

Merit Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

Academic Unit: Department of Mathematics and Statistics

A. Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

I. Overview

Merit criteria are limited to three areas: Teaching, Research, and Service. Tenure-track bargaining unit faculty members in the department are evaluated for merits in teaching, research and service, in accordance with their allocation of effort. Allocation of effort is addressed in Subsection II of Section D. The Non-tenure-track bargaining unit faculty members in the department will be evaluated for merits in only teaching and service. Each of the aforementioned areas will be evaluated using a number of performance indicators outlined in Subsection II below. As stipulated in Section B, the merit committee forms a tenure-track subcommittee to evaluate each tenure-track faculty member in the Bargaining Unit, and also a non-tenure-track subcommittee to evaluate each non-tenure-track faculty member in the Bargaining Unit. Each subcommittee member reviews information in the merit dossier submitted by a faculty member and uses the scale of 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 with no decimals to assign a component score for each area using the expected level of the performance, according to the following interpretations:

Scores of 4 and 5: Exceeding expectations. Activities in area cumulatively exceed expectations and reflect a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for a faculty member in the department.

Scores of 2 and 3: Meeting expectations. Activities in area cumulatively meet expectations and reflect standard levels of performance for the department.

Score of 1: Failing to meet expectations. Activities in area cumulatively do not meet expectations and fall below the standard levels of performance for the department.

Score of 0: Unacceptable performance. Failing to meet expectation as a pattern.

Each subcommittee will meet to review and reach consensus on the component score of each relevant area of a faculty member. The subcommittee will then assign an overall merit score to each faculty member using the approach found in Subsection I of Section D. The overall merit score is assigned on the scale of 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 with no decimals, according to the following interpretations:

Overall merit ratings of 4 and 5: Exceeding expectations for merit.

Overall merit ratings of 2 and 3: Meeting expectations for merit.

Overall merit ratings of 1: Failing to meet expectations for merit.

Overall merit ratings of 0: Overall unacceptable performance.

II. Lists of Performance Indicators for Teaching, Research, and Service.

This section provides performance indicators for evaluations in the areas of teaching, research, and service. In each area, some performance indicators are more important than others, and they are listed as primary performance indicators. Other performance indicators should be evaluated based on the quality and amount of work involved. The indicators on the following lists provide a general guideline for faculty members to prepare for their merit dossiers as indicated in Section C, and also for the merit committee to evaluate faculty members' component scores. By no means are they exhaustive.

1. Teaching

Primary performance indicators include (but are not limited to):

Quality teaching including quantitative and qualitative student evaluations

Recognition of exemplary teaching in the form of honors or awards

Course coordination and number of sections coordinated

Direction of undergraduate research, master's theses, doctoral dissertations

Other performance indicators include (but are not limited to):

Innovative teaching methods

Use of technology in the classroom

Experiments in course content

Publishing textbooks or materials

Teaching-related professional development

Curriculum design and development

Teaching in emporium setting

Volunteering in the tutoring center

Reading students and independent study students

Work with student groups on teaching related activities

Writing and grading of comprehensive exams and qualifying/preliminary exams

Memberships on master's thesis reading committees

Memberships on preliminary and doctoral committees

Classroom guest lectures

2. Research

Primary performance indicators include (but are not limited to):

Refereed papers submitted, accepted, in press, and appeared including the name of journal (indicate whether refereed or not)

Funded grant and research proposals

Doctoral students who completed degree requirements (indicate name of student)

Engaged scholarship activities with evidence of sound scholarship within mathematical sciences

Other performance indicators include (but are not limited to)

Grant and research proposals submitted

Refereed conference papers

Publications including problems, problem solutions, abstracts, research reports and announcements
 Invited addresses
 Contributed papers
 Seminars and colloquia presented at BGSU or elsewhere (indicate date and place)
 International, national and regional conferences attended
 Participation in seminars
 Research work in progress

3. Service

Primary performance indicators include (but are not limited to):

Chairing department, college and university committees
 Memberships on department, college and university committees (indicate your contributions)
 Managing of department homepage
 Serving as the department mediator
 Public relation promotion such as alumni newsletter
 Community outreach or engagement of a professional nature
 Recruitment of graduate and undergraduate students
 Advising of graduate and undergraduate students
 Work with student groups
 Coach of mathematics or statistics team
 Running seminars
 Review of published articles
 Refereeing activity for journals, books, grant proposals etc (indicate date, type, and number of items refereed)
 Editorial activity (indicate title of position, organization, and responsibility)
 Leadership in professional organization
 Serving on professional committees
 Service to professional societies such as KME, MAA, NCTM etc.
 Conduct professional development

Other performance indicators include (but are not limited to):

Mentoring of graduate teaching assistants
 Mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students
 Mentoring faculty members
 Running departmental computer systems and labs
 Preview Day
 STEM Day
 Writing peer teaching evaluations
 Writing recommendation letters

III. Evaluations of Teaching, Research, and Service

This section outlines the expected level of performance in each of the areas: Teaching, Research and Service. The merit committee members should use the expected level of performance to determine the component score of each relevant area of each faculty member.

