Merit Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

Academic Unit: Collections & Technical Services, University Libraries

Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

Overview

Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the department member for the following performance criteria: Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarship, and Service. Each of the aforementioned criteria will be evaluated using a number of performance indicators. Merit committee members will review information submitted by each faculty member to assign a numerical score for each criteria using an anchored rating scale anchored with examples of expected levels (or their equivalent) of performance on the performance indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Rating Category</th>
<th>LIBRARIAN EFFECTIVENESS</th>
<th>Possible Merit Score for Librarian Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds expectations for merit</td>
<td>A faculty member shall be deemed to have exceeded expectations in librarian effectiveness if he or she provides evidence of fulfilling the functions included in his/her position responsibilities in a competent and professional manner and also contributing to the mission of the library by participating in special projects which go beyond his/her position responsibilities. <strong>Competence:</strong> Mastery and maintenance of professional skills and knowledge required to fulfill the duties related to the librarian’s position. (See specific position responsibilities.) Exceeds: Demonstrates leadership and innovation by implementing emerging trends, applying new skills, and actively seeking ways to make improvements to CATS services and workflows. Communicates with colleagues about emerging trends/innovations. Attends professional meetings and workshops and applies new skills/knowledge to UL/CATs. <strong>Collaboration:</strong> Effective interaction and collaboration with library faculty, staff, student assistants, and users.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exceeds: Actively pursues leadership roles, makes efficient use of colleague and staff time, actively requests feedback from colleagues and users for improvement, pursues new opportunities for collaboration, assesses collaborative endeavors and their effects

Service orientation: Positive and constructive interaction with library stakeholders and service providers.

Exceeds: Anticipates user needs or tries to discover user needs and build ways to accommodate them, seeks out communication opportunities with users, donors and vendors, demonstrates persistence in following up with service providers to solve problems or seeking out the right person to talk with

Continuous improvement: Regular assessment and improvement of service in relation to the goals of the library and the department and the needs of users.

Exceeds Expectations: Actively engages in projects and endeavors to continuously improve library services through regular assessment activities; seeks to actively improve individual effectiveness by applying knowledge gained from professional development activities.

Commitment to student learning:
Provision of timely and consistent access to resources in keeping with national standards, including record loading, cataloging/metadata creation, licensing, selection and acquisition of materials. (See specific position responsibilities.)

Exceeds: Proactively explores and/or implements emerging trends in access and maintenance and assesses workflows and procedures for consistency and effectiveness.

Participation in teaching activities where appropriate, including library instruction, individual reference and consultation service, research clinics, and local training workshops as well as instructor of record responsibilities, student advising, and dissertation/thesis advising. (See specific position responsibilities.)

Exceeds: As applicable, seeks opportunities to continuously improve public service interactions in reference, instruction and training through assessment and feedback; continuously builds, improves, and assesses instruction programs; receives positive feedback from students and faculty

Coordinators: In addition to the items in the previous list, the librarian effectiveness of Coordinators will be evaluated on evidence pertaining to their effective management of the resources and operations of their unit/function.

Exceeds Expectations: Develops and implements new programs and policies or improves existing programs through significant
changes to enhance the unit's service and work effectiveness. Successfully advocates for the unit/function, leading to unit and/or service enhancements.

**Meets expectations for merit with distinction**

A faculty member shall be deemed to have met expectations with distinction in librarian effectiveness if he or she provides evidence of fulfilling the functions included in his/her position responsibilities in a competent and professional manner (see performance indicators below) with consistent efficiency and attention to detail.

**Meets expectations for merit**

A faculty member shall be deemed to have met expectations in librarian effectiveness if he or she provides evidence of fulfilling the functions included in his/her position responsibilities in a competent and professional manner.

**Competence:** Mastery and maintenance of professional skills and knowledge required to fulfill the duties related to the librarian's position. (See specific position responsibilities.)

Meets: Actively learns new skills and technology; is aware of emerging trends in specialization; adheres to national standards; attends professional workshops and meetings.

**Collaboration:** Effective interaction and collaboration with library faculty, staff, student assistants, and users.

Meets: Attends, is prepared for and participates in meetings, is receptive to and implements pertinent feedback, participates in collaborative endeavors, consistently communicates with colleagues to share knowledge and skills

**Service orientation:** Positive and constructive interaction with library stakeholders and service providers.

Meets: Responds to user requests in a timely manner and actively tries to accommodate user needs, maintains effective relationships with outside vendors and donors, communicates effectively with vendors and donors

**Continuous improvement:** Regular assessment and improvement of service in relation to the goals of the library and the department and the needs of users.

Meets: Actively engages in projects and endeavors to improve library services in relation to the goals of UL and CATS and the needs of users. Stays current with profession (i.e., attends workshops, views webinars, reads blogs, e-mail lists, literature, etc.).

**Commitment to student learning:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does not meet expectations for merit</th>
<th>Evidence submitted falls below the standards established in the Meets Expectations section outlined above (does not qualify for merit).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable performance</td>
<td>A faculty member shall be rated unacceptable in librarian effectiveness if his or her performance for one or more of the criteria below matches the description for unacceptable and has become a pattern of performance that hinders the department from carrying out its mission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Competence:** Mastery and maintenance of professional skills and knowledge required to fulfill the duties related to the librarian’s position. (See specific position responsibilities.)

**Unacceptable:** Frequent instances of failure to learn new skills and technology and/or demonstrate adherence to national standards during the review period.

**Collaboration:** Effective interaction and collaboration with library faculty, staff, student assistants, and users.
Unacceptable: Habitually fails to attend meetings related to his/her position duties and/or participate in collaborative endeavors during the review period.

**Service orientation:** Positive and constructive interaction with library stakeholders and service providers.

Unacceptable: Frequent instances of failure to respond to user requests and/or communicate with outside vendors and donors as necessary to fulfill position duties during the review period.

**Continuous Improvement:** Regular assessment and improvement of service in relation to the goals of the library and the department and the needs of users.

Unacceptable: Frequently does not participate in unit efforts to assess programs and services during the review period.

**Commitment to student learning:**

Provision of timely and consistent access to resources in keeping with national standards, including record loading, cataloging/metadata creation, licensing, selection and acquisition of materials. (See specific position responsibilities.)

Unacceptable: Habitually fails to provide access to resources as required by position duties and/or demonstrate adherence to standards for access and maintenance during the review period.

Participation in teaching activities where appropriate, including library instruction, individual reference and consultation service, research clinics, and local training workshops as well as instructor of record responsibilities, student advising, and dissertation/thesis advising. (See specific position responsibilities.)

Unacceptable: Frequently does not provide reference, instruction or training as required by position duties during the review period.

**Coordinators:** In addition to the items in the previous list, the librarian effectiveness of Coordinators will be evaluated on evidence pertaining to their effective management of the resources and operations of their unit/function.

Unacceptable: Often endangers the unit’s ability to continue its service and work effectively and/or fails to articulate unit needs to colleagues in department, UL and/or University during the review period.

The above scale is based on a 70% allocation of effort for librarian effectiveness. The scale shall be adjusted by the appropriate percent if the faculty member’s allocation of effort is different than 70%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Rating Category</th>
<th>SCHOLARSHIP Expected levels of accomplishment on scholarship performance indicators (or their equivalent)</th>
<th>Possible Merit Score for Scholarship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds expectations for merit</td>
<td>Produce scholarship sufficient to total 10.5 or more points using the chart below.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations for merit with distinction</td>
<td>Produce scholarship sufficient to total 8 – 10.4 points using the chart below.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations for merit</td>
<td>Produce scholarship sufficient to total 6 – 7.9 points using the chart below.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not meet expectations for merit</td>
<td>Produce scholarship sufficient to total 0.5 – 5.9 points using the chart below.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable performance</td>
<td>If no evidence is submitted for Scholarship, or if in the judgment of reviewers the evidence submitted does not reach minimal level of performance for the category “Does not meet expectations for Merit,” the faculty member’s performance in this area will be rated unacceptable.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above scale is based on a 20% allocation of effort for research. The scale shall be adjusted by the appropriate percent if the faculty member’s allocation of effort is different than 20%.

Point chart for determining levels of scholarship performance:
CATS faculty members shall record activity from January 1 through December 31 of the previous calendar year beneath the appropriate category heading.

- Include full citations and month and year of publication/presentation.
- Publications may be recorded with either the date of online publication OR the date of print publication, but may be counted only once for merit, even if those dates are in different calendar years.
- Specify refereed and non-refereed for all articles and presentations.
• Specify the level (local, regional, state, national, etc) for all presentations given and workshops/conferences planned.

• Submit copies of publications, mastheads (for editorships), notification of grants and awards, and other applicable documentation electronically.

• Full points will be awarded for works with up to four total co-authors/co-presenters. If there are more than four co-authors/co-presenters, half the point totals for the activity will be awarded to each participating faculty member.

• Points for grants will be awarded during the year the faculty member receives notice of the award of the grant. The ongoing administration of multi-year grants should be recorded as part of librarian effectiveness.

• For Scholarship of Engagement projects, write a paragraph describing the project, its scope, and significance, and provide appropriate electronic documentation. Activities such as presentations, publications, etc., associated with a Scholarship of Engagement project should be recorded in the appropriate category for those activities.

1. Publications
   a. BOOKS:
      i. Scholarly books (20 points)
      ii. Textbooks (15 points)
      iii. Edited books (editor or co-editor of proceedings, collections or other edited books) (15 points)
      iv. Chapters in books (8 points)
      v. Research/technical reports/white papers (multi-state, national, or international audience) (7 points). Submit a copy of the report and address the following points in the merit form: 1) intended audience, 2) degree of involvement in writing the report, 3) the impetus for the report’s creation (e.g., a regular committee assignment), 4) degree to which the report is reviewed.
      vi. Web guides, indexes, bibliographies, pathfinders, etc. (at least statewide audience) (2 points)
   b. PERIODICAL ARTICLES
      i. Refereed articles, conference proceedings (10 points)
      ii. Non-refereed articles (5 points)
      iii. Columns or nationally recognized professional blogs (2 points per published column/post)
      iv. Newsletter articles (1 point)
   c. REVIEWS (limit of 5 total points for reviews)
      i. Non-refereed reviews or Choice / Library Journal-type reviews of 500 words or less (1 point)
      ii. Longer reviews in refereed journals (2 points)

2. Papers Presented (Provide full citations, including dates. Indicate if invited or refereed.)
   a. International/national (4 points; 5 if refereed or invited)
   b. Multistate (3 points; 4 if refereed or invited)
   c. State (2 points; 3 if refereed or invited)
   d. Local, Regional (1 point; 2 if refereed or invited)

3. Panelist/Reactor/Moderator (1 point). (If activity as a member of a panel includes presenting a paper, report activity under 2 above.)

4. Poster Sessions (Provide full citations, including dates.) Limit of 4 activity points per year for poster sessions.
a. International/national (1 point; 2 if refereed)
b. Multistate (1 point; 2 if refereed)
c. State, regional or local (.5 point; 1.5 if refereed)
5. EDITORSHIPS. Faculty members should clearly define their precise editorial role (i.e. copy editor, editor in chief, etc.) and include a copy of the masthead of the publication or page indicating role for a-c below. No points will be awarded if no journal issues, columns, etc., are published or manuscripts reviewed.
   a. Journal editor: 15 points
   b. Journal column editor; assistant/associate editor: 10 points
   c. Guest editor; newsletter editor: 5 points
   d. Review/board member (e.g., journal editorial board, grant review panel) or manuscript reviewer: 2 points
6. Conferences and workshops/seminars planned and organized. Points will be granted whether or not the conference planned was the work of an official committee designated for conference planning of which the faculty member was a member. Committee membership should also be recorded in the Service portion of the merit form.
   a. International/national conference or conference program/workshop planned/organized (4 points)
   b. Multistate (3 points)
   c. State (2 points)
   d. Region of the state or local (1 point)
7. Grants and awards. Points will be awarded to those playing a major role in writing the proposal, obtaining funding, or administering the grant after it is awarded. Include description and extent of duties as well as a statement describing the impact of the project funded. Points are awarded for the year the grant is obtained or extended (as the result of new application for grant extension).
   a. External (outside University)
      i. Grant from international/national agency
         1. For project of at least national scope and amount of over $10,000 (15 points)
         2. For project of at least statewide scope and amount of at least $5,000 (10 points)
         3. For project of at least statewide scope and amount of at least $2,500 or a grant for personal scholarship output/professional development and amount of at least $2,500 (5 points)
      4. Any grant of less than $2,500 or any other grant (2 points)
   ii. Grant from multistate/state/local agency
      1. For project of at least national scope and amount of over $10,000 (10 points)
      2. For project of at least statewide scope and amount of at least $5,000 (8 points)
      3. For project of at least statewide scope and amount of at least $2,500 or a grant for personal scholarship output/professional development and amount of at least $2,500 (5 points)
      4. Any grant for less than $2,500 or any other grant (2 points)
   b. Internal grant (within University or from University Libraries)
      i. Grant from University (BGSU)
         1. University Faculty Development Grant (2.5 points)
         2. University Faculty Research Grant (2.5 points)
3. University Faculty Improvement Leave (Merit points for a Faculty Improvement Leave will be awarded in the year the leave is granted) (2 points)

4. University Speed Grant (1 point*)

5. Other (2 points)

ii. UL grant

1. Library Faculty Research Grant (1 point*)
2. Kerbel award: (2 points)
3. Other (2 points)

*MAXIMUM OF ONE [1] ACTIVITY POINTS PER YEAR FOR SPEED GRANTS AND LIBRARY FACULTY RESEARCH GRANTS

c. Awards:

i. National/international award (5 points)

ii. Multi-state/state award (4 points)

iii. Local/BGSU award (3 points)

iv. Departmental/UL award (2 points)

8. Engaged Scholarship. Engaged Scholarship Activities that satisfy the working definition of the BGSU Report of the Task Force on Scholarship of Engagement for SoE are eligible for recognition & reward if the project results in an activity described above. Faculty requesting that engaged scholarship projects be considered for merit will provide the following information:

a. The public & private communities involved with this project. Describe the community’s degree of involvement, along with your individual role in this collaborative project.

b. Whether the project was related to economic development, educational reform, quality of life issues, or a combination of two or more of these areas.

c. The goal(s) of the project.

d. The outcome(s) of the project (including scholarship).

e. The significance/impact of this project (include any supporting documentation from external, non-peer, stakeholder groups).

f. Any additional information & documentation which may assist faculty in evaluating the engaged scholarship project.

9. Active research agenda. For scholarship/creative projects on which faculty are actively working, include a brief description of the project(s) and the activity completed (i.e., abstracts written/submitted, bibliography of readings completed, etc.). (0.5 points. A maximum of 0.5 points will be awarded for this category.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Rating Category</th>
<th>SERVICE Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators (or their equivalent)</th>
<th>Possible Merit Score for Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds expectations for merit</td>
<td>Perform service sufficient to total 8.5 or more points using the chart below.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations for merit with distinction</td>
<td>Perform service sufficient to total 6 – 8.4 points using the chart below.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations for merit</td>
<td>Perform service sufficient to total 4 – 5.9 points using the chart below.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not meet expectations for merit</td>
<td>Perform service sufficient to total 0.5 – 3.9 points using the chart below.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable performance</td>
<td>If no evidence is submitted for Service, or if in the judgment of reviewers the evidence submitted does not reach minimal level of performance for the category “Does not meet expectations for Merit,” the faculty member’s performance in this area will be rated unacceptable.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above scale is based on a 10% allocation of effort for service. The scale shall be adjusted by the appropriate percent if the faculty member’s allocation of effort is different from 10%. For example, if the faculty member’s allocation of effort for service is 20%, the scale shall be adjusted appropriately.

**Point chart for determining levels of service work performance:**

Service is defined as:

- Participation in the shared governance of UL or the university (including voluntary representation of the faculty member's department or college on UL or University governance committees),
- Representation of BGSU UL to statewide or national organizations (OhioLINK, ARSC)
- Participation in local, statewide, multistate or national organizations as an active committee member, elected or appointed officer, intern, or other essential participant in the governance
or activities of the organization (excluding voting and attendance at general membership meetings).

Membership in a professional organization not accompanied by active committee membership or an elected or appointed office is not eligible for merit. Membership in the Friends of the Library and volunteer activities not included in the activities described below are not eligible for merit.

Committees on which membership is ex-officio due to the committee member’s position title or UL/University task forces convened to aid the faculty member in completing work directly related to his or her position responsibilities should be reported under librarian effectiveness. Committees on which membership is ex-officio due to another elected or appointed office may be considered for merit, but ex-officio status should be noted.

Report all work related to a subcommittee within activity related to its governing committee if the subcommittee’s membership is drawn entirely from the governing committee and the governing committee typically breaks up into subcommittees in order to complete its primary work. Service on subcommittees that do not fit this description can be recorded separately.

All participation in the governance of the faculty member’s department (i.e., merit, RPT, faculty search committees) should be recorded under UL Service. However, merit points will be awarded for the activity only if it was delegated to a committee in which a subset of department faculty is representing the entire department and not all faculty are participants.

1. UL Service. Describe committee activities (workload, number of meetings, etc.).
   a. UL standing committee membership (1-2 points)
   b. UL screening committee (1 points)
   c. UL Friends Board (1-2 points)
   d. Chair or officer of any of the above (1 point additional)
   e. Faculty secretary (1-2 points)
   f. Presiding officer of the library faculty (1 point)
   g. CATS or other UL department committee/service position (Merit Coordinator, Chair of CATS PTRC Committee, etc.) (1-2 points)

2. University Service. Describe committee activities and individual contributions to the work of the committee, number of meetings, etc.
   a. Faculty Senate membership (2 points)
   b. Graduate or Undergraduate Council membership (2 points)
   c. University committee, task force, etc. membership (1-2 points)
   d. Chair or officer of any of above (1 point additional)
   e. Advisor to University social or recreational group (1 point)

3. Networks, Consortia, etc. (where BGSU Libraries is a member; e.g., OhioLINK. List committee memberships and offices.)
   a. International/national consortium committee membership (2 points)
   b. Multistate consortium committee membership (1.5 points)
c. OhioLINK standing committee membership (2 points)
d. OhioLINK task force or other state, region of the state, or local consortium committee membership (1 point)
e. Chair or officer of any of the above (a-d) (1 point additional)

4. Professional Organizations (May be library or other position-related associations. List committee memberships and offices, other service, and attendance at meetings.)
   a. Officer (any position elected or appointed to the organization's executive board. Committee chairs that attend executive meetings should be reported under b-d below) of international/national/regional/statewide organization (e.g. ALA, ALA Divisions - ACRL - or sections - STARS, ALAO, etc.) (3 points)
   b. Committee of an international/national professional organization (2 points for membership, 3 points if chair)
   c. Committee of a multistate professional organization (1.5 points for membership, 2.5 points if chair)
   d. State, region of the state, or local committee (1 point for membership, 2 points if chair)

---

**Overall Merit Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Merit Score</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5-4</td>
<td>Exceeds expectations for merit; eligible for merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6-3.4</td>
<td>Meets expectations for merit with distinction; eligible for merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7-2.5</td>
<td>Meets basic expectations for merit; eligible for merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5-1.6</td>
<td>Performance is below expectations for merit but acceptable for position; recommendation for no merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-0.4</td>
<td>Performance is unacceptable for position; recommendation for no merit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Merit Committee Composition and the Election/Appointment Process**

1. The department merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member.
   1.1. All bargaining unit faculty in the department will participate in assigning merit scores, forming a committee of the whole. All references to the merit committee in this document will refer to either all bargaining unit faculty members in the department (when acting as a committee of the whole) or a department merit committee (if a committee is elected).
1.2. In the event the Department consists of more than three (3) bargaining unit faculty, CATS faculty may choose to elect a representative committee to serve as a departmental merit committee. The committee must be made up of faculty members in CATS and consist of at least 3 people elected by the department faculty. In the case of a tie, lots will be cast to determine membership on the committee.

2. One faculty member in CATS will serve as the Merit Coordinator annually. This position will rotate in alphabetical order throughout the department faculty. The person holding this position will be responsible for:
   2.1. Sending out the call for merit.
   2.2. Making sure faculty members are aware of deadlines throughout the merit process;
   2.3. Collecting the merit forms and calculating the final merit scores using the following procedure:
      2.3.1. Averaging the scores given to each faculty member by Department colleagues in each of the categories of librarian effectiveness, scholarship, and service
      2.3.2. Calculating each faculty member’s overall merit score using these averages and the faculty member’s individual allocation of effort
      2.3.3. Giving this information to the faculty member to review
   2.4. Forwarding all required merit documentation, including scored merit forms and each faculty member’s pertinent documentation, as well as an unscored copy of each faculty member’s merit form to the CATS Department Chair by the appointed deadline.
   2.5. Serving as chair of the CATS Merit Committee in the event Department faculty choose to elect a committee.

2.6. At the conclusion of the merit process and in advance of the issuance of contracts for the next fiscal year, the Merit Coordinator shall compile and issue a report of the results of the merit process, including merit scores and merit salary allocations for all department bargaining unit faculty members. This is to ensure a fair and transparent process for all CATS faculty members. This report shall be issued internally to each faculty member in the CATS department, and will include the following information concerning all CATS department faculty members:
   2.6.1. Results of Departmental scoring. This information will be obtained by reviewing the Merit Coordinator’s report.
   2.6.2. Results of Chair’s scoring. This information will be obtained by reviewing the Chair’s report.
   2.6.3. Results of Dean’s scoring. This information must be forwarded to the Merit Coordinator by individual department faculty members for inclusion in the report.
   2.6.4. Resulting merit salary adjustment for each faculty member. This information comes from the Provost and must be forwarded to the Merit Coordinator by individual department faculty members for inclusion in the report.
   2.6.5. Percent of the Department merit pool represented by each faculty member’s salary adjustment. This information will be calculated by the Merit Coordinator.

3. The Chair will be responsible for the following actions. In the event that CATS faculty have questions about the Chair’s merit evaluation of the bargaining unit faculty, the faculty may request additional information from the Chair.
3.1. Make an independent recommendation of department Bargaining Unit Faculty Members based upon the materials forwarded by the Merit Coordinator, and following the CATS Merit Criteria & Performance Indicators Rubric (below) and the weighted Allocation of Effort Algorithm (section 2.5 of the main document). The Chair’s recommendation will consist of scores for each faculty member in the areas of librarian effectiveness, scholarship (where applicable), and service plus an overall merit score.

3.2. Review all merit calculations for accuracy.

3.3. Inform each Bargaining Unit Faculty Member of his or her overall merit score plus recommendation from the Chair.

**Elements of the Merit Dossier**

4. The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements:
   4.1. Position responsibilities
   4.2. Official allocation of effort (if different than the standard 70/20/10)
   4.3. Electronic copies or links to publications or other supporting evidence required
   4.4. Completed Merit Form
   4.5. Documentation of any special circumstances

**Calculation of Overall Merit Score**

5. With the exception of external peer review, the same performance indicators described in the library’s reappointment, promotion and tenure policies are to be used for merit review and they are to be consistent with those criteria found in Article 14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and the individual faculty member’s allocation of effort.
   5.1. Merit reviews shall accurately reflect the actual responsibilities, assigned duties, and allocation of effort percentages of each department faculty member.
   5.2. Once the merit committee has completed its work and produced component merit scores for each performance area (Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarship, and Service), the overall merit score is computed using a simple algorithm taking into account the weighted allocation of effort for each performance area:
   
   \[
   \text{Overall Merit Score} = \frac{\text{Average Librarian Effectiveness Merit Score} \times \text{Allocation of Effort} + \text{Average Scholarship Merit Score} \times \text{Allocation of Effort} + \text{Average Service Merit Score} \times \text{Allocation of Effort}}{\text{Total Allocation of Effort}}
   \]

5.3. All records and forms used to score merit forms are forwarded to the Dean’s Office for retention as soon as the merit process is completed. Merit point scores will be kept on file in the Dean’s Office in compliance with the University Libraries records retention policy.

5.4. CATS faculty recommend that the Dean allocate the total merit pool for the CATS Department equally among all continuing CATS faculty whose final merit scores qualify them for merit by meeting or exceeding expectations as outlined in section 2.5.2.

5.5. In the event that CATS faculty have questions about the Dean’s allocation of the merit pool, the faculty may request additional information from the Dean.
Forms to be Used in Merit Process

Merit Form to be filled out by faculty member

Instructions
It is the responsibility of each faculty member to complete a merit form, providing evidence to support the faculty member’s performance related to each criterion.

