

## **Merit Policy**

### **School of Earth, Environment and Society**

#### Preamble

Merit raises refer to the component of salary raises that are provided to 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 Earth, Environment & Society 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 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, 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. Prior to the beginning of the calendar year, each Bargaining Unit Faculty Member will confirm his/her allocation of effort (e.g., 50/40/10 for teaching, scholarship, and service) with the Director.
- 2.2. The School Merit Committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every Bargaining Unit Faculty Member. The committee is composed of four members, one elected from each department and one school appointee. To the extent possible, the committee should have representation from each faculty category (NTTF, undergraduate, graduate).
- 2.3. Each faculty member submits a merit report to the Merit Committee by January 31<sup>st</sup> (if a weekend, the next business day). Faculty members who fail to submit a merit report 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 report must include a copy of the College Annual Faculty Record Update form (or electronic equivalent). Should the faculty member feel that the update form does not

sufficiently describe or include activities that s/he feels are meritorious, s/he may include a brief (one-page maximum) description of those activities for consideration by the Merit Committee. Student course evaluations (both written comments and numerical scores) will be used as a part of the teaching quality evaluation, and will be available electronically to faculty. Each faculty member is responsible for submitting accurate and complete documents by the deadline. No changes to those documents will be accepted after the deadline. However, the Director or the Merit Committee members may request further explanation of certain activities after submission.

- 2.5. Each committee member will evaluate the merit report, guided by the criteria described in Appendix A, and arrive at a merit score using the system described in Appendix B. Evaluations will be done in light of the negotiated workload allocations described in Appendix C. Members of the Merit Committee will not evaluate themselves.
- 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

- 3.1. January 31: Last date for faculty merit dossiers to be submitted to an academic unit.
- 3.2. 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.
- 3.3. February 28: Academic unit faculty committee's merit score recommendation to the Director (with a copy to the faculty member).
- 3.4. March 7: Last date for faculty members to appeal the committee's recommendation to the Director (with a copy to the committee).
- 3.5. March 31: Director's merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copies to the committee and faculty members).
- 3.6. 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's. 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.
- 3.7. April 30: Dean's recommendation to the Provost. Thereafter, the Provost and Dean may confer through on or about May 19.
- 3.8. 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 Act. If related to Family Medical Leave Act, 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 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 Act. If related to Family Medical Leave Act, 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 faculty member will negotiate variations in the workload allocation with the Director prior to the leave to account for the differences between normal activities and activities while on leave. The Merit Committee will evaluate the faculty member based on this workload allocation.
- 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 Merit Committee may also consider special circumstances not covered in 3.1 above and make a recommendation to the School 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 School 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.

Approved by the School of Earth, Environment and Society at the January 30, 2015 Faculty Meeting. Revisions accepted by the faculty on February 27, 2015, further amended on March 10, 2015.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Charles Onasch, Director


Date 3/10/15

Approved:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Raymond Craig, Dean of College of Arts & Sciences

Date 3/10/15

Approved:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Rodney Rogers, Provost Senior VPAA

Date 3/11/15

## **APPENDIX A**

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

Merit criteria are limited to three areas: teaching, research, and service. To determine whether faculty members have failed to meet, met, or exceeded expectations for merit, a merit system should identify performance indicators and expected levels of performance for each of the relevant areas noted above. The merit system should also describe how information on the various performance indicators are combined to calculate the relevant component merit scores (i.e., teaching, research, and service).

#### **Overview**

Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the School faculty member on the following performance criteria: teaching, research, and service. Each of the aforementioned criteria (e.g., teaching) will be evaluated using a number of performance indicators (e.g., quantitative student evaluations of teaching). Merit Committee members will review information submitted by each faculty member to make an evaluation rating on each performance indicator.

Evaluation ratings provided for all performance indicators within each performance criteria will be combined by each member of the Merit Committee to reach a component rating for each of the relevant performance criteria (teaching, research, and service). Merit Committee members will meet as a committee to review and reach consensus on component scores for each of the relevant performance criteria using the summary form that follows.

