Merit Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

Academic Unit: Sociology

Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

The performance indicators shown below are illustrative, not exhaustive. Nor should they be construed as mere checklists. Executive Committee and the Department Chair will appraise the overall levels of quality and quantity of performance, engagement, and contributions that faculty members demonstrate in teaching, research, and service. The totality of evidence will inform the overall scores in each of these three domains.

Evaluation Rating Category	TEACHING Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Teaching
Exceeds expectations for merit	• Instructor composite scores in quantitative student evaluations that are significantly higher than the average for comparable level (e.g., 1000, 2000, 3000-level, etc) courses • Higher than average involvement in supervising theses and dissertations • Teaching the jumbo SOC 1010 course • New courses developed • Documentation of substantial improvements to existing courses • Evidence of effective integration of new technology or pedagogical approaches • Teaching award nominations • Mentorship of undergraduate research (e.g., honor's theses or research projects) • Publication of scholarship on teaching, submitting or/and receiving teaching-related grants • Teaching leadership (e.g., mentorship, working groups) • Demonstration of efforts at improvement of instruction through attending working group or workshops • Participation in Honors College programming or other university-wide undergraduate initiatives	4-5

Meets expectations for merit	• Instructor composite scores in quantitative student evaluations that are around the average for comparable level courses • Supervising theses and dissertations, membership on MA or PhD committees • Active participation in preliminary examination committees • Participation in students' professional socialization activities	2-3
Fails to meet expectations for merit	• Clear evidence of weak teaching • Instructor composite scores in quantitative student evaluations that are significantly below the average for comparable level courses • No participation on graduate student MA/PhD committees or prelim exams (if appropriate) • No participation in students' professional socialization activities (e.g., practice talks for professional meetings, capstone presentations, etc)	1
Unacceptable	• Poor performance on instructor composite scores for quantitative student evaluations (under 2.5) for two or more courses and no subsequent involvement in any instructional development efforts or opportunities to improve teaching performance • No involvement in other teaching-related activities (e.g., student professional socialization activities)	0

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

Evaluation Rating Category	RESEARCH Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Research
Exceeds expectations for merit	• Publication of an article or book, or an active external grant • Consideration will be given to the order of authorship, co-authorship with students, refereed journal quality, quality of the press, and overall number of publications.	4-5

	• Research independence and leadership as evidenced by some solo or first authored publications. • Federally funded grants generally are assigned greater values than grants from other sources. • Consideration will also be given to principal investigator status or other evidence of grant leadership. • Awards for research contributions	
Meets expectations for merit	• Demonstration of research activities that signal eventual productivity and an ongoing stream of scholarship • Research in progress (multiple papers submitted to or under revision for journals, book prospectuses, conference presentations, working papers, and works in progress) • Research activity includes new activity since the prior year.	2-3
Fails to meet expectations for merit	• Minimal research activity (e.g., limited research in progress, manuscripts or grant proposals submitted, and paper presentations) • Negligible productivity (e.g., no peer-reviewed manuscripts published nor grant proposals funded)	1
Unacceptable	• No evidence of research activity nor productivity	0

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

Evaluation Rating Category	SERVICE Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Service
Exceeds expectations for merit	• Serving on (and performing the relevant work for) three or more college, university, or professional committees • Chairing committees at the department, college, university, or professional levels • Serving on a committee that requires a considerable amount of time commitment	4-5

	• Organizing and maintaining active working groups within the department or across different departments • Awards for service contributions • Editorship of major journals or editorial board service • NIH grant proposal study section membership or equivalent grant review membership • National conference leadership position – planning or organizing sessions • Faculty involvement with student organizations, especially in sociology • Engaged scholarship activities such as the dissemination or translation of research to larger audiences	
Meets expectations for merit	• Serving on (and performing the relevant work for) one or two committees at the department level and/or the college or university level • Participates in specialty area committee work • Attend department meetings regularly • Response to requests for activity reports, teaching preferences, and other requests in a timely manner • Expected service to the profession includes but is not limited to journal manuscript reviewing, grant proposal reviews, tenure reviews for other institutions, and participation in regional and national professional associations	2-3
Fails to meet expectations for merit	• No or little engagement in major department committees, specialty area committees, or undergraduate or graduate program activities • Failure to attend department meetings regularly. • Failure to respond to requests for activity reports, teaching preferences, and other requests in a timely manner. • Limited participation in service activities at college, university, or professional levels.	1

	• No evidence of participation on department committees and/or department faculty meetings	
	• No evidence of participation in any non-committee service opportunities (e.g., department events such as recruitment weekend and commencement)	
Unacceptable	weekend and commencement)	0

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

<u>Merit Committee Composition and the Election/Appointment Process</u>

The department merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. The Bargaining Unit Faculty Members of the Executive Committee are charged with the responsibility of evaluating the performance of each faculty member annually for purposes of merit increases. The Executive Committee is composed of five members who are elected each year by the entire faculty. All faculty are eligible to serve on Executive Committee.

<u>Elements of the Merit Dossier</u>

The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements:

Each faculty member will provide the Executive Committee with a completed Annual Faculty Record Update form, as utilized by the College of Arts and Sciences. Instructions on how to complete the Update form will be provided to all faculty members. The Executive Committee may request a copy of the first page or cover page of each publication or grant proposal from faculty for review. At his/her discretion, each faculty member may also submit:

- Published reviews of books or other publications;

- Peer reviews of teaching, course syllabi, unsolicited testimonials from students, or other evidence of extraordinary effort and/or success in teaching (e.g., one paragraph narrative of teaching activities);

- Testimonials from university or professional colleagues regarding the extent or quality of service provided; and/or

- Other evidence of meritorious research, teaching, or service.

<u>Calculation of Overall Merit Score</u>

Separate evaluations are made in the areas of teaching, research, and service using 5-point scales with the following anchors: 0 (*unacceptable*); 1 *(no merit)*; 2 or 3 *(meeting departmental expectations at the low or high end, respectively)*; 4 or 5 *(exceeding departmental expectations at the low or high end, respectively)*. The committee then meets and resolves any discrepancies in the independent evaluations of each faculty member on each scale. Agreement is achieved by

consensus if possible, vote if necessary. Committee members will absent themselves when their own or a spouse/partner's merit is being reviewed.

Merit points are assigned to each faculty member as the sum of the products of merit ratings in each of the three domains and allocation of effort in that domain. For purposes of determining merit, allocation of effort is translated to a tripartite scale whose elements sum to 10-points (e.g., a 40-50-10 allocation of effort becomes 4 points [teaching], 5 points [research], 1 point [service]). The elements serve as weights, which when multiplied by the merit scores for each domain creates a scale with a theoretical range of 0 to 50 total points for each faculty member. Total point values between 0 and 9 points indicate unacceptable performance. Scores that range from 10 to 19 signal failure to meet expectations, between 20 and 25 indicate meeting expectations, and above 25 (i.e., 26-50) indicate exceeding expectations. The formula is thus:

$$TP = M_T E_T + M_R E_R + M_S E_S$$

Where TP = total points, M = merit rating within each domain, E = effort allocated to each domain, and $_{T, R, S}$ refer to research, teaching, and service.

Because allocation of effort is determined on an academic year basis and merit is awarded on a calendar year basis, a situation will frequently arise where a faculty member has one allocation of effort for spring semester and another for fall in a calendar year. In this case the mean of the allocations for each domain will be used as the multiplier. The three year moving average score will be calculated by averaging the current and last two year's overall merit scores.

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation
0-9	Unacceptable in one or more categories; Recommendation for no merit
10-19	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
20-25	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
26-50	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit

Additional Academic Unit Merit Policy Information

Approved by the Department/School of Sociology at the February 15, 2017 Faculty Meeting

_____   Date __3 / 1 / 17__

Name, Chair/Director

Approved: _____ Date __3/6/17__

Name, Dean of College Name

Approved: _____ Date __3/6/17__

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