1. Fill in applicable calendar year, name, rank, and date at the top of the form.
2. Record activity from January 1 through December 31 beneath the appropriate category headings in the form below.
   2.1. If a given activity serves as evidence for more than one category, it should be recorded in all applicable categories.
   2.2. Language from each individual faculty member’s position responsibilities can be inserted along with evidence to provide clarity.
3. No faculty member shall score her or his own form.
4. Each faculty member should submit the completed form electronically to all members of the CATS Merit Committee (if applicable) or Committee of the Whole along with:
   4.1. Position responsibilities
   4.2. Official allocation of effort
   4.3. Electronic copies of publications or other supporting evidence required

Merit form for calendar year YYYY
FACULTY MEMBER NAME AND RANK
CATS Department, University Libraries
DATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Librarian Effectiveness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds expectations for merit:</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations for merit with distinction:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations for merit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not meet expectations for merit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable performance</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does not meet expectations for merit
All CATS faculty must demonstrate librarian effectiveness through evidence pertaining to the following criteria.
I. **Competence**: Mastery and maintenance of professional skills and knowledge required to fulfill the duties related to the librarian’s position. (See specific position responsibilities.)

   [LIST EVIDENCE HERE]

II. **Collaboration**: Effective interaction and collaboration with library faculty, staff, student assistants, and users.

   [LIST EVIDENCE HERE]

III. **Service orientation**: Positive and constructive interaction with library stakeholders and service providers.

   [LIST EVIDENCE HERE]

IV. **Continuous improvement**: Regular assessment and improvement of service in relation to the goals of the library and the department and the needs of users.

   [LIST EVIDENCE HERE]

V. **Commitment to student learning (A)**: Provision of timely and consistent access to resources in keeping with national standards, including record loading, cataloging/metadata creation, licensing, selection and acquisition of materials. (See specific position responsibilities.)

   [LIST EVIDENCE HERE]

VI. **Commitment to student learning (B)**: Participation in teaching activities where appropriate, including library instruction, individual reference and consultation service, research clinics, and local training workshops as well as instructor of record responsibilities, student advising, and dissertation/thesis advising. (See specific position responsibilities.)

   [LIST EVIDENCE HERE]

In addition to the items in the previous list, the librarian effectiveness of Coordinators will be evaluated on evidence pertaining to the following criterion:

i. **Effective management of the resources and operations of their unit/function.**

   [LIST EVIDENCE HERE]

**Scholarship**

| Exceeds expectations: 8 points or higher | 4 |
| Meets expectations with distinction: 6 - 7.9 points | 3 |
| Meets expectations: 4 - 5.9 points | 2 |
| Does not meet expectations for merit: 0.5 - 3.9 points | 1 |
| Unacceptable performance: 0 points | 0 |

**PUBLICATIONS**
Books
Scholarly books
Textbooks
Edited books
Chapters in books
Research/technical reports/white papers
Web guides, indexes, bibliographies, pathfinders, etc.

Periodical articles
Refereed articles, conference proceedings
Non-refereed articles
Columns or national recognized professional blogs
Newsletter articles

Reviews
Non-refereed or short reviews
Longer, refereed reviews

PAPERS PRESENTED

International/national
Multistate
State
Local

OTHER

Panelist/reactor/moderator
Poster sessions
Editorships
Conferences and workshops planned/organized
Grants and awards
Engaged scholarship
Active research agenda

Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds expectations: 8.5 points or higher</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations with distinction: 6-8.4 points or higher</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet expectations: 4-5.9 points</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not meet expectations for merit: .5-3.9 points</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable performance: 0 points</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Libraries service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UL standing committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UL screening committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UL departmental service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University committee, task force, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Networks, consortia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OhioLINK standing committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OhioLINK task force or other state/local committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional organizations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer of international/national/regional (multi-state)/statewide organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee membership (international/national professional organization)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee membership (multistate organization)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee membership (state, region of state or local organization)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Merit Scoring Form

Instructions
It is the responsibility of the CATS Merit Committee (if applicable) or Committee of the Whole to evaluate the performance of each bargaining unit faculty member.

