

Merit Document
Department of Philosophy

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. 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 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. The committee consists of three tenured members of the philosophy department. The committee members are elected by a vote of the department. Both TTF and NTTF members participate in this vote.

- 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: an updated cv, a list of publications and presentations from the previous calendar year, student teaching evaluation scores, a copy of any peer reviews of teaching that were performed during the calendar year, a list of dissertation and these committees that the faculty member served on in the previous year, and a list of the faculty member’s service activities. Faculty members may also choose to submit a narrative statement about any of the three areas, including any additional information which the faculty member wishes be taken into account.
- 2.5. The overall merit score is calculated according to the “weighted allocation of effort” algorithm exemplar C from Appendix B. Each component score for each faculty member is multiplied by the percentage allocation of effort for that component and then these products are summed.
- 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.

6. Additional Information

Approved by the Department of Philosophy at the May 6, 2015 Faculty Meeting


Michael Weber, Chair, Philosophy

Date May 18, 2015

Approved:


Raymond Craig, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Date May 20, 2015

Approved:


Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP

Date May 21, 2015

Effect from calendar year 2016

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

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

Three exemplars are available for adaptation and use, as listed below. Immediately following each exemplar is an example of how it might be completed (although it is up to each academic unit to decide what to include in its own exemplar based on discipline, mission, etc.).

EXEMPLAR #3 EXAMPLE (for illustrative purposes only):

Merit committee members will individually review the faculty member’s merit dossier and provide a score in each of the areas of teaching, research, and service. Merit committee members will provide integer scores (1-5). Committee members will try to arrive at a consensus on the numerical scores for each component for each faculty member. However, when consensus cannot be reached, scores will be arrived at by averaging the scores from each committee member.

Evaluation Rating Category	<p style="text-align: center;">TEACHING</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)</p>	Possible Merit Score for Teaching
Exceeds expectations for merit	<p>Typically either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very strong student and peer evaluations and evidence of curricular and/or pedagogical development <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. An overall rating of “excellent” or above on a peer evaluation, if one has been conducted in the year under review b. Quantitative student evaluation scores <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. on average, 10% over the level average or, (since level averages can be quite high) ii. averaging around 3.3 on our 4 point scale c. Evidence of curricular and/or pedagogical development including, e.g., design of new courses, modification of current courses, participation in professional development activities, integration of new pedagogical techniques such as those involved in ‘active learning’ <p>Or:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Strong peer and student evaluations, curricular and/or pedagogical development, and considerable extra work <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. An overall rating of “good” on a peer evaluation, if one has been conducted in the year under review b. Quantitative student evaluation scores <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. at or about the level averages or, (since level averages can be quite high) 	4 – 5

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. averaging about 2.5 on our 4 point scale c. Evidence of curricular and/or pedagogical development including, e.g., design of new courses, modification of current courses, participation in professional development activities, integration of new pedagogical techniques such as those involved in 'active learning' d. Considerable extra work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. directing an unusually large number of theses or dissertation committees or directed readings ii. making unusually significant contributions to curriculum or course development, for example, being instrumental in designing a new minor or 'track' for the major. <p>Note that these conditions are sufficient, not necessary. A faculty member may also submit additional information relevant to teaching effectiveness, including but not limited to a narrative about his or her teaching philosophy and practice, information about the use of "active learning methods" in class, information about participation in professional development activities, teaching awards, syllabi, unsolicited student comments, and results of objective evaluations of teaching effectiveness (e.g., comparison pre-and post-tests of course material). Furthermore, the evaluation committee may also consider extenuating circumstances when reviewing quantitative scores that fall far outside departmental norms.</p>	
<p>Meets expectations for merit</p>	<p>Typically either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Strong student and peer evaluations and some evidence of curricular and/or professional development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. strong peer evaluations – an overall rating of "good" or above on a peer evaluation, if one has been conducted in the year under review b. quantitative student evaluations scores <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. on average, at or around the level averages or, (since level averages can be quite high) ii. averaging around 2.5 on our 4 point scale c. some participation in curricular and/or pedagogical development, e.g., design of new courses, modification of current courses, participation in professional development activities, integration of new pedagogical techniques such as those involved in 'active learning' 	<p>2 – 3</p>

	<p>or</p> <p>2 Considerable extra work</p> <p>a. Directing an unusually large number of theses or dissertations or directed readings</p> <p>or</p> <p>b. Making unusually significant contributions to curriculum or course development, including, for instance, being instrumental in the development of a new minor or track for the major.</p> <p>Note that these conditions are sufficient, not necessary. A faculty member may also submit additional information relevant to teaching effectiveness, including but not limited to a narrative about his or her teaching philosophy and practice, information about the use of “active learning methods” in class, information about participation in professional development activities, teaching awards, syllabi, unsolicited student comments, and results of objective evaluations of teaching effectiveness (e.g., comparison pre-and post-tests of course material). Furthermore, the evaluation committee may also consider extenuating circumstances when reviewing quantitative scores that fall far outside departmental norms.</p>	
<p>Fails to meet expectations for merit</p>	<p>Student evaluation quantitative scores fall well below the department averages, and peer evaluations, if any have been conducted, are mixed. The faculty member plays little role in directing theses or dissertations or directed readings. The faculty member shows little participation in professional development activities or curricular development.</p>	<p>1</p>

