

Merit Document
Department of Public & Allied Health
Bowling Green State University

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 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 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, Research, and Service), performance indicators and expectations for the criteria, and the calculation of the component merit scores (i.e., Teaching Effectiveness, 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 (e.g., 60/30/10 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 three members need to be tenured faculty and be in the bargaining unit. The committee members will be elected by the department full time faculty. If there are only three eligible members, the chair shall assign membership to the committee. Tenured faculty members from other departments will be invited to serve on the merit committee if fewer than three PAH tenured faculty were available.

- 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: updated CV, related activities completed during the previous calendar year (and not submitted to the merit committee in previous years), and student teaching evaluations from the previous calendar year.
- 2.5. A 5-point scale is used for merit evaluations. Ratings of ≤ 2.0 are not considered for merit. Ratings of > 2.0 are considered for merit. A description of how the overall merit score is calculated is provided in Appendix B.
- 2.6. An academic unit may report its merit score recommendation to no greater than one-tenth decimal place (for example, a unit using 1-5 categories or rating levels may assign a score of 3.1 or 3.9 but may not assign a score of 3.15 or 3.975).

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.

3. Special Circumstances

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

- 3.1.1. **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.
 - 3.1.2. **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.
 - 3.1.3. **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.
 - 3.1.4. **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.
 - 3.1.5. **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.
 - 3.1.6. **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.
 - 3.1.7. **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.
- 3.2. Consideration of Other Special Circumstances
- 3.2.1. **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.
 - 3.2.2. 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.

4. 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 Public & Allied Health on November 5, 2014.

M. Ahmad Chaudhry
M. Ahmad Chaudhry, Chair

Date: 3/18/15

Approved: Marie Huff
Marie Huff, Dean of College of Health & Human Services

Date 3/18/2015

Approved: Rodney Rogers
Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP

Date 3/23/15

APPENDIX A

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

Merit criteria are limited to three areas: Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service. To determine whether faculty members have failed to meet, met, or exceeded expectations for merit, a merit system should identify performance indicators and expected levels of performance for each of the relevant areas noted above. The merit system should also describe how information on the various performance indicators are combined to calculate the relevant component merit scores (i.e., Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service).

Overview

Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the PAH department member on the following performance criteria: Teaching, Research, 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.

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, Research, 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 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.

Teaching

Teaching Effectiveness assignment for calendar year: _____

Pre-specified allocation of effort for Teaching: 60 %

Using the minimum five 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.

To meet departmental expectations in Teaching, faculty should demonstrate applicable activity in all of the following ways.

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (Circle One)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (Evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
<u>Undergraduate Teaching</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceeds expectations (4.25 or higher) 	

<p><i>Quantitative ratings of teaching effectiveness. A total student evaluation average (on a 5 point scale) of all courses taught in the calendar year.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets expectations (3.5 or higher) • Does not meet expectations (less than 3.5) 	
<p><u>Undergraduate Teaching</u> <i>Qualitative ratings of teaching effectiveness.</i> Documentation of successful student learning outcomes (such as medium to high scores on standardized assessment measures, licensure or professional examinations, positive reports from the adjunct faculty of affiliated clinical sites).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive • Neutral • Negative 	
<p><u>Graduate Teaching</u> A total student evaluation average (on a 5 point scale) of all courses taught in the calendar year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceeds expectations (4.25 or higher) • Meets expectations (3.5 or higher) • Does not meet expectations (less than 3.5) 	
<p><u>Graduate Teaching</u> Participation in the direction of theses and/or dissertations, or membership on graduate committees. Graduate Faculty status.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceeds expectations—2 or more activities • Meets expectations—1 activity • Does not meet expectations—no activity 	
<p><u>Additional contributions to student learning</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent studies offered to students above typical workload • The development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses • Innovations in the effective use of instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning • Participation in curriculum review or development of master syllabi • Integration of service learning activities • Academic advising services provided to students • Effective guidance of students in clinical settings, internships, or cooperative work experiences • Participation in University, College, or Department projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning; and other pedagogical activities that contribute to effective teaching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceeds expectations—3 or more activities • Meets expectations—2 activities • Does not meet expectations—1 or less activity 	

Merit Score (point allocation)

Definition and Description

Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Teaching (4-5)	Preponderance of ratings are in the highest categories OR preponderance of ratings are in the upper-middle categories with one aspect rated as truly exceptional Innovative teacher; provides leadership in instructional development
Meets Expectations for Merit in Teaching (2-3)	Preponderance of ratings are in the middle to upper middle categories Meets obligations well
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Teaching (1)	Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories Minimally meets expectations for performance but not to the level deserving of merit Substandard and ineffective teacher

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

Research

Pre-specified allocation of effort for Research: 30%

There are differing levels of importance, academic depth, and prestige associated with the various types of Research that are recognized by the Department. A two-tiered model is used to categorize faculty research activities. Research will be evaluated using the minimum five 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. To **meet** departmental expectations in Research, faculty should demonstrate applicable activity in all of the following ways.

