

Merit Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

Academic Unit: Computer Science

Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

Merit criteria are limited to three areas: Teaching Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service. To determine whether faculty member's performance is unacceptable, does not meet expectations for merit, does meet expectations for merit, or exceeds 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 is combined to calculate the relevant component merit scores (i.e., Teaching Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service).

Exemplar #3

Overview

Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the Department member on the following performance criteria: Teaching Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service. Each of the aforementioned criteria (e.g., teaching) will be evaluated using a number of performance indicators (e.g., quantitative student evaluations of teaching, including university-wide questions). Merit committee members will review information submitted by each faculty member to assign a numerical score for each criteria using an anchored rating scale anchored with examples of expected levels (or their equivalent) of performance on the performance indicators. Merit committee members will meet as a committee to review and reach consensus on component scores for each of the relevant performance criteria using the summary form provided.

The levels on each of the performance indicators used to capture how the unit defines faculty member's performance are noted below.

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.

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

Performance does not 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.

Performance is unacceptable: Activities in area cumulatively indicate a pattern of performance that is below an ordinary and acceptable level of performance for the

department, school, unit, and discipline and warrants attention. It is presumed to occur infrequently.

Evaluation Rating Category	TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Teaching Effectiveness*
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding student teaching evaluations (including university-wide questions) [examples: 60% of quantitative student evaluations in above average or superior category; 75% of quantitative student evaluations in average or above category; frequent use of active learning activities; positive peer evaluations; use of assessment Instruments to demonstrate teaching Improvement; positive qualitative student evaluations] • Significant contribution to Instruction [examples: external teaching/instruction-related grant submissions; Introduction or teaching of new courses; course modules (of faculty being evaluated) used by other faculty; other curriculum development initiatives; development of assessment instruments; other documentation of student success; supervision of 4 or more graduate or undergraduate student projects; chair of thesis or doctoral committees; impact of professional development activities on improving classroom instruction; teaching awards and distinctions; other scholarly and creative activities that contribute to teaching expertise] 	5.0 - 7.0
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good student teaching evaluations (including university-wide questions) [examples: majority of quantitative student evaluations In average or above category;-peer evaluations are positive, but provide some pointers for Improvement; use of active teaming techniques] • Additional performance indicators [examples: supervision of 2 or more graduate or undergraduate student projects; funded teaching/instruction-related internal grants; use of assessment instruments in teaching; participation in teaching-related professional development activities; member of thesis or doctoral committees] 	3.0 - 4.9
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic competence in teaching as evidenced by student teaching evaluations (including university-wide questions) and/or mediocre peer teaching observations [examples: majority of quantitative student evaluations in average or below category; recurring issues noted in qualitative student evaluations; student complaints and Inadequate follow-up] • Minimal additional performance indicator 	1.0 - 2.9
Unacceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal competence in teaching, as evidenced by consistently poor student evaluations (including university-wide questions) and/or substantial problems noted in peer observations [examples: majority of quantitative student evaluations in below average category; recurring issues noted in qualitative student evaluations with little or no indication of effort to address identified concerns; repeated record during the evaluation period of no involvement in any instructional development efforts or opportunities] • No additional performance indicators 	0.0 - 0.9

*Insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 1-5 point scale.

Merit Score for Teaching Effectiveness

(to be completed by merit committee member): _____

Evaluation Rating Category	SCHOLARLY / CREATIVE WORK Expected levels of accomplishment on scholarly/creative work performance indicator (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for scholarship/creative works*
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant publications in refereed journal/conference proceedings/presentations and/or funded external grant activity [examples: 3 or more peer reviewed journal/conference publications; prestigious conference presentations; high impact journal publication; impact of publications through measures such as citation count; funded external grant activities; frequent grant submissions and breadth of submissions; unfunded external grant submissions, but favorable reviews; collaborative publications with students or other university entities; other positive evidence on the nature and scope of publications or external grant submissions; paper or grant reviewer for federal or high impact publications; design or development of software/hardware to support scholarly/creative efforts; interdisciplinary scholarly/creative activities] 	5.0 - 7.0
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publications in refereed journal/conference or presentations and/or external grant activity and/or significant professional development [examples: 1 peer reviewed journal/conference publication; conference presentations; technical reports; external grant submissions; funded Internal grants; impact of scholarly/creative activity oriented professional development (for example acquiring new skill set in a scholarly domain) activities on scholarly/creative activities; collaborative work with student co-authors; minor additions to existing hardware or software systems to promote scholarly/creative activities; participation in collaborative scholarly/creative endeavors] 	3.0 - 4.9
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unrefereed publications in journal/conference and/or no external grant activity [examples: no refereed journal/conference or presentations and/or no external or internal grant activity; Professional development activities and/or service as editor, referee, or reviewer] 	1.0 - 2.9
Unacceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of scholarly/creative productivity [examples: no scholarly publications or submissions; Lack of professional development activities and lack of service to the profession - such as service as editor, referee, or reviewer] 	0.0 - 0.9

*Insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 1-5 point scale.

Merit Score for Scholarly/Creative Works (to be completed by merit committee member): _____

Evaluation Rating Category	SERVICE Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicator (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Service*
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant contribution in service activities [examples: service in the unit such as executive committee, assessment coordination and contribution to policy development; impact of faculty advisor roles in student-centered organizations; faculty advisor for two or more levels (example, freshmen and sophomore); leadership roles in CSAB or its subcommittees; CAS services such as A&S council, PTRC, major efforts in committees such as curriculum, scholarship, diversity; other major BGSU service efforts such as ad-hoc service activities and positive confirmation of service letters; other leadership/active engagement in service roles within BGSU, or outside In CS related roles; breadth of service roles; significant contributions to service learning projects] 	5.0 - 7.0
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular participation in service activities [examples: service in the unit such as ad hoc committees, book selection committee, coordinator for three or more courses, faculty advisor roles in student organizations; faculty advisor for one level [example, freshmen advisor]; CAS committee services; services to other BGSU or CS-related non-BGSU entities; willing to participate in service activities; some CS-related service roles within and outside of the unit; active in committee discussions] 	3.0 - 4.9
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal participation in service activities [examples: minimal contribution in committees within and/or outside the units; occasional complaints from stakeholders] 	1.0 - 2.9
Unacceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of contribution in committees within and/or outside the units or recurring issues with service activities. [examples: Unsatisfactory performance in service activities; repeated absences during the evaluation period from participation in program or unit committees; committee work not done or tardy; repeated absences during the evaluation period from participation in any non-committee services opportunities (e.g. program or unit events, contributing teaching materials to program or unit, program or unit teaching activities); frequent complaints from stakeholders; lack of non-BGSU service to the profession (e.g. reviewer, session organizer or chair, panelist)] 	0.0 - 0.9

*Insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 1-5 point scale.

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

SUMMARY FORM

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

Faculty Member	Merit Score for Teaching Effectiveness	Merit Score for Scholarly/Creative Work	Merit Score for Service
<i>Faculty member 1</i>
<i>Faculty member 2</i>
<i>Next faculty member, etc.</i>

Merit Committee Composition and the Election/Appointment Process

The department merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member.

The Computer Science department's Executive Committee (EC), excluding the CS chair, serves as the department Merit Committee. The process for electing this committee is described in the department handbook.

Members of the committee recuse themselves from self-evaluation, and evaluation of any EC member is done by the other EC members.

Elements of the Merit Dossier

The candidate will enter information and submit appropriate documentation of achievement in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work (if applicable), and service, via the system for electronic review. Student evaluation data will be uploaded by the Chair or designee.

Calculation of Overall Merit Score

The overall merit score is calculated based on standard template, 'Exemplar C.' The three year rolling average score will be calculated by averaging the current and last two years' overall merit scores.

Options for Determining Overall Merit Score Recommendations

The individual component merit scores for teaching 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.

Exemplar C: Weighted Allocation of Effort Algorithm

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

- Overall Merit Score (round to one decimal place) =
 [Teaching Effectiveness Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] +
 [Scholarly/Creative Work Merit Score* Allocation of Effort] +
 [Service Merit Score* Allocation of Effort]

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation
0.0 - 0.9	Performance is unacceptable
1.0 - 2.9	Falls to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
3.0 - 4.9	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
5.0 - 7.0	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit

Approved by the Department of Computer Science on March 30, 2021.




 Jong Kwan "Jake" Lee, Chair

Date _____

Approved:  _____

Theodore Rippey, Dean of College of Arts and Science

Date _____

Approved: 
[Joe Whitehead \(Aug 3, 2021 17:07 EDT\)](#) _____

Joe B. Whitehead, Provost/ Senior VP

Date _____











CS Merit Rev 7-23-21FINAL

Final Audit Report

2021-08-03

Created:	2021-07-28
By:	Lisa Meyer (lmeyer@bgsu.edu)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAA5gJ4GFMRVagJbPhsmks5Bav0oB0n1Ec

"CS Merit Rev 7-23-21FINAL" History

-  Document created by Lisa Meyer (lmeyer@bgsu.edu)
2021-07-28 - 7:46:46 PM GMT- IP address: 129.1.110.20
-  Document emailed to Jong Kwan Lee (leej@bgsu.edu) for signature
2021-07-28 - 7:47:40 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Jong Kwan Lee (leej@bgsu.edu)
2021-07-28 - 8:17:56 PM GMT- IP address: 24.53.176.14
-  Document e-signed by Jong Kwan Lee (leej@bgsu.edu)
Signature Date: 2021-07-28 - 8:18:54 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 24.53.176.14
-  Document emailed to Theodore Rippey (theodor@bgsu.edu) for signature
2021-07-28 - 8:18:56 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Theodore Rippey (theodor@bgsu.edu)
2021-07-28 - 8:41:56 PM GMT- IP address: 129.1.192.147
-  Document e-signed by Theodore Rippey (theodor@bgsu.edu)
Signature Date: 2021-07-28 - 8:42:53 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 129.1.192.147
-  Document emailed to Joe Whitehead (jwhitehead@bgsu.edu) for signature
2021-07-28 - 8:42:55 PM GMT
-  Document e-signed by Joe Whitehead (jwhitehead@bgsu.edu)
Signature Date: 2021-08-03 - 9:07:44 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 129.1.110.146
-  Agreement completed.
2021-08-03 - 9:07:44 PM GMT