

Merit Document
Department of Natural and Social Sciences

Preamble

Merit raises refer to the component of salary raises that are provided to department/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 department in the following areas: Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service. Each faculty member will receive an overall merit score which 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.

Both the merit committee of the academic unit and the chair 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/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service), performance indicators and expectations for the criteria, and the calculation of the component merit scores (i.e., Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, 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 chair.
- 2.2. The department merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. This committee will consist of one faculty member each from Mathematics, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences, along with a fourth member who may be from any of these disciplines. Members are elected for three-year terms on a rotating basis, so that a maximum of two members are elected in any given year. The member of the committee with the longest tenure on the committee will serve as merit committee chair.

- 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 following elements for the preceding year: syllabi from each course taught, Woods form summary and calculation of the average median for each course taught, peer observations (if applicable), demonstration of Indicators of Growth and Incorporation of Scholarship of Engagement (see Appendices), and evidence of meritorious accomplishments for Research/Professional Development and Service.
- 2.5. The overall merit score will be calculated using the algorithm in Appendix B.
- 2.6. An academic unit may report its merit score recommendation to no greater than one-tenth decimal place (for example, a unit using 1-7 categories or rating levels may assign a score of 3.1 or 5.9 but may not assign a score of 3.15 or 5.975).

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 chair.

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

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

March 31: Chair’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 chair’s merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copy to the chair). The faculty member may raise in any appeal to the Dean: (i) the chair’s merit score recommendation, and (ii) only those aspects of the committee’s recommendation that the faculty member has previously raised in the faculty member’s appeal to the chair. Issues related to the committee’s recommendation not raised previously with the chair (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.

Approved by the Department of Natural and Social Sciences at the October 19, 2015 Department Meeting:



Victor Odafe, Chair

Date 10/19/15

Approved: 

Andrew Kurtz, Dean of Firelands College

Date Oct 20, 2015

Approved: 

Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VPAA

Date 10/29/15

Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations, Calculation of Component Merit Scores

Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness

Pre-specified allocation of effort for Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness: _____ %

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (circle one) Merit Committee members will review the materials submitted and reach a consensus decision on the number of points awarded (up to a maximum of 64 points).	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.) by the Merit Committee
<p>Teaching Growth and Development (see appendices)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New/Diverse Teaching Methods (up to 6 pts. for social science/ 8 pts. for math) OR Lab preparation (up to 8 pts. for natural science) 2. Inclusion of Writing Assignments (up to 6 pts. for social science/ up to 4 pts. for natural science and math) 3. Scholarship of Engagement (up to 6 pts.) 4. Syllabi (up to 12 pts.) <p>Student Evaluations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The average median for each course taught will be multiplied by credit hours for the course, and these values are summed. The sum is divided by the total credit hours taught for the year, this quotient is multiplied by 4, to give total points (rounded to the nearest tenth) (up to 28 pts.) <p>Peer Observations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Classroom observations carried out for the purpose of evaluation. Does not include a presentation given in another faculty member's course (4 pts. per observation, up to 12 pts.) <p>Other</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Teaching activities not covered by the above criteria 	<p>Excellent (earned 57.6 points or more)</p> <p>Very Good (earned 51.2 to 57.5 points)</p> <p>Good (earned 44.8 to 51.1 points)</p> <p>Fair (earned 38.4 to 44.7 points)</p> <p>Poor (earned 1 to 38.3 points)</p> <p>N/A (no assessments submitted)</p>	

(up to 3 pts. each, time and effort dependent)		
--	--	--

Points in all teaching components (above) are summed, with a maximum value of 64. This sum is divided by 64 and multiplied by 10, to give a score on a 0-10 scale for teaching.

Merit Score for Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness

(to be completed by merit committee member): _____

Merit Score	Definition and Description
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Teaching (9-10)	Woods form scores in the very good to excellent range, shows growth in teaching, likely to have peer reviews supporting excellent teaching, or the equivalent.
Generally Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Teaching (8-8.9)	Woods form scores in the very good range, shows growth in teaching, may or may not have peer reviews, or the equivalent.
Meets Expectations for Merit in Teaching (7-7.9)	Woods form scores in the above average range, shows growth in teaching, may or may not have peer reviews, or the equivalent.
Generally Meets Expectations for Merit in Teaching (6-6.9)	Woods form scores in average range, may lack expected growth in teaching, may or may not have peer reviews, or the equivalent.
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Teaching (0-5.9)	Woods form scores are below average, limited growth in teaching, likely to lack peer reviews, or the equivalent.

Research/Professional Development

Pre-specified allocation of effort for Research/Creative Work: _____ %

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (Circle One) Merit Committee members will review the materials submitted and reach a consensus decision on the number of points awarded (up to a maximum of 45 points).	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.) by the Merit Committee
<p>Professional Organizations</p> <p>1. Membership (1 pt. each)</p> <p>2. Officeholder <u>National/Regional/State</u> Pres/VP/Sec/Treas (6 pts.) Bd. of Dir/Trustee (5 pts.) Committee Chair (4 pts.) Committee Member (2 pts.) <u>Local</u> Pres/VP/Sec/Treas (3 pts.) Committee Chair (2 pts.)</p> <p>Conference Attendance</p> <p>3. <u>With no presentation</u> National/Regional/State (2 pts.) Local (1 pt) Webinar (.5 pts.) <u>With presentation (This category also includes presentations to professional groups for member training and/or certification, whether paid or unpaid.)</u> International/National (6 pts.) Regional/State (4 pts.) Local (2 pts.) Symposia/Forums/Colloquia (2 pts.) Organizer Nat/Reg/State (4 pts.) Organizer Local (external, 2 pts.)</p> <p>Journal Publications</p> <p>4. <u>Refereed</u> National (10 pts. each) Regional/State (5 pts. each)</p> <p>5. <u>Non-Refereed</u> Journal/Newsletter (2 pts.) National Editor (5 pts.)</p>	<p>Excellent (earned 18 or more points)</p> <p>Very Good (earned 9 to 17.9 points)</p> <p>Good (earned 4.5 to 8.9 points)</p> <p>Fair (earned 2.3 to 4.4 points)</p> <p>Poor (earned 1 to 2.2 points)</p> <p>N/A (no assessments submitted)</p>	

<p>Reg/State Editor (3 pts.) Unpaid Book Review Essay (exceed 1000 words, 2 pts.) Unpaid Book Review (1 pt each)</p> <p>Book Publications and Reports</p> <p>6. Author (30 pts.) 7. Co-author/Editor (including contributed chapters, 15 pts.) 8. Chapter in book (6 pts.) 9. Reports: Published (3 pts.), Unpublished (2 pts.)</p> <p>Post Graduate Professional Programs (NSF/Chataquas/FIL/ Graduate Training/Learning Communities)</p> <p>10. 3 pts. each</p> <p>Grants</p> <p>11. External to University (1 pt per \$10,000 of grant received) 12. Internal (beneficial to Dept/Univ, not self, 1 pt)</p> <p>Research in Progress</p> <p>13. <i>Available for only two years on any one project</i> (2 pts. each)</p> <p>Non-print Projects</p> <p>14. Software/CAI (distributed beyond University, 2 pts.) 15. AV productions (aired/distributed beyond University, 15 pts.)</p> <p>Other</p> <p>16. Research/professional development not contained in this listing (up to 3 pts. each, time and effort dependent)</p>		
---	--	--

Points in all research/professional development components (above) are summed, with a maximum value of 45. This sum is divided by 45 and multiplied by 10, to give a score on a 0-10 scale for research/professional development.

**Merit Score for Research/Professional Development
(to be completed by merit committee member): _____**

Merit Score	Definition and Description
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Scholarship/Professional Development (4-10)	Very likely to have published a book and/or an article. This rating may also be achieved by conference attendance(s) with presentation(s), being an officer of a state/national professional organization, or the equivalent.
Generally Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Scholarship/Professional Development (2-3.9)	Likely to have attended conference(s) and have presented. Exhibits membership in appropriate organizations. May have participated in webinars, or the equivalent.
Meets Expectations for Merit in Scholarship/Professional Development (1-1.9)	Typically will have attended conference(s), but unlikely to have presented. Will have membership in appropriate organizations. May have participated in webinars, or the equivalent.
Generally Meets Expectations for Merit in Scholarship/Professional Development (0.5-0.9)	Minimal membership in professional organizations and/or conference attendance or webinars. No presentations or publications, or the equivalent.
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Scholarship/Professional Development (0-0.4)	Little to no membership in professional organizations and/or conference attendance or webinars. No presentations or publications, or the equivalent.

Service

Pre-Specified Allocation of Effort for Service _____%

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (Circle One) Merit Committee members will review the materials submitted and reach a consensus decision on the number of points awarded (up to a maximum of 45 points).	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.) by the Merit Committee
<p>University</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Faculty Senate (3 pts.) 2. SEC (4 pts.) 3. Senate Chair/Sec (4 pts.) 4. UG Council (4 pts.) 5. Other Committees (2 pts. each) 6. Committee Chair (1 extra pt each) <p>College</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Major Committees (College Council, AA, Budget, CRPTC, Ombudsman, or other committee that has an unusually high workload in a given year – evidence must be given – 5 pts. each) 8. Faculty Chair/Sec (2 pts.) 9. Other Committees (1 pt each) 10. Committee Chair (1 extra pt each) 11. Dorn Fellowship (5 pts.) <p>Department</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 12. Merit Committee (5 pts.) 13. Search Committee (4 pts.) 14. Promotion Committee (1 pt) 15. Chair of Merit or Search Committee (extra 2 pts. each) 16. Chair of Tenure, Promotion, Mid-Probationary Review, or Enhanced Review Committee (1 pt each) 17. Recruiting (1 pt) 18. Providing a peer evaluation for a faculty member (2 pts. each) <p>Student Services</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 19. Unpaid academic advising (2 pts.) 	<p>Excellent (earned 18 points or more)</p> <p>Very Good (earned 9 to 17.9 points)</p> <p>Good (earned 4.5 to 8.9 points)</p> <p>Fair (earned 2.3 to 4.4 points)</p> <p>Poor (earned 1 to 2.2 points)</p> <p>N/A (no assessments submitted)</p>	

<p>20. Co-ops/No Posts (1-5 students, 2 pts.; each 5 additional students, 1 pt each)</p> <p>21. Independent Study (5 pts.)</p> <p>22. Thesis/Dissertation Committee (1 pt each)</p> <p>23. Chair Thesis/Dissertation Committee (5 pts.)</p> <p>24. Student Club Advisor (2 pts. each)</p> <p>25. Recommendation/reference letters (1 pt per unique document)</p> <p>Curriculum Development</p> <p>26. New Course (not new to faculty member, 3 pts. each)</p> <p>27. New AA program (12 pts.)</p> <p>28. New 3 + 1 program (8 pts.)</p> <p>29. New certificate program (4 pts.)</p> <p>Community</p> <p>30. Chair major group (5 pts.)</p> <p>31. Member Board of Directors or Trustee (2 pts.)</p> <p>32. Speaker's Bureau or other unpaid speaking engagements (1 pt per hour of each speech)</p> <p>33. Unpaid consulting (2 pts.)</p> <p>34. Chair academic program (2 pts. each)</p> <p>35. Assist academic program (1 pt each)</p> <p>Other</p> <p>36. Service not contained in this listing, including any professional representation of BGSU (1-3 pts. each, time and effort dependent)</p>		
---	--	--

Note: Consideration for additional points for service activities may be requested if the activity had an unusual or extraordinarily high workload. Documentation/justification must be given.

Points in all service components (above) are summed, with a maximum value of 45. This sum is divided by 45 and multiplied by 10, to give a score on a 0-10 scale for service.

