, discussion board etc.)
2. Innovative use of course content (i.e., creative use of source material, innovative and effective in-class projects, etc.)
3. Innovative and effective incorporation of one's own scholarly research into the classroom or student activities.
4. The dedicated instruction of a large quantity of enrolled students (over 100 students per semester who receive official grades).
5. Approval of new course (include blue sheet).
6. Major changes to existing course (include examples of significant changes to course -- beyond merely keeping current or up-dating textbook. Indicate intended reason for change and impact of change. Include both old and new syllabi.)
7. Course new to individual including new topic to general topics course (describe course, benefit of course to college, work required to create course).
8. Classes for special audiences (explain audience, circumstance, number of meetings).
9. Independent study courses (describe course, breadth of content, number of students).
10. Facilitating student development outside the classroom (e.g., writing recommendation letters, taking students to a local conference/ academic talk).
11. Teaching awards.
12. Unsolicited and non-anonymous student communications that reflect instructor's innovation, dedication, or effectiveness.
13. Development of new library program, new online information source, library handling procedures, etc.

NTT Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (5) Adjustment x 1.25 = 6.25	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Ratings is 12 or above.
Generally Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (4) Adjustment x 1.25 = 5	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Ratings is 11.
Meets Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (3) Adjustment x 1.25 = 3.75	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Ratings is 10.
Generally Meets Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (2) Adjustment x 1.25 = 2.5	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Ratings is 9.
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (1) Adjustment x 1.25 = 1.25	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Ratings is 6-8.
Unacceptable Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (0) Adjustment x 1.25 = 0	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Rating is 5 or below.

TT Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (5) Adjustment x 1.43 = 7.15	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Ratings is 12 or above.
Generally Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (4) Adjustment x 1.43 = 5.72	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Ratings is 11.
Meets Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (3) Adjustment x 1.43 = 4.29	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Ratings is 10.
Generally Meets Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (2) Adjustment x 1.43 = 2.8	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Ratings is 9.
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (1) Adjustment x 1.43 = 1.43	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Ratings is 6-8.
Unacceptable Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (0) Adjustment x 1.43 = 0	Total points from Teaching/Librarianship Evaluation Rating is 5 or below.

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORK/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Pre-specified allocation of effort for Research/Creative Work: ___ %

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
Faculty should complete and submit **Worksheet for Professional Development/ Scholarly & Creative Work"** with evidence for indicators and narratives as needed. This worksheet is found in the Additional Academic Unit Merit Policy Information section.	• Excellent: Worksheet score of 10 or higher. • Very Good: Worksheet score of 8-9. • Good: Worksheet score of 6-7 • Fair: Worksheet score of 4-5. • Poor: Worksheet score 2-3. • Unacceptable: Worksheet score under 2.	

NTT Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Scholarship /Creative Work/ Professional Development (5) Adjustment x 20 = 100	Evaluation Rating of "Excellent" as determined by worksheet points
Generally Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Scholarship/Creative Work/Professional Development (4) Adjustment x 20 = 80	Evaluation Rating of "Very Good" as determined by worksheet points
Meets Expectations for Merit in Scholarship/Creative Work/Professional Development (3) Adjustment x 20 = 60	Evaluation Rating of "Good" as determined by worksheet points
Generally Meets Expectations for Merit in Scholarship/Creative Work/Professional Development (2) Adjustment x 20 = 40	Evaluation Rating of "Fair" as determined by worksheet points

Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Scholarship/Creative Work/Professional Development (1) Adjustment x 20 = 20	Evaluation Rating of "Poor" as determined by worksheet points
Unacceptable Scholarship/Creative Work/Professional Development (0) Adjustment x 20 = 0	Evaluation Rating of "Unacceptable" as determined by worksheet points

TT Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Scholarship /Creative Work/ Professional Development (5) Adjustment x 6.67 = 33.35	Evaluation Rating of "Excellent" as determined by worksheet points
Generally Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Scholarship/Creative Work/Professional Development (4) Adjustment x 6.67 = 26.68	Evaluation Rating of "Very Good" as determined by worksheet points
Meets Expectations for Merit in Scholarship/Creative Work/Professional Development (3) Adjustment x 6.67 = 20.01	Evaluation Rating of "Good" as determined by worksheet points
Generally Meets Expectations for Merit in Scholarship/Creative Work/Professional Development (2) Adjustment x 6.67 = 13.34	Evaluation Rating of "Fair" as determined by worksheet points
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Scholarship/Creative Work/Professional Development (1) Adjustment x 6.67 = 6.67	Evaluation Rating of "Poor" as determined by worksheet points
Unacceptable Scholarship/Creative Work/Professional Development (0) Adjustment x 6.67 = 0	Evaluation Rating of "Unacceptable" as determined by worksheet points

SERVICE

Pre-Specified Allocation of Effort for Service ___ %

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
Service Performance Indicators might include a range of activities that illustrate service to the College, University or Department and /or service to relevant professional organizations or the community. Faculty should complete and submit the Service Worksheet" to document service contributions, which is found in the Additional	• Excellent: Serves in no less than two areas with total service points of 12 or above. • Very Good: Serves in no less than two areas with total service points of 10-11. • Good: Serves in no less that one area with total points of 6-9. • Fair: Serves in one area with total points of 3-5.	

