Merit Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

Academic Unit: **School of Intervention Services**

Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

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

Evaluation Rating Category	TEACHING Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Merit Score for Teaching
Exceeds Expectations for Merit	• Quantitative student evaluations average of all courses equal to or exceeding 4.20 on a 5-point scale **AND** • High level of involvement in other teaching activities, including 5 or more indicators delineated in "Meets Expectations for Merit" section	5
Exceeds Expectations for Merit	• Quantitative student evaluations average of all courses equal to or exceeding 4.0 on a 5-point scale **AND** • High level of involvement in other teaching activities, including 4 or more indicators delineated in "Meets Expectations for Merit" section	4
Meets Expectations for Merit	• Quantitative student evaluations average of all courses equal to or exceeding 3.7 on a 5-point scale **AND** • High level of involvement in other teaching activities, including 3 or more indicators delineated in "Meets Expectations for Merit" section	3

Meets Expectations for Merit	• Quantitative student evaluations average of all courses is at least 3.5 on a 5-point scale
	AND
	• Involvement in other teaching activities, including 2 indicators of teaching effectiveness listed below:
	  • Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities (provide evidence of activities, evaluations and/or peer observations).
	  • Engagement in professional development related to teaching effectiveness (include explanation of how it was incorporated into current teaching)
	  • Teaching Awards and Distinctions
	  • Development of New Courses (Provide copy of EDHD course modification proposals and new syllabi)
	  • Curriculum Modification of Existing Courses (provide copy of EDHD course modification proposals and new syllabi) substantive changes or changes to multiple courses
	  • Academic Advising (quantity of students and quality of advising are considered; provide evidence through student testimonials and/or coordinator or director letters of support)
	  • Student Professional Development Activities of substantial value (e.g. a full-day student career day, a series of extracurricular seminars, an exhibition, etc.; provide evidence)
	  • Integration of Teaching Initiatives, involving Engagement/Service Learning (provide description and evidence of the events)
	  • Participation in a learning community, tech boot camp, etc. (provide evidence of outcomes)
	  • Grants to support teaching activities (not travel grants)
	  • Study abroad and extended student trips off campus
		2

	• Thesis/Dissertation Chair and Committees • Comprehensive Examination Chair or Committees (thesis, dissertations) • Supervision of Independent Studies (provide list) • Master's Project Chair/Committees • Undergraduate Honor's Project Chair/Advisor or Committees • Other (please describe) NOTE: Each category is counted only ONCE towards merit.	
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit	• The Quantitative student evaluations average of all courses are below 3.5 on a 5-point scale AND/OR • Low level of involvement in other teaching activities. • Limited or no engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness. • Minimal to no involvement in additional indicators of teaching effectiveness.	1
Unacceptable	• The Quantitative student evaluations average of all courses are below 3.2 on a 5-point scale AND/OR • There are major flaws and problems in the faculty's teaching. • No materials were submitted.	0

Merit Score for Teaching (to be completed by Personnel Committee members): ___X___

Evaluation Rating Category	RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Research
Exceeds Expectations for merit	• Two peer-reviewed publications (Provide copies) OR • One peer-reviewed publication AND either (a) one Book/Book Chapter or (b) one External Grant Submitted/Funded (i.e., Two items total; Provide copies)	5
Exceeds Expectations for merit	• One peer-reviewed publication (Provide copy) OR • One Book/Book Chapter (Provide copy) OR • One External Grant Submitted/Funded (Provide copy).	4
Meets Expectations for merit	• A combination of three or more of the items listed below.	3
Meets Expectations for merit	• A combination of two of the following items: • Internal Research Grant, funded (excluding travel grants) • Internal Research Grant, submitted (excluding travel grants) • Published Symposia • Published Book Review in a peer-reviewed journal • Invited Presentations, International, National, or Regional Conferences • Refereed Presentation or Poster at International, National, or Regional Conferences • Abstract published in conference proceedings or peer-reviewed journals (if not	2

	mentioned as paper/poster presentation) • Positions as Associate Editors or Guest Editor of a peer-reviewed journal (please describe) • Refereed Creative Work (at national or regional adjudicated exhibitions or competitions) • Other (please describe) * You may want to identify items that are part of the Scholarship of Engagement. ** Provide proof for all achievements listed in your report, multiple items from the same category are counted separately.	
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit	• Minimal evidence of scholarship (one item in the above list)*. * In rare cases, when a faculty has only one item, but a very substantial one, that faculty might qualify for level 2.	1
Unacceptable	• No evidence of scholarship. • No materials were submitted.	0

