

Merit Document
School of Media and Communication

Preamble

Merit raises refer to the component of salary raises that are provided to school bargaining unit faculty members who meet or exceed their assigned unit performance expectations. In any given year, it is possible that all of the Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in an academic unit may be eligible for merit salary raises. Merit is calculated during spring semester based on performance during the previous calendar year. Merit salary raises are added to base salary for the ensuing fiscal year (on September 1 for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members on 9-month contracts, and on July 1 for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members on 12-month contracts).

Merit eligibility for faculty members will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations for merit in the school in the following areas: Teaching, Research/Creative Work, and Service. Each faculty member will receive an overall merit score that will identify whether s/he did not meet, met, or exceeded expectations for merit. The overall merit score will include five or more categories or rating levels to allow for greater discrimination among levels of performance; each of the categories or rating levels on the overall merit score must clearly identify whether it does not meet expectations for merit, meets expectations for merit, or exceeds expectations for merit. For example, using the minimum five categories or rating levels, the following evaluation concepts would be included: 1 = Does not meet expectations for merit; 2/3 = Meets expectations for merit; 4/5 = Exceeds expectations for merit.

Both the merit committee of the academic unit and the director may make recommendations to the Dean for allocation of merit dollars and/or percentages. However, as provided for by Section 11.2 of Article 17 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the Dean is not bound by such recommendations and the determination of the actual merit increase is within the Dean's reasonable discretion.

1. Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations, and Calculation of Merit Scores

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 Appendix A.

2. General Procedure for Faculty Evaluation and Score of Merit

- 2.1 Prior to the beginning of the calendar year, each faculty member will confirm his/her allocation of effort (e.g., 50/30/20 for teaching, scholarship, and service) with the director.
- 2.2 The school merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. The merit committee is composed of four faculty members: one **tenured** faculty member is elected from each of the three departments and one NTTF faculty member elected by all full-time NTTF faculty members in the school. Terms are for two years, staggered such that the committee is composed of two newly elected members and two returning members. Individuals may serve more than one term. The department chairs may not be members of the merit committee.

The committee shall elect a chair from the returning members. It is the responsibility of the committee chair to organize meetings, collect and compile scores and inform individuals and the director of the scores on teaching, research, and service as well as the composite score.

All committee members will, independently, provide a score of 1 to 5 in the areas of teaching and service. Only the tenured members will provide a score on research. In the case of a conflict of interest, (e.g., a spouse) a faculty member will recuse him/herself from that specific case and the remaining committee members will provide scores. Similarly, committee members will not provide scores for themselves.

After scores have been assigned, the committee will meet to discuss scores. Based on the discussion, individual committee members may choose to change scores. It is not necessary, however, for the committee to reach a consensus on the scores. After discussion and revision of scores (if any), the merit committee chair will compile the overall score. That is, all scores in each category are averaged and that average is then multiplied by the AOE. (See section 2.5).

2.3 Faculty members who fail to submit a merit portfolio by the deadline will receive an automatic rating of “does not meet expectations” and will not be eligible for a merit salary increase or the market adjustment from the Fixed Market Pool (Article 17, section 7.1).

2.4 The submitted merit dossier must include the elements listed below (This list is repeated in Appendix B):

1. Updated vita in BGSU format with merit activities highlighted.
2. College AFR and any materials required by the college. (Reminder: the AFR should report all activity completed during the previous calendar year, regardless of whether an activity counts toward merit.)
3. Merit worksheet (Appendix C) which indicates AOE and includes a list of research accomplishments to be considered for merit. For each item listed, the faculty member should indicate **the type of work** (e.g., conference paper, scholarly book chapter, double-blinded refereed journal article etc.) and the **status of the work** (e.g., in press, under review). The faculty member may also choose to include quality indicators such as impact factors, rejection rates and the like. The member must provide appropriate documentation for research items (e.g., letter of acceptance, copy of page of conference program, etc.). Items without appropriate documentation will not be considered.
4. Optional Commentary and Optional Materials. If some activities or outcomes require more explanation than the vita or AFR provides, the faculty member MAY attach brief explanatory narratives for any category. Also, the faculty member may submit supplemental teaching materials.
5. **The prior year’s merit worksheet (ITEM 3 ABOVE) of research accomplishments that were considered for merit in the previous year, as in most cases an item can only be counted once.**

2.5 Weighted Allocation of Effort (AOE) Algorithm

Once the merit committee has arrived at 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:

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

For example, in the case of a faculty member whose allocation of effort is 40 percent teaching, 40 percent research and 20 percent service:

	Teaching (.40)	Research (.40)	Service (.20)	Overall Merit Score
Score by CM 1	5	3	2	
Score by CM 2	5	3	1	
Score by CM 3	4	4	3	
Score by CM 4	5	3	2	
Average score	4.75	3.25	2	
AOE Multiplier	.4 * 4.75	.4 * 3.25	.2 * 2	
AOE Score	1.9 +	1.3+	0.4	3.6 (Exceeds Expectations)

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation
1.0 - 1.4	Does not meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
1.5 - 3.4	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
3.5 - 5.0	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit

2.6 An academic unit may report its merit score recommendation to no greater than one-tenth decimal place.

3. Significant Dates for Merit Consideration and Appeals

January 31: Last date for faculty merit dossiers to be submitted to an academic unit.

The merit committee of the academic unit is urged to work informally with all faculty being reviewed to resolve any factual or interpretive issues in advance of making recommendations to the director.

February 28: Academic unit faculty committee's merit score recommendation to the director (with a copy to the faculty member).

March 7: Last date for faculty members to appeal the committee's recommendation to the director (with a copy to the committee).

March 31: Director's merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copies to the committee and faculty members).

April 7: Last date for faculty member to appeal the director's merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copy to the director). The faculty member may raise in any appeal to the Dean: (i) the director's merit score recommendation, and (ii) only those aspects of the committee's recommendation that the faculty member has previously raised in the appeal to the director. Issues related to the committee's recommendation not raised previously with the director (where the faculty member either knew or through the exercise of reasonable diligence should have known) are not preserved for appeal to the Dean, shall not be considered by the Dean, and shall not be the basis or grounds for any grievance by the BGSU-FA.

April 30: Dean's recommendation to the Provost. Thereafter the Provost and Dean may confer through on or about May 19.

On or about May 20: Dean issues final determination regarding merit.

4. Special Circumstances

4.1 Consideration of Special Circumstances as Required by the Collective Bargaining Agreement

4.1.1 Faculty Exchange Leave (Article 21, Section II: subsection 1.7). Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consultation with the host institution.

4.1.2 Leaves with Extramural Salary Paid through the University Payroll System (Article 21, Section III: subsection 1.3). Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consultation with the sponsoring government agency or private foundation.

4.1.3 Unpaid Leave - 100% time (Article 21, Section IV: subsection 5). Faculty members will not be eligible for merit in any calendar year for which 100% unpaid leave was taken that is unrelated to Family Medical Leave. If related to Family Medical Leave, performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.

4.1.4 Sick Leave (Article 21, Section VIII: subsection 9.1). Performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated for faculty members on sick leave for 40 or more days during the calendar year.

4.1.5 Parental Leave (Article 21, Section IX: subsection 3). Unit Faculty Member who takes parental leave under this Article will only be evaluated for performance during the time in which he or she was not on parental leave (including use of sick leave in addition to parental leave). Performance expectations for merit evaluations that are expressed quantitatively shall be prorated. The Department Chair's/School Director's evaluation shall include a description of the methods used for prorating.

4.1.6 Partial Unpaid Leave – 50% time (Article 21, Section X: subsection 3.3) Faculty members will not be eligible for merit in any calendar year for which 50% unpaid leave was taken that is unrelated to Family Medical Leave. If related to Family Medical Leave, performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.

4.1.7 Faculty Improvement Leave (Article 22, Section 7.3.3) Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consideration of the report submitted to the President detailing accomplishments during the FIL.

4.2 Consideration of Other Special Circumstances

4.2.1 New Faculty Hires. New faculty members whose employment begins in the fall semester shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. Performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.

4.2.2 The unit's faculty advisory body may also consider special circumstances not covered in 4.1 above and make a recommendation to the unit chair or director. Such exceptional circumstances might include a leave without pay to take a short-term research appointment, a leave without pay to participate in professional development, or other leave without pay that enhances the productivity of the faculty member and the reputation of the institution.

5. Amendment of Merit Policy

The unit faculty may amend performance indicators, performance expectations, and the methods for combining this information into both component and overall merit scores at any time. Amendments to the merit policy must be approved by the Dean and Provost/SVPAA. Approved amendments to the merit policy shall not be applied retroactively in the calculation of the previous year's merit scores.

6. Additional Information

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to report materials accurately. Committee members may seek clarification or additional information if needed. Faculty members have some discretion as to when to submit publications for merit. For example, a faculty member may choose to report a journal article upon acceptance or when published. Three-year rolling averages are not permitted; (Article 17, Section 11.1.3).

Approved by the School of Media and Communication on October 12, 2015


 Laura Stafford, Director

Date October 12, 2015

Approved:


 Ray Craig, Dean of College of Arts and Sciences

Date 10/13/15

Approved:


 Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP

Date 10/15/15

APPENDIX A

Overview

Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the school member on the following performance criteria: Teaching, Research/Creative Work, 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). General criteria are enumerated below. The criteria listed are meant as general guidelines for merit expectations rather than strict criteria.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to report materials fully and accurately. When issues of documentation, erroneous or incomplete information, or quality are raised, relevant information may be sought and considered.

Merit committee members will then meet as a committee to review and arrive at component scores and an overall score for each of the relevant performance criteria using the summary form provided. (Appendix D).

The component scores must clearly identify whether the assigned score on the criteria (e.g., teaching) reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

Teaching

Domains used in the evaluation of teaching include: undergraduate teaching, graduate teaching, instructional development, and other contributions to student learning, and they may include teaching initiatives involving engagement/service learning.

Scholarship/Creative Work

Given that the School is a Ph.D.-granting program within a RU/H university, research productivity is expected of tenured and tenure-track faculty. It is also expected that individuals will maintain an active program of research. Therefore, taking the lead on research—as evidenced by order of authorship—is weighted more heavily than being a contributing author. (In the case of an article having multiple co-authors, order of authorship may be ignored when a note of equal contribution appears within the publication). Unless specified in an offer letter or otherwise, there is generally no research expectation on the part of instructors, lecturers, or senior lecturers. In regard to publications, indicators of quality such as impact factors, competitiveness such as blind refereed and acceptance rates, prestige, visibility and the like.

The school considers the term “creative work” to mean “creative scholarship.” Creative Scholarship comprises academic scholarship that cannot be presented or expressed effectively in traditional academic publications. It is *original*, *significant* in content and theme, *coherent*, and *complete* as an academic/artistic entity. It advances the field not only in terms of content but also presentation. When submitted for merit consideration, such artistic work must be clearly related to and arise from scholarship in media and communication. Additionally, such work must be juried, blind reviewed, or otherwise commensurately evaluated.

As with traditional research, acceptance of creative work as an important intellectual activity involves review and evaluation by peers. Contests and festivals provide one avenue for review, because they normally employ panels of expert judges to select the work that will be honored or screened. Because those outside the communication field may not understand the review process involved in these events, information about the contest or festival is important to include in the dossier. This information should include the year the festival or contest was established, the number of entries in the event (if known), the number of works selected to receive recognition or prizes, the venues in which the selection was screened, etc. If available, a copy of the evaluation criteria would also be helpful to reviewers both inside and outside the field. In addition, subsequent reviews of the work that might appear in either scholarly or popular publications could provide insight into the value of the work and should be included in the dossier. Originality of the creative scholarship is highly valued in determining the quality of creative scholarship.

Because of electronic media production format constraints, some production works in non-conventional formats are difficult to get distributed even though their high quality has been demonstrated in professional competitions. Hence the number of venues in which the production was shown should not be used as the sole criterion of the contribution of the creative scholarship. Evaluators should take this factor into consideration.

Another indication of the value of the work is the decision to distribute a creative work to the community outside the university through established commercial or public media channels. In the realm of traditional scholarship, this is akin to the selection for anthologies and

is recognition of worth. These selections are generally made by a number of knowledgeable professionals at various levels, who are experienced in evaluating creative work and can readily recognize excellence, discovery, and innovation in the use of media form and the value of content for the society at large.

Generally, materials may only count in one merit review period (e.g., a manuscript accepted in one year and in press, published, or presented the next year will only count in one year). However, it is up to the faculty member's discretion as to which year to report each item (i.e., the year accepted, the year in press, or the year of actual publication). As noted above, each year the faculty member must provide a list of materials submitted the prior year.

Given the nature of scholarly books, it is possible to consider markers of progress on books in separate years. For example, the receipt of a contract based upon a substantive proposal (e.g., draft chapters) might count one year, additional draft chapters under review might count in another year and the publication of the book in yet a different year. Various stages of the same book may not count for more than three years.

Similarly, given the nature of creative scholarship, it should be noted that creative endeavors may be—and indeed, are intended to be—exhibited multiple times. Thus, each juried exhibition entry will be counted as one piece of creative scholarship. Thus, the same piece of creative scholarship may be counted for up to three years when it is exhibited in different juried exhibitions in those years.

General criteria follow. These are meant as guidelines to help inform evaluations for merit. A member's overall research productivity including involvement in data collection or field work and work in progress should be taken into account in making merit decisions.

Service

Service to the department, school, college, university, profession and community is critical to the overall mission of the University and is included under this category. A wide range of activities can contribute to a faculty member receiving an evaluation of meets expectations for service.

The least service expectations are placed on probationary faculty. Greater expectations of providing leadership (committee officer, policymaking, and program leadership) are placed on tenured faculty, lecturers, senior lecturers, and instructors who have had at least two EPRs (enhanced performance reviews).

Service also includes performance of any assigned administrative responsibilities including those duties handled by faculty serving as department chairs. A clear description of administrative assignments, how the assignment fits into overall workload, and specific outcomes of administrative assignments should be provided by the faculty member.

University Service

These activities include participation in departmental, school, college, or University committees including governing bodies, Faculty Association participation and leadership, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like. In reporting, service at the unit level is distinguished from broader college/university service.

Performance indicators used to evaluate university service may include:

- amount of time devoted to activities
- significance and scope of activities
- degree of active involvement
- leadership positions held

Community Service

Faculty members sometimes lend their professional expertise to collaborations with external entities that contribute to the well-being of the larger community. To be considered as service appropriate for merit considerations, such external activities must draw upon a faculty member's professional expertise. Faculty members may participate fully in civic and community life as citizens, but they need to recognize that not all such activities will be viewed as service. Service must be directly related to their professional expertise for merit consideration.

Performance indicators used to evaluate community service may include:

- relevant activities and professional contributions (e.g., a research presentation)
- degree of active involvement; significance and scope of involvement in each activity; evidence of contributions and achievements
- leadership positions held

Professional Service

These activities include a faculty member's membership and active involvement with professional organizations connected to his/her discipline at the local, state, national, or international levels. Performance indicators used to evaluate professional service may include:

- service to private or extramural funding agencies
- participation in professional associations and/or at professional meetings and conferences (e.g., moderating or chairing a panel)
- leadership positions held in professional associations
- time spent on fulfilling professional service obligations
- organization of professional conferences, symposia, and the like
- journal or conference paper reviews
- editorship or associate editorship of a professional journal

Performance Indicators

The performance indicators shown below are illustrative, not exhaustive. Nor should they be construed as mere checklists. The merit committee will appraise the overall levels of quality and quantity of performance, engagement, and contributions that faculty members demonstrate in teaching, research, and service. The totality of evidence will inform the overall scores in each of these three domains. **In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the school consider any other evidence of achievement that is appropriate to his/her specific case. The following are meant as general guidelines.**

TEACHING	
Merit Score for Teaching: each committee member must assign an integer from 1 to 5	
<p>Evaluation Rating Category</p> <p>Exceeds expectations for merit 4,5</p>	<p>5 - Meets the baseline expectations for a score of 2 and engages in at least three* of the activities listed in level 3 (or equivalent).</p> <p>4 - Meets the baseline expectations for a score of 2 and engages in at least two* of the activities listed below in level 3 (or equivalent).</p> <p>*Multiple items in the same category may count multiple times. For example, engagement in two significant professional development activities counts as two activities.</p> <p>Teaching evaluations shall also be taken into consideration. Though quantitative scores are by no means the only factor considered in exceeding expectations, it is expected that quantitative teaching evaluations will generally be strong (typically better than a 2.0 on our 5-point scale) in order to receive a merit score of 4 or 5.</p>
<p>Evaluation Rating Category</p> <p>Meets expectations for merit 2,3</p>	<p>3 - Meets the baseline expectations for a score of 2 and engages in at least one of the activities listed (or equivalent).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direction of undergraduate honors project and/or thesis and/or dissertation and/or MA project that leads to student or student team publication in a scholarly journal • Course curriculum modification or development • Engagement in teaching-related professional development activity • Publication of a textbook/significant revision of a textbook/chapter(s) in edited textbook • Academic advising and/or mentoring in quality and/or numbers of undergraduate and/or graduate students (for example, more than the unit average) • Teaching a Service Learning Course that is recognized by the BGSU office of Service Learning • Supervision of an independent study project • Direction of undergraduate honors project or direction of undergraduate research • Internship supervision <p>Teaching evaluations shall also be taken into consideration. Though such scores are by no means the only factor considered in meeting expectations, it is expected that quantitative teaching evaluations will generally be strong (typically better than a 2.5 on our 5-point scale).</p>

<p>Does not meet expectations for merit</p> <p>1</p>	<p>2 – Meets baseline expectations.</p> <p>For all faculty, baseline duties include holding classes as scheduled, providing an adequate syllabus and course of instruction that corresponds to the curriculum and course level, posting and keeping office hours, assigning projects/papers that are suitable for the course content and level, providing feedback in a reasonable time frame throughout the course, providing a timely final grade, offering students the opportunity to evaluate the instructor/course through a standardized instrument, advising undergraduate students, and conducting their teaching according to the university codes and professional standards.</p> <p>Teaching evaluations shall also be taken into consideration. Though such scores are by no means the only factor considered in meeting expectations, it is expected that quantitative teaching evaluations will generally be strong (typically better than a 2.5 on our 5-point scale).</p> <p>For graduate faculty, baseline duties also include participation in the graduate program, such as chairing or serving on graduate student committees, grading qualifying exam questions, and the like.</p>
	<p>1 – Evidence of failure to perform one or more of the basic duties of instruction outlined under meeting expectations.</p>

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORK	
Merit Score for Scholarship/Creative Work: each committee member must assign an integer from 1 to 5	
Multiple items in the same category may count multiple times. For example, two co-authored scholarly book chapters would satisfy the criteria for a score of 5.	
Evaluation Rating Category	
Exceeds expectations for merit 4,5	<p>If research is part of the AOE, at a level of 40% (the typical research AOE for a graduate faculty member):</p> <p>5 - The faculty member should achieve <u>ONE</u> of the following (or equivalent) as the lead or sole author/creator**</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a full-length original article in a scholarly journal of high quality as indicated by impact factors, competitiveness (e.g., being double-blind refereed and having low acceptance rates), prestige, visibility and the like. Research in brief is typically not considered in this category. • a major scholarly book chapter as indicated by the prestige of the series or publisher (e.g., a state-of-the-art handbook chapter) • a scholarly book published by a reputable publisher. Counts as 5 only when the copy-editing is completed (i.e., galley proofs) or the book is actually published. • be a PI on a funded external research grant of any amount • be a co-PI on a funded external research grant exceeding \$50,000 or more • juried/peer reviewed creative scholarship (e.g., documentary, audio or video production) in a significant/prestigious venue <p>*For manuscripts/creative works with multiple contributors, the member may occupy any authorship position when a note of equal contribution appears within the publication.</p>
	<p>If research is part of the AOE, at a level of 20% (the typical research AOE for a tenured faculty member without graduate faculty status):</p> <p>5- The faculty member should achieve <u>ONE</u> of the following (or equivalent) as the lead or sole author/creator**</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a full-length original article in a scholarly journal of high quality as indicated by impact factors, competitiveness (e.g., being double-blind refereed and having low acceptance rates), prestige, visibility and the like. Research in brief is typically not considered in this category. • a major scholarly book chapter as indicated by the prestige of the series or publisher (e.g., a state-of-the-art handbook chapter) • a scholarly book published by a reputable publisher. Counts as 5 only when the copy-editing is completed (i.e., galley proofs) or the book is actually published. • be a PI on a funded external research grant of any amount • be a co-PI on a funded external research grant exceeding \$50,000 or more • juried/peer reviewed creative scholarship (e.g., documentary, audio or video production) in a significant/prestigious venue <p>*For manuscripts/creative works with multiple contributors, the member may occupy any authorship position when a note of equal contribution appears within the publication.</p>

	<p>5 (continued)</p> <p><u>OR</u> be a less than equal contributing author to any <u>THO</u> of the following (or equivalent)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a full-length original article in a scholarly journal of high quality as indicated by impact factors, competitiveness (e.g., being double-blind refereed and having low acceptance rates), prestige, visibility and the like. Research in brief is typically not considered in this category. • be a co-PI on a funded external research grant of any amount • a major scholarly book chapter (e.g., a state of the art handbook chapter) • a scholarly book <p><u>OR</u> be a sole, lead or contributing author/editor/PI/CO-PI of any <u>THREE</u> of the following (or equivalent):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a double-blind, refereed publication in any subscription-based or open access scholarly journal (excluding pay-to-publish journals) • an invited original article in a subscription-based or open access journals (excluding pay-to-publish journals) • a funded external research grant • a scholarly book • a scholarly book chapter • served as an editor of a scholarly book of original manuscripts • have received a contract to write a scholarly book based upon a substantive proposal (e.g., draft chapters) • have additional draft chapters of a contracted scholarly book completed for editor review • peer reviewed paper or panel accepted for presentation, or presented at a conference • peer reviewed conference proceedings • a manuscript that has received a revise and resubmit status and is resubmitted • an external grant application under review 	<p>5 (continued)</p> <p><u>OR</u> be a less than equal contributing author to any <u>ONE</u> of the following (or equivalent)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a full-length original article in a scholarly journal of high quality as indicated by impact factors, competitiveness (e.g., being double-blind refereed and having low acceptance rates), prestige, visibility and the like. Research in brief is typically not considered in this category. • be a co-PI on a funded external research grant of any amount • a major scholarly book chapter (e.g., a state of the art handbook chapter) • a scholarly book <p><u>OR</u> be a sole, lead or contributing author/editor/PI/CO-PI of any <u>TWO</u> of the following (or equivalent):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a double-blind, refereed publication in any subscription-based or open access scholarly journal (excluding pay-to-publish journals) • an invited original article in a subscription-based or open access journals (excluding pay-to-publish journals) • a funded external research grant • a scholarly book • a scholarly book chapter • served as an editor of a scholarly book of original manuscripts • have received a contract to write a scholarly book based upon a substantive proposal (e.g., draft chapters) • have additional draft chapters of a contracted scholarly book completed for editor review • peer reviewed paper or panel accepted for presentation, or presented at a conference • peer reviewed conference proceedings • a manuscript that has received a revise and resubmit status and is resubmitted • an external grant application under review

	<p>4- The faculty member should have at least one of the following (or equivalent):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a double-blind, refereed article in any subscription-based or open access scholarly journal (excluding pay-to-publish journals) • a chapter in a scholarly book • an invited journal article in any scholarly journal • be a co-PI on a funded external research grant of any amount • be a recipient of an internal research seed grant • have received a contract to write a scholarly book based on a substantive proposal (e.g., draft chapters) • have chapters (beyond initial submission) of a contracted scholarly book completed for editor review 	<p>4- The faculty member should have at least one of the following (or equivalent):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a double-blind, refereed article in any subscription-based or open access scholarly journal (excluding pay-to-publish journals) • a chapter in a scholarly book • an invited journal article in any scholarly journal • be a co-PI on a funded external research grant of any amount • be a recipient of an internal research seed grant • have received a contract to write a scholarly book based on a substantive proposal (e.g., draft chapters) • have chapters (beyond initial submission) of a contracted scholarly book completed for editor review • a blind peer-reviewed paper or panel accepted for presentation, or presented at a conference • a book review • an encyclopedia entry • a blind peer-reviewed conference proceedings • juried/peer reviewed creative scholarship (e.g., documentary, audio or video production) at any juried/reviewed venue
<p>Meets expectations for merit 2,3</p>	<p>3- The faculty member should generally have at least ONE of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a peer reviewed paper or panel accepted for presentation, or presented at a conference • a book review • an encyclopedia entry • be a co-PI on a funded external research grant of any amount • a peer reviewed conference proceeding 	<p>3 - The faculty member should generally provide evidence of significant progress toward a tangible research outcome (e.g., data collection) AND at least ONE of any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a manuscript submitted for review (even if rejected) • an external grant application under review (even if rejected) • a conference paper submitted for review (even if rejected) • submission of creative scholarship (even if rejected)
	<p>2- The faculty member should provide evidence of significant progress toward a tangible research outcome beyond the prior year (e.g., data collection, footage) AND at least ONE of any of the following (or equivalent):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a manuscript submitted for review (even if rejected) • an external grant application submitted (even if rejected) • a conference paper, panel or workshop, presented or accepted for presentation 	<p>2- The faculty member should provide evidence of significant progress toward a tangible research or creative scholarship outcome beyond the prior year (e.g., data collection, footage).</p>
<p>Does not meet expectations for merit 1</p>	<p>1- Negligible research activity (e.g., little work in progress, no manuscripts or grant proposals submitted, and no paper presentations)</p>	<p>1- Negligible research activity (e.g., little work in progress, no manuscripts or grant proposals submitted, and no paper presentations)</p>

SERVICE	
Exceeds expectations for merit 4,5	<p style="text-align: center;">Merit Score for Service - each committee member must assign an integer from 1 to 5</p> <p>5- Though it is recognized that not everyone can attend all events, regular attendance at faculty meetings and some participation at department, school, college and university events (e.g., preview days, award ceremonies, commencement and the like) are baseline expectations. Plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in at least one recognized, continuing service activity in the <u>department</u>. • Plus, participation in at least <u>three</u> additional recognized, continuing service activities in the department, school, college, university, profession or community related to their discipline, or the equivalent. <p>For NTT, a leadership role in one additional recognized, continuing service activity in the department, school, college, university, profession or community related to their discipline may fulfill this criterion</p> <p>For tenured faculty members, leadership roles in committee work, professional service or programs are expected.</p> <p>Individuals with graduate faculty status should have evidence of active involvement with professional organizations connected to their discipline at the local, state, regional, national or international level.</p> <p>4- Though it is recognized that not everyone can attend all events, regular attendance at faculty meetings and some participation at department, school, college and university events (e.g., preview days, award ceremonies, commencement and the like) are baseline expectations. Plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in at least one recognized, continuing service activity in the <u>department</u>. • Plus participation in at least <u>two</u> additional recognized, continuing service activities in the department, school, college, university, profession or community related to their discipline, or the equivalent. <p>For tenured faculty members, leadership roles in committee work, professional service or programs are expected.</p> <p>Individuals with graduate faculty status should have evidence of active involvement with professional organizations connected to their discipline at the local, state, regional, national or international level.</p>
Meets expectations for merit 2,3	<p>3- Though it is recognized that not everyone can attend all events, regular attendance at faculty meetings and some participation at department, school, college and university events (e.g., preview days, award ceremonies, commencement and the like) are baseline expectations. Plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in at least one recognized, continuing service activity in the <u>department</u>. • Plus participation in at least one additional recognized, continuing service activities in the department, school, college, university, profession or community related to their discipline, or the equivalent. <p>2- Though it is recognized that not everyone can attend all events, regular attendance at faculty meetings and some participation at department, school, college and university events (e.g., preview days, award ceremonies, commencement and the like) are baseline expectations. Plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in at least one recognized, continuing service activity in the <u>department</u>.
Does not meet expectations for merit 1	<p>1- No or little engagement in major department committees, specialty area committees, or undergraduate or graduate program activities; Failure to respond to requests for activity reports, teaching preferences, and other requests in a timely manner; Limited participation in service activities at college, university, or professional levels.</p>

Appendix B

List of Items to be included in Merit Materials

1. Updated vita in BGSU format with merit activities highlighted.
2. College AFR and any materials required by the college. (Reminder: the AFR should report all activity completed during the previous calendar year, regardless of whether an activity counts toward merit.)
3. Merit worksheet (Appendix C) which indicates AOE for the calendar year and includes a list of research accomplishments to be considered for merit. For each item listed, the faculty member should indicate **the type of work** (e.g., conference paper, scholarly book chapter, double-blinded refereed journal article etc.) and the **status of the work** (e.g., in press, under review). The faculty member may also choose to include quality indicators such as impact factors, rejection rates and the like. The member must provide appropriate documentation for research items (e.g., letter of acceptance, copy of page of conference program, etc.). Items without appropriate documentation will not be considered.
4. Optional Commentary and Optional Materials. If some activities or outcomes require more explanation than the vita or AFR provides, the faculty member **MAY** attach brief explanatory narratives for any category. Also, the faculty member may submit supplemental teaching materials.
5. **The prior year's merit worksheet (ITEM 3 ABOVE) of research accomplishments that were considered for merit in the previous calendar year as in most cases an item can only be counted once.**

Appendix C
School of Media and Communication
Bowling Green State University
Annual Faculty Merit Worksheet

Name _____ Rank _____ Date _____

Allocation of Effort for the Calendar Year.

- % Instructional Activities
- % Research
- % Service (including administration)

100% TOTAL

List below all research accomplishments to be considered for merit.

For each item listed, the faculty member should indicate **the type of work** (e.g., conference paper, scholarly book chapter, double-blinded refereed journal article etc.) and the **status of the work** (e.g., in press, under review). The faculty member may also choose to include quality indicators such as impact factors, rejection rates and the like. The member must provide appropriate documentation for research items (e.g., letter of acceptance, copy of page of conference program, etc.). **Items without appropriate documentation will not be considered.**

Appendix D

SUMMARY FORM

When scores are reached by the merit committee, this form is to be completed by the chair of the merit committee and provided to the director.

Faculty Member	Merit Score for Teaching/	Merit Score for Research/ Creative Work	Merit Score for Service	Overall Merit Score
<i>Faculty member 1</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</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>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>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>