1. Evaluation of Teaching

Each faculty member is expected to carry out assigned teaching responsibilities according to appropriate professional norms: Such norms include, but are not limited to, setting appropriate academic standard for classes, meeting all assigned classes, being prepared to conduct classes, being available to students outside of class, and responding appropriately to reasonable student questions or complains. Besides failing to meet such norms, indicators of unsatisfactory teaching would include, but are not limited to, persistent legitimate student complaints, substantially negative student evaluations, and substantially weak peer evaluations. The following table provides a guideline for evaluating the teaching performance of a faculty member.

Evaluation Rating Category	TEACHING Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Teaching
Exceeds expectations for merit	Exceeds the minimum standard; substantially positive quantitative and qualitative student evaluations; numerous teaching performance indicators of effective teaching.	4, 5
Meets expectations for merit	Exceeds the minimum standard; quantitative student evaluations approximate department averages for similar courses and qualitative comments are generally positive; multiple teaching performance indicators of effective teaching.	2, 3
Fails to meet expectations for merit	Evidence indicates unsatisfactory teaching according to appropriate professional norms, as described above.	1
Unacceptable performance	Evidence indicates persistent failures to carry out responsibilities according to appropriate professional norms, as described above.	0

2. Evaluation of Research

Every tenure-track faculty member is expected to conduct research that eventually results in publication of an article in a refereed journal with good standing. The reputation of the journal and the length of article are usually good indicators of the quality of publication. The expected level of research performance for tenure-track faculty members with a standard allocation of research effort (40%) is one refereed article per year, or equivalent level of accomplishment. If a faculty member has an alternate allocation, the merit committee makes adjustments that are proportional to the faculty member's allocations of research effort.

Evaluation Rating Category	RESEARCH Expected levels of accomplishment on research performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Research
Exceeds expectations for merit	Two or more refereed articles that were accepted, in press, or appeared; or equivalent level of accomplishments on research performance indicators in any combination.	4, 5
Meets expectations for merit	One refereed article that is accepted, in press, or appeared; or equivalent level of accomplishments on research performance indicators in any combination.	2, 3
Fails to meet expectations for merit	Evidence indicates limited research activity, performance falls below the expected level of research performance described above.	1
Unacceptable performance	Evidence contains no research performance indicators, as described in Subsection II above.	0

3. Evaluation of Service

Each faculty member is expected to contribute service to department, college, university or professional community. The expected level of performance for faculty members with a standard allocation of service effort (20%) is serving on two committees with appropriate contributions (such as attending meetings and contributing to the committee's missions outside meetings in a timely fashion), or equivalent level of accomplishment. If a faculty member has an alternate allocation, the merit committee makes adjustments that are proportional to the faculty member's allocation of service effort.

Evaluation Rating Category	SERVICE Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Service
Exceeds expectations for merit	Memberships on three committees; or equivalent level of accomplishments on service performance indicators in any combination.	4, 5
Meets expectations for merit	Memberships on two committees; or equivalent level of accomplishments on service performance indicators in any combination.	2, 3
Fails to meet expectations for merit	Evidence indicates limited service activity, performance falls below the expected level of service performance described above.	1
Unacceptable performance	Evidence contains no service performance indicators, as described in Subsection II above.	0

B. Merit Committee Composition and the Election//Appointment Process

The department merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score and computing the three-year average to every bargaining unit faculty member, using the guidelines provided in Section D below. The merit committee consists of seven elected members, with four tenure-track faculty members and three non-tenure-track faculty members. Two tenure-track faculty members are elected every year by the tenure-track bargaining unit faculty members to serve a two-year term on the merit committee. Three non-tenure-track members are elected every year by the non-tenure-track bargaining unit faculty members to serve a one-year term on the merit committee. One of the four tenure-track members is elected by the committee to serve as the merit committee chair.

The merit committee chair and other three tenure-track members together form a tenure-track subcommittee. This subcommittee uses the guidelines provided in Section A to evaluate merit of each tenure-track faculty member who is not on the subcommittee. Each faculty member on the subcommittee is to be evaluated by other members of the subcommittee.

The merit committee chair and the three non-tenure-track members together form a non-tenure-track subcommittee. This subcommittee uses the guidelines provided in Section A to evaluate merit of each non-tenure-track faculty member who is not on the subcommittee. Each non-tenure-track faculty member on the subcommittee is to be evaluated by other members of the subcommittee.

C. Elements of the Merit Dossier

The merit dossier of a tenure-track faculty member must include all activities in the whole year divided into three areas: Teaching, Research, and Service. The merit dossier of a non-tenure-track faculty member must include all activities in the whole year divided into two areas: Teaching, and Service. Section A provides guidelines for the activities to be included in the merit dossier. In addition to the merit dossier, a faculty member may submit an optional summary, limited to one page that provides highlights of the activities. The faculty member may also submit further supporting materials for merit evaluation such as summaries of student evaluations, and front pages of research papers etc.