Academic Unit Merit Policy Information section.	• Poor. Limited evidence of service with total points of 1-2. • Unacceptable: No evidence of service with total points below 1. • N/A Service not required of current position.	

NTT & TT Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Service (5) Adjustment x 6.67 = 33.35	Evaluation Rating of "Excellent" as determined by worksheet points
Generally Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Service (4) Adjustment x 6.67 = 26.68	Evaluation Rating of "Very Good" as determined by worksheet points
Meets Expectations for Merit in Service (3) Adjustment x 6.67 = 20.01	Evaluation Rating of "Good" as determined by worksheet points
Generally Meets Expectations for Merit in Service (2) Adjustment x 6.67 = 13.34	Evaluation Rating of "Fair" as determined by worksheet points
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Service (1) Adjustment x 6.67 = 6.67	Evaluation Rating of "Poor" as determined by worksheet points
Unacceptable in Service (0) Adjustment x 6.67 = 6.67	Evaluation Rating of "Unacceptable" as determined by worksheet points

SUMMARY FORM

(To be completed by all members of the merit committee.):

Faculty Member	Merit Score for Teaching/ Librarian Effectiveness	Merit Score for Scholarship/ Creative Work	Merit Score for Service
Merit Committee Member 1	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score
Merit Committee Member 2	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score
Merit Committee Member 3	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score
Final score is the average of the three faculty members' scores as noted in this table. FINAL			

Merit Committee Composition and the Election//Appointment Process

The Humanities Department merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. The merit committee is made up of three members of the Department with no specifications of rank or years of service. Members are elected by the department at a department meeting. Merit committee members should have staggered terms of office so that one person will carry over term of office into the next year in order to provide continuity and experience in procedures and scoring. To safeguard the impartiality of the merit committee, individual terms should be no longer than three years. No member of the department merit committee will evaluate him/herself. An alternate member of the department (typically the most recent faculty to have completed a term on the merit committee) will serve in that capacity.

Elements of the Merit Dossier

The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements: peer and student teaching evaluations from the previous calendar year, documentation of new course materials/innovation, documentation of conference/workshop/publication/exhibition acceptance, etc. as appropriate, and completed merit review template (see Academic Unit Merit Policy Information section).

Calculation of Overall Merit Score

The overall merit score will be calculated using the algorithm in the Academic Unit Merit Policy Information section, with score rounded to the one-tenth decimal place. The overall merit score will be an average of the merit scores from the most recent three years.

Weighted Allocation of Effort Algorithm:

Once the merit committee has reached consensus on component merit scores on each performance areas (Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service), the overall merit score is computed using a simple algorithm taking into account the weighted allocation of effort for each performance area:

[Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] + [Research/Creative Work Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] + [Service Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] = Overall Merit Score

Total Merit Evaluation: To determine overall merit evaluation, compare the total of all three scores after the *standard weighting* (based on allocation of effort) has been applied to the criteria below:

	Raw Score	Weight	Section Score
Teaching/Librarianship		80%/70%	
Professional Development		5%/15%	
Service		15%/15%	
		TOTAL	

Overall Merit Score for NTTF	Overall Merit Score for TTF	Interpretation*
12-15	12-15	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
6-11.9	6-11.9	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
3 – 5.9	3 – 5.9	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
2.9 and below	2.9 and below	Unacceptable

* If a faculty member (whether NTTF or TTF) receives a Merit Score of 2.9 or below (Unacceptable) for Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, that faculty member will not be eligible for merit, regardless of the faculty member's Merit Scores for Professional Development and Service. In such a case, if the faculty member's Merit Scores for Professional Development and Service combine to produce a score of 5.9 or more, the faculty member's Overall Merit Score will be reduced to an Overall Merit Score of 5.

Additional Academic Unit Merit Policy Information

Worksheet for Professional Development/Scholarly & Creative Work

*Throughout this appendix, please include level of the work and the audience for the work (local, state, regional, national or international)

Category	Narrative and/ or Evidence	Score: Determined by Merit Committee
Professional Organizations 1 pt each/max 3 pts	List the names of the organization to which you are a member. 1. 2. 3.	
Conference Presentation, Workshop Leader or Panel Participant. Local (3 pts) State/Regional (4 pts) National (5 pts) International (6 pts) *Invited presenter/leader.* add 1-3 pts.)	(Explain your role, include evidence of participation)	
Professional Development Activities To keep abreast of the field, such as viewing plays and exhibits, networking activities, webinars. (.5 pts) Participation in learning community (2-4 pts depending on role/responsibilities) Conference attendance (1-2 pts)		
Readings or Presentations Other than those in classrooms or at conferences: e.g. All College Book contributions) (1-3 pts)		
Publications Reprints (1 pt per work per reprint) Initial submission of peer reviewed journal article or book chapter (1 pt) Acceptance of peer reviewed journal article or book chapter (3 pts)	Include copy of the publication. For publications resulting from engagement initiatives, describe extent of distribution and potential impact on audience (if known). Make note of type of journal (national, regional, peer reviewed, open access web based . . .)	

Peer reviewed journal or book chapter (4-8 pts)
Invited journal or book chapter (5-8 pts)
Non-peer reviewed journal or book chapter (5 pts
Books
    Book Contract (3pts)
    Completed Chapters (3 pts/chapter)
    Publication (5-10 pts)
Reviews of books, films, plays, records, etc. (1-5 pts)
Creative Writing (poetry, short stories, creative non-fiction, theatrical production, etc.) (2-10 pts)
White papers and other publications (2-4 pts		

Professional/Nonprofessional Journal Editor (3 pts) Peer reviewer (2 pts)		
Web Projects (including web developer for organization) (1-10 pts)	Include intended audience (NOT potential audience), degree of involvement in technical production, design and organization, and content decisions.	
Theatrical Productions Directing (5-10 pts) Acting (3 pts) Designing: scenic, costume, light, sound (2-3 pts each) Stage Managing (3-5 pts) Dramaturgy (3 pts) Respondent (2 pts)		
Residencies & Conferences Organizing or Chair (1-3 pts) Attendance (1 pt)		
Group Art Exhibitions - Juried/Refereed Local (1 pt) Regional (2-3 pts) National (4-8 pts) International (4-10 pts) Non-juried (1-4 pts)		
Solo Exhibition – Juried/Refereed Local (2 pts) Regional (3 pts) National (4-8 pts) International (5-10 pts) Non-juried (2-5 pts)		
Awards in Exhibitions Local (1 pt) Regional (2 pts) National (3-8 pts) International (4-8 pts)		
Representation in a Gallery Local (1 pts) Regional or National (1-2 pts) International (2-3 pts)		
Honors or Awards Describe context of award (3 pts)		
Post-Degree Work/Supplemental Education (.25 pt per hr)	List academic coursework	

Research Projects
   Grants:
     Internal (2 pts)
     External (3 pts)
   Internal/External in partnership with outside agencies (community groups, schools, etc.) (2-5 pts)
	Briefly describe research project, source and amount of funding	

Other	Include narrative to explain nature of scholarship/creative work and impact.	
	TOTAL POINTS	

Worksheet for Service

COMMITTEE PARTICPATION	List committees, semesters served, positions held and useful narrative.	Score: Determined by Merit Committee

UNIVERSITY/BG CAMPUS
Membership
   4 pts/ semester
Chair/Secretary
   1 pt/semester
Senate Executive Committee
   3 pts/semester
 	
Include narrative to explain special circumstances of participation. Merit committee can add 1-3 points as seems appropriate.		

FIRELANDS COLLEGE
 	
Membership
   3 pts/ semester
Chair/Secretary
   1 pt/semester
 	
Include narrative to explain special circumstances of participation. Merit committee can add 1-3 points as seems appropriate.		

DEPARTMENT
 	
Membership
   2 pts/ semester
Department Secretary
   2 pts/semester
Mentoring PT faculty
   1 pt/semester
Other Designated Department Roles
   1 pt/semester
 	
Include narrative to explain special circumstances of participation. Merit committee can add 1-3 points as seems appropriate.		

OTHER COLLEGE SERVICE	Identify the service provided and impact on the college.	
Administration of Programs/Directorships (i.e. Little Gallery, Writing Lab, Firelands College Theatre etc.) 2 pts/item Other examples include: • Special recruitment/retention work • Administrative Reports • Service Award • Participation in campus outreach/events Include narrative to explain the nature and impact of service. Merit committee can award 1-5 pts per item.		
PROFESSIONAL SERVICE	Identify the venue for the service and the relationship to your profession.	
Includes such work as consulting, holding an office or providing service to a professional organization of which you are a member; serving a body of the community that directly relates to your profession/position at the College. Include narrative to explain the nature and impact of service. Merit committee can award 1-5 pts per item.		
COMMUNITY SERVICE AND ENGAGEMENT	Identify the organization, time involved and benefit provided.	
Includes work that may not relate specifically to your role at the College but that represents, at some level, your commitment to any larger community. Include narrative to explain the nature and impact of service. Merit committee can award 1-3		

pts per item.		
OTHER	*Include narrative to explain nature of service and impact.*	
	TOTAL POINTS	

Approved by the Department of Humanities of Firelands College on <u>Month, day, year</u>

Jolene Buehrer   Date   3-13-17

Jolene Buehrer, Chair

Approved: *Andrew Kurtz*   Date   3/14/2017

Andrew Kurtz, Dean of Firelands College

Approved: *[signature]*   Date   3/15/17

Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP