

## Merit Document Department of Psychology

### Preamble

Merit raises refer to the component of salary raises that are provided to department and 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 Department in the following areas: Teaching/Librarian 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 five or more 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 it 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: 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 Chair 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/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service), performance indicators and expectations for the criteria, and the calculation of the component merit scores (i.e., Teaching/Librarian 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 or her allocation of effort (e.g., 40/40/20 for teaching, research, and service) with the Chair.
- 2.2. The Department Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (SPAT) committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member.
  - 2.2.1. All bargaining unit faculty members can vote for and are eligible to be elected to the SPAT committee;
  - 2.2.2. The SPAT committee consists of 4 full-time faculty members, 3 of whom are to be elected each year;

- 2.2.3. The election is by mail ballot;
  - 2.2.4. The ballot lists the names of all eligible faculty members.
  - 2.2.5. Whenever the number of non-tenured probationary faculty in their second year of employment or beyond numbers three or more, one and only one such member shall be elected to the Committee
  - 2.2.6. The SPAT committee shall consist of no more than two faculty members from the same program area (Clinical, Developmental, Industrial-Organizational, Neural and Cognitive Sciences);
  - 2.2.7. The ballots shall be counted by Chair and Vice Chair;
  - 2.2.8. The department is bound by the election, except for ties;
  - 2.2.9. Ties shall be broken by the flip of a coin.
  - 2.2.10. Election to the SPAT committee will occur no later than November 15.
  - 2.2.11. The SPAT Committee elects its own chair from among its members, but it may not be the previous year's SPAT Chair;
  - 2.2.12. The previous year's SPAT Chair shall be the continuing member of the committee. When the previous SPAT Chair is unavailable for service, one of the members of the previous year's committee shall be re-elected by the committee.
  - 2.2.13. No person shall serve more than 2 consecutive years on the committee, except in the case (2.2.12 above) in which a previous committee member must serve in place of the previous chair.
- 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: the Department's Faculty Annual Update Form, a current copy of their curriculum vita, as well as copies of teaching evaluation summaries;
- 2.5. The overall merit scores will be calculated by a weighted average of the individual scores for teaching, research, and service. These weights reflect each faculty member's previously determined allocation of effort (e.g., 40% teaching, 40% research, 20% service).
- 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: The last date for faculty merit dossiers to be submitted to the SPAT committee.

The SPAT committee is urged to work informally with all faculty members being reviewed to resolve any factual or interpretive issues before submitting merit scores to the Department Chair.

February 28: SPAT Committee's merit score recommendation to the Chair (with a copy to the faculty member).

March 7: The last date for faculty members to appeal the SPAT committee's recommendation to the Chair to the Chair (with a copy to the SPAT committee).

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

April 7: The last date for faculty members to appeal the Department Chair's merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copy to the Department Chair). The faculty member may raise in any appeal to the Dean: (i) the Department Chair's merit score recommendation, and (ii) only those aspects of the SPAT committee's recommendation that the faculty member has previously raised in the faculty member's appeal to the Department Chair. Issues related to the SPAT committee's recommendation not raised previously with the Department 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: The 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 FML. If related to FML, 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 FML. If related to FML, 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 SPAT committee may also consider special circumstances not covered in 4.1 above and make a recommendation to the Department Chair. 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 SPAT committee 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

- 6.1. SPAT members will use the rubric in Appendix A as a guideline to derive individual ratings of each faculty member. SPAT committee members discuss their individual ratings and come to a consensus on what the rating should be for each faculty member's teaching, research, and service. As a Department, we highly value the principle of shared governance. SPAT committee members are elected by faculty members and selected to represent the interests of all academic areas of the Department. Awarding merit ratings to each faculty member is a process that is grounded in Department merit guidelines and based on discussions and consensus of the SPAT committee.
- 6.2. Expectations for merit differ as a function of faculty rank (instructor, assistant, associate, full professor). When evaluating whether a faculty member exceeds, meets, or fails to meet expectations, the faculty member shall be compared to other faculty with the same rank.
- 6.3. As a Department, we recognize that there are multiple paths to success within any particular area (i.e., teaching, research, and service). The rubrics in Appendix A provide examples of outcomes and behaviors associated with each performance level. We recognize that within a particular level, an individual faculty member is unlikely to perform all aspects of behavior. The SPAT Committee and 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.

Approved by the Department of Psychology at the Month, Date, Year Faculty Meeting

  
Name, Chair/Director \_\_\_\_\_ Date 4/10/15

Approved:   
Name, Dean of College Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date 4/13/15

Approved:   
Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VPAA \_\_\_\_\_ Date 4/13/15

**APPENDIX A**

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

Evaluation Rating Category	<b>TEACHING</b> Examples of levels of accomplishment on teaching performance (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Teaching*
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quantitative student evaluations are positive (compared to relevant benchmarks).</li> <li>• If appropriate, observations by peers indicate high levels of effectiveness in the classroom.</li> <li>• Chairs multiple thesis and dissertation committees.</li> <li>• Serves on multiple thesis and dissertation committees.</li> <li>• If appropriate, additional teaching roles are undertaken (e.g., clinical supervision, undergraduate advising) and evaluated positively.</li> <li>• If appropriate, demonstrates effort at improving instruction through attending workshops, participating in communities of interest, and using innovative pedagogy.</li> <li>• Works on curriculum development.</li> <li>• Mentors undergraduate students (e.g., honors theses, independent studies, internships)</li> </ul>	3 to 4
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quantitative student evaluations are average (compared to relevant benchmarks).</li> <li>• If appropriate, observations by peers indicate good levels of effectiveness in the classroom.</li> <li>• Chairs at least one thesis or dissertation committee</li> <li>• Serves on at least one thesis or dissertation committee.</li> <li>• If appropriate, additional teaching roles are undertaken (e.g., clinical supervision, undergraduate advising) and deemed to be good.</li> </ul>	1 to 2
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quantitative student evaluations are negative (compared to relevant benchmarks).</li> <li>• If appropriate, observations by peers indicate significant opportunities for improvement.</li> <li>• Does not chair thesis and dissertation committees.</li> <li>• Does not serve on thesis and dissertation committees.</li> <li>• If appropriate, additional teaching roles are not undertaken (e.g. clinical supervision, undergraduate advising) or are deemed to be in need of improvement.</li> </ul>	0

\*Insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 0-4 point scale.

Evaluation Rating Category	<b>SCHOLARSHIP</b> Examples of levels of accomplishment on research performance (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Research*
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multiple peer-reviewed publications</li> <li>• External grant submissions and/or awards</li> <li>• Book chapters in high profile publications</li> <li>• Evidence of multiple research collaborations with students</li> <li>• Evidence of a highly active and on-going research program(s) (e.g., current data collections and writing projects; conference presentations)</li> <li>• Awarded or recognized for research contributions</li> </ul>	3 to 4
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One peer-reviewed publication</li> <li>• Book chapter(s)</li> <li>• Internal grant submissions and awards</li> <li>• Evidence of at least one research collaboration with student(s)</li> <li>• Evidence of an active and on-going research program (e.g., current data collections and writing projects; conference presentations)</li> </ul>	1 to 2
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No peer-reviewed publications</li> <li>• No book chapters</li> <li>• No internal or external grant submissions and awards</li> <li>• No evidence of an active and on-going research program (e.g., no current data collections or writing projects)</li> </ul>	0

\*Insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 0-4 point scale.



Evaluation Rating Category	<b>SERVICE</b> Examples of levels of accomplishment on service performance (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Service*
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chairs committees at the Department, College, University, or Professional Levels</li> <li>• Serves on at least one committee that requires a substantial time commitment</li> <li>• Assumes leadership role in community service relevant to the profession</li> <li>• Recognized for service contributions</li> <li>• Serves as editor or on editorial board of peer-reviewed journal(s)</li> </ul>	3 to 4
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serves on committees at the Department, College, University, or Professional Levels</li> <li>• Provides community service relevant to the profession</li> <li>• Reviews for academic journal(s)</li> <li>• Regularly attends faculty meetings</li> </ul>	1 to 2
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little to no participation in Department, College, University, and/or Professional-level committees</li> <li>• No involvement in community service relevant to the profession</li> <li>• Does not regularly attend faculty meetings</li> </ul>	0

\*Insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 0-4 point scale.

