

## **Merit Policy**

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

**Academic Unit:** Department of Public and Allied Health

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

Merit criteria are limited to three areas: Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service. To determine whether faculty members have failed to meet, met, or exceeded expectations for merit, a merit system should identify performance indicators and expected levels of performance for each of the relevant areas noted above. The merit system should also describe how information on the various performance indicators are combined to calculate the relevant component merit scores (i.e., Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service).

#### **Overview**

Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to faculty members in the Department of Public and Allied Health (PAH) based on the following performance criteria: Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service. Each of the aforementioned criteria (e.g., teaching) will be evaluated using a number of performance indicators (e.g., quantitative student evaluations of teaching). Merit Committee members will review information submitted by each faculty member to make an evaluation rating on each performance criteria, providing some basis or justification of each rating where appropriate.

Evaluation ratings provided for all performance indicators within each performance criteria will be combined by each member of the Merit Committee to reach a component rating for each of the relevant performance criteria (Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service). Merit Committee members will meet as a committee to review and reach consensus on component ratings for each of the relevant performance criteria, using the summary form provided below. The component ratings must clearly identify whether the component reflects performance that is unacceptable, does not meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit. The Merit Committee will then assign an overall merit rating that clearly identifies whether performance is unacceptable, does not meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

Five rating levels will be used by the Merit Committee to evaluate each performance criteria. Ratings of 4 and 5 indicate performance that exceeds expectations for merit. Ratings of 2 and 3 indicate performance that meets expectations for merit. A rating of 1 indicates that performance does not meet expectations for merit. A 0 may be assigned if indicators are consistently unacceptable. The quality and/or quantity of performance indicators will be used to assign a 5 (vs. a 4) and a 3 (vs. a 2) as described in each performance criteria below.

#### **Teaching Effectiveness**

Pre-specified allocation of effort for Teaching: 60% for Tenure-Track Faculty (TTF), 80% for Qualified Rank Faculty (QRF)

Using four categories with five rating levels, the following evaluation concepts will be used: Less than 1= "unacceptable" performance; 1 = Does not meet expectations for merit; 2/3 = Meets expectations for merit; 4/5 = Exceeds expectations for merit.

**Teaching Effectiveness Rubric:**

<b>Evaluation Rating Category</b>	<b>TEACHING</b>  <b>Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators</b>	<b>Possible Merit Score for Teaching</b>
Exceeds expectations for merit	<p>#1 and #3 are required to exceed expectations for merit in teaching. High quality teaching (as demonstrated by indicators listed in #2) is required to achieve a “5”.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Quantitative student ratings of teaching effectiveness of all courses taught during the academic year, including summer courses, have a combined average of 4.0 or greater on the 5.0 scale.</li><li>2. At least one other indicator of teaching quality such as the following:<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Peer teaching evaluations that indicate outstanding performance such that the average score is 2.0 or greater on a scale of 3.0 used in the PAH peer evaluation criteria.</li><li>b. Summary of qualitative comments from the University Wide Student Evaluations. Qualitative student course evaluation comments will be examined for evidence of a supportive and inclusive student learning environment and instructor/student interactions.</li><li>c. Unsolicited messages from students indicate impactful teaching.</li><li>d. Documentation of successful student learning outcomes (such as medium to high scores on standardized assessment measures, licensure or professional examinations, positive reports from the adjunct faculty of affiliated clinical sites).</li></ol></li><li>3. Three or more of the following other contributions to student learning such as the following:<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Participation in the direction of theses and/or dissertations, or membership on graduate committees. Graduate Faculty Status.</li><li>b. Independent studies offered to students or honors project supervision above typical workload.</li><li>c. CURS project Mentor.</li><li>d. Development of new courses or improvement of existing courses.</li><li>e. Innovations in the effective use of instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning.</li><li>f. Participation in curriculum review or development of master syllabi.</li><li>g. Integration of service-learning activities.</li><li>h. Academic advising services provided to students.</li><li>i. Effective guidance of students in clinical settings, internships, or co-operative work experiences.</li></ol></li></ol>	4.0-5.0

