Merit Policy
Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes
Academic Unit: School of Family and Consumer Sciences
Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

Evaluation Rating Category	TEACHING Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or equivalent)	Merit Score for Teaching
Exceeds Expectations for Merit	• Quantitative student evaluations average of all courses equal to or exceeding 4.20 on a 5-point scale, and • High level of involvement in other teaching activities, including 5 or more indicators delineated in "Meets Expectations for Merit" section.	5
Exceeds Expectations for Merit	• Quantitative student evaluations average of all courses equal to or exceeding 4.0 on a 5-point scale, and • High level of involvement in other teaching activities, including 4 or more indicators delineated in "Meets Expectations for Merit" section.	4
Meets Expectations for Merit	• Quantitative student evaluations average of all courses equal to or exceeding 3.7 on a 5-point scale, and • High level of involvement in other teaching activities, including 3 or more indicators delineated in "Meets Expectations for Merit" section.	3

Meets Expectations for Merit	• Quantitative student evaluations average of all courses is at least 3.5 on a 5-point scale.
	• In addition, include 2 indicators of teaching effectiveness listed below:
	   • Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities.
	   • Engagement in professional development related to teaching effectiveness
	   • Teaching Awards and Distinctions
	   • Development of New Courses (Provide copy of EDHD blue sheets)
	   • Curriculum Modification of Existing Courses (provide copy of EDHD blue sheets) substantive changes or changes to multiple courses
	   • Academic Advising (quantity of students and quality of advising are considered)
	   • Student Professional Development Activities of substantial value, e.g. a full-day student career day, a series of extracurricular seminars, an exhibition, etc.
	   • Integration of Teaching Initiatives, involving Engagement/Service Learning (provide description)
	   • Participation in a learning community, tech boot camp, etc.
	   • Grants to support teaching activities (not travel grants)
	   • Accreditation reports (use only once, either in teaching or in service)
	   • Study abroad and extended student trips off campus
	   • Thesis/Dissertation Chairs
	   • Thesis/Dissertation Committees
	   • Comprehensive Examination Chairs (thesis, dissertations)
	   • Comprehensive Examination Committees (thesis, dissertations)
	   • Supervision of Independent Studies (provide list)
	   • Master's Project Chair/Committees
	   • Undergraduate Honor's Project Chair/Advisor
	   • Undergraduate Honor's Project Committee
	   • Independent studies
	   • Other (please describe)
		2

Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit	• Quantitative student evaluations average of all courses are below 3.5 on a 5 point scale • Low level of involvement in other teaching activities. • Limited or no engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness. • Minimal to no involvement in additional indicators of teaching effectiveness.	1
Unacceptable	An unacceptable rating in teaching is defined as quantitative student evaluation's average below 3.2 on a 5 point scale on all courses, major flaws and problems in the faculty member's teaching or no materials turned in for review.	0

Merit Score for Teaching. (To be completed by FD&E committee member.) ⎯⎯

Evaluation Rating Category	RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK Expected levels of accomplishment on research performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Research
Exceeds Expectations for merit	• Two peer-reviewed publications (Provide copies).	5
Exceeds Expectations for merit	• One peer-reviewed publication (Provide copy).	4
Meets Expectations for merit	• A combination of three or more of the items listed below.	3

Meets Expectations for merit	• A combination of two of the following items:
	  • External Grant Funded* (Provide copy)
	  • External Grant Submitted* (Provide copy)
	  • Internal Research Grant,* funded (excluding travel grants)
	  • Internal Research Grant, submitted* (excluding travel grants)
	  • Book (Provide copy)
	  • Book Chapter
	  • Published Symposia
	  • Published Book Review in a peer-reviewed journal
	  • Invited Presentations, International, National, or Regional Conferences
	  • Refereed Presentation or Poster at International, National, or Regional Conferences
	  • Abstract published in conference proceedings or peer-reviewed journals (if not mentioned as paper/poster presentation)
	  • Positions as Associate Editors or Guest Editor of a peer-reviewed journal (please describe)
	  • Permanent member of a journal editorial board (not ad hoc reviewer)
	  • Refereed Creative Work (at national or regional adjudicated exhibitions or competitions)
	  • Other (please describe)
	
	* You may want to identify items that are part of the Scholarship of Engagement.
	** Provide reprints and proof for all achievements listed in your report.
		2

Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit	• Minimal evidence of scholarship (one item in the above list)*. * In rare cases, when a faculty has only one item, but a very substantial one, that faculty might qualify for level 2.	1
Unacceptable	No significant documented scholarship or no materials were turned in for review.	0

Merit Score for Research. (To be completed by FD&E committee member.)   —

*Notes: Very large individual grants (e.g. over $30,000, for a two-year period) can be submitted for each merit year of the time period of the grant. Grants with team members should be at least $100,000 to be counted for each year of the duration of the grant. Additional grant cases can be considered by the FDE committee. In such cases, faculty need to provide documentation about distribution of effort.

BGSU travel grants are not considered as research grants. Service grants count towards service. If the service grant involves a research component, only that component counts towards research. In such cases, faculty need to provide documentation about distribution of effort.

Submitted grants are counted only in the year of submission, regardless of the size of the grant. If they are funded that same year, only the funded grant is counted, not the submission.

Evaluation Rating Category	SERVICE Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Service
Exceeds Expectations for Merit	• The faculty member demonstrates significant service involvement at the program, school, college, university, and/or professional levels. At least 5 committees or recognized service items are required. Examples of recognized service at each level are described in the "Meets Expectations for Merit" section below. Overall contributions should be considerably above "Meets Expectations for Merit" level.	5
Exceeds Expectations for Merit	• The faculty member demonstrates significant service involvement at the program, school, college, university, and/or professional levels. At least 4 committees or recognized service items are required. Examples of recognized service at each level are described in the "Meets Expectations for Merit" section below. Overall contributions should be considerably above "Meets Expectations for Merit" level.	4
Meets Expectations for Merit	• The faculty member demonstrates meaningful service involvement at the program, school, college, university, and/or professional levels. At least 3 committees or recognized service items are required. Examples of recognized service at each level are described in the "Meets Expectations for Merit" section below. Overall contributions should be above "Meets Expectations for Merit" level.	3

Meets Expectations for Merit	• The faculty member demonstrates meaningful service involvement at the program, school, college, university, or professional levels.
	• At least 2 committees or recognized service items are required.
	• Examples of recognized service at each level are described below:
	• Profession
	   Membership in and active involvement with Committees, Task Forces, Boards
	   Chair of Committees, Task Forces, Boards (implies higher level of engagement than a committee member)
	   Officer Positions in Professional Associations (Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer, etc.)
	   Conference Planning
	   Professional Recognition/Awards
	   Service to Government Agency
	   Expert Testimony
	   Moderator/Respondent of Conference Sessions
	   Reviewing Manuscripts (list journal(s) and number reviewed each year)
	   Reviewing Grants (list agency or organization, grant program, number reviewed, etc.)
	   Reviewing Conference Abstracts (list conference(s) and number reviewed, etc.)
	   National Grant Panels
	   Media Appearances at national and regional level (regional like Midwest)
	   Other
	• Program/School
	   Committees, Task Forces (e.g., Search Committees, Standing Committees)
	   Chair of , Task Forces, Boards, etc. (implies higher level of engagement than a committee member)
	   Assigned Administrative Duties* (e.g. Graduate Coordinator, Program Director)
	   Supervision of Student Clubs, Organizations, and Activities
	   Recruitment and Retention beyond School Service (i.e., beyond Preview Day, Presidents' Day, Commencement attendance requirements)
	   Other
	• College/University/Community
	   Committees, Task Forces
	   Chair of Committee
	   Other
	•Community service must be related to faculty's professional area.
		2

Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit	The faculty member demonstrates little to no service involvement at the program, school, college, university, and/or professional levels. Examples of recognized service at each level are described above in the meets expectation section.	1
Unacceptable	No significant documented service or no materials turned in for review.	0

Merit Score for Service. (To be completed by FD&E committee member.)   _____

Merit Committee Composition and the Election/Appointment Process

The School of Family and Consumer Sciences FD&E committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. The committee consists of one representative from each program area. The representatives are elected by all school faculty members to serve a two year term.

Elements of the Merit Dossier

The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements: title page, table of contents, self-filled table of meritorious achievements during the previous calendar year (see template below); updated CV with highlighted activities during the previous calendar year (not submitted to the merit committee in previous years*); teaching narrative (from a few lines to no more than 2/3 page, 1.5 line spacing); quantitative student teaching evaluations from the previous year (see template below) and any other proof of achievement; research narrative, (from a few lines to no more than 2/3 page, 1.5 line spacing) and copies of publications or any other proof of achievement; service narrative of similar length and any necessary evidence materials. If using the category "Other" in your summary or any other table, use the narratives to explain your case. In the merit documents, narratives are different from tenure and promotion submissions and they are used for explanation of achievements only. In its shortest form (a few lines) the narrative serves as a cover page for the section/category.
Note: * For registering grants, please see the note under the Research table.

Calculation of Overall Merit Score for One Year

Once the FD&E committee has reached consensus on the component merit scores in each performance category (teaching, research, service), the overall merit score is computed using a simple algorithm taking into account the weighted allocation of effort for each performance area. The FCS workload allocation is 60% teaching, 25% research/creative work and 15% service for TTF and 80% teaching and 20% service for NTTF. The algorithms are [Teaching merit score * Allocation of Effort] + [Research/Creative work merit score * Allocation of Effort] + [Service merit score * Allocation of Effort] = Overall TTF Merit Score or [Teaching merit score * Allocation of Effort] + [Service merit score * Allocation of Effort] = Overall NTTF Merit Score. Also, to achieve "Meets Expectations for Merit," the applicant has to achieve meritorious level of 2 in *each* required category prior to weighting each category using the algorithm.

^ Multipliers for allocation of effort will be adjusted for alternative allocations

Template for Determining Overall Merit Score Recommendations (Examples)
(To be completed with agreement reached by all members of the FD&E committee)

Faculty Member	Merit Score for Teaching *.60^	Merit Score for Research/Creative Work *.25^	Merit Score for Service *.15^	Score	Merit Category
Tenure-Track Examples					
TTF Person 1	5*.60 = 3	4 * .25 = 1	1*.15= .15	4.15	Does not meet merit because did not meet target level 2 in each category.
TTF Person 2	2 * .60 =1.2	2 * .25 = .5	2 *.15 =.3	2	Meets expectations for merit
TTF Person 3	5 *.60 = 3	4* .25= 1	2*.15 = .3	4.3	Exceeds expectations for merit
Non-TTF examples					
NTTF Person 1	5*.80 = 4	NA	1* .20 =.2	4.2	Does not meet merit because did not meet target level 2 in each category.
NTTF Person 2	5*.80 = 4	NA	2* .20 = .4	4.4	Exceeds expectations for merit
NTTF Person 3	5* .80 = 4	NA	3 * .20 =.6	4.6	Exceeds expectations for merit

Note: * TTF Person 1 and NTTF Person 1 do not meet the expectation for merit despite of their overall merit score is above the overall score required for meeting the expectation for merit because the their score in one category is lower than the required score of 2 in each category in order to meet the expectations for merit.

Overall Merit Score Levels for One Year: The average of all three sections' scores and/or additional criteria[a, b, c]

Exceeds Expectations for Merit[b]	3.3 – 5.0
Meets Expectations for Merit[c]	2.0 – 3.2
Fails to Meet Expectations	< 2.0
Unacceptable	0

[a] Each category (Teaching, Research/Creative Work, and Service) is calibrated on its own scale (0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5). Tenure track/tenured faculty (TTF) are rated in all three areas while non-TTF are rated in teaching and service only.
[b] To achieve "Exceeds Expectations for Merit," a TT faculty member needs to score 4 *in two or more* categories; a NTT faculty needs to score 4 in Teaching, while Service can be at level 3.
[c] To achieve "Meets Expectations for Merit," the applicant has to achieve meritorious level of 2 in *each* required category.

Merit Score Levels for the Three-Year Rolling Period

"Merit rating is averaged with the merit ratings from the previous two merit periods to calculate a three-year rolling average that will be used to recommend merit increases.

These are the requirements for merit level for the three-year rolling period:

Exceeds Expectations for Merit[b]	3.3 – 5.0
Meets Expectations for Merit[c]	2.0 – 3.2
Fails to Meet Expectations	<2.0
Unacceptable	0

Note: There is NO requirement to score at least 2 in any of the preceding years in order to get merit rating of Meet or Exceeds Expectations for Merit.

Template for Self-Filled Summary Table of Meritorious Achievements (example)

This summary table is required to be submitted in paper and electronic format. It will be used to compile the merit record for the whole School of Family and Consumer Sciences. The summary table might be updated each year and sent to SFCS faculty members before the merit portfolio preparation starts.

Name	Special workload issues	Teaching Comments	Rating	Research Comments	Rating	Service Comments	Rating	Total
Your Name	You can fill this if you need	• 4 44 (AVERGE OF ALL 2014-2016 COURSES) • Advised 30 students • 1 Diss Chair • 3 master com membership		• 1 ref journal article • 1 abstract, • 2 conf paper presentations		• FCS 4 comm • EDHD 3 comm. • U-ty 3 comm. • Profession. 4 comm.		

Note: Merit Scores to be completed by the FD&E committee

Template for Quantitative Student Evaluation Scores

Semester	Course	Number of Students	Number of Respondents	Course Mean	Course SD	SFCS Mean	SFCS SD	Comments to the FD&E Committee
Student evaluations average of all courses for this year:								

Approved by the School of Family and Consumer Sciences on 05/04/17

Approved: _____   Date _May 23, 2017_

Deborah Wooldridge, Director School of FCS

Approved: _____   Date _May 30, 2017_

Dawn Shinew, Dean, College of EDHD

Approved: _____   Date _6/3/17_

Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP

R:\DeanBalzer\VPFASI\Successor Contract\Implementation of CBA 2\CBA Committees\Labor-Management\Merit Template Part II - FINAL - Consensus Approved by BGSU-FA and Provost October 24, 2016.docx