

## Department of English MERIT POLICY

### [Part I: University-Wide Processes Required by the CBA, Revised May 16, 2022](#)

### Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

Academic Unit: ENGLISH

#### Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators, and Expectations

Merit dossiers are evaluated using the expectations and indicators included in this Merit Policy rather than by comparison with other faculty members. Faculty accomplishments may be counted for one category only, e.g., a publication focused on pedagogy may count either for Teaching or for Scholarly/Creative Activity. A minimum of two members of the Merit Review Committee (MRC) will review each dossier to determine if the faculty member's file exceeds, meets, or does not meet expectations for merit and assign a score in accordance with the criteria detailed in each section of this document. The MRC is required to contact the faculty member if any questions arise that might make a difference in determining a faculty member's merit determination. As noted in [Part I](#), if a dossier is assigned a rating of unacceptable, or if the faculty member fails to submit a dossier, the faculty member becomes eligible for an Extraordinary Review as indicated in Article 31, Section 3.1 of the CBA.

Ratings will be determined for each category according to the following:

**4-5: Exceeds expectations for merit** – The dossier meets expectations and has documented achievements beyond those expected.

**2-3: Meets expectations for merit** – The dossier meets expectations.

**1: Does not meet expectations for merit** – Activities in area cumulatively do not meet expectations and fall below the standard level of performance for the department.

**0: Unacceptable performance** – The faculty member fails to submit merit documents, and /or has received unacceptable performance in the categories of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, or service.

#### **GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

In addition to all quantitative and qualitative end-of-term student evaluations for all courses taught during the review period (to be uploaded by the Chair or designee), evidence of the illustrative indicators listed below be considered by the MRC when evaluating faculty for merit.

### **First Tier Performance Indicators in Undergraduate and Graduate Teaching**

- Impactful pedagogy in examples from one or more courses delivered in the year under review (e.g., syllabi that include clearly stated learning objectives and a plan for achieving those objectives, timely and meaningful feedback to student work, assignments, lesson plans, group activity plans).
- An ongoing commitment to an inclusive learning environment as illustrated by documents such as syllabi, class materials, class activities, lesson plans.
- A commitment to ongoing pedagogical development as shown by one of the following:
  - participation in a local, regional, or national conference with substantial, documented pedagogical development outcome;
  - contributing to scholarly conversations on teaching and/or mentoring through published scholarship or public-facing writing such as professional blog, news article, or podcast;
  - contributing to the instructional development of departmental or university colleagues through leadership of workshops or professional development sessions
- Contributions to curriculum development, revision, or innovation as shown by any of the following:
  - creating or collaborating on a curriculum modification for a new course;
  - delivery of a new course or substantially revised course;
  - delivery of a learning community designated course;
  - delivery of an experiential learning tagged course;
  - piloting cross-listed courses for the Department, Honors College, or learning communities;
  - presentation or publication of scholarly/creative activity linked to courses taught and/or pedagogy;
  - teaching awards and recognitions.
- Contributions to mentorship as shown by one or more of the following
  - academic supervision of a student internship or cooperative work experience;
  - supervision of independent studies, honors projects, and undergraduate and graduate research and creative activities;
  - serving as a formally recognized mentor for another faculty member or graduate student.
  - mentorship of a CCP secondary educator or representing the unit as a CCP liaison;

### **Second Tier Performance Indicators in Undergraduate and Graduate Teaching:**

- Participation in a university, college, or departmental teaching or student mentoring initiative.
- Participation in university, college, or departmental assessment of student learning. Participation in university or professional seminars, courses, training to improve teaching effectiveness.

### **Merit Evaluation: Teaching**

<b>Evaluation Rating Category</b>	<b>TEACHING</b> <i>Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators</i>	<b>Possible Merit Score for Teaching</b>
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence of at least two Tier One performance indicators</li> <li>● Summative quantitative course evaluations are above 4.0 (on a 5.0 scale).</li> <li>● Qualitative course evaluations indicate a strongly positive learning experience.</li> <li>● Tier One or Tier Two indicators will be considered in rating recommendation determinations.</li> </ul>	4.0-5.0
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence of at least one Tier One performance indicator</li> <li>● Summative quantitative course evaluations are regularly at or exceed 4.0 (on a 5.0 scale).</li> <li>● Qualitative course evaluations indicate a positive learning experience.</li> <li>● Tier Two indicators will be considered in rating recommendation determinations.</li> </ul>	2.0-3.9
Fails to meet expectations for merit (At least one of the three bulleted criteria applies.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The dossier lacks evidence of achieving a Tier One or Tier Two performance indicator.</li> <li>● Summative quantitative course evaluations are between 3.0 and 4.0 (on a 5.0 scale).</li> <li>● Qualitative course evaluations indicate a negative learning experience.</li> </ul>	1.0-1.9
Unacceptable performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Summative quantitative course evaluations are below 3.0 (on a 5.0 scale).</li> <li>● Dossier does not include evidence that the faculty member has fulfilled basic obligations for teaching.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No merit dossier submitted.</li> </ul>	0-0.9

### **GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION OF SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITY**

The English Department expects that all probationary and tenured faculty annually demonstrate evidence of an active, ongoing scholarly or creative agenda. Evidence of the illustrative indicators listed below will be considered by Merit Review Committee when evaluating faculty whose workload requires scholarly/creative activity for merit.

