

## Merit Document Department of Human Services

### 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 Department of Human Services 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 chair 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., 50/30/20 for teaching, scholarship, and service) with the chair.

2.2. The department merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. The Department has established an elected Merit Committee to undertake merit review in accord with Article 17 section 11.2.2. The Committee will be composed of 5 faculty with one elected by each of the disciplinary units (CRJU, GERO, and SOWK) and 2 elected at-large. Each member shall serve a two year term, with the disciplinary members elected in alternate years from the at-large members.

- 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 up-to-date CV, a Teaching Portfolio (see Appendix B), and a copy of the Annual Update of Faculty Record (see Appendix C) for the past calendar year.
- 2.5. The merit committee will determine individual component merit scores for teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and service (developed using the format in Appendix A). These individual merit scores will then be used to assign an overall merit score based on an holistic evaluation in accord with the following table.

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation
1 – 2	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Ratings of 1-2 in one or more performance areas regardless of ratings in the other performance areas Recommendation for no merit
3– 5	Meets basic expectations for merit; Receipt of rating of 3-5 (on 7-point scale) in all three performance areas; Eligible for merit
6 – 7	Exceeds expectations for merit; Receipt of a rating of 6-7 (on 7-point scale) in at least one performance area while receiving at least a 3 in all other areas; Eligible for merit

- 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 chair.

**February 28:** Academic unit faculty committee’s merit score recommendation to the chair (with a copy to the faculty member).

**March 7:** Last date for faculty members to appeal the committee’s recommendation of the chair (with a copy to the committee).

**March 31:** Chair’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 chair’s merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copy to the chair). The faculty member may raise in any appeal to the Dean: (i) the chair’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 chair. Issues related to the committee's recommendation not raised previously with the chair (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

None

Approved by the Department of Human Services at the January 29, 2015 Faculty Meeting

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Steve Lab, Chair

Date 2/3/15

Approved:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Marie Huff, Dean of College of Health and Human Services

Date 2/11/15

Approved:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP

Date 2/27/15



Pre-specified allocation of effort for teaching: 60 %

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (circle one)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
<b>Quantitative ratings of teaching effectiveness.</b> The grand mean of student ratings of teaching effectiveness for all courses taught during the preceding 12 months.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent (scores 4.25 and above)</li> <li>• Good (scores 3.25-4.24)</li> <li>• Fair (scores 3.0-3.24)</li> <li>• Poor (scores below 3.0)</li> </ul>	
<b>Qualitative ratings of teaching effectiveness.</b> All students' written open-ended feedback on the teaching evaluation instrument, indicating both positive and negative teaching strategies and outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent - 80% and above of all comments are positive or constructive</li> <li>• Very Good - 60-79% of all comments</li> <li>• Good - 50-59% of all comments</li> <li>• Fair - fewer than 50% of submitted student comments are positive OR there is a pervasive pattern of negative comments across two or more indicators in two or more classes (pervasive generally operationalized as 33% or more)</li> <li>• Poor - not included in portfolio</li> </ul>	
<b>Peer reviews of teaching effectiveness</b> (if used by the individual). Peer reviews conducted using the formal department template; informal comments NOT accepted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent</li> <li>• Good</li> <li>• Fair</li> <li>• Poor</li> <li>• N/A – peer review not required</li> </ul>	
<b>Innovative Teaching Activities.</b> Effective use of practices that are considered to be innovative and student centered learning strategies and approaches. Examples include: 1) service learning practices 2) undergraduate research 3) active learning pedagogies 4) funding received in support of teaching 5) other novel approaches to teaching to reach diverse students and class goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent – 3 or more activities listed</li> <li>• Good – 2 activities listed</li> <li>• Fair – 1 activity listed</li> <li>• N/A – innovative teaching activities not required</li> </ul>	
<b>Non classroom teaching.</b>		

<p>Teaching that doesn't take place in formal settings such as the classroom.</p> <p>1) student advising (REQUIRED)  2) thesis and dissertation direction  3) honors project direction  4) graduate student mentoring  5) independent studies  7) provision of continuing education</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent - Completion of required advising role and 2 plus other non- classroom teaching activities</li> <li>• Good- Completion of required advising role and 1 other non-classroom teaching activity</li> <li>• Fair- Completion of required advising role and no other non-classroom teaching activities.</li> <li>• Poor- Failure to complete required advising role, regardless of other activities</li> </ul>	
<p><i>Other.</i> Other examples of teaching effectiveness not otherwise provided. Examples include:</p> <p>1) specific examples of student performance/success (e.g. awards) teaching awards;  2) documented engagement in continuing education to support teaching effectiveness  3) development of new courses  4) guest lecturing  5) unsolicited note and comments from students and/or parents</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent – 3+ contributions to teaching effectiveness (e.g. awards)</li> <li>• Good – 2 contributions to teaching effectiveness</li> <li>• Fair - 1 indicator of teaching effectiveness</li> <li>• Little or no activity in other activities of teaching effectiveness. No penalty indicated by lack of documented evidence.</li> </ul>	

Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description	Narrative Justification
<p><b>Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Teaching</b> (6-7)</p>	<p>Preponderance of ratings for required activities are in the highest categories and medium to high levels of activity in the preponderance of non-required activity categories.</p>	
<p><b>Meets Expectations for Merit in Teaching</b> (3-5)</p>	<p>Preponderance of ratings for required activities are in the upper middle to high categories. Neutral to positive assessment of non-required activities.</p>	
<p><b>Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Teaching</b> (1-2)</p>	<p>Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories.</p>	

**Merit Score for Teaching (to be completed by merit committee member): \_\_\_\_\_**

### **Merit Evaluation – Research**

The faculty recognize 4 domains indicators for rating a faculty member's research effort. Each of these performance indicators appears below grouped into logical categories. Evaluation of performance and rating is based on holistic assessment of factors across all of the 20 performance indicators.

Peer-reviewed journal articles and scholarly books and chapters are the primary products of any research work, and thus central to its evaluation. Faculty should be able to demonstrate the ability to produce these particular products of research.

For purposes of the annual merit review, the faculty recognize the value of other indicators that can provide a demonstration of a faculty member's ongoing commitment to research including funded research, scholarship of engagement, and other activities. The relative value of these activities should be judged on the basis of factors that include but are not limited to the significance and scope of the published work, the quality of the publication outlet, whether the work is solo or co-authored, and the order of authorship, the size of awards, the role of the individual in a project, and other factors that appear in the following table.

The faculty recognize the value of institutional outreach/scholarship of engagement, in particular the importance of these activities within the context of the provision of human services. Institutional outreach/scholarship of engagement has direct impacts on the policies, procedures, and/or activities of human service agencies and the populations they serve. Thus, activities within this realm may be a component of a faculty member's scholarly activity. The relative value of these activities should be judged in terms of the significance and scope of the activity; documentation of the scholarly contributions of the work over and above the service component to the agency(s), and documentation of individual contributions and accomplishments in relation to these activities.

Continuing NTTF typically have no assigned research expectations. For those NTTF who have assigned research expectations, the following should be noted:

1. The expected level of research productivity will reflect the assignment for such activities set forth in the annual success plan;
2. Focus will be placed on cooperative participation and involvement with other faculty both inside and outside the department.
3. In the case of an individual with responsibility for field coordination, research and scholarship is expected to reflect and incorporate work with agencies and external constituencies.
4. There is no expectation for independent extramural funding support.

Faculty members are not expected to engage in all domains of performance indicators. In assessing these categories, a lack of evaluation is not an indicator of poor performance and should not be considered as failing to meet expectations. They should be considered in determinations of exceeding expectations and their absence is not to be considered as failing to meet basic expectations.

For the evaluation of research, the primary evaluation category is research and scholarly dissemination. Research funding, institutional outreach, scholarship of engagement, and other research achievement



are not required activities, but elected by individual faculty members. They are additive elements: their absence may not in any way be interpreted as a negative. The faculty member's rank is to be used to inform the evaluation of research.

