<div align="center">

Merit Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

</div>

Academic Unit: Natural and Social Sciences

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

Teaching

Pre-specified allocation of effort for Teaching: _____ %

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (circle one) Merit Committee members will review the materials submitted and reach a consensus decision on the number of points awarded (up to a maximum of 64 points).	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.) by the Merit Committee
Teaching Growth and Development (see appendices) 1. New/Diverse Teaching Methods(up to 6 pts. for social science/ 8 pts. for math) OR Lab preparation (up to 8 pts. for natural science) 2. Inclusion of Writing Assignments (up to 6 pts. for social science/ up to 4 pts. for natural science and math) 3. Scholarship of Engagement (up to 6 pts.) 4. Syllabi (up to 12 pts.) **Student Evaluations** 5. The average median for each course taught will be multiplied by credit hours for the course, and these values are summed. The sum is divided by the total credit hours taught for the year, this quotient is multiplied by 4, to give total points (rounded to the nearest tenth) (up to 28 pts.)	Excellent (earned 57.6 points or more) Very Good (earned 51.2 to 57.5 points) Good (earned 44.8 to 51.1 points) Fair (earned 38.4 to 44.7 points) Poor (earned 1 to 38.3 points) Unacceptable (No assessments submitted)	

Peer Observations 6. Classroom observations carried out for the purpose of evaluation. Does not include a presentation given in another faculty member's course (4 pts. per observation, up to 12 pts.) **Other** 7. Teaching activities not covered by the above criteria (up to 3 pts. each, time and effort dependent)		

Points in all teaching components (above) are summed, with a maximum value of 64. This sum is divided by 64 and multiplied by 10, to give a score on a 0-10 scale for teaching.

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

Score	Result
0.0-5.5	Unacceptable
5.6-6.8	Acceptable, but not Meritorious
6.9-8.0	Meets expectations for Merit
8.1-10.0	Exceeds expectations for Merit

Research/Professional Development

Pre-specified allocation of effort for Research/Creative Work: _____ %

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (Circle One) Merit Committee members will review the materials submitted and reach a consensus decision on the number of points awarded (up to a maximum of 45 points).	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.) by the Merit Committee
Professional Organizations		
1. Membership (1 pt. each) 2. Officeholder <u>National/Regional/State</u> Pres/VP/Sec/Treas (6 pts.) Bd. of Dir/Trustee (5 pts.) Committee Chair (4 pts.) Committee Member (2 pts.) <u>Local</u> Pres/VP/Sec/Treas (3 pts.) Committee Chair (2 pts.) **Conference Attendance** 3. <u>With no presentation</u> National/Regional/State (2 pts.) Local (1 pt) Webinar (.5 pts.) <u>With presentation</u> *(This category also includes presentations to professional groups for member training and/or certification, whether paid or unpaid.)* International/National (6 pts.) Regional/State (4 pts.) Local (2 pts.) Symposia/Forums/Colloquia (2 pts.) Organizer Nat/Reg/State (4 pts.) Organizer Local (external, 2 pts. **Journal Publications** 4. <u>Refereed</u> National (10 pts. each) Regional/State (5 pts. each) 5. <u>Non-Refereed</u> Journal/Newsletter (2 pts.)	Excellent (earned 18 or more points) Very Good (earned 9 to 17.9 points) Good (earned 4.5 to 8.9 points) Fair (earned 2.3 to 4.4 points) Poor (earned 1 to 2.2 points) Unacceptable (no assessments submitted)	

National Editor (5 pts.)
Reg/State Editor (3 pts.)
Unpaid Book Review Essay
(exceed 1000 words, 2 pts.)
Unpaid Book Review (1 pt each)
Book Publications and Reports
  6. Author (30 pts.)
  7. Co-author/Editor (including contributed chapters, 15 pts.)
  8. Chapter in book (6 pts.)
  9. Reports: Published (3 pts.), Unpublished (2 pts.)
Post Graduate Professional Programs (NSF/Chataquas/FIL/ Graduate Training/Learning Communities)
  10. 3 pts. each
Grants
  11. External to University (1 pt per $10,000 of grant received)
  12. Internal (beneficial to Dept/Univ, not self, 1 pt)
Research in Progress
  13. *Available for only two years on any one project* (2 pts. each)
Non-print Projects
  14. Software/CAI (distributed beyond University, 2 pts.)
  15. AV productions (aired/distributed beyond University, 15 pts.)
Other
  16. Research/professional development not contained in this listing (up to 3 pts. each, time and effort dependent)		

Points in all research/professional development components (above) are summed, with a maximum value of 45. This sum is divided by 45 and multiplied by 10, to give a score on a 0-10 scale for research/professional development.

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

Score	Result
0.0-0.5	Unacceptable
0.6-1.1	Acceptable, but not Meritorious
1.2-3.3	Meets expectations for Merit
3.4-10.0	Exceeds expectations for Merit

Service

Pre-Specified Allocation of Effort for Service _____ %

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (Circle One) Merit Committee members will review the materials submitted and reach a consensus decision on the number of points awarded (up to a maximum of 45 points).	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.) by the Merit Committee
University 1. Faculty Senate (3 pts.) 2. SEC (4 pts.) 3. Senate Chair/Sec (4 pts.) 4. UG Council (4 pts.) 5. Other Committees (2 pts. each) 6. Committee Chair (1 extra pt each) **College** 7. Major Committees (College Council, AA, Budget, CRPTC, Ombudsman, or other committee that has an unusually high workload in a given year – evidence must be given – 5 pts. each) 8. Faculty Chair/Sec (2 pts.) 9. Other Committees (1 pt each) 10. Committee Chair (1 extra pt each) 11. Dorn Fellowship (5 pts.) **Department** 12. Merit Committee (5 pts.) 13. Search Committee (4 pts.) 14. Promotion Committee (1 pt) 15. Chair of Merit or Search Committee (extra 2 pts. each) 16. Chair of Tenure, Promotion, Mid-Probationary Review, or Enhanced Review Committee (1 pt each) 17. Recruiting (1 pt) 18. Providing a peer evaluation for a faculty member (2 pts. each) **Student Services**	Excellent (earned 18 points or more) Very Good (earned 9 to 17.9 points) Good (earned 4.5 to 8.9 points) Fair (earned 2.3 to 4.4 points) Poor (earned 1 to 2.2 points) Unacceptable (no assessments submitted)	

19. Unpaid academic advising (2 pts.)		
20. Co-ops/No Posts (1-5 students, 2 pts.; each 5 additional students, 1 pt each)		
21. Independent Study (5 pts.)		
22. Thesis/Dissertation Committee (1 pt each)		
23. Chair Thesis/Dissertation Committee (5 pts.)		
24. Student Club Advisor (2 pts. each)		
25. Recommendation/reference letters (1 pt per unique document)		
Curriculum Development		
26. New Course (not new to faculty member, 3 pts. each)		
27. New AA program (12 pts.)		
28. New 3 + 1 program (8 pts.)		
29. New certificate program (4 pts.)		
Community		
30. Chair major group (5 pts.)		
31. Member Board of Directors or Trustee (2 pts.)		
32. Speaker's Bureau or other unpaid speaking engagements (1 pt per hour of each speech)		
33. Unpaid consulting (2 pts.)		
34. Chair academic program (2 pts. each)		
35. Assist academic program (1 pt each)		
Other		
36. Service not contained in this listing, including any professional representation of BGSU (1-3 pts. each, time and effort dependent)		

Note: Consideration for additional points for service activities may be requested if the activity had an unusual or extraordinarily high workload. Documentation/justification must be given.

Points in all service components (above) are summed, with a maximum value of 45. This sum is divided by 45 and multiplied by 10, to give a score on a 0-10 scale for service.

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

Score	Result
0.0-0.5	Unacceptable
0.6-1.9	Acceptable, but not Meritorious
2.0-3.9	Meets expectations for Merit
4.0-10.0	Exceeds expectations for Merit

SUMMARY FORM

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

Faculty Member	Merit Score for Teaching/ Librarian Effectiveness	Merit Score for Research/ Creative Work	Merit Score for Service
Faculty member 1	*Insert numerical score*	*Insert numerical score*	*Insert numerical score*
Faculty member 2	*Insert numerical score*	*Insert numerical score*	*Insert numerical score*

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. This committee will consist of one faculty member each from Mathematics, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences, along with a fourth member who may be from any of these disciplines. Members are elected for three-year terms on a rotating basis, so that a maximum of two members are elected in any given year. The member of the committee with the longest tenure on the committee will serve as merit committee chair.

Elements of the Merit Dossier

The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements for the performance period under review: syllabi from each course taught, Woods form summary and calculation of the average median for each course taught, peer observations (if applicable), demonstration of Indicators of Growth and Incorporation of Scholarship of Engagement, and evidence of meritorious accomplishments for Research/Professional Development and Service.

Calculation of Overall Merit Score

The overall merit score will be calculated using the algorithm below. The overall merit score will be an average of the merit scores from the most recent three years.

Weighted Allocation of Effort Algorithm

Once the merit committee has reached consensus on component merit scores on each performance areas (Teaching, Research/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:

[Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness Merit Score * Allocation of Effort]   =_____

+   [Research/Creative Work Merit Score * Allocation of Effort]   =_____

+   [Service Merit Score * Allocation of Effort]   =_____

=   Overall Merit Score   =_____

Overall Merit Score	Definition and Description
0.0 – 4.0	**Unacceptable:** Little to no professional development and/or service, teaching indicators are below average
4.1 – 5.3	**Fails to meet expectations:** Little to no professional development and/or service, teaching indicators are average or below average
5.4 – 6.1	**Meets expectations:** Appropriate professional development and/or service, teaching indicators are average or higher
6.2 – 10.0	**Exceeds expectations:** Very good professional development and/or service, teaching indicators are very good or higher.

Approved by the Natural and Social Sciences Department via electronic ballot on March 14, 2017.

Christine Genovese   Date _3/14/17_

Christine Genovese, Chair/Director

Approved: _Andrew Kurtz_   Date _3/14/2017_

Andrew Kurtz, Dean of BGSU Firelands

Approved: _Rodney Rogers_   Date _3/15/17_

Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP

R:\DeanBalzer\VPFASI\Successor Contract\Implementation of CBA 2\CBA Committees\Labor-Management\Merit Template Part II - FINAL - Consensus Approved by BGSU-FA and Provost October 24, 2016.docx