

Merit Document

Department of Marketing in the College of Business Administration

Preamble

Merit raises refer to the component of salary raises that are provided to department 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 Department of Marketing in the following areas: Teaching, Research, 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 ten (10) categories or rating levels to allow for discrimination among levels of performance; each of the categories or rating levels on the overall merit score must clearly identify whether it does not meet expectations for merit, meets expectations for merit, or exceeds expectations for merit. For example, using the ten categories or rating levels, the following evaluation concepts would be included: 1.0 – 4.9 = Does not meet expectations for merit; 5.0 – 7.9 = Meets expectations for merit; 8.0 – 10.0 = Exceeds expectations for merit.

Both the Merit Committee of the academic unit and the chair of the department 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, Research, and Service), performance indicators and expectations for the criteria, and the calculation of the component merit scores (i.e., Teaching, Research, and Service) are contained in Appendix A.

2. General Procedure for Faculty Evaluation and Score of Merit

- 2.1. Allocation of Effort.** 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 chair.
- 2.2. Merit Committee.** The Department of Marketing Merit Committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. The Merit Committee is composed of five bargaining-unit faculty members, three of which will be tenure-track faculty (TTF) and two will be continuing non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF). Of the TTF, no more than one may be probationary. Of the NTTF, no more than one may be of the rank of Instructor except under extenuating circumstances (e.g., there are not enough NTTF of higher rank available to

serve). The faculty members are elected by bargaining-unit department faculty in staggered two-year terms such that two new TTF and one NTTF are elected one year and one new TTF and one new NTTF in the next year. The Chair of the Merit Committee shall be elected by the members of the Merit Committee from the continuing committee members.

- 2.3. Failure to Submit.** Each faculty member submits a complete merit dossier to the Merit Committee by a predetermined date selected by the Merit Committee. Faculty members who fail to submit a complete merit dossier 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. Merit Dossier.** The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements:
1. Individual Cumulative Faculty Service Reports completed by each faculty member with activities and outputs during the preceding calendar year (January-December) highlighted.
 2. Relevant documentation regarding all publications (if relevant), journal/proceeding/presentation acceptances (if relevant), teaching portfolios, and service activity during this period.
 3. Additional information elaborating on data contained in the Cumulative Faculty Service Report
- 2.5. Overall Merit.** The individual component merit scores for Teaching, Research, and Service are combined to arrive at an overall merit score. Allocation of effort is taken into account when determining overall merit score. NTTF are normally not expected to engage in research. However, if the Workload Agreement with the NTTF faculty member includes a research allocation of effort, then research will be considered for merit. The overall merit will include ten rating levels and clearly identify whether the overall merit reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

Once the Merit Committee has reached consensus on component merit scores on 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:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &[\text{Teaching Merit Score} * \text{Allocation of Effort}] + \\
 &[\text{Research Merit Score} * \text{Allocation of Effort}] + \\
 &[\text{Service Merit Score} * \text{Allocation of Effort}] = \text{Overall Merit Score}
 \end{aligned}$$

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation (10 point scale)
8.0 – 10.0	Exceeds expectations for merit; eligible for merit
5.0 – 7.9	Meets basic expectation for merit; eligible for merit
1.0 – 4.9	Fails to meet basic expectation for merit; recommendation for no merit

- 2.6. Decimal Convention.** An academic unit may report its merit score recommendation to no greater than one-tenth decimal place (for example, a unit 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 chair.

February 28: Academic unit faculty committee's merit score recommendation to the chair (with a copy to the faculty member).

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

March 31: Chair'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 chair's merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copy to the chair. The faculty member may raise in any appeal to the Dean: (i) the chair'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 chair. Issues related to the committee's recommendation not raised previously with the chair (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 unrelated 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 will 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.

Appendix A

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

Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the department member on the following performance criteria: Teaching, Research, and Service. Each of the aforementioned criteria will be evaluated using a number of performance indicators described in the sections that follow. The Merit Committee will review information submitted by each faculty member and reach consensus to assign a numerical score for each of the relevant performance criteria using the rating scales described in the sections that follow.

The levels on each of the performance indicators capture how the unit defines exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, and failing to meet expectations for performance:

Exceeds expectations for merit: Activities exceed expectations and reflect a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for an individual with a given faculty rank in the department, college, unit, and discipline.

Meets expectations for merit: Activities meet expectations and reflect standard levels of performance for the department, college, unit, and discipline.

Fails to meet expectations for merit: Activities do not meet expectations and fall below the standard levels of performance for the department, college, unit, and discipline.

The Merit Committee will then assign an overall merit rating using the approach found in Section 2.5 (and Appendix B) of the merit policy.

Each section that follows includes components to be used in making evaluations. The Merit Committee will reach consensus to assign a numerical score for each of the criteria.

A. Teaching

The department values all effective teaching activities of faculty members, including those that occur outside of the classroom. The following will be considered to evaluate Teaching, as appropriate. However, classroom effectiveness is considered relatively more important than other components of teaching listed below:

1. Classroom Effectiveness

Effective performance in the classroom will be evaluated by examining student evaluations, the appropriateness of teaching materials used/assignments given for the nature and level of the course taught, and methods used to assess student performance. Consideration will also be given to the faculty member's goals and objectives for the course. Other aspects of classroom teaching performance that could be used to further assist the evaluation of teaching are the nature of the course(s) taught (required vs. elective, new preparations, new courses, diversity of courses, graduate vs. undergraduate, size of class, etc.), the use of innovative teaching methods in the classroom, peer evaluations, and teaching awards.

2. Nonclassroom Teaching

Teaching activities that take place outside of the traditional classroom are also considered in the evaluation of a faculty member's teaching performance. These activities would include such activities as involvement in a student thesis or research paper, dissertation advising, independent studies conducted with undergraduate or graduate students, and any out-of-class workshops/seminars conducted with students.

3. Advising Activities

The department values advising and recognizes its importance in the students receiving a quality educational experience. Therefore, academic advising responsibilities are also taken into account in the evaluation of a faculty member's contribution in the teaching area. Advising includes the number of advisees the faculty is responsible for, the quality of advice given to advisees, serving as advisor to a student organization, and advising student competitions. It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide evidence of advising activities.

4. Curriculum Design/Modification/Assessment

In addition to direct teaching and advising responsibilities, a faculty member's contribution in the teaching area includes the creation of the courses and programs that directly impact the quality, quantity, and diversity of courses offered within the University, as well as committees dealing with assessment and curriculum.

5. Professional Development Activities

Faculty participation in professional development activities related to teaching includes activities such as attending or conducting teaching conferences and/or workshops, participating in faculty colloquiums devoted to teaching, etc.

6. Publication of Teaching Materials

Development and publication of materials to facilitate the teaching of a subject are also considered legitimate teaching activities. These would include development of textbooks, instructor's manuals, test banks, software, etc.

Evaluation Rating Category	TEACHING Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Teaching
Exceeds expectations for merit	<i>Using the criteria listed above in Section A of Appendix A, teaching is judged at a high level.</i>	8.0 – 10.0
Meets expectations for merit	<i>Using the criteria listed above in Section A of Appendix A, teaching is judged at a moderate level.</i>	5.0 – 7.9
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<i>Using the criteria listed above in Section A of Appendix A, teaching is judged at a low level.</i>	1.0 – 4.9

Merit Score for Teaching (to be determined by Merit Committee): _____

B. Research

All tenure-track faculty members are expected to participate in research activities. These are four general areas of research: publications, professional activities, committee activities, and research grants and recognition. However, publications are generally more important than other research activities.

1. Publications

The greatest weight will be given to journal publications. In general, refereed publications are given greater weight than non-refereed publications. Those publications that are individually authored are given greater weight than equal quality publications that are co-authored. The following research activities will be considered publication-related (in general rank order):

1. Refereed publications in academic journals
2. Refereed publications in the proceedings of recognized professional societies
3. Books, excluding textbooks
4. Editor-selected publications in journals
5. Invited publications in journals
6. Published book reviews
7. Editor-selected publications in proceedings
8. Invited publications in proceedings
9. Presentations of refereed papers at professional conferences from which an abstract was published.
10. Presentations at professional conferences not related to any published paper or abstract
11. Submitted papers to journals or conferences
12. Work in progress

In addition, the quality of the publication, as well as the quality of the publication vehicle, will also impact the relative value of any particular publication. When applicable, the Merit Committee will use the Department of Marketing Journal and Refereed Volume Ratings in effect as of the last day of the calendar year being evaluated for merit. For example, merit evaluations for 2015 will use the journal ratings in effect as of December 31, 2015.