Pre-specified allocation of effort for research 30 %

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (circle one)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
<p><b>Research &amp; Scholarly Dissemination</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Peer-reviewed papers accepted</li> <li>2. Books and book chapters</li> <li>3. Monographs/technical reports from applied research and consulting</li> <li>4. Other scholarly publications</li> <li>5. Academic meeting presentations</li> <li>6. Other electronic publications and presentations connected to funded/sponsored projects</li> <li>7. Papers receiving a revise and resubmit review</li> <li>8. Papers submitted for peer review</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent - 4+ examples, with at least one two from category 1 through 4 and two from categories 5 through 8</li> <li>• Very Good - 3 examples, at least 1 of which is from category 1 – through 4 and two from categories 5 through 8</li> <li>• Good - 2 examples, at least 1 from category 1 through 4 and 1 from categories 5 through 8</li> <li>• Fair - 1 example from any category 5 through 7</li> <li>• No activity to report</li> </ul> <p>NOTE: Multiple examples in one category are considered positively in overall evaluation.</p> <p>The committee may consider information on the selectivity of journals in making its overall evaluation.</p>	
<p><b>Research funding: While no specific quantity of extramural research support is required for promotion or tenure, program expectations are based upon norms appropriate to the discipline.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. External funds awarded for research and evaluation projects; \$ amount to be considered</li> <li>2. Internal funds awarded for research and evaluation projects excluding start-up funding or travel; \$ amount to be considered</li> <li>3. External funds awarded</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent - Category 1</li> <li>• Very Good - At least one from categories 2 or 5</li> <li>• Good - One from categories 3, 4, or 6</li> <li>• Fair - One from category 7</li> <li>• No Evidence</li> </ul>	

<p>for enhancing research(e.g. awards to buy equipment or technology)</p> <p>4. Internal funds awarded for enhancing research(e.g., awards to buy or technology)</p> <p>5. Management of multiple-year externally funded research and evaluation projects.</p> <p>6. Number and size of external or internal grant applications submitted for research and evaluation projects.</p> <p>7. Number and size of external or internal grant applications submitted for enhancing research</p>		
<p><b><i>Institutional Outreach/Scholarship of Engagement</i></b></p> <p>1. PI on applied research that has direct impact on the policies, procedures or activities of human services agencies and/or the populations they serve.</p> <p>2. Participation as a researcher in applied research that has direct impact on the policies, procedures or activities of human services agencies and/or the populations they serve.</p> <p>3. PI on institutionally-initiated outreach activities through centers, institutes or alliances/partnerships beyond simple membership.</p> <p>4. Participation in institutionally-initiated outreach activities through centers, institutes or alliances/partnerships</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent - One activity from category 1 or 5</li> <li>• Very Good One activity from category 2.</li> <li>• Good. One activity from category 3.</li> <li>• Fair. One activity from category 4.</li> <li>• Poor. No activity to report</li> </ul> <p>NOTE: The committee is directed to consider the significance and scope of the activity; role of the faculty member in the activity; documentation of the scholarly contributions of the work over and above the service component to the agencies; documentation of the specific contributions and accomplishments.</p>	

<p>beyond simple membership.</p> <p>5. Development of patents, licensed materials and commercialization activities</p>		
<p><b>Other Research/Scholarly Achievement</b></p> <p>1. Awards/recognitions for research activities (editor's awards, university recognition, fellowship in professional and scholarly societies)</p> <p>2. Invitations to keynote at prestigious conferences</p> <p>3. Editorship of scholarly journal.</p> <p>4. Project being written for peer-reviewed publication</p> <p>5. Project being written for peer-reviewed conference presentation</p> <p>6. Project in data analysis</p> <p>7. Project in data collection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent - One from category 1</li> <li>• Very Good - One from category 2 or 3 and two from any category 4 through 7</li> <li>• Good - Two from category 4 through 7.</li> <li>• Fair - One from categories 4 through 7</li> <li>• No activity</li> </ul>	

<p><b>Merit Score (point allocation)</b></p>	<p><b>Definition and Description</b></p>	<p><b>Narrative Justification</b></p>
<p><b>Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Research (6-7)</b></p>	<p>Preponderance of ratings for required activities are in the highest categories and medium to high levels of activity in the preponderance of non-required activity categories.</p>	
<p><b>Meets Expectations for Merit in Research (3-5)</b></p>	<p>Preponderance of ratings for required activities are in the upper middle to high categories. Neutral to positive assessment of non-required activities.</p>	
<p><b>Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Research (1-2)</b></p>	<p>Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories.</p>	

**Merit Score for Research (to be completed by merit committee member): \_\_\_\_\_**

### Merit Evaluation – Service

The faculty recognizes 3 domains of performance indicators to be considered in the service portion of the annual review for merit. Performance evaluation and rating rests on a holistic assessment of the indicators in each domain of performance. In addition, there are differing expectations for faculty based on faculty rank. All faculty are required to participate in Academic Service activities. Tenured faculty must participate in External Community Service and/or Service to the Profession. NTTF at the rank of Lecturer or above must to participate in External Community Service. Degree of involvement (e.g. participant vs. chair); time commitment to activities (e.g. extensive responsibilities across the academic year vs. time limited/little activity), and similar factors will be taken into consideration for the evaluation of service performance.

Faculty members are not expected to engage in all domains of performance indicators. In assessing these categories, a lack of evaluation is not an indicator of poor performance and should not be considered as failing to meet expectations. They should be considered in determinations of exceeding expectations and their absence is not to be considered as failing to meet basic expectations.

For the evaluation of service, the primary evaluation categories are academic services and service to the profession. External community service activities are not required activities of all faculty, but are expected of tenured faculty members. External service activities would then be additive elements for non-tenure track faculty and tenure-track faculty. Their absence may not in any way be interpreted as a negative. The faculty member's rank is to be used to inform the evaluation of research.

Pre-specified allocation of effort for service 10 %

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (circle one)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
<b>Academic Service (Required of all faculty)</b> 1. Participation in university, college or departmental standing committees 2. Participation in university, college, or departmental governance activities 3. Participation in university, college or departmental task forces that create and enhance the campus learning environment 4. Leadership position on university, college or department committee 5. Award or recognition of excellence in service 6. Serve as faculty advisor to a student club or organization 7. Participation in activities that promote program offerings and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent - Participates on 3 or more activities across or within categories 1-6 with award or recognition of excellence in any category; and category 7</li> <li>• Very Good - Participates in 2 or more activities across or within 1-6 ; and category 7</li> <li>• Good - Participates in 1 activity across or within categories 1-6; and category 7.</li> <li>• Fair - Participates in only 1 activity across or within categories 1-6 ; only category 7</li> <li>• Poor - Fails to meet standards for "fair" rating as listed above</li> </ul>	

<p>services (Required)</p> <p>8. Completion of assigned administrative duties (program director, undergraduate/graduate director, center director, internship/field director, etc.) Category 8 considered only for those with administrative assignments. Counts as equal to categories 2 &amp; 4.</p>		
<p><b>External Community Service</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Participation in agency boards of directors or advisory boards</li> <li>2. Participation in national, state or community planning task forces</li> <li>3. Participation in national, state or community planning committees</li> <li>4. Participation in activities that relate to staff, policies, procedures and/or activities of human services agencies and/or the populations served</li> <li>5. Funding secured in support of an external agency (amount to be considered)</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent - Participates in 3 or more activities across or within categories 1-4 with award or recognition of excellence in any category</li> <li>• Very Good - Participates in 3 or more activities from category 1-4</li> <li>• Good - Participates in 2 activities from categories 1-4;</li> <li>• Fair - Participates in 1 activity from categories 1-4;</li> <li>• Poor - Fails to meet standards for "fair" rating as listed above.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Service to the Profession</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Leadership positions held in professional organizations</li> <li>2. Awards/recognition for service activity from professional organizations</li> <li>3. Organization of professional conferences, symposia, etc.</li> <li>4. Peer review for academic journals and/or reviewer for private or extramural funding agencies</li> <li>5. Peer review of academic credentials for other institutions</li> <li>6. Sessions moderated and roundtables organized that contribute to the profession</li> <li>7. Participation in activities that enhance the profession</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent - contribution noted across or within category 1 and/or 2 and 3 activities in categories 3-6</li> <li>• Very Good - category 1 and/or 2 and 2 activities across or within categories 3-6.</li> <li>• Good - 1 activity from categories 3-7.</li> <li>• Fair - 1 activity from categories 3-7.</li> <li>• Poor - no service to the profession.</li> <li>• N/A - service to the profession not expected</li> </ul>	

(licensure activities, professional supervision, professional consultation, etc.)		
---	--	--

<b>Merit Score (point allocation)</b>	<b>Definition and Description</b>	<b>Narrative Justification</b>
<b>Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Service (6-7)</b>	Preponderance of ratings for required activities are in the highest categories and medium to high levels of activity in the preponderance of non-required activity categories.	
<b>Meets Expectations for Merit in Service (3-5)</b>	Preponderance of ratings for required activities are in the upper middle to high categories. Neutral to positive assessment of non-required activities.	
<b>Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Service (1-2)</b>	Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories.	

**Merit Score for Service (to be completed by merit committee member): \_\_\_\_\_**

**Summary Merit Scores**

Individual merit scores are used to assign an overall merit score based on an holistic evaluation in accord with the following table.



## Appendix B

### Guidelines for Teaching Portfolio Department of Human Services

The teaching portfolio should be **NO MORE THAN** a total of fifty (50) pages in length. Please note the **REQUIRED** materials that must be included and follow the order in which they are presented. Note that there is some flexibility in the **OPTIONAL** materials section. You are not required to utilize the maximum page length in the document. Page limitations listed are recommended.

#### Required Materials

- |  |             |
|--|-------------|
| 1. Table of Contents   | (1 page)    |
| 2. Statement of Teaching Philosophy  | (1-3 pages) |
| 3. Courses Taught  | (1-3 pages) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List and description of courses taught</li> <li>• Methods utilized in teaching</li> </ul> |             |
| 4. Representative syllabus or elements from syllabus for one of the courses taught   | (7 pages)   |
| 5. Teaching evaluation instrument  | (1 page)    |
| 6. Summarized teaching evaluation data<br>(include course means and grand mean across courses)                                     | (5 pages)   |
| 7. Narrative comments from student evaluations<br>(include all qualitative comments for each course)                               | (5 pages)   |

#### Optional Materials

- |   |             |
|---|-------------|
| Representative assignments from course<br>(exams, writing assignments, quizzes, etc.) | (10 pages)  |
| Unsolicited letters from students   | (3 pages)   |
| Statements from peers and senior faculty  | (3 pages)   |
| Peer teaching evaluations   | (3-5 pages) |
| Other forms of evaluation of teaching effectiveness                                   | (2 pages)   |



### Appendix C

(The following is an example of the Annual Update of Faculty Record used by the College. Faculty should submit the appropriate form being used by the College for the year in question.)

**Annual Update of Faculty Record  
Department of Human Services  
January 1, 20XX through December 31, 20XX**

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Department/Program \_\_\_\_\_

% of Allocation of Effort:    \_\_\_\_\_ Teaching    \_\_\_\_\_ Research    \_\_\_\_\_ Service

**Honors, Awards, Professional Activities (#1 will be included in the "Annual Report")**

1. List all honors, awards or other forms of commendation received in the calendar year of 20XX only. Include some descriptions of the nature of the award and selection process, if appropriate. Distinguish between commendations from BGSU and from those external agencies, organization, groups, etc. Please type appropriate information for the "Annual Report."

**BGSU Honors and Awards**

<u>Name of Award</u>	<u>Date Conferred</u>	<u>Conferring Group</u>
----------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------

**External Honors and Awards**

<u>Name of Award</u>	<u>Date Conferred</u>	<u>Conferring Group</u>
----------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------

**Research/Scholarly Activity (#'s 2, 3, & 4 will be included in the "Annual Report")**

2. List all scholarly publications during the calendar year 20XX only. For each journal article, list order of author(s), title of manuscript, title of journal, volume #, page numbers, month, and year. For other types of publications, please list the relevant documentation. Please type appropriate information for the "Annual Report." Example: Doe, J. & Smith, A.B. "Older Adult Survivors." Journal of Adults. Vol. 3, pp. 26-30, July 20XX. Please mark any publications that reflect or represent "Scholarship of Engagement" with an asterisk (\*) at the beginning of the citation.

<u>Author(s)</u> <u>(Y/N)</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Publication</u>	<u>Vol.</u>	<u>Pg.#(s)</u>	<u>Month/Year</u>	<u>Refereed</u>
----------------------------------	--------------	--------------------	-------------	----------------	-------------------	-----------------

3. List all presentations to professional/scholarly societies during calendar year 20XX only. For each presentation, list order of presenter(s), date of presentation, title of presentation, name of meeting, location of meeting. Please type appropriate information for the "Annual Report." Example: Doe, J., June 20XX, "Needs Assessment," Gerontological Society of America, San Francisco, CA. Please mark any presentations that reflect or represent "Scholarship of Engagement" with an asterisk (\*) at the beginning of the citation.

4. List all grants, contracts, and other projects of funded support received during the calendar year 20XX only. External support refers to support from outside BGSU. BGSU support refers to speed, travel, research, etc. Please type appropriate information for the "Annual Report." Please mark any grant projects that reflect or represent "Scholarship of Engagement" with an asterisk (\*) at the beginning of the citation.

**External Grants and Contracts Awarded**

<u>Investigator(s)</u>	<u>Funding Agency</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Award Period</u>	<u>\$ Awarded</u>
------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	-------------------

**BGSU Grants and Contracts Awarded**

<u>Investigator(s)</u>	<u>Funding Agency</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Award Period</u>	<u>\$ Awarded</u>
------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	-------------------

5. List professional leadership roles assumed in professional organizations during the calendar year 20XX only. These entries should be limited to offices held, committees chaired, special appointments, etc. List committee membership (non-chair) in item 7. Please type appropriate information for the "Annual Report."

<u>Organization</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Date Appointed/Elected</u>	<u>Term</u>
---------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------	-------------

6. Describe instructional responsibilities for Spring, Summer, and Fall 20XX. Include laboratories, independent studies, etc. Use an asterisk to designate all courses taught the first time. Attach summaries of student evaluations, if required by the department/program.

<u>Course Number</u>	<u>Course Title</u>	<u>Credit Hours</u>	<u>Class Hrs./Wk.</u>	<u># of Students</u>
----------------------	---------------------	---------------------	-----------------------	----------------------

SPRING  
20XX

SUMMER  
20XX

FALL  
20XX

7. Describe participation on graduate student committees during the 20XX calendar year only including committee level (master's, doctorate), name and home department of student, title of thesis or dissertation, your role on the committee (chair, member).

8. Describe any other instructional activities.

9. List all scholarly work in progress or submitted. Include publications under review/in press. Also include submitted grant proposals and their status (ex: unfunded, rejected, action not yet taken).

10. List professional meetings attended during the 20XX calendar year only. Include workshops and other forms of professional development. It is not necessary to re-list those meetings from section 3 at which papers were presented.

Meeting

Location

Date(s)

11. List professional service activities in the 20XX calendar year only. Include active memberships, committee activities, etc. Limit this section to external organizations. List service activities at BGSU in item 12.

Organization

Status (member, committee member, etc.)

12. List department/program, college or university service activities during the 20XX calendar year only. If appropriate, describe the nature of your involvement (chair, coordinator, etc.)

Activity

Level (dept., coll., univ.) Term (if applicable)

13. List community service activities during the 20XX calendar year only, that were professionally related. Describe the nature of your involvement, if appropriate (chair, coordinator, etc.)

14. List any other contributions and accomplishments that have not been included in any of the previously mentioned categories, instructional, scholarly, or service.

**Submit Electronically to the Department Chair no later than January 31, 20XX .**

**Please list all attachments: \_\_\_\_\_**