1. Supply the name of the faculty member being evaluated and your name as the evaluator, along with the date.
2. Carefully examine the evidence presented in the completed merit form (appendix B) and evaluate the faculty member’s performance in light of the rubrics and performance indicators provided in Appendix A.
   2.1. Using the performance indicators provided, assign a numerical score for Librarian Effectiveness.
   2.2. Using the point system provided, assign numerical score(s) for Scholarship (for TTF) and Service (for both TTF and NTTF).
   2.3. Using the charts provided for each of the three criteria, determine whether the faculty member’s score meets, meets with distinction, exceeds, or fails to meet the established criteria for Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarship (for TTF) and Service.
3. No faculty member shall score her or his own form.
4. Print out the form and record these scores in the blanks provided on the form.
5. Turn in the completed Scoring Form to the Merit Coordinator.

CATS Department, University Libraries

Merit Scoring Form for ____________________________ for year ____________.
   (Name of faculty member whose form is being scored) (Year of activity)

Scored by: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

REFER TO THE COMPLETE CATS MERIT SALARY AWARDS DOCUMENT FOR DETAILED INSTRUCTIONS ON SCORING. Submit scores to the CATS Merit Coordinator by February 1.

Librarian Effectiveness
Scale for Librarian Effectiveness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds expectations for merit</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations for merit with distinction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations for merit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not meet expectations for merit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable performance</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Librarian Effectiveness

FINAL LIBRARIAN EFFECTIVENESS SCORE (0-4) (LE): __________

☐ Rating for Librarian Effectiveness is Unacceptable

This LE score will be added to the LE scores provided by the other CATS faculty members for this individual which will then be averaged to become this individual’s Final Score for Librarian Effectiveness.

Scholarship

Scale for Scholarship

| Exceeds expectations: 8 points or higher | 4 |
| Meets expectations with distinction: 6 – 7.9 points | 3 |
| Meet expectations: 4 – 5.9 points | 2 |
| Does not meet expectations for merit: 0.5 – 3.9 points | 1 |
| Unacceptable performance: 0 points | 0 |

PUBLICATIONS

POINTS: __________

PAPERS PRESENTED

POINTS: __________

OTHER

POINTS: __________

Scholarship

FINAL SCHOLARSHIP SCORE (RAW): __________

FINAL SCHOLARSHIP SCORE (R) (0-4): __________

☐ Rating for Scholarship is Unacceptable

This R score will be added to the R scores provided by the other CATS faculty members for this individual which will then be averaged to become this individual’s Final Score for Scholarship.

Service
Scale for Service

| Exceeds expectations: 8.5 points or higher | 4 |
| Meets expectations with distinction: 6-8.4 points or higher | 3 |
| Meet expectations: 4-5.9 points | 2 |
| Does not meet expectations for merit: .5-3.9 points | 1 |
| Unacceptable performance: 0 points | 0 |

University Libraries service

POINTS:

University service

POINTS:

Networks, consortia

POINTS:

Professional organizations

POINTS:

Service

FINAL SERVICE SCORE (RAW):

FINAL SERVICE SCORE (S) (0-4):

☐ Rating for Service is Unacceptable

This S score will be added to the scores provided by the other CATS faculty members for this individual which will then be averaged to become this individual's Final Score for Service.

Final Merit Score

The final merit score will be calculated by averaging the final librarian effectiveness (LE) scores awarded to each faculty member by his/her colleagues, the final scholarship (R) scores, and the final service (S) scores, then weighting those final scores by the faculty member's allocation of effort. For example, if his/her allocation of effort is 70% Librarian Effectiveness, 20% Scholarship and 10% Service, his/her Final Merit Score (FMS) would be calculated by the following formula: \(0.7 \times LE + 0.2 \times R + 0.15 = FMS\). The FMS will be applied to the scale below to determine whether the faculty member exceeds, meets with distinction, meets, is below, or fails to meet expectations.

Exceeds expectations for merit: 3.5–4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations for merit with distinction:</td>
<td>2.6-3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations for merit</td>
<td>1.7-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not meet expectations for merit</td>
<td>0.5-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable performance</td>
<td>0-0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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