

Merit Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

Academic Unit: Political Science

Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

Calculation of Merit Scores

Teaching

Teaching assignment for calendar year: _____

Pre-specified allocation of effort for Teaching: ___ %

| Performance Indicators (description) | Evaluation Rating (Circle One) | Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.) |
|--|--|--|
| <i>Quantitative teaching evaluations</i> | <i>5=exceeds expectations</i> <i>4=exceeds expectations</i> <i>3=satisfactory</i> <i>2=satisfactory</i> <i>1=fails to meet expectations</i> | See below ^{1, 2} |
| <i>Peer evaluations</i> | <i>Superior evaluation(s)</i> <i>Positive evaluation(s)</i> <i>Neutral evaluation(s)</i> <i>Negative evaluation(s)</i> <i>N/A=no peer evaluation available</i> | Judgment of merit committee |
| <i>Open ended comments from teaching evaluations</i> | <i>Superior</i> <i>Positive</i> <i>Neutral</i> <i>Negative</i> | Judgment of merit committee based on their categorization of the preponderance of the comments |
| <i>Syllabi and course materials showing high impact teaching practices</i> | <i>Highly positive: two or more examples of high impact</i> <i>Positive: one or more example</i> <i>Neutral: no high impact activities but sound pedagogy</i> <i>Negative: no high impact activities and problems with pedagogy</i> | Judgment of the merit committee based on their analysis of course materials presented. |
| <i>Teaching in addition to teaching assignment, including guest lectures, team teaching, service on exam/thesis committees, etc.</i> | <i>Very high level</i> <i>High level</i> <i>Moderate level</i> <i>None</i> | Judgment of the merit committee based on the time and effort devoted to supplemental teaching activities. This category cannot lower an overall merit rating but may move it up beyond what is accomplished in the other categories. |
| <i>Teaching awards or recognitions</i> | <i>Yes</i> <i>No</i> | Merit committee evaluates based on the significance and prestige of award/recognition. This category cannot lower an overall merit rating but may move it up beyond what is accomplished in the other categories. |

| Merit Score (point allocation) | Definition and Description |
|---|---|
| Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Teaching Score of 4-5 | <i>Quantitative teaching evaluation level 4 or 5 and a preponderance of positive evaluations in other categories excluding "teaching awards or recognitions." (Merit committee may recommend a change of one level up or down based on their evaluation of evidence of teaching effectiveness).</i> |
| Meets Expectations for Merit in Teaching Score of 2-3 | <i>Quantitative teaching evaluation level 2 or 3 and a preponderance of positive evaluations in other categories excluding "teaching awards or recognitions." (Merit committee may recommend a change of one level up or down based on their evaluation of evidence of teaching effectiveness).</i> |
| Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Teaching Score of 1 | <i>Quantitative teaching evaluation level 1 (Merit committee may recommend a change of one level up or down based on their evaluation of evidence of teaching effectiveness other than the quantitative evaluations).</i> |
| Unacceptable | <p><i>An unacceptable performance in teaching consists of all of the following:</i></p> <p><i>Two consecutive semesters where for each course taught in each of the fall and spring semesters average student evaluations of teaching across the questions currently used from the BGSU Department of Political Science Student Course Evaluation (questions 1, 3- 5, 7, 8, 10-14, 16-17) were less than or equal to the following for each numerical level (5 is the highest, 1 the lowest):</i></p> <p><i>1000/2000: 2.75</i> <i>3000/4000: 3.0</i> <i>5000/6000: 3.25</i></p> <p><i>along with no involvement in any instructional development efforts or opportunities.</i></p> |

¹Calculation of levels for quantitative teaching evaluations:

Based on criteria outlined below, a level (1-5) is assigned to faculty for each course. A faculty member's overall teaching level for quantitative evaluations is calculated by averaging the levels assigned for each course taught during the year (rounded to the nearest whole number). **Please note that the scale on department evaluation forms rates 5 as the highest level of achievement and 1 as lowest.**

² Calculation of quantitative teaching scores in absence of department evaluation data

In the absence of department student course evaluation data, the Merit Committee shall assign a rating of "meets expectations" in the category of "quantitative teaching evaluations." In assigning an overall Teaching score, the Merit Committee may adjust the overall rating to reflect contributions in the other teaching categories.

Quantitative Teaching Evaluation Levels:

Unacceptable/Level 0:

The threshold is an average across the questions currently used from the BGSU Department of Political Science Student Course Evaluation (questions 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-14, 16-17) less than the following range for each course taught at each numerical level:

1000/2000: 2.75

3000/4000: 3.0

5000/6000: 3.25

Level 1:

The threshold is an average across the 14 questions currently used from the BGSU Department of Political Science Student Course Evaluation (questions 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-14, 16-17) within the following range for each course taught at each numerical level:

1000/2000: 2.75-3.50

3000/4000: 3.0-3.75

5000 & +: 3.25-4.25

Level 2:

The threshold is an average across the 14 questions currently used from the BGSU Department of Political Science Student Course Evaluation (questions 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-14, 16-17) of greater than or equal to the following for each course taught at each numerical level:

1000/2000: 3.50

3000/4000: 3.75

5000 & +: 4.25

Level 3:

Faculty must be at Level 2 and must average greater than or equal to the following thresholds on Questions 10, 11 (pedagogy for critical thinking) 16 and 17 (course/faculty comparison) for each course taught at each numerical level:

1000/2000: 3.50

3000/4000: 3.75

5000 & +: 4.25

Level 4:

The threshold is an average across the questions (1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-14, 16-17) now used on the student teaching evaluation of greater than or equal to the following, for each course taught at each numerical level:

1000/2000: 4.0

3000/4000: 4.25

5000 & + 4.50

Level 5:

Faculty must be at level 4 and must average greater than or equal to the following thresholds on questions 10, 11 (pedagogy for critical thinking) 16 and 17 (course/faculty comparisons) for each course taught at each numerical level:

1000/2000: 4.0

3000/4000: 4.25

5000 & +: 4.50

Note: The thresholds for each teaching level are based on historical trends which clearly show that 1000/2000 level courses consistently score worse than 3000/4000 level, and that graduate (5000+) courses regularly achieve the (best) scores.

Merit Score for Teaching (to be completed by merit committee): _____

Research

Pre-specified allocation of effort for Research: ___ %

| Performance Indicators (description) | Evaluation Rating (Circle One) | Basis of the Evaluation Rating (Evidence, accomplishment, etc.) |
|---|--|--|
| Scholarship: publications and presentations ¹ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior: Similar to "High" level but either greater in quantity or of a national/international impact; may also be awarded for a single book of superior quality • High: Multiple articles, chapters, and/or other similar works; Published book manuscript • Significant: Peer-reviewed article; substantive book chapter, or similar works • Satisfactory: Research presentation; convention paper; book review; encyclopedia entry, article/chapter under submission; or other similar works • None: No demonstration of research activity | Judgment of the Merit Committee. Rating may be moved up or down the scale based on significance and impact of the scholarship. |
| Grant activity ² | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior: External grant(s) greater than \$40,000 • High: External grant(s) greater than \$2,500 but less than \$40,000 • Significant: Internal grant(s) or external grant(s) of less than or equal to \$2,500 • Satisfactory: Activity evident but all applications denied or pending. • None: No activity | Judgment of the Merit Committee. Ratings may be moved up the scale based on significance, impact, and/or degree of difficulty obtaining the grant. |
| Applied research and scholarship of Engagement ³ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior: Significant and substantial local/national/international impact • High: Significant and substantial impact in a local/regional community • Significant: important substantial impact • Satisfactory: Minimal impact • None: No work in this area | Judgment of the Merit Committee. This category cannot lower an overall merit rating but may move it up beyond what is accomplished in the other categories. |
| Research awards and recognitions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior: National or international award • High: External Award, Professional or regional award • Significant: Internal Award or recognition • None: No Award | Judgment of the Merit Committee. Awards may be moved up or down the scale based on significance and impact. This category cannot lower an overall merit rating but may move it up beyond what is accomplished in the other categories. |

¹ Articles, books, and book chapters are counted once, upon acceptance or publication, at the discretion of the faculty member. Accepted books and book chapters must be accepted without further revisions, excluding copyediting. Book contracts are not evidence of acceptance.