D. Calculation of Overall Merit Score and three-year average

Evaluation of a merit dossier by a merit committee member is guided by the criteria described in Section A. The overall merit score and the three-year average of a faculty member are determined using the weighted algorithm described in Subsection I below, in light of the workload allocation described in Subsection II below. The distributions of merit dollars to faculty members are recommended to the Dean using an algorithm in Subsection III below.

I. Determining Overall Merit Score and Three-Year Average

Once the merit committee has reached consensus on the component merit scores of a faculty member following the guidelines in Section A, the committee is responsible for computing the overall merit score and then the three year as follows.

1. Overall Merit Score for the Year of Evaluation

First Step: The committee calculates the weighted merit score of each faculty member for the year of evaluation:

Weighted Merit Score = [Teaching Merit Score * Allocation of Teaching Effort] + [Research Merit Score * Allocation of Research Effort] + [Service Merit Score * Allocation of Service Effort].

Second Step: Using the weighted merit score, the merit committee determines the overall merit score of each faculty member using the following conversion in Table I.1.1

Weighted Merit Score	Overall Merit Score
0.0 -- 0.9	0
1.0 -- 1.9	1
2.0 -- 2.7	2
2.8 -- 3.5	3
3.6 -- 4.3	4
4.4 -- 5.0	5

Table I.1.1

2. Three-Year Average

After the merit committee determines the overall merit score X_0 of a faculty member for the year of evaluation, the committee uses the faculty member's overall merit scores X_1 , X_2 assigned by the department's merit committee in the previous two years to compute the value

$$X = (X_0 + X_1 + X_2) / 3.$$

The merit committee then determines the three-year average of each faculty member using Table I.2.1

Range of X	Three-Year Average
$0.0 \leq X \leq 0.9$	0
$0.9 < X \leq 1.9$	1
$1.9 < X \leq 2.7$	2
$2.7 < X \leq 3.5$	3
$3.5 < X \leq 4.3$	4
$4.3 < X \leq 5.0$	5

Table I.2.1

The merit committee and the bargaining unit faculty members should interpret the three-year averages using Table I.2.2.

Three-Year Average	Interpretation
0, 1	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
2, 3	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
4, 5	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit

Table I.2.2

II. Allocations of Effort

1. Tenure-Track Faculty Members

Prior to the beginning of each calendar year, every tenure-track faculty member in the department confirms with the department chair his/her allocation of effort in each of the three categories: Research, Teaching and Service. The standard allocation of effort for tenure-track faculty members is 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. The typical teaching load is 6 credits per semester. If duties warrant an alternate allocation, that allocation shall be agreed to by the faculty member and the chair. Once the allocation of effort is confirmed with the chair, neither the chair nor the faculty member can change it in the middle of the year, unless the role of the faculty member has changed.

2. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members

Prior to the beginning of each calendar year, every non-tenure-track faculty member in the department confirms with the department chair his/her allocation of effort. The typical teaching load of a non-tenure-track faculty member is 12 credit hours per semester. The typical allocation of effort is 80% teaching and 20% service. If duties warrant an alternate allocation, that allocation shall be agreed to by the faculty member and the chair. Once the allocation of effort is confirmed with the chair, neither the chair nor the faculty member can change it in the middle of the year, unless the role of the faculty member has changed.

III. Recommendation to Dean on Distribution of merit dollars

The three-year averages determined by the merit committee in Subsection I above are used to calculate recommended merit raises of the faculty members. The department's pool of merit dollars is divided into two portions, one portion for eligible tenure-track faculty members and the other portion for eligible non-tenure-track faculty members. Each portion is in corresponding proportion with the total salary of all tenure-track faculty members and the total salary of all non-tenure-track faculty members.


Using the tenure-track portion of the merit pool, the department recommends that merit dollars be allocated to the tenure-track faculty members according to the ratios in the following Table III.1.1, which is based on the merit dollar amount x allocated to a tenure-track faculty member receiving an overall merit score of a 2.

Using the non-tenure-track portion of the merit pool, the department recommends that merit dollars be allocated to the non-tenure-track faculty members according to the ratios in the following Table III.1.1, which is based on the merit dollar amount x allocated to a non-tenure-track faculty member receiving an overall merit score of a 2.


Overall Merit Score	Merit Raise in dollar amount
0, 1	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
2	x dollars
3	2x dollars
4	3x dollars
5	4x dollars

Table III.1.1

Approved by the Department of Mathematics and Statistics at December 14th, 2016 Faculty Meeting


 _____ Date 3/7/2017
 Hanfeng Chen, Chair/Director

Approved: 
 _____ Date 3/9/17
 Name, Dean of College Name

Approved: 
 _____ Date 3/15/17
 Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP