

Merit Document
Construction Management Department of COTAAE

Preamble

Merit raises refer to the component of salary raises that are provided to department 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 Construction Management Department in the following areas: Teaching, Research, 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. For example, using the minimum five categories or rating levels, the following evaluation concepts would be included: 1-1.5 = Does not meet expectations for merit; 1.6-3.5 = Meets expectations for merit; 3.6-5 = 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, Research, and Service), performance indicators and expectations for the criteria, and the calculation of the component merit scores (i.e., Teaching, Research, 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. The committee will be all full time faculty members.
- 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: the faculty member's PVF in the format as designated in Appendix A, student evaluations for the review period, and any other items that the faculty member feels is relevant to the merit evaluation. The merit dossier

will be a hardcopy submission and will be cumulative with the previous calendar year highlighted.

- 2.5. Once the merit committee has reached consensus on component merit scores on each performance areas (Teaching, Research, and Service), the overall merit score is computed using a simple algorithm taking into account the weighted allocation of effort for each performance area as explained in Appendix B.
- 2.6. The merit committee will submit merit scores to Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in the unit prior to transmitting scores to the chair. Faculty members may appeal the merit score they received from the department merit committee by submitting an appeal within two business days. The merit committee will review each appeal and provide those faculty members with the final merit score assigned.
- 2.7. An academic unit may report its merit score recommendation to no greater than one-tenth decimal place (for example, a unit using 1-5 categories or rating levels may assign a score of 3.1 or 4.9 but may not assign a score of 3.15 or 4.935).

3. Significant Dates for Merit Consideration and Appeals

January 31	Last date for faculty merit dossiers to be submitted to an academic unit. <i>Note: 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.</i>
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 of 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 Construction Management at the Month, Date, Year Faculty Meeting


L Travis Chapin, Chair

Date 2/16/2015

Approved:


Venu Dasigi, Dean of College of Technology, Architecture and Applied Engineering

Date 2/16/2015

Approved:


Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VPAA

Date 2/27/15

APPENDIX A

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

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

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

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

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

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

Though the Evaluation Criteria is rather prescriptive by quantifying the expected effort, the Department Merit Committee has the right and obligation to take into account equivalent effort and productivity though the faculty being evaluated does not fall neatly within the following criteria. The teaching/research/service scores will be based on the abundance of evidence in the performance indicators (or their equivalent) shown in the following tables. Meeting the stated below performance indicators in each category represent the maximum possible merit score. For example, if the faculty member publishes three peer-reviewed articles and secures external grant(s) of \$25K or more, he/she should obtain a research merit score of 5.

The merit committee will then assign an overall merit rating using the approach found in Appendix B of the merit policy. The overall merit may include any number of values or rating levels, but it must clearly identify whether the overall merit rating reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

Evaluation Rating Category	TEACHING Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Teaching
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative student evaluations regularly exceed departmental averages for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are general positive; • Observations by peers indicate highest levels of excellence in the classroom; • Excellent syllabi preparation, class meets regularly, and regular office hours maintained for students; • Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are regularly introduced and evaluated; AND • Regular engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness 	3.6 – 5.0
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative student evaluations approximate departmental averages for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are general positive; • Observations by peers indicate high levels of performance in the classroom; • Good preparation of syllabi, class meets regularly, and regular office hours maintained for students; • Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are occasionally introduced with some assessment of their impact; AND • Modest engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness 	1.6 – 3.5
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative student evaluations are among lowest in department for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are mixed; • Observations by peers indicate significant opportunities for improvement; • Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are generally absent and rarely evaluated; AND • Limited or no engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness 	1.0 – 1.5

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

Evaluation Rating Category	RESEARCH Expected levels of accomplishment on research performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Research
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One peer-reviewed journal article or more plus two or more peer-reviewed conference papers; AND • High activity in grantsmanship with external funding of \$25K+ 	3.6 – 5.0
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One peer-reviewed journal article or two peer-reviewed conference papers; AND • Some activity in grantsmanship such as preparing/submitting internal or external grants; internal funding award. 	1.5 – 3.5
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-peer-reviewed articles or presentation • No peer-reviewed articles or conference papers • No current active research projects since last year merit submission; • No active grantsmanship or clear plans for applying for internal or external funding; AND • No recognition/ awards for research 	1.0 – 1.5

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

Evaluation Rating Category	SERVICE Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Service
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chairing one or more committees at department, college, and/or university levels. • Membership of at least one committee at department, college, and university levels. • Exceptional academic advising, mentoring, and/or recruiting activities. • Community/professional service to one or more significant activities related to faculty appointment ; AND • Two or more examples of the following: service award, significant service leadership, high impact practice, or high visibility service 	3.6 – 5.0
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chairing one or more committees at department, college, and/or university levels. • Membership of at least one committees at department, college, and/or university levels. • Adequate academic advising, mentoring, and/or recruiting activities; AND • Community/professional service to at least one activities related to faculty appointment 	1.6 – 3.5
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership of one committees at department, college, and/or university levels. • Limited to no engagement (no advising or committees; limited attendance at faculty meetings) at departmental level; • No significant service participation at college, university, or professional levels; limited community engagement 	1.0 – 1.5

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 Research	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>
<i>Next faculty member, etc.</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>

Appendix B Determining Overall Merit Score Recommendations

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

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

Overall Merit Score*	Interpretation (assumes component performance ratings made on 5-point scale)
1.0 – 1.5	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
1.6 – 3.5	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
3.6 – 5.0	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit

**Although the overall merit score and their interpretation serve as a guideline for merit/no merit preliminary decision, the merit committee should also take allocation of teaching, research, and service effort into consideration when reaching the final decision. This is detailed as follows:*

- *Receipt of 'fails to meet' in two or more performance areas (teaching, research, or service)
OR receipt of 'fails to meet' in either teaching or research => not eligible for merit*