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

<p>Evaluation Rating Category</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">RESEARCH</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Expected levels of accomplishment on research performance indicators (or their equivalent)</p>	<p>Possible Merit Score for Research</p>
<p>Exceeds expectations for merit</p>	<p>Typically,</p> <p>a. two substantial publications (“substantial” means an article, rather than simply a note or a book review) in a national or international journal</p> <p>or</p> <p>b. one substantial publication in a top tier journal</p>	<p>4 - 5</p>

	<p>or</p> <p>c. one publication in a national or international journal and one “revise and resubmit” from a national or international journal</p> <p>“National and international” here is meant to exclude merely regional journals, for example the Proceedings of the Ohio Philosophical Association. At the beginning of each academic year the members of the department agree on a list of which count as the “top tier” journals.</p> <p>The evaluation committee may also take into account other performance indicators, including grants applied for and/or received, invited talks, prizes, presentations at regional, national, and international conferences, and invited comments on papers at regional, national, or international conferences, work in progress, articles which have been submitted but not yet accepted, articles in the revise and resubmit stage, etc. The committee can award a rating of “exceeds expectations” if, in its judgment, the faculty member’s overall research productivity has been roughly equivalent to two published papers.</p>	
<p>Meets expectations for merit</p>	<p>Typically, one substantial publication in a national or international journal</p> <p>“National and international” here is meant to exclude merely regional journals, for example the Proceedings of the Ohio Philosophical Association.</p> <p>The evaluation committee may also take into account other performance indicators, including grants applied for and/or received, invited talks, prizes, presentations at regional, national, and international conferences, and invited comments on papers at regional, national, or international conferences, work in progress, articles which have been submitted but not yet accepted, articles in the revise and resubmit stage, etc. The committee can award a rating of “meets expectations” if, in its judgment, the faculty member’s overall research productivity has been roughly equivalent to one published paper.</p>	<p>2 - 3</p>
<p>Fails to meet expectations for merit</p>	<p>Either no or minimal research activity. The delivery of a single paper at a conference shall count as minimal research activity.</p>	<p>1</p>

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

Evaluation Rating Category	<p style="text-align: center;">SERVICE</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators (or their equivalent)</p>	Possible Merit Score for Service
Exceeds expectations for merit	<p>For faculty members other than the chair of the department: participates in activities expected of all faculty members (for instance, attendance at faculty meetings, attendance and participation in departmental retreats, graduate entry advising), and, for those who are members of the graduate faculty, those activities expected of all graduate faculty (including graduate student review and MA portfolio review); is chair of at least two departmental committees or is chair of one and an active member of another, at least one of which has a heavy workload; serves on at least one college or university committee. (This last requirement can be waived in case where someone has made an attempt to serve on college or university committees by standing for election, but has not been given the opportunity.)</p> <p>The requirements for the departmental chair must be different, since the chair does not typically chair department committees. The department faculty members are asked each year to fill out a (college) chair evaluation form, where the chair's performance on a number of parameters is evaluated on a four point scale (excellent, good, fair, and weak). To receive a rating of 'exceeds expectations', the chair must have received a preponderance of ratings of 'excellent' on this form.</p>	
Meets expectations for merit	<p>For faculty members other than the chair: participates in activities expected of all faculty members (for instance, attendance at faculty meetings, attendance and participation in departmental retreats, student advising), and, for those who are members of the graduate faculty, those activities expected of all graduate faculty (for instance graduate student review, MA portfolio review); is chair of at least one departmental committee or is an active member of a committee with a heavy workload; and shows willingness to participate in college or university service (as shown by willingness to put his or her name up for</p>	2 - 3

	<p>elections, for instance, and agreeing to serve on committees if asked).</p> <p>For the chair of the department: has received a preponderance of ratings of at least good on the college chair evaluation form that faculty are asked to fill out each year.</p>	
<p>Fails to meet expectations for merit</p>	<p>For faculty members other than the chair: Doesn't regularly participate in activities expected of all faculty members (for instance, attendance at faculty meetings, attendance and participation in departmental retreats, student advising), or, for those who are members of the graduate faculty, those activities expected of all graduate faculty (graduate student review, MA portfolio review). Minimal or no committee service.</p> <p>For the chair: has received an preponderance of ratings of 'fair' or 'poor' on the college evaluation form that faculty are asked to fill out each year.</p>	<p>1</p>

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

SUMMARY FORM

(Each merit committee member shall assign integer values for each merit score. The merit committee will try to reach consensus on each component score for each faculty member. However, if consensus is impossible to reach, the overall score for each component will be computed by averaging the scores provided by each merit committee member. The composite score is achieved by using a weighted algorithm. That is, each faculty member's score for each component is multiplied by his or her allocation of effort for that component., and the resultant figures are summed. So, if a faculty member has a 40/40/20 allocation of effort for teaching, research, and service, his/her teaching and research scores will be each be multiplied by .4, and his/her service score by .2. The resultant numbers will be summed to reach a final score.)

Faculty Member	Merit Score for Teaching	Merit Score for Research	Merit Score for Service
Next faculty member			
Next faculty member			

Appendix B Options for Determining Overall Merit Score Recommendations

Exemplar C: 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:

$[Teaching/Librarian\ Effectiveness\ Merit\ Score * Allocation\ of\ Effort] + [Research/Creative\ Work\ Merit\ Score * Allocation\ of\ Effort] + [Service\ Merit\ Score * Allocation\ of\ Effort] = Overall\ Merit\ Score$

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation
1.0 – 1.9	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; not eligible for merit
2.0 – 3.1	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
3.2 - 5.0	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit