

Merit Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

Academic Unit: Theatre and Film

1. Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

Merit eligibility for faculty members will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations for merit in the Dept. of Theatre and Film in the following areas: Teaching, Research/Creative Work, and Service. Each faculty member will receive an overall merit score which will identify whether s/he did not meet, met, exceeded expectations for merit or whether performance was unacceptable.

The merit criteria (i.e., Teaching, Research/Creative Work, and Service), performance indicators and expectations for the criteria, and the calculation of the component merit scores (i.e., Teaching, Research/Creative Work, and Service) are contained in Section 5.

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

The Department of Theatre and Film's Merit Committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. The Merit Review Committee will be broadly representative of the faculty, and will be elected from representative groups of the faculty and serve 3-year terms. The committee will have five members: two members from the PhD faculty (coming from either theatre studies and/or film studies), one from the theatre production faculty; one from the film production faculty; and at least one non-tenure track faculty from either film or theatre. Non-tenure track faculty may serve as members of the production faculty or as the NTTF faculty member. Members' terms will be staggered so that at most only two new members will be appointed each year thereby allowing terms to overlap and provide continuity. In late spring of each year, the Department Chair will ask those who wish to serve to submit their names and a vote of the Bargaining Unit members will determine the composition of the committee.

3. Elements of the Merit Dossier

The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements:

- A complete and up-to-date vita in BGSU required format
- The completed "Annual Update of Faculty Record" form
- The one to three-page narrative specifying the quantity and contextualizing the quality of the achievements in Teaching, Research/Creative, and Service activities. The narrative must include a statement regarding the individual's assigned allocation of effort.
- Appendices with appropriate documentation for all achievements claimed in the narrative. Please see "Guidelines for Evaluation" of each area, included below, for detailed information of "appropriate documentation."
- For graduate faculty, documentation is required that attests that the faculty member's graduate faculty status is current and indicates the level of graduate faculty status the faculty member holds.

4. Calculation of Overall Merit Score

In each area – Teaching Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service – three members of the Merit Committee will read the merit file and determine if the faculty does not meet, meets, exceeds expectations for merit, or if performance is unacceptable, and assign scores –one for each area--in accordance with the criteria detailed in section 5 below. The three members will report their scores which are then compiled with the other readers' scores to determine the overall score. The entire Merit Committee will vote to accept or reject the readers' final score. If the vote is not unanimous, the file will then be read by the entire committee and they will reconvene to determine a final score and evaluation. Allocation of effort is taken into account when determining overall merit score. The overall merit may include six or more values or rating levels, but it must clearly identify whether the overall merit rating reflects performance that is unacceptable, fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

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

$$[\text{Teaching Merit Score} * \text{Allocation of Effort}] + [\text{Research/Creative Work Merit Score} * \text{Allocation of Effort}] + [\text{Service Merit Score} * \text{Allocation of Effort}] = \text{Overall Merit Score}$$

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation (Assumes component performance ratings made on 5-point scale)
0-.9	Unacceptable; Activities in areas cumulatively below an ordinary acceptable level of performance; Recommendation for review
1.0 – 1.5	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
1.6 – 3.5	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
3.6 – 5.0	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit

The Department of Theatre and Film has elected to use numbers as follows: 0 -.9 = Unacceptable; 1-1.5 = Does not meet expectations for merit; 1.6-3.5 = Meets expectations for merit; 3.6-5 = Exceeds expectations for merit. The Merit Committee report of the overall merit score recommendation will be no greater than one-tenth decimal place (for example, the Merit Committee may assign a score of 3.1 or 4.9 but may not assign a score of 3.15 or 3.975. Each category will be averaged across the three-year period of review. In each individual year, an average is calculated for the composite score.

5. Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations, and the Calculation of Component Merit Scores

Overview

The Department of Theatre and Film's production program presents a special circumstance in categorizing its work. The production program may be both curricular (credit bearing) and co-curricular (non-credit bearing). In production, many of the faculty roles require working in concert with students, teaching process and practice, though these same roles will also at times require the faculty member to prepare and/or work alone or with minimal student involvement. Typically, each production assignment will include a combination of activities that encompass teaching, research/creative, and service. How an individual faculty member reports his or her production activities will depend on the nature of the faculty appointment and allocation of effort.

Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding performance expectations that are assigned to the department member on the following performance criteria: Teaching Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service. Each of the aforementioned criteria (e.g., teaching) will be evaluated using a number of performance indicators (as indicated below). Merit Committee members will review information submitted by each faculty member to assign a numerical score for each criterion using a rating scale anchored with examples of expected levels (or their equivalent) of performance on the performance indicators. Using the summary form provided, Merit Committee members will meet as a committee to reach consensus on component scores for each of the relevant performance criteria. The component scores may include any range of values, but they must clearly identify whether the assigned score on the criteria (e.g., teaching) reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, exceeds expectations for merit or is unacceptable.

The levels on each of the performance indicators should capture how the unit defines exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, failing to meet expectations for performance, and unacceptable performance:

Exceeds expectations for merit: Activities in area cumulatively exceed expectations and reflect a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for an individual with a given faculty rank in the department, school, unit, and discipline.

Meets expectations for merit: Activities in area cumulatively meet expectations and reflect standard levels of performance for the department, school, unit, and discipline.

Fails to meet expectations for merit: Activities in area cumulatively do not meet expectations and fall below the standard levels of meritorious performance for the department, school, unit, and discipline.

Unacceptable: Activities in area cumulatively indicate a pattern of performance that is below an ordinary and acceptable level for the department, school, unit and discipline and warrant attention. (CBA Article 31, Section 3.1)

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK

The Department of Theatre and Film expects that all tenured and tenure track faculty show evidence of an active, ongoing scholarly or creative agenda. Additionally, this document recognizes that non-tenure track faculty may also have research/creative work assigned as a part of his or her allocation of effort in order to fulfill the needs of the production program in Theatre and Film. The department recognizes that it is impossible to include all conceivable

types of activities in this document. The chair and the Merit Committee will use the following activities as guidelines rather than adhering to the list inflexibly.

The faculty member should strive for *refereed* or *juried* publication, exhibitions, festivals, and presentations. The proportion of refereed publications/creative works a department member achieves may vary depending on the person's specialization, and the nature of "refereeing" varies in some specializations. In all cases, with one exception noted below, some peer-reviewed publication/creative work is expected over the longer term. The exception is for those faculty members for whom their primary research/creative activity supports the department's on-site theatre production program and for whom, therefore, those responsibilities preclude their being able to seek external venues for their creative work. In these cases, documentation of in-house productions will be used to determine merit. When budget permits or when funds can be sought to offset the expense, outside adjudication of in-house productions may occur. In these instances, those external reviews will be considered for merit review.

Consistent with evolving practice in higher education and professional guidelines, the department recognizes the important role of collaboration in research and publication/creative work (when submitting material for review, faculty should explain the extent of her or his role); it recognizes publication in web-based journals of high quality and reputation; it recognizes pedagogical and curricular manifestations of scholarship and engaged research; and it recognizes research and scholarship focused on issues and problems of the university and, in the case of the Scholarship of Engagement, the surrounding community and region.

Concerning merit determinations, the Department of Theatre and Film is committed to treating research and creative work of engagement equally with traditional approaches to scholarship and artistic practice. Faculty undertaking such engaged research and creative work must develop appropriate methods, reporting of results, and publication of findings in formats acceptable in the scholar's / creative artist's field of inquiry. The Department acknowledges that engaged research may vary in its forms and aims from program to program.

It is the position of The Department of Theatre and Film that research/creative activities for production including: filmmaking, directing, screen or play writing, designing scenery, costumes, lighting, sound, and projections/installations as well as the execution by specialists in corresponding fields (performance, film editing, fabricating costumes/scenery/props/puppets, for example) are appropriate forms of research/creative activity for faculty in the disciplines of theatre and film. These research/creative activities require substantial analysis, historical and/or technological research and the synthesis of information; they result in the creation of new works of art that are widely disseminated through public performance.

Achievement in the First Tier will be awarded a minimum merit rating of 4.0 and will be eligible for higher ratings based on number and quality of achievements and further achievements in First, Second and Third Tier.

Achievement in the Second Tier without corresponding achievement in the First Tier will be awarded a minimum rating of 3.0 and will be eligible for higher ratings based on number and quality of achievements and further achievements in Second and Third Tier.

Achievement in the Third Tier without corresponding achievement in the First or Second Tier will be awarded a maximum rating of 2.0 based on number of achievements.

Activities in the Fourth Tier without off-setting achievement in the First, Second or Third Tier will be awarded a maximum rating of 0.0.

First Tier Performance Indicators in Research/Creative:

- A. Publication of a book demonstrating original research or conceptualization by academic presses or peer-reviewed trade publications directed to an audience of scholarly peers. This category also includes scholarly editions of literary or theoretical texts, the publication of textbooks, and the editing of collections strongly reflecting the faculty member's perspective and individual contributions. A book, film, or other significant creative work, post-publication/presentation, can be claimed for up to two merit review years upon publication. (The same project may be claimed for a second-tier indicator for one prior merit year when initially put under contract and also claimed for one prior merit year as a third-tier indicator after being contracted while it is a work in progress.)
- B. Publication of articles, book chapters, or proceedings articles demonstrating original research or conceptualization, in scholarly, peer-reviewed journals or in academic books as described above, both in print and electronic media. Articles can be claimed for two consecutive merit review years. In order to do so, faculty must make a case for the quality and reach of his or her work so that it may be considered for more than one year of merit.
- C. Contributions to exhibitions, performances, and/or the distribution of creative works. Works may be presented in-house and presented for merit review when documentation of its significance is provided in the merit dossier; they may be presented in professional venues (including non-Equity venues), for commercial exhibition, and/or be accepted for commercial distribution (whether handled by a distribution company or self-distributed via broadcast in cable, theatrical, online or home video release) for which the faculty member was selected by means of a screening process or adjudicated by means of a jury or peer review or evaluated by an external adjudicator, or other recognized organizations within the disciplines of theatre, performance studies and/or film). Creative works judged substantial by the Merit Committee can be claimed for two consecutive merit review years.
- D. Publication of translations in significant disciplinary venues such as peer-reviewed journals or by academic presses (either commercial or university) noted for their record of publication in the field of theatre or film.
- E. Publication or other forms of dissemination as appropriate to the Scholarship of Engagement.
- F. Editing of nationally known peer-reviewed journals and of magazines of high reputation.
- G. Major external grants to support research or creative work.

Second Tier Performance Indicators in Research/Creative:

- A. Presentation of research/creative work at conferences, including presentation of work at research seminars and through invited addresses and workshops at scholarly conferences, colloquia, and professional development forums.
- B. External consulting or presentation of research/creative work that draws on the scholarly expertise of faculty, leading to enhanced university, regional, national, and international reputation.
- C. Patents, Contracts (not including standard book contracts), Licenses resulting from the scholarly, creative, and entrepreneurial labor of faculty.
- D. Standard book contracts. (May be claimed for one merit review year as second tier)
- E. Presentation of creative work or performance-work at state, regional, national, or international meetings, conferences, or through radio, television, or other media with national or international impact.
- F. Awards for Research/Creative work by recognized disciplinary organizations or by the university.

Third Tier Performance Indicators in Research/Creative:

- A. Publication of performance and book reviews directed to an audience of scholarly peers.
- B. Publication of research/creative work in magazine articles, books etc. directed to a general audience.
- C. Publication of research/creative work in non-peer reviewed journals directed to a scholarly or practitioner audience.
- D. Standard book contracts previously claimed as second tier with documentation of progress since first year. (Documentation could include emails from publisher, evidence of submission and revision, or comparable documentation. May be claimed for one merit review year as third tier.)
- E. Reviews, citations, and reprints.
- F. Minor external grants to support research and/or creative work.
- G. Dissemination of research/creative work through other media (e.g., software, museum exhibitions, or other non-print media such as performance, design, film).
- H. Live performances or film screenings at non-academic venues. (May be claimed as second tier indicator based upon documentation of significance and impact of venue. Documentation may include professional standing, history and prestige of producing organization or comparable documentation.)
- I. Work in outreach activities that bring to bear direct applications of research/creative work or provide research venues upon which future work may be based (i.e., co-curricular service learning activities, etc. leading to research)
- K. Internal or external consulting or presentation of research/creative work that draws on scholarly expertise.

Fourth Tier Performance Indicators in Research/Creative – Unacceptable Performance:

- A. No publication of performance and book reviews directed to an audience of scholarly peers.
- B. No publication of research in magazine articles, books etc. directed to a general audience.
- C. No publication of research articles in non-peer reviewed journals directed to a scholarly

- or practitioner audience.
- D. No standard book contracts previously claimed as second tier with documentation of progress since first year. (Documentation could include emails from publisher, evidence of submission and revision, or comparable documentation. May be claimed for one merit review year as third tier.)
 - E. No reviews, citations, and reprints.
 - F. No minor external grants to support research and/or creative work.
 - G. No dissemination of research through other media (e.g., software, museum exhibitions, or other non-print media such as performance, design, film).
 - H. No live performances or film screenings at non-academic venues. (May be claimed as second tier indicator based upon documentation of significance and impact of venue. Documentation may include professional standing, history and prestige of producing organization or comparable documentation.)
 - I. No work in outreach activities that bring to bear direct applications of research/creative work or provide research venues upon which future work may be based (i.e., co-curricular service learning activities, etc. leading to research)
 - J. No internal or external consulting that draws on scholarly expertise.
 - K. Loss of graduate faculty status.

In addition to those items enumerated above, the faculty member under review may submit and request that the Merit Committee consider other evidence that is appropriate to his/her specific case.

Evaluation Rating Category	RESEARCH Expected levels of accomplishment on research performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Research
Exceeds expectations for merit	<i>Achievement in the First Tier will be awarded a minimum merit rating of 4.0 and will be eligible for higher ratings based on number and quality of achievements and further achievements in First, Second and Third Tier.</i>	4-5
Meets expectations for merit	<i>Achievement in the Second Tier without corresponding achievement in the First Tier will be awarded a minimum rating of 3.0 and will be eligible for higher ratings based on number and quality of achievements and further achievements in Second and Third Tier.</i>	2-3

	<i>Achievement in the Third Tier without corresponding achievement in the First or Second Tier will be awarded a maximum rating of 2.0 based on number and quality of achievements.</i>	
FAILS TO MEET EXPECTATIONS FOR MERIT	<i>The faculty member has not produced a refereed or juried publication or other indicator in Tier One, and activity in the indicators detailed in Tiers Two and Three is not indicative of a sufficiently active research or creative agenda.</i>	1
UNACCEPTABLE	<i>The faculty member has a pattern of Tier Four Indicators without off-setting achievements in Tiers One, Two or Three.</i>	0

Merit Score for Research/Creative work (to be completed by Merit Committee member): _____

.....

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The Department of Theatre & Film places a primary emphasis on high-quality teaching to both graduate and undergraduate students. The department recognizes the following principles of effective teaching:

- The encouragement and development of reciprocity and cooperation among students.
- The use of active and/or experiential learning techniques.
- Providing comprehensive syllabi and transparent course expectations for students.
- Providing high-impact learning opportunities

In order to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching, faculty must provide a dossier containing evidence of merit in teaching from the most recent academic year. Each dossier must contain the mandatory indicators to be eligible for merit consideration. Dossiers must include additional indicators from Category A or B.

Dossiers must contain the following Mandatory Indicators:

- Syllabi from all classes taught during the most recent academic year of teaching.
- No more than 3 items from Categories A or B.

In addition to the dossier, the merit committee will consult:

- All quantitative end-of-term student evaluations for all courses taught during the most recent academic year of teaching.
- All qualitative end-of-term student evaluations for all courses taught during the most recent academic year of teaching.

Category A. Performance Indicators for Graduate and Undergraduate Teaching (All from most recent academic year):

- Peer review letter(s)/evaluations from the most recent academic year of teaching.
- Documentation of evaluation of preliminary and/or qualifying exams,
- Thesis, and dissertation progress and completion
- Evidence of teaching courses for the first time
- Evidence of piloting new courses
- Supervision of independent studies, honor projects, and undergraduate and graduate research
- Sample evaluation of student writings or creative work
- Sample assignment sheets and activities
- Teaching sections that require additional or different content/pedagogies and/or Service Learning components for the Honors College, Learning Communities, etc.
- Evidence of pedagogy for special needs students
- Evidence of extracurricular support of learning:
- Sponsorship of student activities
- Accompanying students to professional meetings
- Awards for teaching by recognized disciplinary organizations or by the university.

Category B. Performance Indicators for Graduate and Undergraduate Instructional and Program Development (All from most recent academic year):

- Documentation of new course proposals including a narrative rationale for the new course and accompanied by approved green sheet or blue sheet
- Documentation of course revisions including old and revised syllabi, a narrative rationale for the revision, and accompanied by approved green sheet or blue sheet
- Development of online classes
- Documentation of programmatic revision including a narrative rationale for the revision, old and revised curriculum audit forms, and approved green sheet or blue sheet.
- Attendance at faculty development sessions (program or university-wide)
- Attendance at teaching-related conferences
- Documentation of work done in exchange for reassigned time
- Instructional Improvement Grants
- Leadership roles in instructional enhancement projects

In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the department consider Other Evidence of Achievement in Teaching that is appropriate to his/her specific case.

Performance Indicators for Unacceptable Teaching (A pattern of performance all from the most recent academic year):

- Faculty member does not submit merit dossier by unit deadline
- Faculty member does not provide course syllabi for any courses taught
- Course syllabi do not conform to guidelines stipulated in the CBA
- Faculty member loses graduate faculty status
- Faculty member fails to provide regular student assessment

- Faculty member fails to provide students with regular access (office hours, email correspondence, scheduled appointments, etc.)
- Faculty member fails to utilize Canvas or other electronic platforms for the dissemination of course information
- Faculty member does not provide evidence of significant performance indicators in Category A or B.
- Faculty member’s student course evaluations are consistently below department norms.

Process for Evaluating Merit in Teaching

1. Using the student evaluations for all courses taught in the academic year under review, the Merit Committee will compare the scores for all courses taught during the year with departmental norms for similar courses and determine if the scores are indicative of Exceeding Expectations, Meeting Expectations, Failing to Meet Expectations or are unacceptable, taking into account context provided by the faculty member.
2. The Merit Committee will read the Qualitative Student Evaluations, keep a record of prevalent kinds of comments, positive and/or negative, and determine if the comments are indicative of Exceeding Expectations, Meeting Expectations, Failing to Meet Expectations or are unacceptable, taking into account context provided by the faculty member.
3. The Merit Committee will then consider the syllabi, along with Performance Indicators for Graduate and Undergraduate Teaching, Performance Indicators for Instructional and Program Development, and Other Evidence of Achievement in Teaching.
4. Exceeding Expectations in the required dossier will be awarded a merit rating in the range of 4.0 to 5.0.
5. Meeting Expectations in the required dossier will be awarded a merit rating in the range of 2.0 to 3.0.
6. Failing to Meet Expectations in the required dossier will be awarded with a maximum rating of 1.0.
7. Unacceptable in the required dossier will be awarded with a maximum rating of 0.

Evaluation Rating Category	TEACHING Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Teaching
Exceeds expectations for merit	<i>The faculty member has quantitative student evaluations that, when compared to departmental averages, are consistent with excellence in teaching: most are 1.0 to 2.0, a 5 being the least desirable ranking. The faculty member has qualitative evaluations by students that are indicative of excellence in teaching: 75% to 100% positive</i>	4-5

	<i>comments. Peer reviews, if included, are excellent. At least one Performance Indicators in Classroom Teaching, Instructional and Program Development, and Contributions to Student Learning are indicative of excellent engagement in teaching.</i>	
Meets expectations for merit	<i>The faculty member has quantitative student evaluations that, when compared to departmental averages, are consistent with satisfactory teaching: most are between 2.0 and 3.0, a 5.0 being the least desirable ranking. The faculty member has qualitative evaluations by students that are consistent with satisfactory teaching: 50% to 74% positive comments. Peer reviews, if included, are good. At least one Performance Indicator in Classroom Teaching, Instructional and Program Development, and Contributions to Student Learning are indicative of satisfactory engagement in teaching.</i>	2-3
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<i>The faculty member has quantitative student evaluations that, when compared to departmental averages, are not consistent with satisfactory teaching: average course evaluations are above 3.0, a 5.0 being the least desirable ranking. The faculty member has qualitative evaluations by students that are not consistent with satisfactory teaching: less than 50% positive comments. Peer reviews, if included, are poor to fair. Performance Indicators in Classroom Teaching, Instructional and Program Development, and Contributions to Student Learning are not indicative of engagement in teaching.</i>	1
Unacceptable	<i>The faculty member has a pattern of</i>	

	<p><i>activities that fall in the Indicators for Unacceptable Teaching without off-setting achievements in Performance Indicators from Categories A and B.</i></p> <p><i>The faculty member has a pattern of responses in qualitative evaluations by students and peer reviews, if included, that continually fall below an ordinary acceptable level of performance: less than 50% positive comments.</i></p>	
--	--	--

Merit Score for Teaching Effectiveness (to be completed by Merit Committee member): ___

.....

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION OF SERVICE

Departmental Service

Service means primarily the contributions faculty make to the department/program, college, university, to the profession and discipline, and to the community as a scholar and/or creative artist. Civic, religious, social, and educational contributions that are directly related to our university or professional expertise may be considered in merit evaluation.

Faculty in Theatre & Film are expected to contribute to the life and governance of the department through service on at least one major departmental committee or an administrative post, such as:

- Faculty Advisory Board
- Promotion, Retention, and Tenure Committee
- Merit Committee
- Undergraduate Committee
- Graduate Committee
- Production Committee
- Season Selection Committee
- Ad Hoc Committees
- Search Committees
- Chair Selection Committee
- Graduate Coordinator
- Undergraduate Coordinator

This minimum amount of departmental service is required for faculty to meet expectations. In cases of joint appointment with another school or department (in the School of Cultural & Critical Studies or the Honors College, for example), service on committees within the other unit can count as “departmental.” All faculty members appointed to committees will receive a minimum rating of 2.0, provided there is documentation of consistent participation and effort.

Should a faculty member fail to meet this minimum requirement for service merit, the rating for the academic year will be 1.0, indicating that the individual “does not meet expectations” for merit in Service. However, in the event membership on major departmental committees or attendance at department meetings is not possible through programmatic representation or constituent group (lecturers, instructors), other forms of department service may be counted as part of the service requirement, provided there is documentation of consistent participation and effort.

Should a faculty member cumulatively fail to meet this minimum requirement for service merit, the rating for the academic year will be 0, indicating that the individual receives an “unacceptable” for merit in Service.

In addition to serving on a major departmental committee or in an administrative post, the Merit Committee will expect to see service activities that are part and parcel of an academic appointment. Service activities that are to be fulfilled as a regular expectation of academic appointment include:

- Regular Attendance at Departmental Meetings
- Programmatic Committees
- Attendance at Preview Days
- Attendance at Graduation
- Participation in President’s Day Recruiting Events
- Participation in Arts Discovery Day
- Other activities to promote departmental programs and services to current and prospective students
- Activities to engage alumni
- Evidence of academic advising services provided to students, both graduate and undergraduate
- Involvement in the production program not designated as teaching or creative activity
- Involvement in internships, or co-operative work experiences
- Involvement in clubs, organizations, and activities promoting faculty-student interaction
- Leadership in service learning activities (not attached to a service learning course) and other forms of engagement with the community
- Participation in university initiatives to create a campus-wide learning community
- Participation in university, college, or departmental projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning
- Holding one hour of office hours each week for each course taught

College and University Service

Because basic expectations for professional appointment do include service roles beyond the department, college and university service are also important responsibilities and should be rewarded appropriately. Documentation of roles and responsibilities for college and university service should indicate positions held, frequency of meetings, reports or other deliverables. Sample service may include:

- Curriculum Committees (undergraduate and graduate)
- Interdisciplinary Program Committees
- University Center or Program Directorships
- Advisory Boards
- Faculty Senate
- Arts and Sciences Council
- Graduate Council and its subcommittees
- University Standing Committees
- College PRTC Committee
- Scholarship and other Award Committees
- Ad Hoc Committees and Taskforces
- Special Event Planning

The Merit Committee will consider service to the College and University in determining the final merit Score for Service.

BGSU Faculty Association Service

In accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 4, section 4, the Merit Committee will consider and credit service to the local BGSU-FA union in the same manner as they consider and credit service to all University committees.

Professional Service

Service to one's community and one's discipline is a significant part of developing a professional identity and shall be rewarded. Similar to college and university service, faculty should document roles, responsibilities, and scope (regional, national, and international). Such service roles may include:

- National Committees or Advisory Boards
- Community Outreach *not* designated as teaching or scholarship
- Consulting or Reviewing roles *not* designated as teaching or scholarship
- Service to the state and national AAUP
- Organization of panels or research seminars for the dissemination of scholarship within the research community
- Screening the research/creative work of others as a referee for publication/presentation, for example, judging for academic prizes or awards

Unacceptable Merit for Service

A pattern of failure to fulfill service in the above examples for Service activities will result in a merit rating of 0.

Evaluation	SERVICE	
Rating Category	Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Service

Exceeds expectations for merit	<i>The faculty member has served in a major service role for the department, or has fulfilled his/her obligations on one of the major departmental committees. Additionally, the faculty member has performed additional service to the department, College or University, to the BGSU FA, or to the Profession (i.e., leadership in the BGSU FA, Chairing a College or University Committee, Leadership role for a national or international professional organization).</i>	4-5
Meets expectations for merit	<i>The faculty member has fulfilled their obligations on a major departmental committee, and has performed minimal additional service.</i>	2-3
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<i>Limited engagement (i.e., no advising or committees; limited attendance at faculty meetings) at departmental level; No significant service participation at college, university, or professional levels; limited community engagement (i.e., 1 limited activity or no participation)</i>	1
Unacceptable	<i>A pattern of no significant engagement (no significant advising or committees; no consistent attendance and participation at faculty meetings) at departmental level; No significant service participation at college, university, or professional levels; No significant community engagement.</i>	0

Merit Score for Service (to be completed by Merit Committee member): _____



SUMMARY FORM

(To be completed with agreement reached by all members of the Merit Committee):

	Merit Score for	Merit Score for	Merit Score for
--	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

Faculty Member	Teaching/ Librarian Effectiveness	Research/ Creative Work	Service
<i>Faculty member 1</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>
<i>Faculty member 2</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>
<i>Next faculty member, etc.</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>

Additional Academic Unit Merit Policy Information

n/a

Approved by the Department/School of Theatre and Film at the February 28, 2017 Faculty Meeting


Name, Chair/Director

Date August 22, 2017

Approved:


Name, Dean of College Name

Date 8/23/2017

Approved:


Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP

Date 12/18/17