Evaluation Rating Category	TEACHING  Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators	Possible Merit Score for Teaching
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>j. Participation in Program, Department, College, or University projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning.</li> <li>k. Evidence of professional development activities for enhancing teaching.</li> <li>l. Evidence of teaching awards and distinctions</li> <li>m. Evidence of published or unpublished pedagogical materials.</li> <li>n. Evidence of pedagogical activities that contribute to effective teaching.</li> </ul>	
Meets expectations for merit	<p>#1 and #2 are required to meet expectations for merit in teaching. High quality teaching (as demonstrated by indicators listed in #2) is required to achieve a “3”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quantitative student ratings of teaching effectiveness of all courses taught during the academic year, including summer courses, have a combined average of 3.0 or greater on the 5.0 scale.</li> <li>2. At least one other indicator of teaching quality such as the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Peer teaching evaluations that indicate outstanding performance such that the average score is 2.0 or greater on a scale of 3.0 used in the PAH peer evaluation criteria.</li> <li>b. Summary of qualitative comments from the University Wide Student Evaluations. Qualitative student course evaluation comments will be examined for evidence of a supportive and inclusive student learning environment and instructor/student interactions.</li> <li>c. Unsolicited messages from students indicate impactful teaching.</li> <li>d. Documentation of successful student learning outcomes (such as medium to high scores on standardized assessment measures, licensure or professional examinations, positive reports from the adjunct faculty of affiliated clinical sites).</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Two or more of the following other contributions to student learning such as the following:</li> </ul>	2.0-3.9

Evaluation Rating Category	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>TEACHING</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators</b></p>	Possible Merit Score for Teaching
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Participation in the direction of theses and/or dissertations, or membership on graduate committees. Graduate Faculty Status.</li> <li>b. Independent studies offered to students or honors project supervision above typical workload.</li> <li>c. CURS project Mentor</li> <li>d. Development of new courses or improvement of existing courses.</li> <li>e. Innovations in the effective use of instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning.</li> <li>f. Participation in curriculum review or development of master syllabi.</li> <li>g. Integration of service-learning activities.</li> <li>h. Academic advising services provided to students.</li> <li>i. Effective guidance of students in clinical settings, internships, or co-operative work experiences.</li> <li>j. Participation in Program, Department, College, or University projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning.</li> <li>k. Evidence of professional development activities for enhancing teaching</li> <li>l. Evidence of teaching awards and distinctions</li> <li>m. Evidence of published or unpublished pedagogical materials</li> <li>n. Evidence of pedagogical activities that contribute to effective teaching.</li> </ul>	
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<p>Evidence of merely meeting #1 and #2 is consistent with failing to meet expectations for merit in teaching.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quantitative student ratings of teaching effectiveness of all courses taught during the academic year, including summer courses, have a combined average of less than 3.0 on the 5.0 scale.</li> <li>2. No other indicators of teaching quality.</li> <li>3. One or fewer of the following other contributions to student learning such as the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Participation in the direction of theses and/or dissertations, or membership on graduate committees. Graduate Faculty Status.                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Independent studies offered to students or honors project supervision above typical workload</li> <li>b. CURS projects Mentor</li> <li>c. Development of new courses or improvement of existing courses.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	1.0-1.9

Evaluation Rating Category	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>TEACHING</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators</b></p>	Possible Merit Score for Teaching
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d. Innovations in the effective use of instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning.</li> <li>e. Participation in curriculum review or development of master syllabi.</li> <li>f. Integration of service-learning activities.</li> <li>g. Academic advising services provided to students.</li> <li>h. Effective guidance of students in clinical settings, internships, or co-operative work experiences.</li> <li>i. Participation in Program, Department, College, or University projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Evidence of professional development activities for enhancing teaching</li> <li>3. Evidence of teaching awards and distinctions</li> <li>4. Evidence of published or unpublished pedagogical materials</li> </ul> <p>Evidence of pedagogical activities that contribute to effective teaching.</p>	
Unacceptable	<p>Evidence indicates teaching performance that frequently falls below the department's basic standard (evaluations &lt;3.0, poor qualitative student comments, &lt;2.0 on peer evaluations, lack of other contributions to student learning.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>No materials submitted.</p>	0-0.9

**Merit Score for Teaching (to be completed by Merit Committee member):** \_\_\_\_\_

### Scholarly/Creative Activity

Pre-specified allocation of effort for Scholarly/Creative Activity: 30% for TTF, 0% for QRF

There are differing levels of importance, academic depth, and prestige associated with the various types of scholarly/creative activity that are recognized by the Department. A two-tiered model is used to categorize faculty scholarly/creative activity activities. Scholarly/creative activity will be evaluated using the minimum five rating levels: Less than 1= “unacceptable” performance; 1 = Does not meet expectations for merit; 2/3 = Meets expectations for merit; 4/5 = Exceeds expectations for merit.

### **Scholarly/Creative Activity Rubric:**

<b>Evaluation Rating Category</b>	<b>SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITY</b>  <b>Expected levels of accomplishment on scholarly/creative activity performance indicators</b>	<b>Possible Merit Score for Scholarly/ creative activity</b>
Exceeds expectations for merit	<p>Criteria for #1 (Tier 1 activities) AND #2 (Tier 2 activities) are required to exceed expectations for merit in scholarly/creative activity.</p> <p>To score a “5” in “exceeds expectations for merit”, faculty must either have one <i>additional</i> indicator from Tier 1 OR two <i>additional</i> indicators from Tier 2 activities OR provide evidence of leadership, scholarly/creative activity quality, or expanded scope of the research activities, as indicated by factors such as size of the grant, the quality of publication outlets, leadership roles on projects that produced scholarly products, order of authorship, and the impact of specific scholarly/creative activity designs (e.g., ethnographic, qualitative, and/or longitudinal) that may reasonably elongate publication timelines on particular research projects.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Two or more of the following (Tier 1 activities):<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Peer reviewed publications (or acceptance letter) in journals or symposia. “Received by” date will be used to determine the appropriate merit period. If the submitted article is rejected, substantial revision and resubmission to a different journal may be counted as a Tier I activity the following year.</li><li>b. Publication or submission of books, book chapters, monographs, and review articles.</li><li>c. Successful procurement of an external grant (Principal Investigator or Co-PI). Active work on the external grant counts as a Tier 1 activity for every year of the project period.</li><li>d. Three Tier 2 activities may replace up to one Tier 1 activity.</li></ol></li><li>2. Two or more of the following (Tier 2):<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Any indicator from Tier 1</li><li>b. Presentations at national or international meetings sponsored by professional societies or organizations recognized for leadership in the discipline.</li></ol></li></ol>	4.0-5.0

Evaluation Rating Category	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITY</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Expected levels of accomplishment on scholarly/creative activity performance indicators</b></p>	Possible Merit Score for Scholarly/creative activity
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. Peer-reviewed abstracts published in journals and proceedings of leading societies in the discipline.</li> <li>d. Unfunded research proposals.</li> <li>e. Research funds awarded.</li> <li>f. Digital products, such as software, provided they are published and distributed by a recognized vendor.</li> <li>g. Presentations at state or regional meetings sponsored by professional societies or organizations recognized for leadership in the discipline.</li> <li>h. Substantial professional development activities on- or off-campus. Examples may include in-depth courses or multi-day workshops to develop scholarly/creative activity skills.</li> <li>i. Local presentations.</li> <li>j. Community outreach with evaluation component.</li> </ul>	
Meets expectations for merit	<p>Either #1 OR #2 are required to meet expectations for merit in scholarly/creative activity.</p> <p>To score a “3” in “meets expectations for merit”, faculty must either have one <i>additional</i> indicator from Tier 1 OR two <i>additional</i> indicators from Tier 2 activities OR provide evidence of leadership, scholarly/creative activity quality, or expanded scope of the scholarly/creative activity activities, as indicated by factors such as size of the grant, the quality of publication outlets, leadership roles on projects that produced scholarly products, order of authorship, and the impact of specific scholarly/creative activity designs (e.g., ethnographic, qualitative, and/or longitudinal) that may reasonably elongate publication timelines on particular research projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. One or more of the following (Tier 1 activities): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Peer reviewed publications (or acceptance letter) in journals or symposia. “Received by” date will be used to determine the appropriate merit period. If the submitted article is rejected, substantial revision and resubmission to a different journal may be counted as a Tier I activity the following year.</li> <li>b. Publication or submission of books, book chapters, monographs, and review articles.</li> <li>c. Successful procurement of an external grant (Principal Investigator or Co-PI). Active work on the external grant counts as a Tier 1 activity for every year of the project period.</li> <li>d. Three Tier 2 activities may replace up to one Tier 1 activity.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Three or more of the following:</li> </ul>	2.0-3.9

Evaluation Rating Category	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITY</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Expected levels of accomplishment on scholarly/creative activity performance indicators</b></p>	Possible Merit Score for Scholarly/creative activity
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Any indicator from Tier 1</li> <li>b. Presentations at national or international meetings sponsored by professional societies or organizations recognized for leadership in the discipline.</li> <li>c. Peer-reviewed abstracts published in journals and proceedings of leading societies in the discipline.</li> <li>d. Unfunded research proposals.</li> <li>e. Research funds awarded.</li> <li>f. Digital products, such as software, provided they are published and distributed by a recognized vendor.</li> <li>g. Presentations at state or regional meetings sponsored by professional societies or organizations recognized for leadership in the discipline.</li> <li>h. Substantial professional development activities on- or off-campus. Examples may include in-depth courses or multi-day workshops to develop scholarly/creative activity skills.</li> <li>i. Local presentations.</li> <li>j. Community outreach with evaluation component.</li> </ul>	
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<p>No activity in Tier 1 and fewer than three activities in Tier 2 is consistent with failing to meet expectations for merit in scholarly/creative activity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Tier 2 activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Any indicator from Tier 1</li> <li>b. Presentations at national or international meetings sponsored by professional societies or organizations recognized for leadership in the discipline.</li> <li>c. Peer-reviewed abstracts published in journals and proceedings of leading societies in the discipline.</li> <li>d. Unfunded research proposals.</li> <li>e. Research funds awarded.</li> <li>f. Digital products, such as software, provided they are published and distributed by a recognized vendor.</li> <li>g. Presentations at state or regional meetings sponsored by professional societies or organizations recognized for leadership in the discipline.</li> <li>h. Substantial professional development activities on- or off-campus. Examples may include in-depth courses or multi-day workshops to develop scholarly/creative activity skills.</li> <li>i. Local presentations.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	1.0-1.9



Evaluation Rating Category	<b>SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITY</b>  <b>Expected levels of accomplishment on scholarly/creative activity performance indicators</b>	<b>Possible Merit Score for Scholarly/ creative activity</b>
	j. Community outreach with evaluation component.	
Unacceptable	No materials submitted.	0-0.9

**Merit Score for Scholarly/Creative Activity (to be completed by Merit Committee member): \_\_\_\_\_**

## Service

Pre-Specified Allocation of Effort for Service: 10% for TTF, 20% for QRF

Service will be evaluated using the minimum five rating levels, the following evaluation concepts would be included: Less than 1= “unacceptable” performance; 1 = Does not meet expectations for merit; 2/3 = Meets expectations for merit; 4/5 = Exceeds expectations for merit.

### **Service Expectations Rubric:**

<b>Evaluation Rating Category</b>	<b>SERVICE</b>  <b>Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators</b>	<b>Possible Merit Score for SERVICE</b>
Exceeds expectations for merit	<p>Criteria for #1 (Internal service) AND #2 (External service) are required to exceed expectations for merit in Service. For consideration of “5”, evidence of substantial contributions such as leadership positions, total time commitment, number of activities above the minimum in each category, etc. is required.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Participation in four or more of the following (Internal service) activities. At least one must come from the activities listed in “g”. Examples are not all inclusive:<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Appointment/election and service on College Committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like.</li><li>b. Appointment/election and service on University Committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like.</li><li>c. Special projects by assignment from Chair, Dean, Provost, or President.</li><li>d. Evidence of contributions to the recruitment and retention of undergraduate and/or graduate students, and placement of graduates (as appropriate).</li><li>e. Serve as faculty advisor to student club or organization.</li><li>f. Serve and actively participate on faculty search and/or annual symposium planning committees.</li><li>g. Participation in internal activities such as commencement, orientation, homecoming activities, recruitment activities, advising activities, or other comparable activities.</li></ol></li><li>2. Three or more of the following (External service). Examples are not all inclusive:<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Participation in agency boards of directors or advisory boards.</li></ol></li></ol>	4.0-5.0

Evaluation Rating Category	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SERVICE</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators</b></p>	Possible Merit Score for SERVICE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. Organization of professional conferences, symposia, etc.</li> <li>c. Peer review for academic journals and/or reviewer for extramural funding agencies</li> <li>d. Participation in activities that enhance one's profession (e.g., licensure activities, professional supervision).</li> <li>e. Membership and active involvement with professional organizations connected to discipline at the local, state, national, or international levels.</li> </ul>	
Meets expectations for merit	<p>Criteria for #1 (Internal service) AND #2 (External service) are required to meet expectations for merit in Service. For consideration of “3”, evidence of substantial contributions such as leadership positions, total time commitment, number of activities above the minimum in each category, etc. is required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Participation in two or more of the following (Internal service) activities. At least one must come from the activities listed in “g”. Examples are not all inclusive:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Appointment/election and service on College Committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like.</li> <li>b. Appointment/election and service on University Committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like.</li> <li>c. Special projects by assignment from Chair, Dean, Provost, or President.</li> <li>d. Evidence of contributions to the recruitment and retention of undergraduate and/or graduate students, and placement of graduates (as appropriate).</li> <li>e. Serve as faculty advisor to student club or organization.</li> <li>f. Serve and actively participate on faculty search and/or annual symposium planning committees.</li> <li>g. Participation in internal activities such as commencement, orientation, homecoming activities, recruitment activities, advising activities, or other comparable activities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. One or two of the following (External service). Examples are not all inclusive:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Participation in agency boards of directors or</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2.0-3.9

Evaluation Rating Category	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SERVICE</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators</b></p>	Possible Merit Score for SERVICE
	<p style="text-align: center;">advisory boards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. Organization of professional conferences, symposia, etc.</li> <li>c. Peer review for academic journals and/or reviewer for extramural funding agencies</li> <li>d. Participation in activities that enhance one's profession (e.g., licensure activities, professional supervision).</li> <li>e. Membership and active involvement with professional organizations connected to discipline at the local, state, national, or international levels.</li> </ul>	
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<p>One or fewer internal service activities and no external service activities is consistent with failing to meet expectations for merit in service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. One or fewer of the following (Internal service). Examples are not all inclusive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Appointment/election and service on College Committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like.</li> <li>b. Appointment/election and service on University Committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like.</li> <li>c. Special projects by assignment from Chair, Dean, Provost, or President.</li> <li>d. Evidence of contributions to the recruitment and retention of undergraduate and/or graduate students, and placement of graduates (as appropriate).</li> <li>e. Serve as faculty advisor to student club or organization.</li> <li>f. Serve and actively participate on faculty search and/or annual symposium planning committees.</li> <li>g. Participation in internal activities such as commencement, orientation, homecoming activities, recruitment activities, advising activities, or other comparable activities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. One of the following (External service). Examples are not all inclusive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Participation in agency boards of directors or advisory boards.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	1.0-1.9

Evaluation Rating Category	<b>SERVICE</b>  <b>Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators</b>	Possible Merit Score for SERVICE
	b. Organization of professional conferences, symposia, etc. c. Peer review for academic journals and/or reviewer for extramural funding agencies d. Participation in activities that enhance one's profession (e.g., licensure activities, professional supervision). e. Membership and active involvement with professional organizations connected to discipline at the local, state, national, or international levels.	
Unacceptable	No materials submitted.	0.0-0.9

**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)

Faculty Member	Merit Score for Teaching	Merit Score for Scholarly/Creative Activity	Merit Score for Service

**3-Year Rolling Average Score: \_\_\_\_\_**

### **Merit Committee Composition and the Election/Appointment Process**

The PAH Merit Committee is responsible for assigning an Overall Merit Score to every Bargaining Unit Faculty Member. The three members need to represent each of the disciplinary units (Food and Nutrition, Medical Laboratory Sciences, Public Health) and be department full-time faculty for at least 2 years. At least one member must be tenured. The committee members will be elected by the department full-time faculty.

All department faculty members must electronically submit a copy of their PAH Annual Merit Portfolio according to University deadlines.

### **Calculation of Overall Merit Score**

A 5-point scale is used for merit evaluations. Ratings of less than 2.0 are not considered for merit. Ratings of 2.0 or greater are considered for merit. A description of how the Overall Merit Score is calculated is provided below.

The individual component merit scores for Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service are combined to arrive at an Overall Merit Score. Allocation of effort is taken into account when determining Overall Merit Score. This must clearly identify whether the overall merit rating reflects performance that is unacceptable, fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

A three-year rolling average is used to determine merit-based salary increases. Merit score for the current review period is averaged with the merit scores from the previous two merit periods.

The Department uses the following method to evaluate faculty for merit.

1. A 5-point scale is used for merit evaluations.
2. Merit Committee averages the Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service scores from each committee member and then submits individual ratings for Teaching, Scholarly/creative activity, and Service for each PAH full-time faculty member.
3. The final scores of each category are multiplied by the PAH allocation of effort percentages (for TTF: 60% teaching, 30% scholarly/creative activity, 10% service; for TTF with administrative responsibilities: 40% teaching, 30% scholarly/creative activity, 10% service, 20% administration; for QRF: 80% teaching, 20% service). Percentages for faculty with alternative allocations of effort will be adjusted.
4. Scores from each category are added together for the Total Individual Merit Score. A faculty member falling below 2 points in any category is disqualified from receiving merit, no matter how high their Total Individual Merit Score.
5. Total Individual Merit Score recommendations are compiled by the Chair and forwarded to the Dean.
6. The Dean informs each faculty member of their Total Individual Merit Score.

<b>Overall Merit Score</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
Less than 1	“Unacceptable” performance; Recommendation for no merit
1	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
2-3	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation
4-5	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit

**Merit Score Interpretation:**

### **Elements of the Annual Merit Portfolio**

The Annual Merit Portfolio should contain an up-to-date Curriculum Vitae (CV, in the standard BGSU format) and the following elements in each of the three components (Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service) from the past academic year. The Merit Portfolio should contain only information based on the preceding academic year of work (not three-year rolling averages).

#### *Teaching Component of Portfolio*

1. A list of courses taught over the past academic year. For clinical teaching, a list of numbers of students supervised per semester.
2. Student rating summary sheets (detailed report with qualitative comments) and syllabi for all courses taught, and for any clinical teaching assignments, over the past academic year.
3. A list of other instructional activities.
4. Self-reflection/analysis of performance based on student ratings and any other factors the faculty member wishes to include. See Appendix 1.

#### *Scholarly/Creative Activity Component of Portfolio*

1. A numbered list of scholarly/creative activity success indicators organized by tier. It is advisable to also include a narrative description of research success indicators to describe elements such as size of the grant, quality of publication outlets, leadership roles, order of authorship, impact of specific research designs, etc., to assist the committee in assigning scores (i.e., “5” vs “4”). See Appendix 2.

#### *Service Component of Portfolio*

1. A numbered list of service activities organized by setting (internal and external). It is advisable to also include a narrative description of service activities to describe elements such as leadership positions, responsibilities, frequency of meetings, total time commitment, number of activities above the minimum in each category, etc. to assist the committee in assigning scores (i.e., “5” vs “4”). See Appendix 3.



### **Evaluation Procedure**

The Merit Committee will take into consideration each faculty member's allocation of effort in determining a merit score for each area. QRF lacking allocation of effort to scholarly/creative activity need not be evaluated in this area. TTF faculty with different allocations of effort to scholarly/creative activity must be evaluated with this differential in mind; those with lesser allocations of effort to scholarly/creative activity have lower expectations for productivity than those with greater allocations of effort to scholarly/creative activity.

The Merit Committee is charged with evaluating portfolios submitted by Bargaining Unit Faculty Members and transmitting a Merit Score for each, with a written rationale and an overall recommendation for merit scores, to the Chair and uploaded into the electronic review system. The Chair will conduct an independent Merit evaluation.

### **Evaluations of Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service**

The Merit Committee will evaluate the Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service of each continuing faculty member and submit their recommendations to the Chair and uploaded into the electronic review system as prescribed below.

1. Study PAH Annual Merit Portfolios of all continuing full-time faculty.
2. Produce 3 independent sets of ratings for Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service for each continuing full-time faculty member who has submitted a Merit Portfolio.
3. The Merit Committee rates each full-time faculty member on a 5-point scale (Less than 1= “unacceptable” performance; 1 = Does not meet expectations for merit; 2/3 = Meets expectations for merit; 4/5 = Exceeds expectations for merit). The Merit Committee does not produce percentages or dollar figures.
4. The Merit Committee will produce a rolling 3-yr average at the end of the rubric using previous years’ data provided by the Dean’s office.
5. The Merit Committee Chair forwards ratings to the Department Chair.
6. The Department Chair uses the Merit Committee findings as described in the “Calculation of Overall Merit Score” section.

### **Consideration for Varying Allocations of Effort**

The Chair must inform the Merit Committee in writing of any faculty members who are assigned an allocation of effort differing from the normal percentages. Likewise, members of the Merit Committee must take these variances into consideration in their evaluations.

### **Additional Academic Unit Merit Policy Information**

None.

Approved by the Department of Public and Allied Health on 09/17/2025.

Approved by:

Carrie Hamady  
[Carrie Hamady \(Jan 3, 2025 14:46 EST\)](#)

Department Chair, Public and Allied Health

.. Jane R Hesler

Dean, College of Health and Human Services

Glenn Davis  
[Glenn Davis \(Jan 3, 2025 16:53 EST\)](#)

Interim Provost and Senior Vice President

01/03/2025

Date

01/03/2025

Date

01/03/2025

Date

**Appendix 1: Template for teaching component of merit portfolio**

**Courses Taught and Student Rating Summary**

<b>Semester</b>	<b>Course</b>	<b>Number of Students (Response Rate)</b>	<b>Instructor Score</b>	<b>Maximum Possible Score</b>
Fall 'XX				
Spring 'XX				5***
Summer 'XX				5***
<b>Overall Mean</b> <b>Undergraduate Mean</b> <b>Graduate Mean</b>				5***

\*\*\*Scores are based on a 5-point Likert scale with 1=strongly disagree (lowest) to 5=strongly agree (highest).

**Qualitative Comments from Students**

**(List all qualitative comments from students if using as evidence of teaching quality)**

Additional footnotes may be used to help put the scores into context, such as COVID-19, first time teaching course online, using a new pedagogy, etc.

## **Appendix 2: Template for scholarly/creative activity component of merit portfolio**

### **20XX-20XX Indicators of Scholarly/Creative Activity Success**

#### **Tier 1**

*Peer-reviewed publications, books, and book chapters -Accepted*  
[Numbered list]

*Externally Funded Grants (awarded and/or active)*  
[Numbered list]

#### **Tier 2**

*Peer-reviewed publications under review*  
[Numbered list]

*Presentations or abstracts at national or international meetings*  
[Numbered list]

*Poster presentations at national or international meetings*  
[Numbered list]

*Presentations or abstracts at state or regional meetings*  
[Numbered list]

*Poster presentations at state or regional meetings*  
[Numbered list]

*Unfunded research proposals*  
[Numbered list]

*Other*  
[Numbered list]

**Narrative description of scholarly/creative activity success indicators to describe elements such as size of the grant, quality of publication outlets, leadership roles, order of authorship, impact of specific research designs, etc., to assist the committee (optional):**

### **Appendix 3: Template for service component of merit portfolio**

#### **20XX-20XX Service Activities**

##### **Internal service activities**

[Numbered list]

##### **External service activities**

[Numbered list]

**Narrative description of service activities to describe elements such as leadership positions, responsibilities, frequency of meetings, total time commitment, number of activities above the minimum in each category, etc. to assist the committee in assigning scores (i.e., “5” vs “4”). (optional):**











# Approved PAH Merit Policy August 2024 - FINAL 1-2-2025xx (002)

Final Audit Report

2025-01-03

Created:	2025-01-03
By:	Kimberly Caris (kcaris@bgsu.edu)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAVNAXEkpygomzKSTDRmyV11LqSRaoJHDr

## "Approved PAH Merit Policy August 2024 - FINAL 1-2-2025xx (002)" History

-  Document created by Kimberly Caris (kcaris@bgsu.edu)  
2025-01-03 - 7:38:41 PM GMT- IP address: 129.1.193.98
-  Document emailed to Carrie Hamady (carrieh@bgsu.edu) for signature  
2025-01-03 - 7:39:52 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Carrie Hamady (carrieh@bgsu.edu)  
2025-01-03 - 7:45:12 PM GMT- IP address: 134.228.64.228
-  Document e-signed by Carrie Hamady (carrieh@bgsu.edu)  
Signature Date: 2025-01-03 - 7:46:20 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 134.228.64.228
-  Document emailed to James Ciesla (jciesla@bgsu.edu) for signature  
2025-01-03 - 7:46:21 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by James Ciesla (jciesla@bgsu.edu)  
2025-01-03 - 9:08:12 PM GMT- IP address: 73.211.226.149
-  Document e-signed by James Ciesla (jciesla@bgsu.edu)  
Signature Date: 2025-01-03 - 9:09:30 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 73.211.226.149
-  Document emailed to Glenn Davis (gmdavis@bgsu.edu) for signature  
2025-01-03 - 9:09:32 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Glenn Davis (gmdavis@bgsu.edu)  
2025-01-03 - 9:52:18 PM GMT- IP address: 129.1.73.168
-  Document e-signed by Glenn Davis (gmdavis@bgsu.edu)  
Signature Date: 2025-01-03 - 9:53:12 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 129.1.73.168

✔ Agreement completed.

2025-01-03 - 9:53:12 PM GMT