# MERIT TEMPLATE-updated following MOU

*Note*

***For Merit Template Document (pages 1-4):*** *Each Academic Unit will edit material highlighted in blue, insert material where highlighted in yellow, and delete material highlighted in gray.*

***For Appendix A (pp. 5- 28) and Appendix B (pp. 29-30):*** *Text in blue font is included to show examples of information that could be included; each Academic Unit will replace this with information appropriate to its own discipline, mission, etc.). Text in red font show examples of information that merit committee members might provide when completing the merit instrument.*

Merit Document
Department of Sociology

## 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 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/her allocation of effort (e.g., 50/30/20 for teaching, scholarship, and service) with the chair.

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

2.3. Each faculty member submits a complete merit dossier to the merit committee by January 31st (if a weekend, the next business day). 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:

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

- Published reviews of books or other publications;
- Peer reviews of teaching, course syllabi, unsolicited testimonials from students, or other evidence of extraordinary effort and/or success in teaching (e.g., one paragraph narrative of teaching activities);
- Testimonials from university or professional colleagues regarding the extent or quality of service provided; and/or
- Other evidence of meritorious research, teaching, or service.

2.5. Separate evaluations are made in the areas of teaching, research, and service using 5-point scales with the following anchors: 0 *(no merit)*; 1 or 2 *(meeting departmental expectations at the low or high end, respectively)*; 3 or 4 *(exceeding departmental expectations at the low or high end, respectively)*. The committee then meets and resolves any discrepancies in the independent evaluations of each faculty member on each scale. Agreement is achieved by consensus if possible, vote if necessary. Committee members will absent themselves when their own or a spouse/partner's merit is being reviewed.

Merit points are assigned to each faculty member as the sum of the products of merit ratings in each of the three domains and allocation of effort in that domain. For purposes of determining merit, allocation of effort is translated to a tripartite scale whose elements sum to 10-points (e.g., a 40-50-10 allocation of effort becomes 4 points [teaching], 5 points [research], 1 point [service]). The elements serve as weights, which when multiplied by the merit scores for each domain creates a scale with a theoretical range of 0 to 40 total points for each faculty member.

Total point values between 0 and 9 points indicate failing to meet expectations, between 10 and 15 indicate meeting expectations, and above 15 indicate exceeding expectations. The formula is thus:

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

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

Because allocation of effort is determined on an academic year basis and merit is awarded on a calendar year basis, a situation will frequently arise where a faculty member has one allocation of effort for spring semester and another for fall in a calendar year. In this case the mean of the allocations for each domain will be used as the multiplier.

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 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.

6. Additional Information

Insert any information that does not fit in the preceding template items.

Approved by the Department of Sociology at the February 18, 2015 Faculty Meeting

Susan L. Brown, Chair Date 2/18/15

Approved: Name, Dean of College Name Date 02/20/15

Approved: Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP Date 3/1/15

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

Merit criteria are limited to three areas: Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, 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/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service).

Three exemplars are available for adaptation and use, as listed below. Immediately following each exemplar is an example of how it might be completed (although it is up to each academic unit to decide what to include in its own exemplar based on discipline, mission, etc.).

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

| Evaluation Rating Category | **TEACHING**<br>Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent) | Possible Merit Score for Teaching |
|---|---|---|
| Exceeds expectations for merit | • Instructor composite scores in quantitative student evaluations that are significantly higher than the average for comparable level (e.g., 1000, 2000, 3000-level, etc) courses<br>• Higher than average involvement in supervising theses and dissertations<br>• Teaching the jumbo SOC 1010 course<br>• New courses developed<br>• Documentation of substantial improvements to existing courses<br>• Evidence of effective integration of new technology or pedagogical approaches<br>• Teaching award nominations<br>• Mentorship of undergraduate research (e.g., honor's theses or research projects)<br>• Publication of scholarship on teaching, submitting or/and receiving teaching-related grants<br>• Teaching leadership (e.g., mentorship, working groups)<br>• Demonstration of efforts at improvement of instruction through attending working group or workshops | 3-4 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Meets expectations for merit | • Instructor composite scores in quantitative student evaluations that are around the average for comparable level courses<br>• Supervising theses and dissertations, membership on MA or PhD committees<br>• Active participation in preliminary examination committees<br>• Participation in students' professional socialization activities | 1-2 |
| Fails to meet expectations for merit | • Clear evidence of problematic teaching<br>• Poor student evaluations or student feedback<br>• Failure to meet classes without notice<br>• Being unprepared to conduct class<br>• Engaging in inappropriate behaviors with students in classes as defined by BGSU policies and guidelines | 0 |