#### **First Tier Performance Indicators in Scholarly/Creative Activity:**

- Acceptance or publication of a book-length work (scholarly or creative), a scholarly

collection and/or a textbook by a reputable publisher, i.e. commercial presses, nonprofit presses, or academic presses. (Note that credit cannot be claimed for *accepted* books in one year and then claimed again for *published* works the following year.)

- Publication of articles, book chapters, or proceedings in scholarly, peer-reviewed journals, academic books, or peer-reviewed trade publications directed to an audience of scholarly peers.
- Publication of original works of poetry, short fiction, or creative nonfiction in reputable and competitive venues, such as commercial magazines, literary journals, electronic media, chapbooks, or anthologies.
- Publication of other forms of dissemination of work as appropriate to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.
- Publication of podcasts or editorial columns that appear in magazines or blogs for a general audience, with demonstrable grounding in scholarly/creative activity and documented editorial review process prior to publication.
- Editing nationally known, peer-reviewed journals and magazines of high quality.
- Award of major external grants to support scholarly/ creative activity, from venues such as the National Endowment for the Arts, National Endowment for the Humanities, Ohio Arts Council, Ohio Humanities, or entities of comparable stature.
- Submission of final report for major external grants to support scholarly/ creative activity, from venues such as the National Endowment for the Arts, National Endowment for the Humanities, Ohio Arts Council, Ohio Humanities, or entities of comparable stature.

### **Second Tier Performance Indicators in Scholarly/Creative Activity:**

- Evidence of work-in-progress (e.g., work in preparation for submission, work under initial review, book proposals, work under revision according to editorial feedback).
- Awards of minor or internal grants to support scholarly/creative activity.
- External consulting that draws on the scholarly expertise of faculty, leading to enhanced regional, national, and international reputation.
- Presentation of scholarly/creative activity at conferences, including presentation of work at research seminars and through invited addresses and workshops at national or regional scholarly conferences, colloquia, and professional development forums.
- Presentation of creative work at external reading series and writers' conferences.
- Publication of book reviews directed to an audience of scholarly peers.
- Publication of scholarly/creative activity in magazine articles, books, etc., directed to a general audience.
- Publication of scholarly articles in non-peer reviewed journals directed to a scholarly or practitioner audience.
- Reviews, citations, and reprints.
- Patents, contracts, licenses resulting from the scholarly, creative, and entrepreneurial labor of faculty.

### Merit Evaluation: Scholarly/Creative Activity

<b>Evaluation Rating Category</b>	<i>Expected levels of accomplishment on scholarly/creative activity performance indicators</i>	<b>Possible Merit Score for Scholarly/Creative Activity</b>
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dossier includes evidence of one Tier One indicator.</li> <li>• The dossier includes evidence of at least one additional Tier One or Tier Two indicator.</li> </ul>	4.0-5.0
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dossier includes evidence of one Tier One indicator.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dossier includes evidence of two or more Tier Two indicators.</li> </ul>	2.0-3.9
Does not meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of scholarly/creative activity is insufficient to constitute a Tier One or Tier Two indicator.</li> </ul>	1.0-1.9
Unacceptable performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dossier does not include any evidence of scholarly/creative activity</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No merit dossier submitted.</li> </ul>	0-0.9

### GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION OF SERVICE

Per Sections 2.5 and 2.6.1 of the Department of English Charter, English faculty are expected to contribute to governance of the department at a rate of one departmental committee per year or through an equivalent service commitment. Evidence of the illustrative indicators listed below will be considered by MRC when evaluating faculty for merit.

#### First Tier Performance Indicators in Service :

- Active, regular participation on a departmental committee, including standing and ad hoc committees.
- Active participation in an alternative service commitment (e.g., serving as Faculty Senator, holding a leadership position in the FA, serving as a unit representative to the FA, representing the Department through appointed faculty liaison positions such as the Integrative Learning Task Force, the Center for Faculty Excellence Advisory Board, the Institutional Review Board).

- Consulting or reviewing roles *not* designated as teaching or scholarship.
- Holding an officer position for a major professional organization.
- Leadership in a community outreach project or initiative *not* designated as teaching or scholarship.
- Serving on a college or university standing or ad hoc committee.
- Serving in a leadership position, such as Associate Chair or as a program director for English or partner unit/program (e.g. T/ESOL, Creative Writing, ACS, ICS).
- Serving as editor or co-editor for a major publication (e.g., *ATTW Bulletin*, *CCC*, *TESOL Quarterly*, *MAR*).
- Service to professional organization (e.g., ATTW award selection and/or standing committees, service on state and national AAUP committees).

### Second Tier Performance Indicators in Service :

- Judging in-house or external academic prizes for books and articles, as well as product and technology design competitions in both scholarly and professional venues.
- Participation in community outreach programs or initiatives.
- Participation in departmental recruiting and/or outreach events (e.g., Preview Day, Presidents' Day).
- Screening of the scholarly/creative activity of others as a referee for publication.
- Participation in clubs, organizations, and activities promoting student-faculty interaction.

### Merit Evaluation: Service

Evaluation Rating Category	SERVICE <i>Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators</i>	Possible Merit Score for Service
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The dossier includes evidence of more than one Tier One performance indicator <i>or</i> one Tier One and one or more Tier Two performance indicators.</li> </ul>	4.0-5.0
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The dossier includes evidence of one Tier One Indicator.</li> </ul>	2.0-3.9
Does not meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The faculty member has not fulfilled the requirements for service through active participation on a departmental committee</li> </ul>	1.0-1.9
Unacceptable performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The dossier lacks evidence of service on any committee or approved alternative service contribution.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p>	0-0.9

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No merit dossier submitted.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

### Merit Committee Composition and Appointment Process

The Merit Review Committee (MRC) of the Department of English is responsible for assigning an overall merit score recommendation to every bargaining unit faculty member. MRC members are appointed in accordance with Article 2 of the English Department Charter and are broadly representative of unit faculty to ensure balance and fairness of merit evaluation.

### Elements of the Merit Dossier

To be considered for merit, the faculty member must upload the following documents to Faculty180 according to the deadlines established in [Part I](#):

- a current [BGSU-templated vita](#);
- a 1-page narrative that contextualizes and highlights achievements in teaching, scholarly/creative activity (if required), and service for the review period;
- evidence supporting achievements highlighted in the narrative.

### Calculation of Overall Merit Score

MRC members will evaluate the merit report, guided by the criteria described in the “Merit Criteria: Performance Indicators” section above, and will determine score recommendations for teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service.

Overall Merit Scores will be calculated according to the following algorithm:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &[\text{Teaching Merit Score} \times \text{Allocation of Effort}] \\
 &\quad + \\
 &[\text{Scholarly/Creative Activity Merit Score} \times \text{Allocation of Effort}] \\
 &\quad + \\
 &[\text{Service Merit Score} \times \text{Allocation of Effort}] \\
 &\quad = \\
 &\text{Overall Merit Score}
 \end{aligned}$$

<b>Overall Merit Score</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
4.0-5.0	Exceeds expectations for merit; eligible for merit
2.0-3.9	Meets expectations for merit; eligible for merit
1.0-1.9	Does not meet expectations for merit; recommendation for no merit
0-0.9	Unacceptable performance

Sample Form for Assigning Merit Scores

Faculty Member Name:

Academic Year:

**Allocation of Effort for QRF**

Teaching: \_\_\_\_\_ %

Service: \_\_\_\_\_ %

**Allocation of Effort for TTF**

Teaching: \_\_\_\_\_ %

Scholarly/Creative Activity: \_\_\_\_\_ %

Service: \_\_\_\_\_ %

**Overall Merit Score Recommendations**

Teaching Merit:  $\frac{\text{_____}}{\text{Score}} \times \frac{\text{_____}}{\text{AOE}} = \text{_____}$

Scholarly/Creative Activity Merit:  $\frac{\text{_____}}{\text{Score}} \times \frac{\text{_____}}{\text{AOE}} = \text{_____}$

Service Merit:  $\frac{\text{_____}}{\text{Score}} \times \frac{\text{_____}}{\text{AOE}} = \text{_____}$

Overall Merit Score: \_\_\_\_\_

**Merit Recommendation (to be completed by Merit Review Committee): \_\_\_\_\_**



**Three-Year Rolling Average Algorithm (for Department Chair)**

[Current Overall Merit Score + Previous Two Overall Merit Scores] ÷ 3

**Current Overall Merit Score** \_\_\_\_\_

**Previous Two Overall Merit Scores** \_\_\_\_\_

**Total** \_\_\_\_\_ ÷ 3


**Three-Year Rolling Average** \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by the Department/School of English on May 10, 2023

Bradley Felver  
Bradley Felver (May 16, 2023 12:24 EDT)

Date 05/16/2023

Chair of English

Approved: 

Date 05/16/2023

Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences

Approved:   
Joe Whitehead (May 17, 2023 13:13 EDT)

Date 05/17/2023

Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs