

Merit Document  
Department of History

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 of History in the following areas: Teaching Effectiveness, Research, 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 departmental Evaluation Committee 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 Effectiveness, Research, and Service), performance indicators and expectations for the criteria, and the calculation of the component merit scores (i.e., Teaching Effectiveness, 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 History Department Evaluation Committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member.
  - 2.2.1. Members of the Evaluation Committee are elected for three-year terms by all eligible bargaining unit faculty members from the Department's tenured faculty. The committee consists of three members; terms are staggered with one new member elected each year.
  - 2.2.2. If an Evaluation Committee member cannot serve during any part of his/her term due to leave, illness, or other causes, the bargaining unit faculty members may elect a replacement for all or part of the time remaining in the Committee member's term.
- 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. Each faculty member submits a complete merit dossier to the Evaluation Committee by January 31<sup>st</sup> (if a weekend, the next business day). The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements:
  - (a) a completed Annual Faculty Record Update form, as utilized by the College of Arts and Sciences;

(b) a copy of the first page or cover page of each publication or grant proposal, acknowledgment of grant awards, and a copy of conference programs. In addition, instructor and course student evaluation scores from all classes taught in the spring and fall semesters must be included. The chair will also include information on the allocation of effort, leaves, and workload assignments (e.g. number of courses that the faculty member has to teach if this information is not standard). At his/her discretion, each faculty member may also submit:

- A narrative of his/her accomplishments in teaching, research, and service for the previous calendar year (no longer than one page);
- Published reviews of publications or other research-related activities;
- Peer reviews of teaching, course syllabi, testimonials from students, or other evidence of extraordinary effort and/or success in teaching;
- Documentation of engaged scholarship;
- Testimonials from university or professional colleagues regarding the extent or quality of service provided; and/or
- Other evidence of meritorious research, teaching, or service.

2.4.1 The Chair will also include:

- The average annual allocation of effort resulting from leaves, grant contracts etc
- The list of faculty members with an average student evaluation below 3 points; the list of faculty members with an average student evaluation above 4.5 points.
- Any adjustments for special circumstances (see Section 4).

2.5. Once the evaluation committee has reached consensus on component merit scores on each performance area (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: [Teaching Effectiveness Merit Score \* Allocation of Effort] + [Research Merit Score \* Allocation of Effort] + [Service Merit Score \* Allocation of Effort] = Overall Merit Score.

2.5.1. Interpretation of Overall Merit Scores

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation (assumes component performance ratings made on 5-point scale to no greater than one-tenth decimal place)
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

3. Significant Dates for Merit Consideration and Appeals

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

The department Evaluation Committee 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: department Evaluation 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 department's Evaluation Committee may also consider special circumstances not covered in 3.1 above and make a recommendation to the department chair. 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/SVP. Approved amendments to the merit policy shall not be applied retroactively in the calculation of the previous year's merit scores.

## 6. Additional Information

- 6.1 The standard allocation of effort for TTF in the department is 30% research, 50% teaching, and 20% service; and 80% teaching, 5% research and 15% service for NTTF. This allocation is assumed to be correct for all faculty members who do not negotiate a different allocation with the Chair prior to the beginning of each academic year. Each faculty member may negotiate a different allocation of effort with the chair each year, but the negotiation must be concluded prior to the beginning of the calendar year. Any allocation of effort may be negotiated, subject to the following constraints:
- 6.1.1. No probationary faculty member may negotiate an allocation of effort to research of less than 30%.
- 6.1.2. The normal allocation of effort for the Director of Graduate Studies and the Undergraduate Advisor is 40% teaching, 20% research, and 40% service.
- 6.1.3. Any allocation of effort to teaching of greater than 50% must involve the teaching of additional courses beyond the normal load of five per year. Each additional course will add 10% to the allocation for teaching. In addition, courses taught with a beyond the normal maximum enrollment will receive a proportionate increase in the allocation of effort.
- 6.1.4. Faculty members who generate grant funds to buy out courses will normally decrease their allocation to teaching and increase their allocation to research by 10% for each one-course reduction in their teaching load; however, an appropriate allocation of effort (normally not less than 5%) to teaching should be retained to recognize efforts on graduate students' committees.
- 6.1.5. The allocation of effort for non-tenure-track faculty will be as reflected in College and University guidelines. The service percentage may be adjusted upward, and the teaching percentage downward, to accommodate service assignments (committee memberships or other service activities at the department, college or university level).
- 6.1.6. Faculty members who are on Faculty Improvement Leave will normally have an allocation of 100% research, 0% teaching, and 0% service for the period corresponding to their leave. This may be renegotiated on an individual basis depending on the faculty member's activities during the FIL. The faculty member will receive points according to the adjusted allocation of effort, or the departmental average, whichever results in a higher score.
-

Approved by the Department of History at the Sept. 16, 2015 Faculty Meeting

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott C. Martin, Chair      Date 9/16/15

Approved:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Raymond A. Craig, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences      Date 9/17/15

Approved:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP      Date 9/24/15

**APPENDIX A**  
**Calculation of Component Merit Scores**

**1. Teaching Effectiveness**

<p><b>Evaluation</b> <b>Rating Category</b></p>	<p><b>TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS</b> <b>Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)</b></p>	<p><b>Possible Merit Score for Teaching*</b></p>
<p>Exceeds expectations for merit</p>	<p>To exceed expectations for teaching, faculty members must meet the regular expectations for merit and provide evidence of two or more of the following: teaching awards or nominations; creation of new courses; substantial revisions to existing courses or the curriculum; mentored students in documentable activities such as advising student organizations, arranging conference panels for student participation, supervising research or teaching internships, and similar pursuits; obtained instructional grants; chair Plan II M.A. programs; directed theses or dissertations; or received average student evaluations above 4.5 points.</p>	<p>3.6 – 5.0</p>
<p>Meets expectations for merit</p>	<p>To meet expectations for merit, faculty members must receive a satisfactory average score on Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET) for all courses taught and provide evidence of one or more of the activities listed below. The Department defines an average evaluation of 3 points (in a 5-point scale) as satisfactory, although the evaluation committee may consider specific challenges posed by individual courses. Faculty members must also provide evidence of one or more of the following examples of teaching effectiveness: supervising independent study; incorporating</p>	<p>1.6 – 3.5</p>

	revisions to existing courses or the curriculum; supervising research or teaching internships, and similar pursuits; applying for instructional grants; or serving on thesis, dissertation, or Plan II M.A. committees.	
Fails to meet expectations for merit	Faculty members who do not receive a satisfactory average score on Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET) for all courses taught fail to meet expectations for merit.	<i>1.0 – 1.5</i>

*\*Insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 1-5 point scale.*

**Merit Score for Teaching Effectiveness**

(to be completed by Evaluation Committee member): \_\_\_\_\_



## 2. Research

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (Circle One)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
<p><i>Research &amp; Scholarly Dissemination</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Academic monograph or peer-reviewed book published by commercial press</li> <li>2. Edited book.</li> <li>3. Scholarly journal article or chapter in an edited volume</li> <li>4. Books for general public</li> <li>5. Non-peer reviewed papers</li> <li>6. Peer-reviewed presentations, selective conferences OR invited presentation, national or international</li> <li>7. Peer-reviewed presentations, regional/local conference</li> <li>8. Published book reviews</li> <li>9. Invited presentations (regional/local)</li> <li>10. Awards for scholarship (books, articles, papers)</li> <li>11. Other.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superior. 1 from category 1 OR 2+ examples from categories 2-4.</li> <li>• Excellent. 4+ examples, with at least one from categories 2-4.</li> <li>• Very good. 3 examples, at least one from categories 2-4.</li> <li>• Good. 2 examples from any of categories 3 through 11.</li> <li>• Fair. 1 Example.</li> <li>• Poor. No activity to report.</li> </ul> <p>NOTE: Multiple examples in one category are considered positively in overall evaluation.</p> <p>The evaluation committee will consider the following in making its overall evaluation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. whether or not the publication was peer-reviewed;</li> <li>b. the complexity of the product (length, amount of research); and</li> <li>c. the professional prestige of the publication venue.</li> </ol>	
<p><i>Ongoing research</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Book manuscript submitted and under review</li> <li>2. Scholarly article submitted and under review</li> <li>3. Significant external grant activity (for example, award of external grants, \$25K and up; may be claimed in multiple years for multiple year grants)</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent. Category 1 activity reported and at least 1 from categories 2-11.</li> <li>• Good. 2 activities reported, from 2-11.</li> <li>• Fair. 1 activity reported, from 2-11.</li> <li>• Poor. No activity.</li> </ul> <p>NOTES: The committee is directed to recognize that some projects may change status over the course of the year; the faculty member should make clear his/her research</p>	



<p>4. Awarded external grant, &lt;\$25K</p> <p>5. Awarded internal grant, \$5K and up</p> <p>6. Awarded internal grant, &lt;\$5K</p> <p>7. Applied for category 3 grant</p> <p>8. Applied for category 4 grant</p> <p>9. Applied for category 5 or 6 grant.</p> <p>10. Project being written for peer-reviewed publication</p> <p>11. Project being written for peer-reviewed conference presentation</p>	<p>trajectory.</p> <p>The committee can consider overall number and stages of development of projects in its overall assessment.</p> <p>The Evaluation Committee will restrict points for multiple deliveries of the same scholarship: two submissions of one manuscript count as one; two conference presentations that are substantially similar should not be double counted, and so on.</p> <p>Grant applications, however, should be considered separately as they often require considerable rewriting/repurposing.</p> <p>Grants awards should recognize archival research and writing leaves.</p>	
---	---	--

<b>Merit Score (point allocation)</b>	<b>Definition and Description</b>
<p><b>Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Research</b></p> <p><b>(3.6-5.0)</b></p>	<p>“Research and Scholarly Dissemination” is rated as Superior and “Ongoing Research” is rated as Excellent OR one of the categories receives the highest rating and the other is in the upper-middle range (“Research and Scholarly Dissemination” is Superior, Excellent, or Very Good; “Ongoing Research” is Excellent or Good).</p> <p>Clear line of inquiry and established research program, meaningful integration and application</p>
<p><b>Meets Expectations for Merit in Research</b></p> <p><b>(1.6-3.5)</b></p>	<p>Both ratings are in the middle to upper middle categories</p> <p>Active scholarship</p>
<p><b>Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Research</b></p> <p><b>(1-1.5)</b></p>	<p>Both ratings are in the lowest categories</p> <p>Minimally meets expectations for performance but not to the level deserving of merit</p> <p>Limited or no research program</p>

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

### 3. Service

<b>Evaluation Rating Category</b>	<b>SERVICE Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators (or their equivalent)</b>	<b>Possible Merit Score for Service*</b>
Exceeds expectations for merit	A faculty member exceeds expectations in service by meeting the regular expectations for merit and providing evidence of one or more of the following: significant service beyond the Department; membership on University committees; involvement in professional organizations, and service to the community.	3.6 – 5.0
Meets expectations for merit	A faculty member meets expectations for service by fulfilling committee and service commitments within the department, including but not limited to: attending faculty meetings regularly; attending and/or staffing recruitment events and commencement; actively participating in committees and completing assigned committee work, as documented by departmental colleagues or the Chair.	1.6 – 3.5
Fails to meet expectations for merit	A faculty member fails to meet expectations for service through irregular attendance at faculty meetings, unexcused absences from committee meetings; or failure to complete assigned committee work.	1.0 – 1.5

*\*Insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 1-5 point scale.*

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

### SUMMARY FORM

(to be completed with agreement reached by all members of the Evaluation Committee):

<b>Faculty Member</b>	<b>Merit Score for Teaching Effectiveness</b>	<b>Merit Score for Research</b>	<b>Merit Score for Service</b>
<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>