The Merit Committee will then assign an overall merit rating using the approach found in Section 2.5 of the merit policy. The overall merit score may include any number of values or rating levels, but it must clearly identify whether the overall merit score reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

The School Director will also assign an overall merit rating using the same criteria and scoring system as used by the Merit Committee. The Director will provide each faculty member with his/her score and an explanation should the score differ from that of the Merit Committee. The Committee's score and the Director's score, including an explanation of any differences, will then be submitted to the Dean, along with a recommendation as to the distribution of merit dollars (Appendix D).

## **General Guidance for Performance Evaluations**

### **Teaching**

Primary evaluation based on:

- Quality of teaching, including student and peer evaluations (numerical and written)
- Graduate and undergraduate theses completed
- Teaching awards

Also considered:

- Developing and teaching new courses
- Making major revisions to a course or teaching a course for the first time
- Developing and implementing innovative/high impact teaching strategies
- Serving on graduate and undergraduate thesis committees
- Additional teaching contributions (e.g., independent studies, directed readings, directed research, teaching experience outside the classroom, field trips, laboratory instruction, leading workshops, brown bags, etc.)
- Professional development activities designed to improve teaching

### **Research**

Primary evaluation based on:

- Peer-reviewed publications
- External funding received
- Research awards

Also considered:

- Presentations at professional meetings
- Submission of proposals for external funding
- Internal grants and contracts from the University, College, or School
- Professional development activities designed to improve research
- Dissemination of results of engaged scholarship
- Commercialization of research activities

### **Service**

Primary evaluation based on:

- Serving on Departmental, School, College, and University committees
- Service to BGSU FA
- Professional service (including, but not limited to, serving on committees for professional societies, serving as a journal editor, and reviewing grant proposals and manuscripts)
- Serving on committees or advisory panels for federal, state and local government entities
- Service-related activities that take considerable time, but do not result in a course reduction
- Service awards

Also considered:

- Invited lectures at other universities or schools
- Outreach and recruitment activities
- Equipment or lab oversight/instruction
- Professional development activities designed to improve service

# Teaching

Performance Indicator	Scoring Range (0 -2)	Scoring Range (3-5)	Scoring Range (6-7)	Committee Score (0-7)	Weight (sum to total number of Performance Indicators)	Weighted Rating (Comm. Score * Weight)
Quantitative Student Evaluations (using School evaluation form)	Average of courses below 3.0 out of 5	most between 3.0 to 4.0 out of 5, average of courses above 3.5	most above 4.0 out of 5, average of courses above 4.0		2	
Qualitative Student Evaluations (using School evaluation form)	less than 50% positive comments	50% - 74% positive comments	75% - 100% positive comments		1	
Peer Reviews (using School form)	either no peer review or Poor-Fair peer review	good peer review(s)	excellent peer review(s)		1	
Professional Development related to course development/pedagogy	none	one PD activity (or equivalent)	more than one PD activity (or equivalent)		0.5	
High Impact Practices/Innovative Practices/ Instructional Development (e.g., service learning, field trips/field experiences)	none	One HIP, IP or ID (or equivalent)	more than one HIP, IP or ID (or equivalent)		1	
Teaching other than formal classes (e.g., theses, dissertations, independent studies, honors projects, supervise internships, textbook)	none	1 -2 activities (or equivalent)	>2 activities (or equivalent)		1	
Teaching Recognition (e.g., teaching awards, thesis awards, master teacher nomination, etc.)	none	none	1 or more TRs		0.5	
<b>Total teaching score (<math>\Sigma</math> weighted rating/7)</b>						

## Research

Performance Indicator	Scoring Range (0-2)	Scoring Range (3-5)	Scoring Range (6-7)	Committee Score	Weight	Weighted Rating
<b>Publications*</b> Refereed journal article or book chapter published (6 pts. each) Refereed journal article or book chapter submitted (1 pt. each) Scholarly Book (10 pts. each) Editor of refereed symposium proceeding (3 pts. each) Abstract and presentation at professional meeting (national 1 pt. each; regional 0.5 pts. each) Non-refereed articles, reports, etc. (1 pt. each)	<20 pts	20-40 pts	>40 pts		6	
<b>Grants and Contracts*</b> External grant funded (2 pts + 0.0001 times funding amount per year each) Internal grant funded (1 pt. each) Submission of external grant (1 pt. each) Commercialization of products/patents (1 pt. each)						
*Total point values in the section are weighted to account for allocation of effort by dividing by the % allocation.						
<b>Research Recognition</b> Research Honors and Awards High journal impact factor Large (>\$25K/year) grants funded Invited Speaker at Research Conference	none	none	1 or more		1	
*SUM of points in this section is divided by % effort for research (e.g., for 40% effort divide points by .40)					<b>Total Research Score (<math>\Sigma</math> weighted rating/7)</b>	

**NOTE** - The point values are based on the general expectations of:

Exceeds expectations = 2 or more peer-reviewed journal articles, external funding of at least \$20,000, or equivalent combination of other activities.

Meets expectation = 1 peer-reviewed journal article and an external grant of any value, or equivalent combination of other activities.



Does not meet expectations = no peer-reviewed papers, no external funding, no other substantial research indicators.

## Service

Performance Indicator	Score Range (0-2)	Score Range (3-5)	Score Range (6-7)	Committee Score	Weight	Weighted Rating
Service to Department/School	Limited to no advising or committee, limited attendance at faculty meetings)	Serves on 1 or 2 active committees, volunteer service and advising (or equivalent)	Serves on 3 or more active committees, volunteer service and advising (or equivalent)		2	
Service to College/University	No participation on college/univ. committees or events	Serves on 1 committee, faculty senator, volunteer involvement at College/University level (or equivalent)	Serves on 2 or more committees, heavy volunteer involvement at College/University level		2	
Service to Profession	None	Serves on 1 committee, volunteer services (or equivalent)	Serves on 2 or more committees, heavy volunteer (or equivalent)		1	
Service to Community	Limited (1 brief activity) or no participation	1 or 2 significant community service/recruitment activities, 1 of which is extensive/ongoing	3 or more significant community service/recruitment activities, 2 of which are extensive/ongoing		1	
Service Recognition	None	1 example of service award, leadership, high impact practice, or high visibility service (or equivalent)	2 or more examples of service award leadership, high impact practice, or high visibility service (or equivalent)		1	
				<b>Total Service Score (<math>\Sigma</math> weighted rating/7)</b>		

**NOTES****Service Activities for Department/School may include, but are not limited to:**

- Undergraduate Advisor
- Internship Coordinator
- Undergraduate Paleobiology Advisor
- Field Camp Director
- Department or School Committee
- Faculty Search Committee
- Department/School equipment/laboratory maintenance
- Student Organization Advising

**Service Activities for College/University may include:**

- Faculty Senate
- College or University Committee
- Faculty/Student Mentoring at College/University level
- Service to BGSU FA

**Service Activities for Profession may include:**

- Associate Editor of Professional Journal
- Committee Member
- Organizer for Session at Professional Meeting
- Reviewer for Professional Journal/Grant Proposals

**Outreach Activities may include:**

- Community Service related to BGSU Faculty Appointment
- Committees or advisory panels for federal, state and local government entities
- Recruitment Activities

**Service Recognition Activities may include:**

- Journal Editor
- Service Honors and Awards
- Officeholder of Professional Society
- Officeholder Faculty Senate
- Chairing/Leadership on Committees
- Exceptional Service Activity

## APPENDIX B

### Determining Overall Merit Score Recommendations

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 (Appendix C):

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

The assignment of does not meet, meets, and exceed expectations from the merit score is as follows:

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation
<2	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; recommendation for no merit
2-6	Meets basic expectations for merit; eligible for merit
>6	Exceeds expectations for merit; eligible for merit

## **APPENDIX C**

### **Nominal Allocations of Effort for School Faculty According to Role in School**

1. Full-time, non-tenure track faculty

Teaching – 90%

Research – 0%

Service – 10%

2. Tenured or tenure-track faculty whose primary responsibility is undergraduate education

Teaching – 65%

Research – 25%

Service – 10%

3. Tenured or tenure-track faculty whose responsibility includes undergraduate education and graduate education (supervision of MS theses and graduate teaching)

Teaching – 50%

Research – 40%

Service – 10%

## **APPENDIX D**

### **Recommendation to Dean on distribution of merit dollars**

The School recommends that the merit dollars be allocated to the faculty who met or exceeded performance expectations in proportion to their score above the merit line (2.0).