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

Merit Score	Definition and Description
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Service (4-10)	Member of at least one major committee along with other committee work. Likely to have excellent service outside of the committee structure, or the equivalent.
Generally Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Service (2-3.9)	May have a major committee or multiple regular committees. Usually will have some service outside of the committee structure, or the equivalent.
Meets Expectations for Merit in Service (1-1.9)	Appropriate service shown, at least one committee along with service activities outside the committee structure, or the equivalent.
Generally Meets Expectations for Merit in Service (0.5-0.9)	Minimal service shown, in committees or otherwise, or the equivalent.
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Service (0-0.4)	Little to no service shown, in committees or otherwise, or the equivalent.

SUMMARY FORM

(to be completed with agreement reached by all members of the merit committee):

Faculty Member	Merit Score for Teaching/ Librarian Effectiveness	Merit Score for Research/ Creative Work	Merit Score for Service
<i>Faculty member 1</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>
<i>Faculty member 2</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>

APPENDIX B

Weighted Allocation of Effort Algorithm

Once the merit committee has reached consensus on component merit scores on each performance areas (Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, 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:

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
 & \text{[Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness Merit Score * Allocation of Effort]} & = \underline{\hspace{2cm}} \\
 + & \text{[Research/Creative Work Merit Score * Allocation of Effort]} & = \underline{\hspace{2cm}} \\
 + & \text{[Service Merit Score * Allocation of Effort]} & = \underline{\hspace{2cm}} \\
 = & \text{Overall Merit Score} & = \underline{\hspace{2cm}}
 \end{array}$$

Overall Merit Score	Definition and Description
0.0 – 4.1	Fails to meet expectations: Little to no professional development and/or service, teaching indicators are average or below average
4.2 – 6.1	Meets expectations: Appropriate professional development and/or service, teaching indicators are average or higher
6.2 – 10.0	Exceeds expectations: Very good professional development and/or service, teaching indicators are very good or higher.

APPENDIX C

Indicators of Growth

Department members are expected to fulfill teaching elements as listed below:

Mathematics Faculty:

Documented evidence that a variety of teaching methodologies/techniques are utilized (2 pts. each, max of 8 pts.):

Method 1: _____

Method 2: _____

Method 3: _____

Method 4: _____

Documented evidence that writing and/or spatial/quantitative skills are required in a course (1 pt each, max of 4 pts.):

Course 1: _____

Course 2: _____

Course 3: _____

Course 4: _____

Social Science Faculty:

Documented evidence that a variety of teaching methodologies/techniques are utilized (2 pts. each, max of 8 pts.):

Method 1: _____

Method 2: _____

Method 3: _____

Method 4: _____

Documented evidence that students are required to write as a part of the course and that such written material is read/graded by the faculty member (1 pt each, max of 4 pts.):

Course 1: _____

Course 2: _____

Course 3: _____

Course 4: _____

Natural Science Faculty:

Laboratory preparation/supervision (2 pts. per course, max of 8 pts.)

Course 1: _____

Course 2: _____

Course 3: _____

Course 4: _____

Documented evidence that writing and/or spatial/quantitative skills are required in a course (1 pt each, max of 4 pts.):

Course 1: _____

Course 2: _____

Course 3: _____

Course 4: _____

APPENDIX D**Indicators of Incorporation of Scholarship of Engagement**

Department members may choose to include scholarship of engagement activities in a course. Documented evidence of such activities are granted 2 pts. per course, up to a max of 6 pts.

Course 1: _____

Course 2: _____

Course 3: _____

APPENDIX E**Syllabi Content Evaluation**

Points are awarded in each category only if the item appears in all syllabi for the academic year. Anything fewer results in zero points being awarded for the category. (up to 12 pts.)

Learning Outcomes—2 pts.

Course Requirements—2 pts.

Exam procedure/policy—2 pts.

Attendance policy—2 pts.

Academic honesty policy—2 pts.

Disability statement—2 pts.