2. Professional Activities

In addition to publications, the department encourages and values professional research activities that keep a faculty member involved in the research in the discipline. Professional activities are those that involve faculty time and effort in the capacity of either an editor and/or reviewer of manuscripts considered for publication in journals or proceedings, appointment to the editorial review board of a journal, or a participant (track chair, discussant, or an attendee) at professional conferences and seminars.

3. Committee Activities

The department also encourages and rewards faculty participation in committee activities in which research is the major focus, such as publication review committees, Faculty Research Committee, and the CBA Summer Research Grant Committee.

4. Research Grants and Recognition

Research grants obtained that culminate into a grant for the department, College, or University, or any award or recognition given for a faculty member's research activity are also considered research activities warranting recognition.

Continuing NTTF may also be expected to engage in research activities if it is stipulated in their individual contract. For NTTF who are expected to conduct research, their research activities will be evaluated separately from their teaching and service. NTTF who are not expected to conduct research may also engage in research activities. In this case, the research activities may contribute towards the teaching or service components of that NTTF's merit evaluation and the NTTF needs to make the argument as to how the research activities have added value to their teaching or service.

Evaluation Rating Category	RESEARCH Expected levels of accomplishment on research performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Research
Exceeds expectations for merit	<i>Using the criteria listed above in Section B of Appendix A, research activity is judged at a high level.</i>	8.0 – 10.0
Meets expectations for merit	<i>Using the criteria listed above in Section B of Appendix A, research activity is judged at a moderate level.</i>	5.0 – 7.9
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<i>Using the criteria listed above in Section B of Appendix A, research activity is judged not demonstrated.</i>	1.0 – 4.9

Merit Score for Research (to be determined by Merit Committee): _____

C. Service

In addition to the aforementioned teaching and, if applicable, research responsibilities, each faculty member is expected to take an active role in professional service activities. The following will be considered to evaluate Service, as appropriate. These activities may include participation in activities that benefit the academic discipline, the students, faculty, programs, and mission of the department and/or College and/or University, as well as service to the marketing profession. The department does not consider participation in personal activities, including religious, political, or charitable activities, as professional service activity.

1. University Governance Activities

Faculty participation on department, College, and/or University committees concerned with University governance activities (e.g., tenure and promotion committee, Faculty Senate) rather than instructional (e.g., curriculum committees, club advising) or research activities (e.g., editorial review boards, Faculty Research Committee) will be used in the evaluation of a faculty member's service performance. In general, each faculty member's total service performance will be measured, in part, by their involvement and contribution to such activities. The weight given to any particular department, College, and/or University governance activity will vary by the nature of the assignment, the degree of involvement, and the tasks and accomplishments of the committee. In general, major committees are those that involve a substantial time commitment. Further, significant participation can be defined in terms of the quantity and quality of service activities.

2. Service to Profession

Faculty service activities that benefit the discipline or profession will be used to assess each faculty member's overall professional service performance. These activities may include membership and involvement in professional business-related organizations at the local, regional, and national levels. Again, the weight given any particular activity will vary depending upon the nature of the assignment, the degree of involvement, and the specific accomplishments or contribution of the activity.

3. Service Recognition Awards, External Engagement, and Other Service Support Activities

Other faculty service activities not listed elsewhere, such as administrative assignments, service on public/private advisory boards or boards of directors, unpaid professional consulting to other organizations, the establishment and maintenance of contacts with relevant external professional constituencies, or the sharing of knowledge and expertise with external constituents in an unpaid fashion on issues of relevance to their organization(s) will also be included in each faculty member's overall service performance.

4. Recruitment and Retention Activities

In addition to the previously-mentioned activities that may indirectly impact the recruiting and retention of students, faculty are also involved in other activities designed to have a direct impact on these goals. Such activities would include participation in Preview Days, Freshman Fairs, Dean's List receptions, faculty-parent functions, etc.

Evaluation Rating Category	SERVICE Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Service
Exceeds expectations for merit	<i>Using the criteria listed above in Section C of Appendix A, service activity is judged at a high level.</i>	8.0 – 10.0
Meets expectations for merit	<i>Using the criteria listed above in Section C of Appendix A, service activity is judged at a moderate level.</i>	5.0 – 7.9
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<i>Using the criteria listed above in Section C of Appendix A, service activity is judged not demonstrated.</i>	1.0 – 4.9

Merit Score for Service (to be determined by Merit Committee): _____

SUMMARY FORM

(to be determined by the Merit Committee)

Faculty Member Evaluated for Merit	Merit Score for Teaching	Merit Score for Research	Merit Score for Service	Weighted Average for Merit* (rounded to nearest 1/10 of a point)
<i>Faculty member 1</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	
<i>Faculty member 2</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	
<i>Next faculty member, etc.</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	

* Weighted Average for Merit = [Teaching Merit Score × Allocation of Effort**]
+ [Research Merit Score × Allocation of Effort**]
+ [Service Merit Score × Allocation of Effort**]

** See Appendix B for Allocation of Effort.

APPENDIX B

Options for Determining Overall Merit Score Recommendations

The individual component merit scores for Teaching, Research, and Service are combined to arrive at an overall merit score. Allocation of effort is taken into account when determining overall merit score.

Evaluation Scale

A 10-point performance evaluation scale is used with the range of 1.0-4.9 reflecting performance that does not meet expectations, 5.0-7.9 reflecting performance that meets expectations, and 8.0-10.0 reflecting performance that exceeds expectations. Each faculty member will be given a rating in each area of teaching, research, and service for activities.

To meet expectations and qualify for merit, the minimum overall performance rating, after weighting teaching, research, and service, is 5.0. Any score over 5.0 is viewed as exceeding the minimum expectations.

Weighted Allocation of Effort Algorithm

A. Performance Dimensions and Weight Distribution

1. Tenure-track faculty members

As previously stated, each tenured and probationary tenure-track faculty member will be evaluated in the areas of teaching, research, and service. For purposes of merit, the standard base weights for all tenured and probationary faculty will be:

Teaching -- 50%
 Research -- 35%
 Service -- 15%

However, in conjunction with the Department Chair, and prior to the beginning of the calendar year, a tenured Associate Professor or Professor may elect to alter these weights within the following ranges and subject to the four following conditions: (1) research must not be given greater weight than teaching, (2) service cannot be given greater weight than research or teaching, (3) the total weight must be 100%, and (4) desired weights of individual faculty must be consistent with the overall department obligations and objectives as assessed by the Department Chair.

Acceptable Ranges

Teaching -- 40-60%
 Research -- 25-40%
 Service -- 15-25%

2. Continuing non-tenure-track faculty members

NTTF with continuing contracts for the following academic year are eligible for performance-based merit increases as per the guidelines described in this document. Typically, NTTF contribute primarily in the area of teaching and hence their performance evaluation is based on related activities on weights of 80% teaching and 20% service. For an NTTF who receives released time as a result of administrative responsibilities or special

projects (e.g., symposia and competitions) or for NTTF who are expected to conduct research, appropriate weights are determined per the administrative responsibilities or special projects agreed upon by the NTTF and the Department Chair.

B. Evaluation Procedure and Merit Allocation

The Merit Committee will evaluate each faculty in the areas of teaching, research, and service, and assign a rating using the scale provided herein. Members of the Merit Committee will not participate in the evaluation of themselves, spouses, or other family members. Furthermore, NTTF members of the Merit Committee will not be required to evaluate the research components of TTF faculty.

At a meeting of all Merit Committee members, a consensus will be reached regarding the appropriate rating of each faculty in each area of teaching, research, and service. In the event that a consensus cannot be reached, the Committee Chair will then have the responsibility to choose a number that reflects the majority of the committee's evaluation.

Once all the component numbers are obtained, they will be multiplied by the weights for the individual and summed to achieve a final merit rating of the individual for that year rounded to the nearest 1/10 of a point.

The Department of Marketing recommends the departmental Merit Pool be divided into two separate pools: one for TTF and one for continuing NTTF. The size of the two pools shall be proportionally divided based on the total base salaries of the faculty members. Within each pool, the final merit rating for each continuing faculty member in that pool is added together into a Total Performance Base Index for that pool. Then each individual's weighted index is calculated as a percentage of their corresponding Total Performance Base Index, with the resulting percentage (rounded to 1/10 of a percentage point) representing the merit rating earned by each faculty member.

Any faculty member who does not qualify for merit will not receive a merit increase.

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation
8.0 – 10.0	Exceeds expectations for merit; eligible for merit.
5.0 – 7.9	Meets basic expectations for merit; eligible for merit.
1.0 – 4.9	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; recommendation for no merit.