²The full amount of multi-year grants may be counted for each year of the grant.

³Applied research involves the application of scholarship to address the needs of the broader community. Scholarship of engagement (SoE) is similar except it makes contributions to the community of scholars in addition to the broader community. Normally, both applied research and scholarship of engagement include a written

component and involve intellectual content and dissemination that are comparable to traditional academic research. As such it can be evaluated based on its intellectual quality and impact. If the impact of the work is solely in the non-academic arena of public policy makers, public administrators, and other public institutions, then it is applied research. If, in addition, the work has an impact on others in the academic discipline, then it is scholarship of engagement. Like outlets for traditional research, one form is not inherently superior to the other, but rather each should be judged based on its intellectual quality and impact. Examples of such scholarship include, but are not limited to: reports, surveys, or analysis provided to units of government, government agencies, nonprofit groups, or other public sector entities; expert testimony delivered to legislatures or the courts; research projects conducted with a community partner organization. The impact of SoE and applied research is determined by sets of indicators including but not limited to: the readership of reports; number of people and organizations affected; levels of government affected; policies affected, etc.

| Merit Score (point allocation) | Definition and Description |
|--|---|
| Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Research <i>Score of 5</i> | <i>An evaluation level of "superior" in either Scholarship, Applied research, or Grant Activity. (Merit committee may recommend a change of one level up based on their evaluation of other categories).</i> |
| Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Research <i>Score of 4</i> | <i>An evaluation level of "high" in either Scholarship, Applied research, or Grant Activity. (Merit committee may recommend a change of one level up based on their evaluation of other categories).</i> |
| Meets Expectations for Merit in Research/Creative Work <i>Score of 2-3</i> | <i>An evaluation level of "satisfactory" or "significant" in either Scholarship, applied research, or Grant Activity. (Merit committee may recommend a change of one level up based on their evaluation of other categories).</i> |
| Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Research/Creative Work <i>Score of 1</i> | <i>An evaluation level no greater than "none" in Scholarship, applied research, or Grant Activity. (Merit committee may recommend a change of one level up based on their evaluation of other categories).</i> |
| Unacceptable | <i>An unacceptable performance in research consists of two consecutive semesters of an absence of a research agenda. This includes the absence of all of the following for two consecutive semesters: conference proposals, presentations at conferences, proposals for chapters in edited volumes, grant proposals, work on a book or monograph, articles or book reviews submitted to academic journals, or proposals for applied scholarship or scholarship of engagement, or any other research activity.</i> |

