

MERIT TEMPLATE-updated following MOU

MERIT POLICY GENERAL STUDIES WRITING PROGRAM

Preamble

Merit raises refer to the component of salary raises that are provided to department/school bargaining unit faculty members who meet or exceed their assigned unit performance expectations. In any given year, it is possible that all of the Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in an academic unit may be eligible for merit salary raises. Merit is calculated during spring semester based on performance during the previous calendar year. Merit salary raises are added to base salary for the ensuing fiscal year (on September 1 for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members on 9-month contracts, and on July 1 for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members on 12-month contracts).

Merit eligibility for faculty members will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations for merit in the General Studies Writing Program in the following areas: Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service. Each faculty member will receive an overall merit score which will identify whether s/he did not meet, met, or exceeded expectations for merit. The overall merit score will include five or more categories or rating levels to allow for greater discrimination among levels of performance; each of the categories or rating levels on the overall merit score must clearly identify whether it does not meet expectations for merit, meets expectations for merit, or exceeds expectations for merit. For example, using the minimum five categories or rating levels, the following evaluation concepts would be included: 1 = Does not meet expectations for merit; 2/3 = Meets expectations for merit; 4/5 = Exceeds expectations for merit.

Both the merit committee of the academic unit and the General Studies Writing Program director may make recommendations to the Dean for allocation of merit dollars and/or percentages. However, as provided for by Section 11.2 of Article 17 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the Dean is not bound by such recommendations and the determination of the actual merit increase is within the Dean's reasonable discretion.

1. Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations, and Calculation of Merit Scores

The merit criteria (i.e., Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service), performance indicators and expectations for the criteria, and the calculation of the component merit scores (i.e., Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service) are contained in Appendix A.

2. General Procedure for Faculty Evaluation and Score of Merit

- 2.1. Prior to the beginning of the calendar year, each faculty member will confirm his/her allocation of effort (e.g., 80/00/20 for teaching, scholarship, and service) with the General Studies Writing Program director.

- 2.2. The General Studies Writing Program merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. As per the General Studies Writing Program Committee and Service Policy, The General Studies Writing Program merit committee consists of six members: the GSW Assistant Director (serving as Chair) and five full-time GSW faculty members. The GSW Program Director will appoint committee membership, each academic year, based on the need for the committee, the teaching schedules of faculty, a reasonable rotation among faculty based on faculty members' most recent participation on committees, and faculty interest in serving on the merit committee as noted on the GSW program committee preference sheet.
- 2.3. Faculty members who fail to submit a merit portfolio by the deadline will receive an automatic rating of "does not meet expectations" and will not be eligible for a merit salary increase or the market adjustment from the Fixed Market Pool (Article 17, section 7.1).
- 2.4. The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements: an updated CV highlighting activities completed during the previous calendar year (and not submitted to the merit committee in previous years), all quantitative and qualitative student course evaluations from the previous calendar year, two peer review letters from separate classroom observations from the previous calendar year, an updated teaching portfolio containing items described in the attached "Teaching Effectiveness" rubric, and an annual update form.
- 2.5. Once the General Studies Writing Program merit committee has reached consensus on component merit scores on each performance areas (Teaching Effectiveness and Service), the overall merit score is computed using a simple algorithm taking into account the weighted allocation of effort for each performance area:

$$[\text{Teaching Effectiveness Merit Score} * \text{Allocation of Effort}] + [\text{Service Merit Score} * \text{Allocation of Effort}] = \text{Overall Merit Score}$$
- 2.6. An academic unit may report its merit score recommendation to no greater than one-tenth decimal place (for example, a unit using 1-7 categories or rating levels may assign a score of 3.1 or 5.9 but may not assign a score of 3.15 or 5.975).

3. Significant Dates for Merit Consideration and Appeals

January 31: Last date for faculty merit dossiers to be submitted to an academic unit.

The merit committee of the academic unit is urged to work informally with all faculty being reviewed to resolve any factual or interpretive issues in advance of making recommendations to the General Studies Writing Program director.

February 28: Academic unit faculty committee's merit score recommendation to the General Studies Writing Program director (with a copy to the faculty member).

March 7: Last date for faculty members to appeal the committee's recommendation to the General Studies Writing Program director (with a copy to the committee).

March 31 General Studies Writing Program director's merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copies to the committee and faculty members).

April 7: Last date for faculty member to appeal the General Studies Writing Program director's merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copy to the director). The faculty member may raise in any appeal to the Dean: (i) the director's merit score recommendation, and (ii) only those aspects of the committee's recommendation that the faculty member has previously raised in the faculty member's appeal to the director. Issues related to the committee's recommendation not raised previously with the director (where the faculty member either knew or through the exercise of reasonable diligence should have known) are not preserved for appeal to the Dean, shall not be considered by the Dean, and shall not be the basis or grounds for any grievance by the BGSU-FA.

April 30: Dean's recommendation to the Provost. Thereafter the Provost and Dean may confer through on or about May 19.

On or about May 20: Dean issues final determination regarding merit.

4. Special Circumstances

4.1. Consideration of Special Circumstances as Required by the Collective Bargaining Agreement

- 4.1.1. **Faculty Exchange Leave** (Article 21, Section II: subsection 1.7). Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consultation with the host institution.
- 4.1.2. **Leaves with Extramural Salary Paid through the University Payroll System** (Article 21, Section III: subsection 1.3) Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consultation with the sponsoring government agency or private foundation.
- 4.1.3. **Unpaid Leave - 100% time** (Article 21, Section IV: subsection 5). Faculty members will not be eligible for merit in any calendar year for which 100% unpaid leave was taken that is unrelated to Family Medical Leave. If related to Family Medical Leave, performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.
- 4.1.4. **Sick Leave** (Article 21, Section VIII: subsection 9.1). Performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated for faculty members on sick leave for 40 or more days during the calendar year.
- 4.1.5. **Parental Leave** (Article 21, Section IX: subsection 3). Unit Faculty Member who takes parental leave under this Article will only be evaluated for performance during the time in which he or she was not on parental leave (including use of sick leave in addition to parental leave). Performance expectations for merit evaluations that are expressed quantitatively shall be prorated. The Department Chair's/School Director's evaluation shall include a description of the methods used for prorating.
- 4.1.6. **Partial Unpaid Leave – 50% time** (Article 21, Section X: subsection 3.3) Faculty members will not be eligible for merit in any calendar year for which 50% unpaid leave was taken that is unrelated to Family Medical Leave. If related to Family Medical Leave, performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.
- 4.1.7. **Faculty Improvement Leave** (Article 22, Section 7.3.3) Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consideration of the report submitted to the President detailing accomplishments during the FIL.

4.2. Consideration of Other Special Circumstances

- 4.2.1. **New Faculty Hires.** New faculty members whose employment begins in the fall semester shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. Performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.
- 4.2.2. The unit's faculty advisory body may also consider special circumstances not covered in 4.1 above and make a recommendation to the unit chair or director. Such exceptional circumstances might include a leave without pay to take a short-term research appointment, a leave without pay to participate in professional development, or other leave without pay that enhances the productivity of the faculty member and the reputation of the institution.

5. Amendment of Merit Policy

The unit faculty may amend performance indicators, performance expectations, and the methods for combining this information into both component and overall merit scores at any time. Amendments to the merit policy must be approved by the Dean and Provost/SVPAA. Approved amendments to the merit policy shall not be applied retroactively in the calculation of the previous year's merit scores.


6. Additional Information

Approved by the General Studies Writing Program Faculty on April 30, 2015.


Cheryl Hoy, Director

Date 30 April 2015

Approved:


Raymond Craig, Dean of College of Arts & Sciences

Date 5 May 2015

Approved:


Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP

Date May 4/15

Effective for calendar year 2016 and forward

Appendix A

Overview

Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the department/school 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 assign a numerical score for each criteria using an anchored rating scale anchored with examples of expected levels (or their equivalent) of performance on the performance indicators. Merit committee members will meet as a committee to review and reach consensus on component scores for each of the relevant performance criteria using the summary form provided. The component scores may include any range of values, but they must clearly identify whether the assigned score on the criteria (e.g., teaching) reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

The levels on each of the performance indicators should capture how the unit defines exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, and failing to meet expectations for performance:

Exceeds expectations for merit: Activities in area cumulatively exceed expectations and reflect a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for an individual with a given faculty rank in the department, school, unit, and discipline.

Meets expectations for merit: Activities in area cumulatively meet expectations and reflect standard levels of performance for the department, school, unit, and discipline.

Fails to meet expectations for merit: Activities in area cumulatively do not meet expectations and fall below the standard levels of performance for the department, school, unit, and discipline.

The merit committee will then assign an overall merit rating using the approach found in Section 2.5 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 fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

Evaluation Rating Category	<p style="text-align: center;">TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)</p>	Possible Merit Score for Teaching*
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A statement of teaching philosophy that <u>details</u> effective teaching practices built upon cited references to current composition scholarship and/or involvement in teaching development activities. • A current teaching portfolio that demonstrates proactive, innovative curriculum based upon current composition scholarship (within the last 10 years) as a GSW faculty member including <i>at least</i>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Syllabi from each course taught ○ Descriptions of essay assignments <p>as well as any combination of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence of effective lessons and activities ○ Examples of assignments and teaching practices that embrace a multi-modal approach ○ Development of new courses (e.g. Honors, online, special sections). ○ Videos of effective classroom teaching, ○ Evidence of participation in BGSU's Common Reading Experience ○ Evidence of participation in BGSU, Arts & Sciences, or GSW initiatives and/or pilots ○ Instructional grants awarded ○ Other materials that demonstrate a commitment to excellence in teaching practices and/or methods based upon current composition scholarship <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative teaching evaluations, generally 5.0 or above on a 6.0 scale • Qualitative teaching evaluations that are generally very strong • Two current peer review letters detailing innovated and/or pedagogically sound teaching practices • Evidence of teaching development as described below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Present at a professional conference or symposium at the local, regional, or national level <p>OR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Contribute to scholarly conversations in faculty member's field/area of expertise such as with published or web-based articles, reports, reviews, proposals, conference proceedings, creative work, and/or similar works <p>OR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Contribute to the instructional development of others in the GSW program through <u>leading</u> any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ GSW development sessions, ▪ Center for Faculty Excellence workshops ▪ Center for Faculty Excellence faculty learning communities, ▪ Winter Wheat sessions, ▪ University training sessions, presentations, or workshops, and/or similar events ▪ College training sessions, presentations, or workshops, and/or similar events ▪ GSW Program training sessions, presentations, or 	3.6– 5.0

	workshops, and/or similar events	
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A statement of teaching philosophy that details effective teaching practices. • A current teaching portfolio that demonstrates effective teaching practices including, for instance, examples of each of the following that show varied approaches to instructional development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Syllabi from each course taught ▪ Descriptions of essay assignments ▪ Evidence of effective lessons and activities • Quantitative teaching evaluations, suggested range of 4.00-4.99 on a 6.0 scale • Qualitative teaching evaluations are generally positive • Two current peer review letters detailing effective teaching methods. • Evidence of teaching development as described below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Attend a professional conference or symposium at the local, regional, or national level OR: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Attend instructional or professional development sessions available at the University, College, or GSW Program level, such as <u>attending</u> any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ GSW development sessions, ▪ Center for Faculty Excellence workshops ▪ Center for Faculty Excellence faculty learning communities, ▪ BGSU CFE Teaching and Learning Fair/Conference ▪ Winter Wheat sessions, ▪ University training sessions, presentations, or workshops, and/or similar events ▪ College training sessions, presentations, or workshops, and/or similar events ▪ GSW Program training sessions, presentations, or workshops, and/or similar events 	1.6 – 3.5
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no evidence of effective teaching practices • Little or no evidence of any teaching development 	1.0-1.5

Merit Score for Teaching/ Effectiveness

(to be completed by merit committee member): _____

Evaluation Rating Category	SERVICE Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Service*
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serve on two or more GSW Program, College, or University committees OR: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serve on one committee <u>and</u> do two or more of any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Staff GSW program and/or university events, such as Campus Preview Days or President's Day ○ Assist with a planned ENG 6020 activity ○ Contribute teaching materials to the GSW program ○ Serve in any capacity in a University, College, GSW program, administrative, auxiliary department, faculty, or campus-organization event 	3.6 – 5.0
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serve on one GSW Program, College, or University committee, OR: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do two or more of any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Staff GSW program and/or university events, such as Campus Preview Days or President's Day ○ Assist with a planned ENG 6020 activity ○ Contribute teaching materials to the GSW program ○ Serve in any capacity in a University, College, GSW program, administrative, auxiliary department, faculty, or campus-organization event 	1.6 – 3.5
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no evidence of service 	1.0 – 1.5

*Insert score values on a scale that includes at least seven numerical values, e.g., 1-7point scale.

Merit Score for Service (to be completed by merit committee member): _____

SUMMARY FORM

(to be completed with agreement reached by all members of the merit committee):

Faculty Member	Merit Score for Teaching Effectiveness	Merit Score for Service
<i>Faculty member 1</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>
<i>Faculty member 2</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>
<i>Next faculty member, etc.</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>

Weighted Allocation of Effort

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

$[Teaching\ Effectiveness\ Merit\ Score * Allocation\ of\ Effort] + [Service\ Merit\ Score * Allocation\ of\ Effort] = Overall\ Merit\ Score$

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation (assumes component performance ratings made on 5-point scale)
1.0 – 1.5	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
1.6 – 3.5	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
3.6 – 5.0	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit

