MERIT POLICY

Department of Mathematics and Statistics

Preamble

Merit raises refer to the component of salary raises that are provided to department 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 Mathematics and Statistics in the following areas: Teaching, Research, 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 department 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, Research, and Service), performance indicators and expectations for the criteria, and the calculation of the component merit scores (i.e., Teaching, Research, 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 with the chair.

   2.2. The department Merit Committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. The Merit Committee consists of seven elected members, with four tenure-track faculty and three non-tenure-track faculty. Two tenure-track faculty members are elected every year by the tenure-track bargaining unit faculty to serve a two-year term on the Merit Committee. Three non-tenure-track members are elected every year by the non-tenure-track bargaining unit faculty to serve a one-year term on the Merit Committee. One of the four tenure-track members is elected by the committee to serve as the Merit Committee Chair.

The Merit Committee Chair and other three tenure-track members together form a tenure-track subcommittee. This subcommittee uses the guidelines provided in Section 2.5 below to evaluate merit of each tenure-track faculty who is not on the subcommittee. Each faculty on the subcommittee is to be evaluated by other members of the subcommittee.

The Merit Committee Chair and the three non-tenure-track members together form a non-tenure-track subcommittee. This subcommittee uses the guidelines provided in Section 2.5 below to evaluate merit of each non-tenure-track faculty who is not on the subcommittee. Each non-tenure-track faculty on the subcommittee is to be evaluated by other members of the subcommittee.

2.3. Faculty members who fail to submit a merit report 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 merit report of a tenure-track faculty must include all activities in the whole year divided into three areas: Teaching, Research, and Service. The merit report of a non-tenure-track faculty must include all activities in the whole year divided into two areas: Teaching, and Service. Appendix A provides guidelines for the activities to be included in the merit report. In addition to the merit report, a faculty member may submit an optional summary, limited to one-page, that provides highlights of the activities. The faculty may also submit further supporting materials for merit evaluation such as summaries of student evaluations, and front pages of research papers etc.

2.5. Evaluation of a merit report by a merit committee member is guided by the criteria described in Appendix A. The overall merit score of a faculty member is determined using the weighted algorithm described in Appendix B, in light of the workload allocations described in Appendix D. The distributions of merit dollars to faculty are recommended to the Dean using an algorithm in Appendix C.

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 department chair.

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

March 7: Last date for faculty members to appeal the committee's recommendation o the department chair (with a copy to the committee).

March 31: The department 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 department chair's merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copy to the department chair). The faculty member may raise in any appeal to the Dean: (i) the department 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 department chair. Issues related to the committee's recommendation not raised previously with the department 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 department Merit Committee may also consider special circumstances not covered in 4.1 above and make a recommendation to the chair. 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.

Approved by the Department of Mathematics and Statistics at the Faculty Meeting on November 12, 2015.

Date 12/21/2015

Hanfeng Chen, Chair of Department of Mathematics and Statistics

Approved: Date 12/21/15

Raymond Craig, Dean of College of Arts and Sciences

Approved: Date 12/23/15

Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP

Appendix A
Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations, and the Calculation of Component Merit Scores

I. Overview

Merit criteria are limited to three areas: Teaching, Research, and Service. Tenure-track bargaining unit faculty in the department are evaluated for merits in teaching, research and service, in accordance with their allocation of effort. Allocation of effort is addressed in Appendix D. The Non-tenure-track bargaining unit faculty in the department will be evaluated for merits in only teaching and service. Each of the aforementioned areas will be evaluated using a number of performance indicators outlined in Section II of this appendix. As stipulated in Section 2.2 of the Merit Policy, the merit committee forms a tenure-track subcommittee to evaluate each tenure-track faculty in the Bargaining Unit, and also a non-tenure-track subcommittee to evaluate each non-tenure-track faculty in the Bargaining Unit. Each subcommittee member reviews information in the merit report submitted by a faculty member and uses the scale of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 with no decimals to assign a component score for each area using the expected level of the performance, according to the following interpretations:

> Scores of 4 and 5: Exceeding expectations. Activities in area cumulatively exceed expectations and reflect a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for a faculty in the department.
>
> Scores of 2 and 3: Meeting expectations. Activities in area cumulatively meet expectations and reflect standard levels of performance for the department.
>
> Score of 1: Failing to meet expectations. Activities in area cumulatively do not meet expectations and fall below the standard levels of performance for the department.

Each subcommittee will meet to review and reach consensus on the component score of each relevant area of a faculty. The subcommittee will then assign an overall merit score to each faculty using the approach found in Appendix B. The overall merit score is assigned on the scale of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 with no decimals, according to the following interpretations:

> Overall merit ratings of 4 and 5: Exceeding expectations for merit
>
> Overall merit ratings of 2 and 3: Meeting expectations for merit.
>
> Overall merit ratings of 1: Failing to meet expectations for merit.

II. Lists of Performance Indicators for Teaching, Research, and Service.

This section provides performance indicators for evaluations in the areas of teaching, research, and service. In each area, some performance indicators are more important than others, and they are listed as primary performance indicators. Other performance indicators should be evaluated based on the quality and amount of work involved. The indicators on the following lists provide a general guideline for faculty to prepare for their merit reports as indicated in Section 2.4 of the Merit Policy, and also for the Merit Committee to evaluate faculty's component scores. By no means are they exhaustive.

1. **Teaching**
   <u>Primary performance indicators include (but are not limited to):</u>
   Quality teaching including quantitative and qualitative student evaluations
   Recognition of exemplary teaching in the form of honors or awards
   Course coordination and number of sections coordinated

Direction of undergraduate research, master's theses, doctoral dissertations

Other performance indicators include (but are not limited to):
Innovative teaching methods
Use of technology in the classroom
Experiments in course content
Publishing textbooks or materials
Teaching-related professional development
Curriculum design and development
Teaching in emporium setting
Volunteering in the tutoring center
Reading students and independent study students
Work with student groups on teaching related activities
Writing and grading of comprehensive exams and qualifying/preliminary exams
Memberships on master's thesis reading committees
Memberships on preliminary and doctoral committees
Classroom guest lectures

2. **Research**

Primary performance indicators include (but are not limited to):
Refereed papers submitted, accepted, in press, and appeared including the name of journal (indicate whether refereed or not)
Funded grant and research proposals
Doctoral students who completed degree requirements (indicate name of student)
Engaged scholarship activities with evidence of sound scholarship within mathematical sciences

Other performance indicators include (but are not limited to)
Grant and research proposals submitted
Refereed conference papers
Publications including problems, problem solutions, abstracts, research reports and announcements
Invited addresses
Contributed papers
Seminars and Colloquia presented at BGSU or elsewhere (indicate date and place)
International, national and regional conferences attended
Participation in seminars
Research work in progress

3. **Service**

Primary performance indicators include (but are not limited to):
Chairing department, college and university committees
Memberships on department, college and university committees (indicate your contributions)
Managing of department homepage
Serving as the department mediator
Public relation promotion such as Alumni Newsletter
Community outreach or engagement of a professional nature
Recruitment of graduate and undergraduate students
Advising of graduate and undergraduate students
Work with student groups
Coach of mathematics or statistics team
Running seminars
Review of published articles
Refereeing activity for journals, books, grant proposals etc (indicate date, type, and number of items refereed)

Editorial activity (indicate title of position, organization, and responsibility)
Leadership in professional organization
Serving on professional committees
Service to professional societies such as KME, MAA, NCTM etc.
Conduct professional development

Other performance indicators include (but are not limited to):
Mentoring of graduate teaching assistants
Mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students
Mentoring faculty
Running departmental computer systems and labs
Preview day
STEM Day
Writing peer teaching evaluations
Writing recommendation letters

III. Evaluations of Teaching, Research, and Service

This section outlines the expected level of performance in each of the areas: Teaching, Research and Service. The merit committee members should use the expected level of performance to determine the component score of each relevant area of each faculty.

1. **Evaluation of Teaching**
   Each faculty member is expected to carry out assigned teaching responsibilities according to appropriate professional norms: Such norms include, but are not limited to, setting appropriate academic standard for classes, meeting all assigned classes, being prepared to conduct classes, being available to students outside of class, and responding appropriately to reasonable student questions or complains. Besides failing to meet such norms, indicators of unsatisfactory teaching would include, but are not limited to, persistent legitimate students complaints, substantially negative student evaluations, and substantially weak peer evaluations. The following table provides a guideline for evaluating the teaching performance of a faculty member.

Evaluation Rating Category	**TEACHING** Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Teaching
Exceeds expectations for merit	Exceeds the minimum standard; substantially positive quantitative and qualitative student evaluations; numerous teaching performance indicators of effective teaching.	4, 5
Meets expectations for merit	Exceeds the minimum standard; quantitative student evaluations approximate department averages for similar courses and qualitative comments are generally positive; multiple teaching performance indicators of effective teaching	2, 3
Fails to meet expectations for merit	Teaching fails to meet minimum standard	1

2. **Evaluation of Research**
Every tenure-track faculty member is expected to conduct research that eventually results in publication of an article in a refereed journal with good standing. The reputation of the journal and the length of article are usually good indicators of the quality of publication. The expected level of research performance for tenure-track faculty with a standard allocation of research effort (40%) is one refereed article per year, or equivalent level of accomplishment. If a faculty member has an alternate allocation, the Merit Committee makes adjustments that are proportional to the faculty member's allocations of research effort.

Evaluation Rating Category	**RESEARCH** Expected levels of accomplishment on research performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Research
Exceeds expectations for merit	Two or more refereed articles that were accepted, in press, or appeared; or equivalent level of accomplishments on research performance indicators in any combination.	4, 5
Meets expectations for merit	One refereed article that is accepted, in press, or appeared; or equivalent level of accomplishments on research performance indicators in any combination.	2, 3
Fails to meet expectations for merit	Insufficient evidence of research activity that leads to publication in refereed journal, conference paper, or grant application	1

3. **Evaluation of Service**
Each faculty is expected to contribute service to department, college, university or professional community. The expected level of performance for faculty members with a standard allocation of service effort (20%) is serving on two committees with appropriate contributions (such as attending meetings and contributing to the committee's missions outside meetings in a timely fashion), or equivalent level of accomplishment. If a faculty member has an alternate allocation, the Merit Committee makes adjustments that are proportional to the faculty member's allocation of service effort.

Evaluation Rating Category	**SERVICE** Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Service
Exceeds expectations for merit	Memberships on three committees; or equivalent level of accomplishments on service performance indicators in any combination.	4, 5
Meets expectations for merit	Memberships on two committees; or equivalent level of accomplishments on service performance indicators in any combination.	2, 3
Fails to meet expectations for merit	Limited service based on time, quality of effort, contributions and leadership	1

Appendix B
Determining Overall Merit Score Recommendations

Once the merit committee has reached consensus on the component merit scores of a faculty following the guidelines in Appendix A, the overall merit score is computed in two steps.

First Step: The committee calculates the weighted merit score of the faculty:

Weighted Merit Score = [Teaching Merit Score * Allocation of Teaching Effort] + [Research Merit Score * Allocation of Research Effort] + [Service Merit Score * Allocation of Service Effort].

Second Step: Using the weighted merit score, the merit committee determines the overall merit score of the faculty using the following conversion.

Weighted Merit Score	Overall Merit Score
1.0 -- 1.9	1
2.0 -- 2.7	2
2.8 -- 3.5	3
3.6 -- 4.3	4
4.4 -- 5.0	5

The merit committee and the Bargaining Unit faculty should interpret the overall merit scores in the following way.

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation
1	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
2, 3	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
4, 5	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit

Appendix C
Recommendation to Dean on Distribution of merit dollars

The overall merit scores determined by the Merit Committee in Appendix B are used to calculate recommended merit raises of the faculty. The department's pool of merit dollars is divided into two portions, one portion for eligible tenure-track faculty and the other portion for eligible non-tenure-track faculty. Each portion is in corresponding proportion with the total salary of all tenure-track faculty and the total salary of all non-tenure-track faculty.

Using the tenure-track portion of the merit pool, the department recommends that merit dollars be allocated to the tenure-track faculty according to the ratios in the following table, which is based on the merit dollar amount x allocated to a tenure-track faculty receiving an overall merit score of a 2.

Using the non-tenure-track portion of the merit pool, the department recommends that merit dollars be allocated to the non-tenure-track faculty according to the ratios in the following table, which is based on the merit dollar amount x allocated to a non-tenure-track faculty receiving an overall merit score of a 2.

Overall Merit Score	Merit Raise in dollar amount
1	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
2	x dollars
3	2x dollars
4	3x dollars
5	4x dollars

Appendix D
Allocations of Effort

I. Tenure-Track Faculty

Prior to the beginning of each calendar year, every tenure-track faculty in the department confirms with the department chair his/her allocation of effort in each of the three categories: Research, Teaching and Service. The standard allocation of effort for tenure-track faculty is 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. The typical teaching load is 6 credits per semester. If duties warrant an alternate allocation, that allocation shall be agreed to by the faculty member and the chair. Once the allocation of effort is confirmed with the Chair, neither the chair nor the faculty can change it in the middle of the year, unless the role of the faculty has changed.

II. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Prior to the beginning of each calendar year, every non-tenure-track faculty in the department confirms with the department chair his/her allocation of effort. The typical teaching load of a non-tenure-track faculty is 12 credit hours per semester. The typical allocation of effort is 80% teaching and 20% service. If duties warrant an alternate allocation, that allocation shall be agreed to by the faculty member and the chair. Once the allocation of effort is confirmed with the Chair, neither the chair nor the faculty can change it in the middle of the year, unless the role of the faculty has changed.