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

| Evaluation Rating Category | **RESEARCH**<br>Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent) | Possible Merit Score for Research |
|---|---|---|
| Exceeds expectations for merit | • Publication of an article or book, or an active external grant<br>• Consideration will be given to the order of authorship, co-authorship with students, refereed journal quality, quality of the press, and overall number of publications.<br>• Research independence and leadership as evidenced by some solo or first authored publications.<br>• Federally funded grants generally are assigned greater values than grants from other sources.<br>• Consideration will also be given to principal investigator status or other evidence of grant leadership.<br>• Awards for research contributions | 3-4 |
| Meets expectations for merit | • Demonstration of research activities that signal eventual productivity and an ongoing stream of scholarship<br>• Research in progress (multiple papers submitted to or under revision for journals, book prospectuses, conference | 1-2 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | presentations, working papers, and works in progress)<br>• Research activity includes new activity since the prior year. | |
| Fails to meet expectations for merit | • Negligible research activity (e.g., little work in progress, no manuscripts or grant proposals submitted, and no paper presentations)<br>• Negligible productivity (e.g., no peer-reviewed manuscripts published nor grant proposals funded) | 0 |

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

| Evaluation Rating Category | **SERVICE**<br>Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent) | Possible Merit Score for Service |
|---|---|---|
| Exceeds expectations for merit | • Serving on (and performing the relevant work for) three or more college, university, or professional committees<br>• Chairing committees at the department, college, university, or professional levels<br>• Serving on a committee that requires a considerable amount of time commitment<br>• Organizing and maintaining active working groups within the department or across different departments<br>• Awards for service contributions<br>• Editorship of major journals or editorial board service<br>• NIH grant proposal study section membership or equivalent grant review membership<br>• National conference leadership position – planning or organizing sessions<br>• Faculty involvement with student organizations, especially in sociology<br>• Engaged scholarship activities such as the dissemination or translation of research to larger audiences | 3-4 |
| Meets expectations for merit | • Serving on (and performing the relevant work for) one or two committees at the department level and/or the college or university level | 1-2 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | • Participates in specialty area committee work<br>• Attend department meetings regularly<br>• Response to requests for activity reports, teaching preferences, and other requests in a timely manner<br>• Expected service to the profession includes but is not limited to journal manuscript reviewing, grant proposal reviews, tenure reviews for other institutions, and participation in regional and national professional associations | |
| Fails to meet expectations for merit | • No or little engagement in major department committees, specialty area committees, or undergraduate or graduate program activities<br>• Failure to attend department meetings regularly.<br>• Failure to respond to requests for activity reports, teaching preferences, and other requests in a timely manner.<br>• Limited participation in service activities at college, university, or professional levels. | 0 |

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

## SUMMARY FORM

**(to be completed with agreement reached by all members of the merit committee):**

| Faculty Member | Merit Score for Teaching | Merit Score for Research | Merit Score for Service |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| **Next faculty member** | | | |
| **Next faculty member** | | | |

**Appendix B**
**Options for Determining Overall Merit Score Recommendations**

The individual component merit scores for teaching/librarian effectiveness, research/creative work, and service are combined to arrive at an overall merit score. Allocation of effort is taken into account when determining overall merit score. The overall merit may include a greater number of values or rating levels than seven, but it must clearly identify whether the overall merit rating reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

Three exemplars are available for adaptation and use: holistic judgment of the merit committee, a guiding rubric based on ratings in each performance area, or through the use of a simple algorithm that mathematically weights each performance criteria.

## Weighted Allocation of Effort Algorithm

Once the merit committee has reached consensus on component merit scores on each performance areas (Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service), the overall merit score is computed using a simple algorithm taking into account the weighted allocation of effort for each performance area:

[Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] + [Research/Creative Work Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] + [Service Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] = Overall Merit Score

For purposes of determining merit, allocation of effort is translated to a 10-point scale (e.g., a 40-50-10 allocation of effort becomes 4 points [teaching], 5 points [research], 1 point [service]). This creates a scale with a theoretical range of 0 to 40 for each faculty member. Scores between 0 and 9 points indicate a failure to meet expectations. Scores between 10 and 15 indicate meeting expectations and scores above 15 indicate exceeding expectations. The formula is thus:

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

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

| Overall Merit Score | Interpretation |
|---|---|
| 0-9 | Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit |
| 10-15 | Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit |
| 16-40 | Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit |