Merit Document
School of Art

Preamble

Merit raises refer to the component of salary raises that are provided to department/school bargaining unit faculty members who meet or exceed their assigned unit performance expectations. In any given year, it is possible that all of the Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in an academic unit may be eligible for merit salary raises. Merit is calculated during spring semester based on performance during the previous calendar year. Merit salary raises are added to base salary for the ensuing fiscal year (on September 1 for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members on 9-month contracts, and on July 1 for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members on 12-month contracts).

Merit eligibility for faculty members will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations for merit in the School of Art in the following areas: Teaching Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service. Each faculty member will receive an overall merit score, which will identify whether s/he did not meet, met, or exceeded expectations for merit. The overall merit score will include six categories or rating levels to allow for greater discrimination among levels of performance; each of the categories or rating levels on the overall merit score must clearly identify whether the faculty does not meet expectations for merit, meets expectations for merit, or exceeds expectations for merit. For example, using the minimum five categories or rating levels, the following evaluation concepts would be included: 0-1 = Does not meet expectations for merit; 2-3 Meets expectations for merit; 4/5 = Exceeds expectations for merit.

Both the merit committee of the academic unit and the Director may make recommendations to the Dean for allocation of merit dollars and/or percentages. However, as provided for by Section 11.2 of Article 17 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the Dean is not bound by such recommendations and the determination of the actual merit increase is within the Dean's reasonable discretion.

1. Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations, and Calculation of Merit Scores

   The merit criteria (i.e. Teaching Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service), performance indicators and expectations for the criteria, and the calculation of the component merit scores (i.e., Teaching Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service) are contained in Appendix A.

2. General Procedure for Faculty Evaluation and Score of Merit

   2.1 Prior to the beginning of the calendar year, each faculty member will confirm his/her allocation of effort (e.g., 50/30/20 for teaching scholarship, and service) with the Director.
   2.2 The School of Art merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. Merit review in the School of Art is conducted by the RPT Committee comprised of four tenured faculty and two NTTF representatives at the level of lecturer/senior lecturer in the School of Art appointed on a rotational basis.

2.3 Faculty members who fail to submit a merit portfolio by the deadline will receive an automatic rating of "does not meet expectations" and will not be eligible for a merit salary increase or the market adjustment from the Fixed Market Pool (Article 17, section 7.1).

2.4 The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements: a C.V. of activities completed during the previous calendar year, a summary cover sheet that highlights and annotates significant activities from the C.V., and numerical student teaching evaluations from the previous calendar year. Student teaching evaluation statistics will be provided to the RPT committee by the Director.

2.5 The merit committee arrives at an overall merit score for each faculty member as follows:

a) A tally sheet is prepared with the names of continuing faculty members and columns by the names for teaching, research, and service for use by the RPT committee members. The sheet also contains pertinent information for the rating process: standard allocation, approvals of faculty having deviations from the standard allocation, FILs, teaching loads, load reductions, and the rating scale (0-1 = Does not meet expectations for merit; 2-3 = Meets expectations for merit; 4-5 Exceeds expectations for merit).

b) After faculty have submitted their merit portfolios to the main office by the due date, the RPT committee members individually rate each continuing faculty member, except his/herself, on a tally sheet containing a separate column for each of the categories of teaching, research/creative work (for tenured and probationary faculty only), and service. Performance indicators and the rating scale are listed in Appendix A. The completed tally sheets are then submitted to the senior secretary.

c) The senior secretary will:
- combine and average the RPT committee members' scores for each continuing faculty member under each category (teaching, research, and service);
- multiply each of the three averaged scores by the allocations of effort for the area of performance for the individual faculty member (40 Teaching/40 Research/Creative Work/20 Service for TF and TTF, 80 Teaching/20 Service for NTTF, or deviation).
The final calculated score for each faculty member is interpreted as follows:

Overall Merit Score	**Interpretation**
3.6-5.0	**Exceeds Expectations:** Has clearly demonstrated a level of meritorious contributions/achievement beyond the norm. Eligible for merit increase *plus* "exceeds merit" pool.
2.0-3.5	**Meets Expectations:** Has clearly demonstrated the *standard* level of achievement required to meet expectations, but has not demonstrated a level of meritorious contribution/achievement high enough to qualify for *Exceeds Expectations*. Eligible for merit increase.
0.0-1.9	**Does Not Meet Expectations:** Has not demonstrated the minimum standards of contribution/achievement required. Not eligible for merit increase.

d) The average of the three scores in teaching/research/service will be used to determine whether the faculty member exceeds, meets or does not meet expectations in overall merit.

e) The Director reviews the committee's scores, conducts an independent evaluation, and assigns his/her own scores, using the same weighted algorithm method.
f) The distribution of merit: The merit pool will be split in half. One half will be divided equally between all faculty members receiving between 2.0-5.0. The other half of the pool will additionally be divided equally between all faculty members receiving between 3.6-5.0.

2.6 An academic unit may report its merit score recommendation to no greater than one-tenth decimal place (for example, a unit using 1-7 categories or rating levels may assign a score of 3.1 or 5.9 but may not assign a score of 3.15 or 5.975).

3. Significant Dates for Merit Consideration and Appeals:

January 31: Last date for faculty merit dossiers to be submitted to an academic unit.

The merit committee of the academic unit is urged to work informally with all faculty being reviewed to resolve any factual or interpretive issues in advance of making recommendations to the Director.

February 28: School of Art RPT committee's merit score recommendation to the Director (with a copy to the faculty member).

March 7: Last date for faculty members to appeal the committee's recommendation to the Director (with a copy to the committee).

March 31: Director's merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copies to the committee and faculty members).

April 7: Last date for faculty member to appeal the Director's merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copy to the Director). The faculty member may raise in any appeal to the Dean: (i) the Director's merit score recommendation, and (ii) only those aspects of the committee's recommendation that the faculty member has previously raised in the faculty member's appeal to the Director. Issues related to the committee's recommendation not raised previously with the Director (where the faculty member either knew or through the exercise of reasonable diligence should have known) are not preserved for appeal to the Dean, shall not be considered by the Dean, and shall not be the basis or grounds for any grievance by the BGSU-FA.

April 30: Dean's recommendation to the Provost. Thereafter the Provost and Dean may confer through on or about May 19.

On or about May 20: Dean issues final determination regarding merit.

4. Special Circumstances

4.1 Consideration of Special Circumstances as Required by the Collective Bargaining Agreement:

4.1.1 Faculty Exchange Leave (Article 21, Section II: subsection 1.7). Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consultation with the host institution.

4.1.2 Leaves with Extramural Salary Paid through the University Payroll System (Article 21, Section III: subsection 1.3). Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consultation with the sponsoring government agency or private foundation.

4.1.3 Unpaid leave – 100% time (Article 21, Section IV: subsection 5). Faculty members will not be eligible for merit in any calendar year for which 100% unpaid leave was taken that is unrelated to Family Medical Leave. If related to Family Medical Leave, performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.

4.1.4 Sick Leave (Article 21, Section VIII: subsection 9.1). Performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated for faculty members on sick leave for 40 or more days during the calendar year.

4.1.5 Parental Leave (Article 21, Section IX: subsection 3). Unit Faculty Member who takes parental leave under this Article will only be evaluated for performance during the time in which he or she was not on parental leave (including use of sick leave in addition to parental leave). Performance expectations for merit evaluations that are expressed quantitatively shall be prorated. The Department Chair's/School Director's evaluation shall include a description of the methods used for prorating.

4.1.6 Partial Unpaid Leave – 50% time (Article 21, Section X: subsection 3.3). Faculty members will not be eligible for merit in any calendar year for which 50% unpaid leave was taken that is not related to Family Medical Leave. If related to Family Medical Leave, performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.

4.1.7 Faculty Improvement Leave (Article 22, Section 7.3.3). Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members may include consideration of the report submitted to the President detailing accomplishments during the FIL.

4.2 Consideration of Other Special Circumstances:

4.2.1 New Faculty Hires. New faculty members whose employment begins in the fall semester shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. Performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.

4.2.2 The unit's faculty advisory body may also consider special circumstances not covered in 4.1 above and make a recommendation to the unit chair or Director. Such exceptional circumstances might include a leave without pay to take a short-term research appointment, a leave without pay to participate in professional development, or other leave without pay that enhances the productivity of the faculty member and the reputation of the institution.

5. Amendment of Merit Policy

The unit faculty may amend performance indicators, performance expectations, and the methods for combining this information into both component and overall merit scores at any time. Amendments to the merit policy must be approved by the Dean and Provost/SVPAA. Approved amendments to

the merit policy shall not be applied retroactively in the calculation of the previous year's merit scores.

6. Additional Information
n/a

Approved by the School of Art on October 5, 2016

Approved: _____ Date 10/5/16
Dennis Wojtkiewicz, Chair of RPT Committee, School of Art

Approved: _____ Date 10/05/2016
Katerina Ray, Director, School of Art

Approved: _____ Date 10/10/2016
Raymond Craig, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Approved: _____ Date 10/15/16
Rodney Rogers, Provost Senior VP

Appendix A

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

I. Merit Criteria:

A. Criteria Domains:
Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the School of Art member in the following areas: Teaching Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service.

B. Allocation of Effort:
The School of Art expects its probationary and tenured faculty to maintain a standard allocation of effort of 40% Teaching; 40% Research/Creative Work; and 20% Service. Full-time non-tenure track faculty are expected to maintain a standard allocation of effort of 80% Teaching; 20% Service. However, in recognition of the diverse nature of the disciplines within the School and in acknowledgment of the broad variety of contributions that each faculty member is capable of making, the School allows each individual faculty member to define his or her own effort annually, in consultation with the Director in advance of each academic year. Tenured and probationary faculty may allocate effort within the following ranges: 20-55% Teaching; 20-55% Research/Creative Work; 20-40% Service (the sum of the three categories to total 100%) and non-tenure track faculty may allocate effort within the following ranges: 60-80% Teaching; 20-40% Service. All individual variations must be stated in writing and signed by both the faculty member and the School Director. The faculty member's allocation of effort will apply over the period of a calendar year or contract period.

C. Special Circumstances

1. New hires will be evaluated based on their activities for the full calendar year regardless of their contract starting date and where the activities took place.

II. Performance Indicators and Expectations:

The points and descriptions below indicate the activity levels expected for three distinct levels of merit. These are guiding principles intended to assist the evaluators in making a holistic assessment of faculty contributions and achievement, informed by performance indicators outlined in the rubrics below.

(4-5) Exceeds Expectations: Activities clearly exceed expectations and reflect a significant level of achievement beyond the standard level for the division and the School.
(2-3) Meets Expectations: Activities clearly meet the expectations and reflect standard levels of performance for the division and the School.

(0-1) Does Not Meet Expectations: Activities do not meet the minimum standard of performance for the division and the School.

The following scale is used to rate faculty in each domain: Teaching Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service. Points (1-16+) in each domain are awarded for performance based on a tier system, which are then translated into the RPT merit score (0-5).

Points awarded in each domain	Corresponding RPT score awarded in each domain:
0-3 points	0
4-6 points	1
7-9 points	2
10-12 points	3
13-15 points	4
16+ points	5

Points Achieved for Performance Indicators	Merit score assigned by RPT	Rating Category
Evidence of meeting a minimum threshold of 13 points from the Tiers in a given domain rubric.	4-5	Exceeds expectations for merit
Evidence of achieving 7-12 points from the Tiers in a given domain rubric.	2-3	Meets expectations for merit
Fails to meet the minimum threshold of 7 points from the Tiers in a given domain rubric.	0-1	Does not meet expectations for merit

All accomplishments are assessed with the performance indicators outlined in the accompanying rubrics. However, the School recognizes that it is impossible to include all types of activities in these documents; therefore the Director and RPT Committee will use the following rubrics as guidelines rather than a complete listing of possible activities. A rating scale of 0-5 is applied separately to each category of teaching, research/creative work, and service, and is computed as outlined in section 2.5 above.

A. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness:

The following rubric is used to evaluate faculty for Teaching Effectiveness:

TEACHING

Points for performance	Performance Indicators *Points are flexible based on the quantity, duration, intensity, quality and/or prestige of the activity*
3 points This tier implies *external peer-reviewed* and/or *invitational* activity at the regional-international level, e.g. teaching-related external grants or external workshops, or presenter at external teaching conference	• Invited presenter/keynote speaker at national teaching-related conferences and workshops
2 points This tier implies activity beyond normal expectations.	• Workshops taught • Non-traditional courses (e.g. client or community-based) • Refereed presenter at national teaching-related conferences and workshops • Disciplinary/community awards and honors (outside of BGSU) in recognition of teaching • Curricular review/development • Outcomes assessment • Thesis committee chair
1 point This tier implies internal activity that is typically assigned to faculty. Additional points may be given based on the scope of the activity, number of students, etc.	• Team taught courses • Advising (1 point for every 10 students) • Independent studies/Internships • Thesis committee membership • New courses blue-sheeted • Major modifications to existing courses • Client or community-based projects • Instructional improvement seminars, workshops, or conferences attended • Development of course resources • Internal grants for instructional purposes • Recruitment of speakers, exhibitions, field trips, special events
Baseline for meeting merit: 1 point awarded for each course taught. Stacked classes = 1 class; graduate and other classes with less than 6 students = .5 point per 3 students.	The average score for the composite, cumulative student teaching evaluations must be 3.0 or above, indicating satisfactory teaching. Faculty with a composite evaluation average below 3.0 are not eligible to receive points for other teaching activities.

B. Evaluation of Research/Creative Work:

The following outlines the primary domains of evaluation used by divisions within the School. However, it is recognized that faculty can and do cross over into other domains. The School also recognizes that practicing artists in certain areas need to spend time researching new technology and/or materials, and the extent to which this research impinges upon, or otherwise affects, creative output should be taken into account in any evaluation of the faculty member's activity.

The following rubric is used to evaluate faculty for Research/Creative Work:

RESEARCH

Points for performance	**Performance Indicators** ***Points are flexible based on the quantity, duration, intensity, quality and/or prestige of the activity***
4-10 points Points in this tier are reserved for outstanding and rare activities. This tier implies peer-reviewed activity and/or an invitation from a professional organization, institution, publisher, etc. that is beyond the normal range of faculty activity and typically results from multiple years of work.	Rare and prestigious activities such as: • A major exhibition (e.g. 5 = a professional solo exhibition at a venue with a national reach; 10 = the Whitney Biennial) • Publication of a book – scholarly book/monograph, anthology or textbook (points based on authorship, length of book, and prestige of publisher) • Publication of type design, custom-built software/hardware and/or interactive works (points based on prestige of publisher and distribution)
3 points This tier implies *peer-reviewed* activity and/or an *invitation* from a professional organization, institution, publisher, etc. that generally occurs at the *national/international* level, with a national/international audience and scope.	Publications: Refereed articles - Journal, Proceedings Editorships Program Presenter or Papers read to professional societies – refereed/invited, international Grants and funded projects beyond BGSU (over $20,000) Exhibitions: • Invitational group show –international • Solo show – national but with a regional audience • Juried international group show
2 points This tier implies *peer-reviewed* activity and/or an *invitation* from a professional organization, institution, publisher, etc. that generally occurs at the *regional/national* level, with a regional/national audience and scope.	Publications: • Chapters of books • Exhibition catalogs • Reports Program presenter or Papers read to professional societies: • Refereed/invited, national • Non-refereed, international Grants and funded projects beyond BGSU (up to $20,000) Exhibitions curated Exhibitions: • Invitational group show –national • Solo regional show

	• Juried national show
1 point This tier implies *non-refereed* activity generally limited in scope and audience to the *local/regional* level, in-progress research that will lead to publication or exhibition activity, or activity that is initiated by the faculty member.	Publications: • Book/exhibition review essays • Books self-published • Non-refereed articles (Journals, Proceedings, Newsletters) Program Presenter or Papers read to professional societies: • Refereed/invited, regional • Non-refereed, national Grants and funded projects (BGSU, e.g. FDC/FRC) Courses, workshops, conferences and symposia attended Commissions Works placed in permanent collections Collaborative, community-based projects Consultantships Exhibitions: • Invitational group show –regional • Solo local show • Juried regional show Artist residencies Awards and recognitions for research/creative work
.5 points This tier generally implies *BGSU/SOA* activity limited in scope and audience to the *local* level, or activity that is initiated by the faculty member.	Grants and funded projects (Speed Grant, Medici) Program Presenter or Papers read to professional societies: • Non-refereed, regional/local Illustrations of artwork in print/online publications Citations by others, discipline-based Television/radio interviews, local Faculty exhibitions
0 points Activity is limited to non-refereed, self-initiated local or on-campus activity	Membership in honor societies Work in progress - ongoing studio/scholarly research Trips to museums, attendance at area lectures

C. Evaluation of Service:

The School of Art defines Service as performance that falls into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance; professional expertise shared with the external community; and contributions to a faculty member's field. Community service activities must draw upon a faculty member's expertise in order to be considered as appropriate for merit. Professional service activities include a faculty member's membership and active involvement with professional organizations connected to his/her discipline.

The following rubric is used to evaluate faculty for Service:

SERVICE

Points for Performance	Performance Indicators *Points are flexible based on the quantity, duration, intensity, quality and/or prestige of the activity*
3 points This tier implies a *high level* of involvement in the organization/institution, as determined by leadership, time/effort, and scope of activity.	Internal and institutional governance/service: • Committee Chair: University, College, School • Administrative positions/Coordinator • Division Chair • Area Head Professional service: • Leadership positions held • Editorship, Manuscript reviewer Community service: • Leadership positions held
2 points This tier implies ongoing and active involvement in the organization/institution.	Internal and institutional governance/service: • Committee membership: University, College, School • Facilities management • Student organization advisor Professional and Community service: • Active involvement in professional organizations • Jurying • Pro bono work
1 point This tier implies limited or occasional service activity.	Retention/recruitment activities: • Involvement in at least 3 (faculty juror, demos, tours, and similar activities) • Faculty mentor for other faculty or TAs • Digital content manager Professional service: • Tenure/Promotion review for external institution • Consultantship that's not considered teaching or research