

**Merit Document**  
**Department of Archival Collections and Branches, University Libraries**

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: Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/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., Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Work, and Service), performance indicators and expectations for the criteria, and the calculation of the component merit scores (i.e., Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/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, if different than the standard 70% Librarian Effectiveness, 20% Scholarly/Creative Work and 10% Service.
- 2.2. The department merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. ACB faculty may act as a committee of the whole or choose to elect a representative committee of ACB faculty members who will serve as a departmental merit committee. The committee must be made up of faculty members in ACB and consist of

at least 3 people elected by the department faculty. If there is an election held for a merit committee, ties will be resolved by drawing lots.

- The merit process will be initiated by the ACB Faculty Facilitator (see the departmental reappointment, promotion, and tenure document for details on this role) who will take responsibility for forwarding merit information to the department chair and making sure that each member of the merit committee has access to each faculty member's dossier.
  - Bargaining Unit Faculty Members, in this set of procedures, will refer both to tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty members in the Department of Archival Collections and Branches, unless otherwise stated.
- 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:
- completed Annual Data Outline form (Appendix D) listing activities completed during the previous calendar year (and not submitted to the merit committee in previous years)
  - position description
  - copies of (or links to) publications during the calendar year
  - allocation of effort agreement (if different than 70% Librarian Effectiveness, 20% Scholarly/Creative Work and 10% Service).
  - Documentation of special circumstances (see section 4 below), if applicable.
- 2.5. Each Committee Member will mark the Merit Rubric (see Appendix A) for each of the other Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in the department, assigning a score from 1 to 7 for each criteria (Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Work, and Service), using the associated performance indicators to guide the scoring; 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 assigning scores. The committee members will complete and submit a Summary Form (see Appendix C) to the Faculty Facilitator, who will compile and average all scores and share with each individual faculty member their average score from the Committee. A copy of the Summary Form reflecting the average score from Merit Committee Members will be submitted to the department chair, after each faculty member has had an opportunity to resolve informally any factual or interpretive issues.
- The department chair will independently evaluate the ACB Bargaining Unit Faculty Members following the Merit Rubric (Appendix A) and the Weighted Allocation of Effort Algorithm (Appendix B). The department chair will inform each Bargaining Unit Faculty Member of his or her evaluation from the chair. Upon completion of the merit process, the department chair also completes a copy of the Summary Form and submits this, along with the dossiers and the Bargaining Unit Faculty Members' Summary Form to the dean.
  - The individual component merit scores for librarian effectiveness, scholarly/creative work, 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 score is computed using a simple algorithm taking into account the weighted allocation of effort for each performance area:  
 [Librarian Effectiveness Merit Score \* Allocation of Effort]

+ [Scholarly/Creative Work Merit Score \* Allocation of Effort]  
 + [Service Merit Score \* Allocation of Effort]  
 = Overall Merit Score

- 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).
- With the exception of external peer review, the same performance indicators described in the department's reappointment, promotion, and tenure policies are to be used for merit review, and they are to be consistent with those criteria found in Article 14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and the individual faculty member's allocation of effort.
- The ACB Chair and ACB Faculty Facilitator will ensure that all forms used in the merit process are taken to the UL Administrative Office to be kept in compliance with the UL Dean's Office record retention schedule.

### 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 to 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.

Approved by the Department of Archival Collections and Branches at the Month, Date, Year Faculty Meeting

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Susannah Cleveland, Chair

Date March 19, 2015

Approved:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sara Bushong, Dean of University Libraries

Date 3/27/15

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

Date 4/3/15

## **APPENDIX A**

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

Merit criteria are limited to three areas: Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/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., Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Work, and Service).

#### **Merit Rubric**

##### **Overview**

Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the department/school member on the following performance criteria: Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Work, and Service. Each of the aforementioned criteria will be evaluated using a number of performance indicators. Merit committee members will review information submitted by each faculty member to assign a numerical score for each criteria using a rating scale anchored with examples of expected levels (or their equivalent) of performance on the performance indicators. Merit committee members will review each peer's Annual Data Outline (Appendix D) to derive component scores for each of the relevant performance criteria and report scores to the Faculty Facilitator using the summary form provided. The component scores may include any range of values, but they must clearly identify whether the assigned score on the criteria (e.g., librarian effectiveness) reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

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

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

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

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

The merit committee will then assign an overall merit rating using the approach found in Section 2.5 of the merit policy. The overall merit may include any number of values or

rating levels, but it must clearly identify whether the overall merit rating reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

### Instructions

For each activity, determine if the faculty member does not meet, meets, or exceeds the stated expectations. Within the range of points for the appropriate threshold, assign a single score for each activity. Record the score for each activity in the far right column. Assign only one score per activity. Upon completion of each section, review the scores for each activity and derive upon a comprehensive score for that section.

For example, if the faculty member meets expectations in the first category, "Demonstrates mastery and maintenance of professional skills, knowledge required to do job, and subject and/or collection expertise," you would assign a score between 2.5 and 5.49 and record that score in the far right column of the "Meets expectations for merit" row under that activity.

Evaluation Rating Category	LIBRARIAN EFFECTIVENESS Expected levels of accomplishment on librarian effectiveness performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Librarian Effectiveness	Assigned Merit Score for Librarian Effectiveness
Activity	Demonstrates mastery and maintenance of professional skills, knowledge required to do job, and subject and/or collection expertise		
Exceeds expectations for merit	<p>In addition to meeting expectations, also completes listed activities in the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initiates or takes a lead role in special unit projects and activities</li> <li>• Assists other librarians with difficult patron questions</li> <li>• Locates resources beyond patron expectations</li> <li>• Implements emerging trends for the benefit of ACB and/or unit</li> <li>• Actively searches for new innovations to improve ACB and/or unit</li> <li>• Attends professional meetings and workshops and applies new skills/knowledge to ACB and/or unit</li> <li>• Improves individual effectiveness by</li> </ul>	5.5-7.0	

	applying knowledge gained from professional development activities		
Meets expectations for merit	<p>Completes listed activities in the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is prepared for desk shifts, as applicable</li> <li>• Arrives on time and completing assigned tasks in a timely manner</li> <li>• Participates in special unit projects and activities</li> <li>• Works to ensure that patrons are receiving good service</li> <li>• Keeps current knowledge of UL resources (i.e. research databases, LibGuides, reference tools)</li> <li>• Demonstrates knowledge of collection and subject through outreach, orientation, and instruction</li> <li>• Is aware of emerging trends in specialization</li> <li>• Adheres to national standards where appropriate</li> <li>• Stays current with profession (i.e., attends workshops, views webinars, reads blogs, e-mail lists, literature, etc.).</li> </ul>	2.5 – 5.49	
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations</li> <li>• Refuses to respond to mentoring</li> <li>• Demonstrates incompetence in this area</li> </ul>	1.0 – 2.49	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Demonstrates effective written and oral communication skills</b>		
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actively demonstrates leadership in communication style.</li> <li>• Makes efficient use of colleague and staff time</li> <li>• Actively requests feedback from colleagues and users for improvement</li> <li>• Continuously improves collaborative endeavors and their effects</li> </ul>	5.5-7.0	



Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responds in a timely manner to written communications</li> <li>• Attends, is prepared for and participates in meetings</li> <li>• Participates in collaborative endeavors, when appropriate</li> <li>• Consistently communicates effectively with colleagues to share knowledge and skills</li> <li>• Represents the library internally and externally in a positive way through presentations, interactions, or written communications that are a credit to the library</li> <li>• Works to resolve conflicts when they arise</li> <li>• Shares concerns constructively</li> </ul>	2.5 – 5.49	
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations</li> <li>• Refuses to respond to mentoring</li> <li>• Demonstrates incompetence in this area</li> </ul>	1.0 – 2.49	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Maintains constructive interaction and collaboration with the university community (faculty, staff, student assistants, and users)</b>		
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotes/establishes a new collaboration with UL or the University</li> <li>• Makes substantial improvements to existing collaborations</li> <li>• Assumes a leadership role in university community</li> </ul>	5.5-7.0	
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regularly completes projects with others</li> <li>• Collaborates with classroom faculty to develop a meaningful library experience</li> <li>• Participates in campus activities and governance</li> <li>• Maintains positive relationships with campus constituencies</li> </ul>	2.5 – 5.49	

<p>Fails to meet expectations for merit</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations</li> <li>Refuses to respond to mentoring</li> <li>Demonstrates incompetence in this area</li> </ul>	1.0 – 2.49	
<p><b>Activity</b></p>	<p><b>Provides effective service to external clientele (donors, scholars, vendors, et al)</b></p>		
<p>Exceeds expectations for merit</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Succeeds in procuring relevant resources for the collection</li> <li>Succeeds in acquiring substantial funds (\$5,000+) from a new or existing donor to use for the collection</li> <li>Is regularly solicited for feedback from vendors</li> <li>Receives thanks from scholars in publications</li> </ul>	5.5-7.0	
<p>Meets expectations for merit</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintains effective relations with existing donors resulting in continued donations to existing collections of materials</li> <li>Builds productive relationship with appropriate vendors</li> <li>Cultivates relationships with local and visiting scholars and helps them to find appropriate resources</li> </ul>	2.5 – 5.49	
<p>Fails to meet expectations for merit</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations</li> <li>Refuses to respond to mentoring</li> <li>Demonstrates incompetence in this area</li> </ul>	1.0 – 2.49	
<p><b>Activity</b></p>	<p><b>Conducts regular assessment and improvement of service in relation to goals of the library and the department, and needs of users</b></p>		
<p>Exceeds expectations for merit</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates commitment to student learning through regular assessment activities</li> <li>Assesses collaborative endeavors and their effects</li> </ul>	5.5-7.0	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Actively anticipates emerging trends in access and maintenance and assesses workflows and procedures for consistency and effectiveness</li> <li>Actively engages in projects and endeavors to continuously improve library services through regular assessment activities</li> </ul>		
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is receptive to and implements pertinent feedback</li> <li>Actively engages in projects and endeavors to improve library services in relation to the goals of UL, ACB, the unit, and the needs of users</li> <li>Provides access and maintenance to materials in a timely manner</li> <li>Follows prescribed standards for access and maintenance</li> </ul>	2.5 – 5.49	
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations</li> <li>Refuses to respond to mentoring</li> <li>Demonstrates incompetence in this area</li> </ul>	1.0 – 2.49	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Exercises effective judgment, initiative, and flexibility in line with the unit and university's goals and strategic directions</b>		
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initiates and implements personal goals and objectives based on unit strategic directions</li> <li>Demonstrates ability to make effective decisions in the absence of head librarian</li> <li>Introduces initiatives to help colleagues react to change</li> </ul>	5.5-7.0	
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Asks for guidance or assistance as appropriate</li> <li>Exhibits self-motivation in planning work activities</li> <li>Exhibits ability to adapt and/or prioritize work activities</li> <li>Regularly aligns work with department's strategic plan</li> </ul>	2.5 – 5.49	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adapts to changes in environment, technology, standards, etc.</li> </ul>		
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations</li> <li>Refuses to respond to mentoring</li> <li>Demonstrates incompetence in this area</li> </ul>	1.0 – 2.49	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Demonstrates effective time management and use of human and material resources</b>		
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes practical money-saving initiatives</li> <li>Covers desk shifts, staff tasks when other staff are absent</li> <li>Continuously seeks ways to improve workflows and procedures for everyday tasks and works with colleagues to implement them when practical</li> </ul>	5.5-7.0	
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arrives on time and works appropriate hours</li> <li>Manages budgetary allocations responsibly</li> <li>Works efficiently with colleagues</li> <li>Is mindful of preservation in use of materials</li> <li>Responds to requests in a timely manner</li> <li>Adheres to archival standards in relation to collection stewardship</li> <li>Delegates routine tasks as appropriate</li> </ul>	2.5 – 5.49	
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations</li> <li>Refuses to respond to mentoring</li> <li>Demonstrates incompetence in this area</li> </ul>	1.0 – 2.49	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Represents the library and collections professionally to outside groups: local, regional, national, and international</b>		
Exceeds expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initiates contacts with outside entities</li> <li>Actively promotes collection at local,</li> </ul>	5.5-7.0	

ns for merit	regional, state, or national meetings/conferences		
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responds to and accommodates, when possible, requests for tours of collection</li> <li>• Responds to research requests regarding collections</li> <li>• Provides subject expertise to outside entities/individuals</li> </ul>	2.5 – 5.49	
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations</li> <li>• Refuses to respond to mentoring</li> <li>• Demonstrates incompetence in this area</li> </ul>	1.0 – 2.49	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Participates actively and effectively in University Libraries governance and policy formation</b>		
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leads discussions</li> <li>• Volunteers to work directly on policy formation by being on the writing team</li> <li>• Assumes positions of leadership</li> </ul>	5.5-7.0	
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attends meetings</li> <li>• Participates in discussions</li> <li>• Prepares for meetings as necessary</li> <li>• Accepts a role in the work of the committee</li> </ul>	2.5 – 5.49	
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations</li> <li>• Refuses to respond to mentoring</li> <li>• Demonstrates incompetence in this area</li> </ul>	1.0 – 2.49	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Participates actively and effectively in departmental responsibilities (including, but not limited to merit evaluation activities)</b>		
Exceeds expectations for	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Takes a leadership role in departmental activities such as: leading discussions, volunteering to work on tasks force,</li> </ul>	5.5-7.0	

merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• being the Faculty Facilitator, etc.</li> </ul>		
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attends meetings.</li> <li>• Participates in discussions.</li> <li>• Respond to requests for activity reports, etc. in a timely manner.</li> <li>• Participates in special departmental projects and activities.</li> </ul>	2.5 – 5.49	
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations</li> <li>• Refuses to respond to mentoring</li> <li>• Demonstrates incompetence in this area</li> </ul>	1.0 – 2.49	
	<b>Additional Requirements for Collection Heads</b>		
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Develops, implements, and assesses programs, policies, and procedures to enhance the unit's service and work effectiveness</b>		
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actively seeks to refine or develop new policies and procedures to improve service to users.</li> <li>• Improves the unit's service and work effectiveness.</li> </ul>	5.5-7.0	
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updates unit policies and procedures as needed</li> <li>• Participates in assessment of programs and services as needed</li> <li>• Participates in developing and implementing policies and procedures</li> <li>• Cultivates and supports activities of unit staff</li> </ul>	2.5 – 5.49	
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations</li> <li>• Refuses to respond to mentoring</li> <li>• Demonstrates incompetence in this area</li> </ul>	1.0 – 2.49	

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Advocates for the unit, representing concerns to others within the department and the UL</b>		
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In addition to requirements under Meets expectations</li> <li>Anticipates needs for the collection and seeks solutions.</li> </ul>	5.5-7.0	
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attends required meetings</li> <li>Participates in discussion</li> <li>Advocates for ACB and unit as appropriate</li> <li>Delegates unit representation when appropriate</li> <li>Communicates with and solicits feedback from unit staff to keep their interests represented</li> <li>Responds to information requests from library administration in a timely way</li> </ul>	2.5 – 5.49	
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations</li> <li>Refuses to respond to mentoring</li> <li>Demonstrates incompetence in this area</li> </ul>	1.0 – 2.49	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Delegates work appropriately with attention to and recognition of staff contributions</b>		
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Solicits, implements, and promotes ideas by staff members.</li> </ul>	5.5-7.0	
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is willing to hear new ideas by staff members</li> <li>Distributes credit appropriately</li> <li>Manages duties with appropriate sharing of duties</li> </ul>	2.5 – 5.49	
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations</li> <li>Refuses to respond to mentoring</li> <li>Demonstrates incompetence in this area</li> </ul>	1.0 – 2.49	

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Manages unit's day-to-day operations effectively, including clearly articulating unit's goals and objectives and actively participating in unit's work</b>		
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seeks continuous improvement to unit programs and services.</li> <li>Looks for ways to improve unit cohesiveness.</li> </ul>	5.5-7.0	
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gathers staff input for unit goals and objectives</li> <li>Supports staff to acquire professional development to meet unit goals and objectives and personal growth</li> <li>Holds unit staff meetings on a regular basis to discuss current and future activities of all staff and to provide UL updates</li> <li>Is aware of staff activities</li> <li>Addresses personnel issues as they arise</li> <li>Meets with faculty members to assess/review monthly activities</li> <li>Coordinates the activities of the unit to resolve conflicts of resources, time, or personnel</li> </ul>	2.5 – 5.49	
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations</li> <li>Refuses to respond to mentoring</li> <li>Demonstrates incompetence in this area</li> </ul>	1.0 – 2.49	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Develops and manages the special collection</b>		
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Succeeds in procuring appropriate resources for the collection.</li> <li>Succeeds in acquiring substantial funds (\$5,000+) from a new or existing donor to use for the collection.</li> </ul>	5.5-7.0	
Meets expectations for	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has effective relations with donors resulting in continued donations to existing collections of materials</li> </ul>	2.5 – 5.49	



merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sets clear collection development parameters in conjunction with all staff</li> <li>• Addresses archival practices in regard to collection</li> <li>• Regards stewardship of collection as a vital responsibility</li> </ul>		
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations</li> <li>• Refuses to respond to mentoring</li> <li>• Demonstrates incompetence in this area</li> </ul>	1.0 – 2.49	

#### Merit Score for Librarian Effectiveness

(far right column added and divided by 10 for regular faculty member and by 15 for collection heads; to be completed by merit committee member): \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation Rating Category	SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE WORK Expected levels of accomplishment on scholarship/creative work performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Scholarly Work	Assigned Merit Score for Scholarly Work
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete four or more activities from the Meets Expectations category.</li> <li>• Publish a peer-reviewed academic book</li> <li>• Publish a professional textbook with a recognized publisher</li> <li>• Publish a book-length index, bibliography, manual, handbook, or report</li> <li>• Edit or co-edit books, proceedings, collections or other edited books</li> <li>• Edit a professional journal</li> <li>• Publish a professional article in a peer-reviewed journal</li> <li>• Publish a chapter or an essay in a peer-reviewed book</li> <li>• Obtain a significant external grant</li> <li>• Present at a multistate or national conference (poster session or presentation)</li> </ul>	5.5 – 7.0	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan and/or organize a conference or workshop for state, multistate, or national audience</li> <li>• Hold membership on a state-level or above grant review panel</li> <li>• Achieve equivalent (such as media production or discipline-specific creative work).</li> </ul>		
Meets expectations for merit	<p>Complete at least two activities from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engage actively in ongoing scholarship and writing</li> <li>• Submit a conference proposal or present at a local or state conference (including poster sessions )</li> <li>• Deliver local lecture or presentation on ongoing scholarship</li> <li>• Serve as a panelist or moderator</li> <li>• Chair a panel</li> <li>• Plan and/or organize a conference or workshop for local audience</li> <li>• Publish an article in a non-refereed publication</li> <li>• Submit a grant application and/or secure a grant</li> <li>• Serve on a local grant review panel</li> <li>• Publish a book review or another type of professional review</li> <li>• Submit an academic article, book chapter, or the equivalent for review</li> <li>• Publish a section(s) of an index, bibliography, manual, handbook, or report</li> <li>• Publish web-based publications (at least statewide audience) such as: web guides, pathfinders, bibliographies, professional blog posts (external to BGSU)</li> <li>• Edit a newsletter or journal column</li> <li>• Review journal manuscripts</li> <li>• Serve on a journal editorial board</li> <li>• Publish technical reports for a regional, national, or international audience</li> <li>• Grant interviews for externally</li> </ul>	2.5 – 5.49	

	distributed media <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teach an uncompensated for-credit course that is not required in the position description</li> </ul>		
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fail to complete at least two activities from Meets Expectations or Exceeds Expectations categories</li> </ul>	1.0 – 2.49	

**Merit Score for Scholarly/Creative Work (to be completed by merit committee member): \_\_\_\_\_**

<b>Evaluation Rating Category</b>	<b>SERVICE Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators (or their equivalent)</b>	<b>Possible Merit Score for Service</b>	<b>Assigned Merit Score for Service</b>
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lead a major aspect of the department's academic life beyond the day-to-day activities; for example, lead a student organization, direct a departmental program, lead a search, chair an important and productive committee, or the equivalent</li> <li>• Take a leadership role in an important aspect of college or university governance or organization; for example, chair a committee that rewrites major policies, take a faculty leadership role, or the equivalent</li> <li>• Take a leadership role in a state or national professional organization, or function in a central capacity in the publication of a professional journal, or the equivalent</li> <li>• Take a leadership role in a local community service organization based upon professional expertise</li> </ul>	5.5 – 7.0	
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serve on one or two committees at the department level and/or at the college or university level</li> <li>• Chair an active department committee or serve on two or more active committees at the department, college</li> </ul>	2.5 – 5.49	

	<p>or university level or the equivalent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Take a leadership role in some aspect of university work, e.g. assisting with a search, developing a new course, leading an assessment activity for the department or the university, developing a student-centered activity, or the equivalent</li> <li>• Serve on a network or consortial committee</li> <li>• Serve on a committee for a professional organization</li> <li>• Respond to requests for activity reports, workload plans, etc. in a timely fashion.</li> <li>• Perform some community or professional service based upon professional expertise</li> </ul>		
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fail to complete at least two activities from Meets Expectations or Exceeds Expectations categories</li> </ul>	1.0 – 2.49	

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

## **Appendix B Determining Overall Merit Score Recommendations**

The individual component merit scores for librarian effectiveness, scholarly/creative work, 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.

### **Weighted Allocation of Effort Algorithm**

Once each Bargaining Unit Faculty Member has completed the Merit Rubric (Appendix A) for each peer, the overall merit score is computed using a simple algorithm taking into account the weighted allocation of effort for each performance area:

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

<b>Overall Merit Score</b>	<b>Interpretation (assumes component performance ratings made on 7-point scale)</b>
1.0 – 2.49	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
2.5 – 5.49	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
5.5 – 7.0	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit

## Appendix C Reporting Results

After each faculty member scores each Bargaining Unit Faculty Member in the department, the Faculty Facilitator will compile the results of decisions in the following form and send to the department chair. The chair will include a copy of the faculty's completed form along with his or her own reviews when submitting merit information the Dean of the University Libraries.

### SUMMARY FORM

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

Faculty Member	Merit Score for Librarian Effectiveness (A)	Weight for Librarian Effectiveness (B)	Merit Score for Scholarly/Creative Work (C)	Weight for Scholarly/Creative Work (D)	Merit Score for Service (E)	Weight for Service (F)	Total Weighted Score: (A*B) + (C*D) + (E*F)
<i>Faculty member 1</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>		<i>Insert numerical score</i>		<i>Insert numerical score</i>		
<i>Faculty member 2</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>		<i>Insert numerical score</i>		<i>Insert numerical score</i>		
<i>Next faculty member, etc.</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>		<i>Insert numerical score</i>		<i>Insert numerical score</i>		

## Appendix D Annual Data Outline

### Instructions

For each activity, list evidence of your performance in that area. Include activities from the last calendar year that have not been recorded in previous years. Some activities may appear under multiple headings. Once you have completed the form, submit it, along with other documentation (see 2.4 above) to the ACB Faculty Facilitator for distribution to other Bargaining Unit Faculty Members.

For specific criteria, see the Merit Rubric (Appendix A).

<b>LIBRARIAN EFFECTIVENESS</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Demonstrates mastery and maintenance of professional skills, knowledge required to do job, and subject and/or collection expertise</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Demonstrates effective written and oral communication skills</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Maintains constructive interaction and collaboration with the university community (faculty, staff, student assistants, and users)</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Provides effective service to external clientele (donors, scholars, vendors, et al)</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Conducts regular assessment and improvement of service in relation to goals of the library and the department, and needs of users</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Exercises effective judgment, initiative, and flexibility in line with the unit and university's goals and strategic directions</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Demonstrates effective time management and use of human and material resources</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Represents the library and collections professionally to outside groups: local, regional, national, and international</b>

Evidence	
Activity	Participates actively and effectively in University Libraries governance and policy formation
Evidence	
Activity	Participates actively and effectively in departmental responsibilities (including, but not limited to merit evaluation activities)
Evidence	
	<b>Additional Requirements for Collection Heads</b>
Activity	Develops, implements, and assesses programs, policies, and procedures to enhance the unit's service and work effectiveness
Evidence	
Activity	Advocates for the unit, representing concerns to others within the department and the UL
Evidence	
Activity	Delegates work appropriately with attention to and recognition of staff contributions
Evidence	
Activity	Manages unit's day-to-day operations effectively, including clearly articulating unit's goals and objectives and actively participating in unit's work
Evidence	
Activity	Develops and manages the special collection
Evidence	

<b>SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORK</b>	
Activity	Publish a peer-reviewed academic book
Evidence	
Activity	Publish a professional textbook with a recognized publisher
Evidence	
Activity	Publish a book-length index, bibliography, manual, handbook, or report
Evidence	
Activity	Edit or co-edit books, proceedings, collections or other edited books



Evidence	
Activity	Edit a professional journal
Evidence	
Activity	Publish a professional article in a peer-reviewed journal
Evidence	
Activity	Publish a chapter or an essay in a peer-reviewed book
Evidence	
Activity	Obtain a significant external grant
Evidence	
Activity	Present at a multistate or national conference (poster session or presentation)
Evidence	
Activity	Plan and/or organize a conference or workshop for state, multistate, or national audience
Evidence	
Activity	Hold membership on a state-level or above grant review panel
Evidence	
Activity	Achieve equivalent (such as media production or discipline-specific creative work).
Evidence	
Activity	Engage actively in ongoing scholarship and writing
Evidence	
Activity	Submit a conference proposal or present at a local or state conference (including poster sessions)
Evidence	
Activity	Deliver local lecture or presentation on ongoing scholarship
Evidence	
Activity	Serve as a panelist or moderator
Evidence	
Activity	Chair a panel
Evidence	
Activity	Plan and/or organize a conference or workshop for local audience

<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Publish an article in a non-refereed publication</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Submit a grant application and/or secure a grant</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Serve on a local grant review panel</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Publish a book review or another type of professional review</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Submit an academic article, book chapter, or the equivalent for review</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Publish a section(s) of an index, bibliography, manual, handbook, or report</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Publish web-based publications (at least statewide audience) such as: web guides, pathfinders, bibliographies, professional blog posts (external to BGSU)</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Edit a newsletter or journal column</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Review journal manuscripts</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Serve on a journal editorial board</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Publish technical reports for a regional, national, or international audience</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Grant interviews for externally distributed media</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Teach an uncompensated for-credit course that is not required in the position description</b>

Evidence	
----------	--

<b>SERVICE</b>	
Activity	Lead a major aspect of the department's academic life beyond the day-to-day activities; for example, lead a student organization, direct a departmental program, lead a search, chair an important and productive committee, or the equivalent
Evidence	
Activity	Take a leadership role in some aspect of university work, e.g. assisting with a search, developing a new course, leading an assessment activity for the department or the university, developing a student-centered activity, or the equivalent
Evidence	
Activity	Take a leadership role in a state or national professional organization, or function in a central capacity in the publication of a professional journal, or the equivalent
Evidence	
Activity	Take a leadership role in a local community service organization based upon professional expertise
Evidence	
Activity	Serve on one or two committees at the department level and/or at the college or university level
Evidence	
Activity	Chair an active department committee or serve on two or more active committees at the department, college or university level or the equivalent
Evidence	
Activity	Take a leadership role in some aspect of university work, e.g. assisting with a search, developing a new course, evaluating required texts for a course, leading an assessment activity for the department or the university, developing a student-centered activity, or the equivalent
Evidence	
Activity	Serve on a network or consortial committee

<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Serve on a committee for a professional organization</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Respond to requests for activity reports, workload plans, etc. in a timely fashion.</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Perform some community or professional service based upon professional expertise</b>
<b>Evidence</b>	