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (Circle One)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (Evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
<p>Tier 1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Peer reviewed publications (or acceptance letter) of submissions in journals or symposium. Publication or submission of books, monograms, and review articles. Successful procurement of external grant (Primary Investigator) <p>To qualify, each publication must be peer-reviewed and have an ISBN or ISSN number or be published by the federal government.</p> <p>Some of the factors that may be considered in addition to the number of scholarly products include, but are not</p>	<p><u>Exceeds Expectation</u>- Two activities in Tier 1, <u>and</u> at least two additional activities from any tier.</p> <p><u>Meets Expectation</u>- One activity in Tier 1 or three activities in Tier 2.</p> <p><u>Does not meet expectation</u>- No activity in Tier 1 or fewer than three activities in Tier 2</p> <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grants: performance of duties as principal investigator carry more 	

<p>limited to: a) the quality of publication outlets, b) leadership roles on projects that produced scholarly products, c) order of authorship, and d) the impact of specific research designs (e.g., ethnographic, qualitative, and/or longitudinal) that may reasonably elongate publication time-lines on particular research projects.</p>	<p>weight than co-principal investigator for funded projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funded grants are more highly regarded than unfunded research proposals. 	
<p>Tier 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentations at national or international meetings sponsored by professional societies or organizations recognized for their leadership in the discipline. Peer-reviewed abstracts published in journals and proceedings of leading societies within the discipline. Unfunded research proposals. Research funds awarded. Digital products such as software provided they are published and distributed by a recognized vendor. Presentations at state or regional meetings sponsored by professional societies or organizations recognized for their leadership in the discipline. Professional and/or Non-Professional development activities on and off campus Local presentations Community outreach with evaluation component 		

Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description
<p>Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Research (4-5)</p>	<p>Preponderance of ratings are in the highest categories OR preponderance of ratings are in the upper-middle categories with one aspect rated as truly exceptional</p>

	Clear line of inquiry and established research program, meaningful integration and application
Meets Expectations for Merit in Research (2-3)	Preponderance of ratings are in the middle to upper middle categories Active scholarship
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Research (1)	Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories Minimally meets expectations for performance but not to the level deserving of merit Limited or no research program

Merit Score for Research (to be completed by merit committee member): __

Service

Pre-Specified Allocation of Effort for Service 10 %

Service will be evaluated using the minimum five 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.

To **meet** departmental expectations in Service, faculty must demonstrate active involvement in a minimum of two-three internal service activities and active involvement in one-two external service activities.

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (Circle One)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (Evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
<u>Internal</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment/election and service on Departmental Committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like. • Appointment/election and service on College Committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like • Appointment/election and service on University Committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like • Special projects by assignment from Chair or Dean • Evidence of contributions to the recruitment and retention of undergraduates and/or graduates, 	<p>Exceeds expectations - active involvement in four or more internal service activities (examples are not all inclusive)</p> <p>Meets Expectations - active involvement in a minimum of two-three internal service activities.</p> <p>Does not meet expectations - active involvement in one or fewer internal service activities.</p>	

<p>and placement of graduates (as appropriate).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serve as faculty advisor to student club or organization • Serve and actively participate on faculty search and/or annual symposium planning committees 		
<p><u>External/Professional Service</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in agency boards of directors or advisory boards • Organization of professional conferences, symposiums, etc. • Peer review for academic journals and/or reviewer for extramural funding agencies • Participation in activities that enhance one's profession (e.g. licensure activities, professional supervision, etc.) • Membership and active involvement with professional organizations connected to his/her discipline at the local, state, national, or international levels 	<p>Exceeds expectations - active involvement in more than two external service activities (examples are not all inclusive)</p> <p>Meets Expectations - active involvement in a one-two external service activities.</p> <p>Does not meet expectations – no involvement in any external or professional service activities</p>	

Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Service (4-5)	Preponderance of ratings are in the highest categories OR preponderance of ratings are in the upper-middle categories with one aspect rated as truly exceptional
Meets Expectations for Merit in Service (2-3)	Preponderance of ratings are in the middle to upper middle categories
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Service (1)	Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories Minimally meets expectations for performance but not to the level deserving of merit

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	Merit Score for Research	Merit Score for Service

Appendix B

Determining Overall Merit Score Recommendations

The individual component merit scores for teaching, research, and service are combined to arrive at an overall merit score. Allocation of effort is taken into account when determining overall merit score. The overall merit may include a greater number of values or rating levels than seven, but it must clearly identify whether the overall merit rating reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

A Merit Committee of three tenure-track faculty will be formed via faculty vote. NTTF faculty may not serve on the committee but are eligible to vote on its membership. All department faculty members who wish to be evaluated for merit raises must submit a copy of their PAH Annual Merit Portfolio to the Chair in January. The Chair will notify department faculty members of the deadline for submission of the Annual Merit Portfolio by the end of the fall semester each year.

