Merit Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

Academic Unit: Department of Human Services

Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

Merit Evaluation – Teaching

The faculty recognizes 6 domains of performance indicators to be considered under the teaching portion of the annual review for merit. Evaluation is based on a holistic assessment of the domains and the subsequent evaluation scores are used in the overall assessment of each faculty member. Factors such as class size, type of course, and graduate or undergraduate course will be taken into consideration for the evaluation of teaching performance.

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

For the evaluation of teaching, the primary evaluation category is students' evaluation of teaching, both quantitative and qualitative. Peer reviews, innovative teaching activities, non-classroom teaching, and other teaching activities are not required activities, but elected by individual faculty members. They should be considered in determinations of exceeding expectations and their absence is not to be considered as failing to meet basic expectation.

Teaching Assignment for calendar year: (list courses)

Pre-specified allocation of effort for teaching: ___ %

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (circle one)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
Quantitative ratings of teaching effectiveness. The grand mean of student ratings of teaching effectiveness for all courses taught during the preceding 12 months.	• Excellent (scores 4.25 and above) • Good (scores 3.25-4.24) • Fair (scores 3.0-3.24) • Poor (scores below 3.0)	
Qualitative ratings of teaching effectiveness. All students' written open-ended feedback on the teaching evaluation instrument, indicating both positive and negative teaching strategies and outcomes	• Excellent - 80% and above of all comments are positive or constructive • Very Good - 60-79% of all comments • Good - 50-59% of all comments • Fair - fewer than 50% of submitted student comments	

	are positive OR there is a pervasive pattern of negative comments across two or more indicators in two or more classes (pervasive generally operationalized as 33% or more) • Poor - not included in portfolio	
Peer reviews of teaching effectiveness (if used by the individual). Peer reviews conducted using the formal department template; informal comments NOT accepted	• Excellent • Good • Fair • Poor • N/A – peer review not required	
Innovative Teaching Activities. Effective use of practices that are considered to be innovative and student centered learning strategies and approaches. Examples include: 1) service learning practices 2) undergraduate research 3) active learning pedagogies 4) funding received in support of teaching 5) other novel approaches to teaching to reach diverse students and class goals	• Excellent – 3 or more activities listed • Good – 2 activities listed • Fair – 1 activity listed • N/A – innovative teaching activities not required	
Non classroom teaching. Teaching that doesn't take place in formal settings such as the classroom. 1) student advising (REQUIRED) 2) thesis and dissertation direction 3) honors project direction 4) graduate student mentoring 5) independent studies 7) provision of continuing education	• Excellent - Completion of required advising role and 2 plus other non- classroom teaching activities • Good- Completion of required advising role and 1 other non- classroom teaching activity • Fair- Completion of required advising role and no other non-classroom teaching activities. • Poor- Failure to complete required advising role, regardless of other activities	

Other. Other examples of teaching effectiveness not otherwise provided. Examples include: 1) specific examples of student performance/success (e.g. awards) teaching awards; 2) documented engagement in continuing education to support teaching effectiveness 3) development of new courses 4) guest lecturing 5) unsolicited note and comments from students and/or parents	• Excellent – 3+ contributions to teaching effectiveness (e.g. awards) • Good – 2 contributions to teaching effectiveness • Fair - 1 indicator of teaching effectiveness • Little or no activity in other activities of teaching effectiveness. No penalty indicated by lack of documented evidence.	

Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description	Narrative Justification
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Teaching **(6-7)**	Preponderance of ratings for required activities are in the highest categories and medium to high levels of activity in the preponderance of non-required activity categories.	
Meets Expectations for Merit in Teaching **(3-5)**	Preponderance of ratings for required activities are in the upper middle to high categories. Neutral to positive assessment of non-required activities.	
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Teaching **(1-2)**	Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories.	
Unacceptable **(0)**	A majority of courses receiving quantitative teaching evaluations less than 2.5 on a 5 point scale using the approved evaluation instrument across the evaluation period for Fall and Spring semesters and a majority of courses receiving qualitative student feedback indicating a pattern of problems that require formal remediation; or a pattern of failing to meet with scheduled classes without approved leave.	