Merit Score for Research (to be completed by merit committee): _____

Service

Pre-Specified Allocation of Effort for Service ___ %

| Performance Indicators (description) | Evaluation Rating (Circle One) | Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.) |
|--|--|---|
| <i>Department service</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Superior; e.g. chairing search committee or especially time-consuming leadership on department committees, or equivalent</i> • <i>High; e.g. active search committee membership or equivalent</i> • <i>Significant; e.g. leadership on department committees or equivalent</i> • <i>Moderate; e.g. attendance at department and committee meetings</i> • <i>Poor or None: Failure to meet minimum requirements (e.g. not attending department and committee meetings)</i> | Judgment of the Merit Committee based on the time, effort, significance, quality, quantity, and substance of the service. |
| <i>College, university and/or BGSU-FA service</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Superior; e.g. leadership role on major College or University committee, especially time-consuming committee service (such as PTRC), senior leadership role in FA, or equivalent</i> • <i>High; e.g. faculty senate leadership role, or equivalent</i> • <i>Significant; e.g. leadership role on a College or University committee; faculty senate, or equivalent</i> • <i>Moderate; e.g. membership on a College or University committee, or equivalent</i> • <i>Poor or None; e.g. failure to perform committee duties or to attend meetings, or equivalent</i> | Judgment of the Merit Committee based on the time, effort, significance, quality, quantity, and substance of the service. |
| <i>Professional service, including professional organizations and AAUP</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Superior; e.g. senior leadership role in AAUP or professional organization, or equivalent</i> • <i>High; e.g. leadership role not reaching the "superior" category, or equivalent</i> • <i>Significant; e.g. membership on professional organization or FA committees, or equivalent</i> • <i>Moderate; e.g. serving as journal article reviewer, book reviewer, or equivalent</i> • <i>Poor or None; e.g. failure to perform duties voluntarily agreed to, or equivalent</i> | Judgment of the Merit Committee based on the time, effort, significance, quality, quantity, and substance of the service. |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p><i>Community service or work related to the discipline of Political Science or Public Administration</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Superior; e.g. extensive service to the community such as top leadership role in relevant community organization, especially numerous media interviews, highly time-consuming service learning projects serving community organizations, or equivalent.</i> • <i>High; e.g. leadership role in relevant community organization, service learning projects serving community organizations, or equivalent</i> • <i>Significant; e.g. numerous public talks, service learning projects for on-campus clients, or equivalent</i> • <i>Moderate; e.g. active participation in relevant community organizations, public talks, or equivalent</i> • <i>Poor or None; e.g. failure to perform agreed to community service duties, or equivalent</i> | <p>Judgment of the Merit Committee based on the time, effort, significance, quality, quantity, and substance of the service.</p> |
|---|---|--|

| Merit Score (point allocation) | Definition and Description |
|--|---|
| <p>Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Service Score of 4-5</p> | <p><i>An evaluation level of "superior" or "high" in 1 or more categories and a level of at least "moderate" in departmental service (Merit committee may recommend a change of one level up based on a strong evaluation in multiple categories).</i></p> |
| <p>Meets Expectations for Merit in Service Score of 2-3</p> | <p><i>An evaluation level no greater than "moderate" or "significant" in any of the categories and a level of at least "moderate" in departmental service. (Merit committee may recommend a change of one level up based on a strong evaluation in multiple categories).</i></p> |
| <p>Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Service Score of 1</p> | <p><i>An evaluation level of "moderate" or "poor/none" in the majority of the categories. (Merit committee may recommend a change of one level up based on a strong evaluation in a single category).</i></p> |
| <p>Unacceptable</p> | <p><i>Two consecutive semesters of service obligations significantly below a faculty member's assigned workload, (which may be defined as moderate/none in all 4 categories) and a failure consistently to attend to those service obligations, including consistent failure to attend meetings of committees to which one is assigned.</i></p> |

Merit Score for Service (to be completed by merit committee): _____

Merit Committee Composition and the Election//Appointment Process

2.2. The department merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. According to the department charter, the merit committee consists of 3 faculty members nominated by the chair and elected by the full-time faculty members in the department. A new election will be held each year. Any faculty member with rank of Instructor or above may serve, except for faculty in the last year of their appointment (defined as: anyone who has signed a terminal contract, whose renewal appointment has been denied, or who is on a one-year visiting appointment].

Elements of the Merit Dossier

2.4. The submitted merit dossier should include the following elements:

- Department Merit Form which lists activities in teaching, research, and service from the previous academic year and not submitted to the merit committee in previous years.
- Updated CV
- Syllabi from courses taught and assignments showing high impact teaching practices
- Any peer evaluations of teaching conducted in that year
- Open ended course evaluations from any course not already included in online evaluations which are accessible to the merit committee (e.g., courses evaluated on paper forms, taught for other units, etc.)
- An FIL report, if applicable
- Copies of publications, or a letter of acceptance from the publisher or editor if the research has not yet come out in print.
- Evidence of ongoing research demonstrating the existence of a research agenda.
- Any course release the faculty member has and whether it is service-related or research-related.

Calculation of Overall Merit Score

2.5 Description of how the merit score is calculated.

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

[Teaching Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] + [Research Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] + [Service Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] = Current Year Merit Score rounded and expressed to one decimal place (e.g, 3.7, with 3.65 rounding up).

The allocation of effort for TTF shall be within the following ranges:

- a. Normally service will be 0.20; in cases where the faculty member has course or research releases for service-related activities the weight for service will increase by 0.10 for each course release;
- b. The range for teaching and research will normally be 0.35 - 0.45; in cases where the faculty member has course or research releases for service-related activities the weight for teaching or research will be adjusted down accordingly. A faculty member with one course release will have teaching or research weighted from 0.25-0.35; a faculty member with two course releases will have teaching or research weighted from 0.15-0.25; in cases where the faculty member has course releases for research-related activities the weight for teaching and research will be adjusted accordingly.
- c. Faculty on approved leaves (see Section 4, Special Circumstances) may have weights outside of these normal ranges. For example, a faculty member on FIL may be assigned an AOE of 0.00 Teaching, 1.00 Research, and 0.00 Service for the FIL period.
- d. In the instance that a faculty member has 0.0 weighting in any merit component, the Merit Committee shall assign a "not applicable" or "n/a" to that component to reflect that no allocation of effort was expected.
- e. The total weights for research, teaching, and service must sum to 1.00
- f. the weighting is for merit purposes only and will have no effect on the assignment of course loads or other work duties.

The allocation of effort for NTTF shall be within the following ranges:

- a. service will be worth 0.10- 0.20. Service weights below 0.20 will be applied only to short-term NTTF, from whom the department expects minimal service; in cases where the faculty member has course or research releases for service-related activities the weight for service will increase by 0.10 for each course release;
- b. the range for teaching is 0.70 – 0.90 and the range for research is 0.00 – 0.20; in cases where a faculty member has course or research releases for service-related activities the weight for teaching or research will be 0.60-0.80; a faculty member with two course releases will have teaching or research weighted from 0.50-0.70;
- c. the total weights for teaching, research, and service must sum to 1.00.
- d. this weighting is for merit purposes only and will have no effect on the assignment of course loads or other work duties.

A range of weights is beneficial for both the faculty member and the College/University. Multi-year projects (e.g. large grant applications, research for articles and/or books, development of innovative and high-impact learning techniques/pedagogies) do not, by their own nature, conform to the tight restriction of the academic year. Moreover, the “payoff” from these activities cannot necessarily be predicted to a degree of precision (e.g. whether a book is published in July or August) that the academic year system of merit requires. Having a flexible allocation of merit allows the faculty to concentrate on multi-year projects in any of the three merit areas that bring funds, research, recognition, pedagogical innovation, and/or positive attention to the university. Thus, if the merit score can be improved by choosing weights within the ranges specified in 2.5 that are different than the original weights, the merit committee shall do so.

SUMMARY FORM

(to be completed based on a majority vote of the merit committee):

| Faculty Member | Merit Score Teaching | Allocation of effort Teaching | Merit Score Research | Allocation of effort Research | Merit Score Service | Allocation of effort Service | Current year Merit Level ¹ |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <i>Faculty member 1</i> | <i>Insert numerical score</i> | <i>Insert fraction</i> | <i>Insert numerical score</i> | <i>Insert fraction</i> | <i>Insert numerical score</i> | <i>Insert fraction</i> | |
| <i>Faculty member 2</i> | <i>Insert numerical score</i> | <i>Insert fraction</i> | <i>Insert numerical score</i> | <i>Insert fraction</i> | <i>Insert numerical score</i> | <i>Insert fraction</i> | |
| <i>Next faculty member, etc.</i> | <i>Insert numerical score</i> | <i>Insert fraction</i> | <i>Insert numerical score</i> | <i>Insert fraction</i> | <i>Insert numerical score</i> | <i>Insert fraction</i> | |

¹ Merit levels are rounded and expressed to one decimal place (e.g, 3.6, with 3.55 rounding up)

Three Year Average Calculation:

Following guidelines from the College of Arts and Sciences, 3 year averages are based on the average of the merit rating from the past 3 years of evaluation. If a faculty member does not have 3 years, then 2 years are averaged. If they are in their first year, then one year is used. **Three year average** = (Year 1 rating + Year 2 rating + Year 3 rating) /3. This is also expressed as a whole number (e.g., 4, with 3.5 rounding up).

Example:

Professor X: current year
 AOE = 0.35 Teaching 0.45 Research 0.2 Service
 Merit rating= 2 (teaching) 5 (research) 4 (service)
 Year 1 score: 0.35x2 + 0.45x5 + 0.2x4 = 3.8
 Year 2 score 4.8
 Year 3 score 4.2
 Three year average score (3.8 + 4.8 + 4.2)/3 = 4.3 → with rounding, overall score is 4, and its meaning is shown in the chart below.

| Overall 3 year average Merit Score | Interpretation |
|------------------------------------|---|
| 1 | Fails to meet expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit |
| 2-3 | Meets expectations for merit; Eligible for merit |
| 4-5 | Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit |

Additional Academic Unit Merit Policy Information

Additional Information

6. The merit committee will recommend dollar allocations to the Dean of Arts and Sciences, understanding that the final decision rests with the Dean.

6.1 The dollar allocation recommendation shall be based on the following:

a. All faculty members who achieve the same overall level of merit shall receive the same percentage increase in salary, not the same dollar increase.

b. Faculty members who exceed expectations for merit (levels 4-5) and faculty members who meet expectations for merit (levels 2-3) shall be rewarded in a ratio of 4:3. This can be computed as follows:

i. Multiply the salary of each faculty member at level 2-3 by 3. Multiply the salary of each faculty member at level 4-5 by 4. Take the sum of all of these "salary-shares." Divide this number into the total dollar amount available for merit. This yields a fraction that can be multiplied by each faculty member's salary-share to yield their recommended raise in dollars.

Example:

Suppose that we have a department of 3 members.

A makes 60,000 per year and got level 4 merit.

B makes 50,000 per year and got level 3 merit.

C makes 40,000 per year and got level 5 merit.

Following the procedure in (i), salary-shares are:

A salary * 4 = 240,000

B salary * 3 = 150,000

C salary * 4 = 160,000

Total: 550,000

Suppose that the total amount available for merit pay is 3% of the department's total salary (40k+50k+60k = 150,000). $150,000 * .03 = \$4500$.

Now divide: $4500 / 550,000 = 0.008181$ Then multiply that fraction by each salary-share:

A raise = $\$240,000 * 0.008181 = \$1963.36 = 3.27\%$ of A's \$60,000 salary

B raise = $\$150,000 * 0.008181 = \$1227.15 = 2.45\%$ of B's 50,000 salary

C raise = $\$160,000 * 0.008181 = \underline{\$1308.96} = 3.27\%$ of C's 40,000 salary

Total \$4499.47

Note: Ratio of 3.27% to 2.45% = 1.33/1 or 4:3

6.2 Unacceptable Performance

Before assigning a rating of unacceptable, the merit committee shall determine, based on all information within the review dossier, whether extenuating circumstances apply. Before assigning a rating of unacceptable, the chair shall determine, based on all information within the review dossier and on other pertinent information available to the chair, whether extenuating circumstances, such as those in section 4, apply.

Approved by the Department of Political Science at the Faculty Meeting held 4/24/18.

Approved:  Date 4/25/18
 Marc V. Simon, Acting Chair, Political Science

Approved:  Date 4/30/18
 Raymond Craig, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Approved:  Date 8/10/18
 John Fischer, Provost/ Senior VP