Merit Score for Research (to be completed by Personnel Committee members): X

Evaluation Rating Category	SERVICE Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Service
Exceeds Expectations for Merit	• The faculty member demonstrates significant service involvement at the program, school, college, university, and/or professional levels. At least 5 committees or committee-comparable activities are required. Examples of recognized service at each level are described in the "Meets Expectations for Merit" section below. Overall contributions should be considerably above the merit level.	5
Exceeds Expectations for Merit	• The faculty member demonstrates significant service involvement at the program, school, college, university, and/or professional levels. At least 4 committees or committee-comparable activities are required. Examples of recognized service at each level are described in the "Meets Expectations for Merit" section below. Overall contributions should be considerably above the merit level.	4
Meets Expectations for Merit	• The faculty member demonstrates meaningful service involvement at the program, school, college, university, and/or professional levels. At least 3 committees or committee-comparable activities are required.	3

Meets Expectations for Merit	• The faculty member demonstrates meaningful service involvement at the program, school, college, university, and/or professional levels. At least 2 committees or committee-comparable activities are required.
	
	• Examples of recognized service at each level are described below:
	• Profession
	  Member of Committees, Task Forces, Boards
	  Chair of Committees, Task Forces, Boards (implies higher level of engagement than a committee member)
	  Officer Positions in Professional Associations (Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer, etc.)
	  Conference Planning
	  Professional Recognition/Awards
	  Service to Government Agency
	  Expert Testimony
	  Moderator/Respondent of Conference Sessions
		2

	Permanent member of a journal editorial board (not ad hoc reviewer; indicate manuscripts reviewed this year) Reviewing Manuscripts (list journal(s) and number reviewed this year) Reviewing Grants (list agency or organization, grant program, number reviewed, etc.) Reviewing Conference Abstracts (list conference(s) and number reviewed, etc.) National Grant Panels Media Appearances at national and regional level (regional like Midwest) Other • Program/School Committees, Task Forces (e.g., Search Committees, Standing Committees) Chair of, Task Forces, Boards, etc. (implies higher level of engagement than a committee member) Assigned Administrative Duties* (e.g. Graduate Coordinator, Program Director) Supervision of Student Clubs, Organizations, and Activities Recruitment and Retention Other • College/University/Community Committees, Task Forces Chair of Committee Other * Community service must be related to faculty's professional area.	
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit	The faculty member demonstrates little to no service involvement at the program, school, college, university, and/or professional levels. Examples of recognized service at each level are described above in the meets expectation section.	1
Unacceptable	• No service at all • No materials were submitted.	0

Merit Score for Service (to be completed by Personnel Committee members): <u>X</u>

Merit Committee Composition and the Election//Appointment Process

The School of Intervention Services Personnel committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. The committee consists of four members. At least one representative must come from each program area. At least two members of the committee must be tenured faculty. The representatives are elected by all school faculty. Members to serve a two-year term; two positions are elected each year.

Elements of the Merit Dossier

The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements:
- Title page, including name, rank, percentage allocation of effort for each of area of evaluation (e.g., 60% Teaching, 20% Research, 20% Service for TTF; 80% Teaching, 20% Service for NTTF), and merit year
- Updated CV with highlighted activities during the previous calendar year (not submitted to the merit committee in previous years)
- Teaching section

- o Self-filled table of meritorious achievements in TEACHING during the previous calendar year (see template below; include indicators necessary for the merit score sought)
- o Quantitative student teaching evaluations from the previous year (see template in Appendix D) and all original evaluations provided by the college/university
- o Evidence of achievement for each item for which merit credit is sought
- o If using the category "Other" in your summary, include a narrative to explain your case
- Research section (TTF only)
  - o Self-filled table of meritorious achievements in RESEARCH during the previous calendar year (see template below; include indicators necessary for the merit score sought)
  - o Evidence of achievement for each item for which merit credit is sought (e.g., copies of publications or any other proof of achievement)
  - o If using the category "Other" in your summary, include a narrative to explain your case
- Service section
  - o Self-filled table of meritorious achievements in SERVICE during the previous calendar year (see template below; include indicators necessary for the merit score sought)
  - o Evidence of service may include meeting minutes, letters from committee chairs/committee members/journal editors indicating service during the current merit year
  - o If using the category "Other" in your summary, include a narrative to explain your case

Calculation of Overall Merit Score

Once the merit committee has reached consensus on component merit scores in each performance area (Teaching, Research, and Service), the overall merit score is computed using a simple algorithm taking into account the weighted allocation of effort for each performance area. The algorithm is as follows:

[Teaching Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] + [Research/Creative Work Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] + [Service Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] = Overall Merit Score

In addition to this algorithm, the final merit score must adhere to additional criteria indicated below in [a, b].

Exceeds Expectations for Merit [b] Eligible for Merit	$3.3 - 5.0$
Meets Expectations for Merit [c] Eligible for Merit	$2.0 - 3.2$
Fails to Meet Expectations Recommendation for No Merit	$0.2 - 1.9$
Unacceptable	$< .2$

[a] Each category (Teaching, Research/Creative Work, and Service) is calibrated on its own scale (0, 1, 2, 3,

4, 5). Tenure track/tenured faculty (TTF) are rated in all three areas while non-TTF are rated in teaching and service only.

[b] To achieve "Exceeds Expectations for Merit," a faculty member needs to score 4 *in two or more* categories.

[c] To achieve "Meets Expectations for Merit," the applicant has to achieve meritorious level of 2 in *each* required category.

Three-year Rolling Average:

The three-year rolling average for merit will be determined by calculating the average of the overall merit score for the current plus two prior years. This average will be correlated to the appropriate merit score as detailed on the Determination of Overall Merit Score Recommendation table above.

Additional Academic Unit Merit Policy Information

Self-Filled Table of Meritorious Achievements

TEACHING	Merit Score for Teaching
• Quantitative student evaluations average of all courses are ___, exceed ___ on a 5-point scale. • High level of involvement in other teaching activities Proof for all achievements is in CV and in the TEACHING section of the merit binder.	

Merit Score for Teaching (to be completed by Personnel Committee members):

RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORKS	Merit Score for Research
• A combination of two of the following items: Proof for all achievements is in CV and in the RESEACRCH section of the merit binder.	

Merit Score for Research (to be completed by Personnel Committee members):

SERVICE Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Merit Score for Service
• At least ___ committees or committee-comparable activities: Proof for all achievements is in CV and in the SERVICE section of the merit binder.	

Merit Score for Service (to be completed by Personnel Committee members):

Table for Quantitative Student Evaluation Scores

Semester	Course	Number of Students	Number of Respondents	Course Mean	Course SD	SIS Mean	SIS SD	Comments to the Personnel Committee
Student evaluations average of all courses for this year:								

School of Intervention Services Merit Policy For the Definition of Unacceptable Rating

NTTF Members

In place of APRs and EPRs, the annual merit review process shall serve as the annual evaluation for NTTF Members in year seven and beyond. Annual evaluation ratings higher than Unacceptable in all assigned areas, based on a BUFM's allocation of effort, shall indicate a successful annual evaluation.

An Unacceptable rating in teaching is defined as quantitative student evaluation average of all courses below 3.2 on a 5-point scale, major flaws and problems in the faculty's teaching, or no materials turned in for review.

Unacceptable rating in service is defined as 0 merit score based on no documented service or no materials turned in for review.

TTF Members

An Unacceptable rating in teaching is defined as quantitative student evaluations average of all course below 3.2 on a 5-point scale, major flaws and problems in the faculty's teaching or no materials turned in for review.

An Unacceptable rating in research is defined as 0 merit score is based on no evidence of scholarship or not materials were submitted.

An Unacceptable rating in service is defined as 0 merit score is based on no documented service or no materials turned in for review.

Unacceptable Rating Definition Approved December 7, 2106 by the faculty of SIS.

Approved by the <u>School of Intervention Services</u> at the Month, Date, Year Faculty Meeting

SENT VIA EMAIL FROM TRINKA   Date _____

Name, Chair/Director

Approved: _Gill   ACTING DEAN_   Date _3/15/17_

Name, Dean of College Name

Approved: _____   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