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

Merit Evaluation – Research

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

determinations of exceeding expectations and their absence is not to be considered as failing to meet basic expectations.

For the evaluation of research, the primary evaluation category is research and scholarly dissemination. Research funding, institutional outreach, scholarship of engagement, and other research achievement are not required activities, but elected by individual faculty members. They are additive elements: their absence may not in any way be interpreted as a negative. The faculty member's rank is to be used to inform the evaluation of research.

Pre-specified allocation of effort for research ___ %

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (circle one)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
Research & Scholarly Dissemination 1. Peer-reviewed papers accepted 2. Books and book chapters 3. Monographs/technical reports from applied research and consulting 4. Other scholarly publications 5. Academic meeting presentations 6. Other electronic publications and presentations connected to funded/sponsored projects 7. Papers receiving a revise and resubmit review 8. Papers submitted for peer review	• Excellent - 4+ examples, with at least one two from category 1 through 4 and two from categories 5 through 8 • Very Good - 3 examples, at least 1 of which is from category 1 –through 4 and two from categories 5 through 8 • Good - 2 examples, at least 1 from category 1 through 4 and 1 from categories 5 through 8 • Fair - 1 example from any category 5 through 7 • No activity to report NOTE: Multiple examples in one category are considered positively in overall evaluation. The committee may consider information on the selectivity of journals in making its overall evaluation.	
Research funding: While no specific quantity of extramural research support is required for promotion or tenure, program expectations are based upon norms appropriate to the discipline. 1. External funds awarded for research and evaluation projects; $ amount to be considered	• Excellent - Category 1 • Very Good - At least one from categories 2 or 5 • Good - One from categories 3, 4, or 6 • Fair - One from category 7 • No Evidence	

2. Internal funds awarded for research and evaluation projects excluding start-up funding or travel; $ amount to be considered 3. External funds awarded for enhancing research(e.g. awards to buy equipment or technology) 4. Internal funds awarded for enhancing research(e.g., awards to buy or technology) 5. Management of multiple-year externally funded research and evaluation projects. 6. Number and size of external or internal grant applications submitted for research and evaluation projects. 7. Number and size of external or internal grant applications submitted for enhancing research		
Institutional Outreach/ Scholarship of Engagement 1. PI on applied research that has direct impact on the policies, procedures or activities of human services agencies and/or the populations they serve. 2. Participation as a researcher in applied research that has direct impact on the policies, procedures or activities of human services agencies and/or the populations they serve. 3. PI on institutionally-initiated outreach activities through centers, institutes or alliances/partnerships	• Excellent - One activity from category 1 or 5 • Very Good One activity from category 2. • Good. One activity from category 3. • Fair. One activity from category 4. • Poor. No activity to report NOTE: The committee is directed to consider the significance and scope of the activity; role of the faculty member in the activity; documentation of the scholarly contributions of the work over and above the service component to the agencies; documentation of	

beyond simple membership. 4. Participation in institutionally-initiated outreach activities through centers, institutes or alliances/partnerships beyond simple membership. 5. Development of patents, licensed materials and commercialization activities	the specific contributions and accomplishments.	
Other Research/Scholarly Achievement 1. Awards/recognitions for research activities (editor's awards, university recognition, fellowship in professional and scholarly societies) 2. Invitations to keynote at prestigious conferences 3. Editorship of scholarly journal. 4. Project being written for peer-reviewed publication 5. Project being written for peer-reviewed conference presentation 6. Project in data analysis 7. Project in data collection	• Excellent - One from category 1 • Very Good - One from category 2 or 3 and two from any category 4 through 7 • Good - Two from category 4 through 7. • Fair - One from categories 4 through 7 • No activity	

Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description	Narrative Justification
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Research (6-7)	Preponderance of ratings for required activities are in the highest categories and medium to high levels of activity in the preponderance of non-required activity categories.	

Meets Expectations for Merit in Research (3-5)	Preponderance of ratings for required activities are in the upper middle to high categories. Neutral to positive assessment of non-required activities.	
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Research (1-2)	Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories.	
Unacceptable (0)	No research or scholarly production, nor documentation and/or evidence of any research activity in progress, nor any meaningful participation in or contributions to colleague's endeavors in any of the Department's defined areas of scholarship (Scholarly Dissemination, External Funding, Institutional Funding/Scholarship of Engagement, or Other).	

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

Merit Evaluation – Service

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

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

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

Pre-specified allocation of effort for service ___ %

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (circle one)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
Academic Service (Required of all faculty) 1. Participation in university, college or departmental standing committees 2. Participation in university, college, or departmental governance activities 3. Participation in university, college or departmental task forces that create and enhance the campus learning environment 4. Leadership position on university, college or department committee 5. Award or recognition of excellence in service 6. Serve as faculty advisor to a student club or organization 7. Participation in activities that promote program offerings and services (Required) 8. Completion of assigned administrative duties (program director, undergraduate /graduate director, center director, internship/field director, etc.) Category 7 considered only for those with administrative assignments. Counts as equal to categories 2 & 4.	• Excellent - Participates on 3 or more activities across or within categories 1-5 with award or recognition of excellence in any category; and category 7 • Very Good - Participates in 2 or more activities across or within 1-6 ; and category 7 • Good - Participates in 1 activity across or within categories 1-6; and category 7. • Fair - Participates in only 1 activity across or within categories 1-6 ; only category 7 • Poor - Fails to meet standards for "fair" rating as listed above	
External Community Service 1. Participation in agency boards of directors or advisory boards	• Excellent - Participates in 3 or more activities across or within categories 1-4 with	

2. Participation in national, state or community planning task forces 3. Participation in national, state or community planning committees 4. Participation in activities that relate to staff, policies, procedures and/or activities of human services agencies and/or the populations served 5. Funding secured in support of an external agency (amount to be considered)	award or recognition of excellence in any category • Very Good - Participates in 3 or more activities from category 1-4 • Good - Participates in 2 activities from categories 1-4; • Fair - Participates in 1 activity from categories 1-4; • Poor - Fails to meet standards for "fair" rating as listed above.	
Service to the Profession 1. Leadership positions held in professional organizations 2. Awards/recognition for service activity from professional organizations 3. Organization of professional conferences, symposia, etc. 4. Peer review for academic journals and/or reviewer for private or extramural funding agencies 5. Peer review of academic credentials for other institutions 6. Sessions moderated and roundtables organized that contribute to the profession 7. Participation in activities that enhance the profession (licensure activities, professional supervision, professional consultation, etc.)	• Excellent - contribution noted across or within category 1 and/or 2 and 3 activities in categories 3-6 • Very Good - category 1 and/or 2 and 2 activities across or within categories 3-6. • Good - 1 activity from categories 3-7. • Fair - 1 activity from categories 3-7. • Poor - no service to the profession. • N/A - service to the profession not expected	

Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description	Narrative Justification
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Service (6-7)	Preponderance of ratings for required activities are in the highest categories and medium to high levels of activity in the preponderance of non-required activity categories.	
Meets Expectations for Merit in Service (3-5)	Preponderance of ratings for required activities are in the upper middle to high categories. Neutral to positive assessment of non-required activities.	
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Service (1-2)	Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories.	
Unacceptable (0)	Demonstrated and consistent failure to attend to academic service obligations required under "Academic Service (Required of all faculty)" in this document for the period under review.	

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

Summary Merit Scores

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

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation
Unacceptable (0)	Fails to submit a merit portfolio by the deadline or ratings of Unacceptable in one or more performance areas regardless of ratings in the other performance areas. Recommendation for no merit
1 – 2	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Ratings of 1-2 in one or more performance areas regardless of ratings in the other performance areas. Recommendation for no merit
3– 5	Meets basic expectations for merit; Receipt of rating of 3-5 (on 7-point scale) in all three performance areas; Eligible for merit
6 – 7	Exceeds expectations for merit; Receipt of a rating of 6-7 (on 7-point scale) in at least one performance area while receiving at least a 3 in all other areas; Eligible for merit

Faculty Member	Merit Score for Teaching	Merit Score for Research	Merit Score for Service	Summary Score	Merit Determination: Unacceptable, Does not Meet Expectations, Meets Expectations, Exceeds Expectations

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 Department has established an elected Merit Committee to undertake merit review. The Committee will be composed of 5 faculty with one elected by each of the disciplinary units (CRJU, GERO, and SOWK) and 2 elected at-large. Each member shall serve a two year term, with the disciplinary members elected in alternate years from the at-large members.