Annual Merit Portfolio

The Annual Merit Portfolio should contain the following elements in each of the three components (Teaching, Research, and Service) from the past calendar year. The merit portfolio should contain only information based on the preceding calendar year of work (not three year rolling averages).

Teaching Component of Portfolio

1. Teaching philosophy.
2. A list of courses taught over the past calendar year, with enrollment data. For clinical teaching, a list of numbers of students supervised per semester.
3. A list of other instructional activities.
4. Student rating summary sheets for all courses taught, and for any clinical teaching assignments, over the past calendar year.
5. Self-reflection/analysis of performance based on student ratings and any other factors the faculty member wishes to include.

The faculty member may also include other information he or she believes will assist in documenting/evaluating his or her teaching effectiveness. However copies of student ratings and raw data from teaching evaluations should not be included—such data must be summarized.

Research Component of Portfolio

1. Research statement, outlining and explaining faculty member's program of research over the past calendar year as well as goals and projected timelines for research activities.
2. CV, highlighting any of the above-listed elements that are indicators of research success.
3. For any indicators of research success not in the CV, a listing and narrative description of these elements should be appended.

Faculty may submit any additional supporting materials they believe will improve the documentation of their scholarship (e.g., awards and recognitions) with their portfolios. If they prefer, faculty may choose to develop an annotated/bulleted version of the relevant portions of their CV, rather than submitting a highlighted version, for clarity.

Service Component of portfolio

1. Service philosophy.
2. A list of service activities and frequency of meeting for the past calendar, as defined above.
3. Self-reflection/analysis of service activities, including annual goals.

Faculty may also include any other information they believe will assist in documenting/evaluating their service effectiveness.

Evaluation procedure

The Merit Committee will take into consideration each faculty member's allocation of effort in determining a merit score for each area; NTTF lacking allocation of effort to research need not be evaluated in this area, however if they are doing research even though not assigned, they can request evaluation of such efforts. TTF faculty with different allocations of effort to research must be evaluated with this differential in mind; those with lesser allocations of effort to research have lower expectations for productivity than those with greater allocations of effort to research.

The Merit Committee is charged with evaluating portfolios submitted by Bargaining Unit members and transmitting a Merit Score for each, with a written rationale and an overall recommendation for merit salary raise, to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will conduct an independent Merit evaluation.

Evaluations of Research

The Merit Committee will evaluate the Research/Creative Work of each continuing faculty member and submit their recommendations to the Chair as prescribed below.

- Study PAH Annual Merit Portfolios of all continuing full-time faculty
- Produce 3 independent sets of ratings for Teaching, Research/Creative Work and Service for each continuing full-time faculty member that has submitted a Merit Portfolio
- The Merit Committee rates each full-time faculty member on a 5-point scale. Scores of 4 and higher are considered to exceed expectations. The Merit Committee does not produce percentages or dollar figures.
- No composite ratings are produced by the Merit Committee
- Each committee member forwards his/her ratings to the Chair.
- The Chair uses the Merit Committee findings as described in the Evaluation Process for Merit below.

Evaluation Process for Merit

The Department uses the following method to evaluate faculty for merit.

1. A 5-point scale is used for merit evaluations.
 - Ratings <2.0 are not considered for merit; Ratings 4-5 are considered exceeding expectations
2. Merit Committee submits individual ratings for Teaching, Research/Creative Work and Service for each PAH full-time faculty member.

3. The final scores of each category are multiplied by the PAH Allocation of Effort percentages (for TTF: 60% teaching, 30% research/creative, 10% service) (for administrative responsibilities: 40% teaching, 30% research/creative, 10% service, 20% administration) (for NTTF: 80% teaching and 20% service). Percentages for faculty with alternative Allocations of Effort will be adjusted.
4. Scores from each category are averaged together for the Total Individual Merit Score. A faculty member falling below 2 points in any category is disqualified from receiving merit no matter how high their averaged individual merit score.
5. Individual Merit Score recommendations are compiled by the Chair and forwarded to the Dean.
6. The Dean informs each faculty member of his or her Total Individual Merit Score.

Consideration for Varying Allocations of Effort

The Chair must inform the Merit Committee in writing of any faculty members who are assigned an allocation of effort differing from the normal percentages. Likewise, members of the Merit Committee must take these variances into consideration in their evaluations.

Process for Appeal of Merit Decisions

Faculty members may appeal the merit score they received from the department/school merit committee by submitting an appeal within two business days. The merit committee will review each appeal and provide those faculty members with the final merit score assigned. The Chair will submit the committee's report to the Dean with his/her support or non-support of the report's decision. The Dean will make the final decision on the appeal.

The merit committee takes allocation of effort into consideration when holistically combining their consensus ratings for teaching, research, and service to arrive at an overall merit score.

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