Elements of the Merit Dossier

The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements: an up-to-date CV, a Teaching Portfolio (see Additional Academic Unit Merit Policy Information below), and a copy of the Annual Update of Faculty Record (see Additional Academic Unit Merit Policy Information below) for the past calendar year.

Calculation of Overall Merit Score

The merit committee will determine individual component merit scores for teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and service (developed using the format above). These individual merit scores will then be used to assign an overall merit score based on a holistic evaluation in accord with the following table. Merit for the review period under consideration is averaged with the merit ratings from the previous two merit periods to calculate a three-year rolling average that will be used to recommend merit increases.

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation
Unacceptable (0)	Fails to submit a merit portfolio by the deadline or ratings of Unacceptable in one or more performance areas regardless of ratings in the other performance areas. Recommendation for no merit
1 – 2	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Ratings of 1-2 in one or more performance areas regardless of ratings in the other performance areas Recommendation for no merit
3– 5	Meets basic expectations for merit; Receipt of rating of 3-5 (on 7-point scale) in all three performance areas; Eligible for merit
6 – 7	Exceeds expectations for merit; Receipt of a rating of 6-7 (on 7-point scale) in at least one performance area while receiving at least a 3 in all other areas; Eligible for merit

Additional Academic Unit Merit Policy Information

**Guidelines for Teaching Portfolio
Department of Human Services**

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

Required Materials

1. Table of Contents   (1 page)

2. Statement of Teaching Philosophy   (1-3 pages)

3. Courses Taught   (1-3 pages)
    *   List and description of courses taught
    *   Methods utilized in teaching

4. Representative syllabus or elements from syllabus for
    one of the courses taught   (7 pages)

5. Teaching evaluation instrument   (1 page)

6. Summarized teaching evaluation data   (5 pages)

    (include course means and grand mean across courses)

7. Narrative comments from student evaluations   (5 pages)

    (include all qualitative comments for each course)

Optional Materials

Representative assignments from course   (10 pages)
(exams, writing assignments, quizzes, etc.)

Unsolicited letters from students   (3 pages)

Statements from peers and senior faculty   (3 pages)

Peer teaching evaluations   (3-5 pages)

Other forms of evaluation of teaching effectiveness   (2 pages)

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

<div align="center">

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

</div>

Name_____   Department/Program_____

% of Allocation of Effort: _____Teaching _____Research _____Service

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

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

BGSU Honors and Awards
Name of Award   *Date Conferred*   *Conferring Group*

External Honors and Awards
Name of Award   *Date Conferred*   *Conferring Group*

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

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

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

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

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

External Grants and Contracts Awarded

Investigator(s) Awarded	*Funding Agency*	*Project Title*	*Award Period*	*$*

BGSU Grants and Contracts Awarded

Investigator(s) Awarded	*Funding Agency*	*Project Title*	*Award Period*	*$*

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

Organization	*Position*	*Date Appointed/Elected*	*Term*

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

	Course Number	Course Title		Credit Hours	Class Hrs./Wk.	# of Students
SPRING 20XX						
SUMMER 20XX						
FALL 20XX						

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

8. Describe any other instructional activities.

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

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

Meeting	*Location*	*Date(s)*

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

Organization	*Status (member, committee member, etc.)*

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

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

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

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

Submit Electronically to the Department Chair no later than January 31, 20XX .
    Please list all attachments: _____

Approved by the Department of Human Services February 23, 2017

_____ Date 2 - 2 3 - / 7

Name, Chair/Director

Approved: _____ Date 3 / 14 / 2017

Name, Dean of College Name

Approved: _____ Date 3/15/17

Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP