

Merit Document
Department of Political Science

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, 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 seven 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. According to the department charter, the merit committee consists of 3 faculty members nominated by the chair and elected by the full-time faculty members in the department. A new election will be held each year. Any faculty member with rank of Instructor or above may serve, except for faculty in the last

year of their appointment (defined as: anyone who has signed a terminal contract, whose renewal appointment has been denied, or who is on a one-year visiting appointment).

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 should include the following elements:

- Department Merit Form which lists activities in teaching, research, and service from the previous year and not submitted to the merit committee in previous years.
- Updated CV
- Syllabi from courses taught and assignments showing high impact teaching practices
- Any peer evaluations of teaching conducted in that year
- Open ended course evaluations from at least one course selected by the faculty member and compiled by the department secretary
- An FIL report, if applicable
- Copies of publications, or a letter of acceptance from the publisher or editor if the research has not yet come out in print.

2.5. Description of how the overall merit score is calculated.

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:

$[Teaching\ Merit\ Score * Allocation\ of\ Effort] + [Research\ Merit\ Score * Allocation\ of\ Effort] + [Service\ Merit\ Score * Allocation\ of\ Effort] = Overall\ Merit\ Score$ **rounded to the nearest whole number.**

The allocation of effort for TTF shall be within the following ranges:

a. Normally service will be 0.20; in cases where the faculty member has course or research releases for service-related activities the weight for service will increase by 0.10 for each course release;

b. The range for teaching and research will normally be 0.35 - 0.45; in cases where the faculty member has course or research releases for service-related activities the weight for teaching or research will be adjusted down accordingly. A faculty member with one course release will have teaching or research weighted from 0.25-0.35; a faculty member with two course releases will have teaching or research weighted from 0.15-0.25;

c. The total weights for research, teaching, and service must sum to 1.00;

d. the weighting is for merit purposes only and will have no effect on the assignment of course loads or other work duties.

The allocation of effort for NTTF shall be within the following ranges:

a. service will be worth 0.10- 0.20. Service weights below 0.20 will be applied only to short-term NTTF, from whom the department expects minimal service; in cases where the faculty member has course or research releases for service-related activities the weight for service will increase by 0.10 for each course release;

b. the range for teaching is 0.70 – 0.90 and the range for research is 0.00 – 0.20; in cases where a faculty member has course or research releases for service-related activities the weight for teaching or research will be 0.60-0.80; a faculty member with two course releases will have teaching or research weighted from 0.50-0.70;

c. the total weights for teaching, research, and service must sum to 1.00.

d. this weighting is for merit purposes only and will have no effect on the assignment of course loads or other work duties.

A range of weights is beneficial for both the faculty member and the College/University. Multi-year projects (e.g. large grant applications, continued research for articles and/or books, development of innovative and high-impact learning techniques/pedagogies) do not, by their own nature, conform to the tight restriction of the calendar year. Moreover, the “payoff” from these activities cannot necessarily be predicted to a degree of precision (e.g. whether a book is published in December or January) that the calendar year system of merit requires. Having a flexible allocation of merit allows the faculty to concentrate on multi-year projects in any of the three merit areas that bring funds, research, recognition, pedagogical innovation, and/or positive attention to the university. Thus, if the merit score can be improved by choosing weights within the ranges specified in 2.1 that are different than the original weights, the merit committee shall do so.

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation
1	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
2-3	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
4-5	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 (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 FML. If related to FML, 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 Members who take 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 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 shall be eligible for merit in any calendar year during which 50% unpaid leave was taken. In such cases, 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. Faculty members in their first year will be evaluated as meeting expectations unless they have earned a higher ranking.
 - 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

The merit committee will recommend dollar allocations to the Dean of Arts and Sciences, understanding that the final decision rests with the Dean.

The dollar allocation recommendation shall be based on the following:

- a. All faculty members who achieve the same overall level of merit shall receive the same percentage increase in salary, not the same dollar increase.

b. Faculty members who exceed expectations for merit (levels 4-5) and faculty members who meet expectations for merit (levels 2-3) shall be rewarded in a ratio of 4:3. This can be computed as follows:

i. Multiply the salary of each faculty member at level 2-3 by 3. Multiply the salary of each faculty member at level 4-5 by 4. Take the sum of all of these "salary-shares." Divide this number into the total dollar amount available for merit. This yields a fraction that can be multiplied by each faculty member's salary-share to yield their recommended raise in dollars.

Example:

Suppose that we have a department of 3 members.

A makes 60,000 per year and got level 4 merit.

B makes 50,000 per year and got level 3 merit.

C makes 40,000 per year and got level 5 merit.

Following the procedure in (i), salary-shares are:

A salary * 4 = 240,000

B salary * 3 = 150,000

C salary * 4 = 160,000

Total: 550,000

Suppose that the total amount available for merit pay is 3% of the department's total salary (40k+50k+60k = 150,000). $150,000 * .03 = \$450$.

Now divide: $450 / 550,000 = 0.0008181$

Now multiply each salary-share by that fraction to get the raise:

A raise = $\$240,000 * 0.0008181 = \$196.34 = 3.27\%$ of A's \$60,000 salary

B raise = $\$150,000 * 0.0008181 = \$122.72 = 2.45\%$ of B's 50,000 salary

C raise = $\$160,000 * 0.0008181 = \underline{\$130.90 = 3.27\%}$ of C's 40,000 salary

Total \$449.96

Ratio of 3.27% to 2.45% = 1.33/1 or 4:3

Approved by the Department/ of Political Science at the Faculty 2/17/16.

Neil Englehart  Date 2/17/16
Name, Chair

Approved:  Date 3/15/16
Name, Dean of College Name

Approved:  Date 3/19/16
Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VPAA

Appendix A

Calculation of Merit Scores

Teaching

Teaching assignment for calendar year: _____

Pre-specified allocation of effort for Teaching: ____ %

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (Circle One)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
<i>Quantitative teaching evaluations</i>	<i>5=exceeds expectations</i> <i>4=exceeds expectations</i> <i>3=satisfactory</i> <i>2=satisfactory</i> <i>1=fails to meet expectations</i>	See below ¹
<i>Peer evaluations</i>	<i>Superior evaluation(s)</i> <i>Positive evaluation(s)</i> <i>Neutral evaluation(s)</i> <i>Negative evaluation(s)</i> <i>N/A=no peer evaluation available</i>	Judgment of merit committee
<i>Open ended comments from teaching evaluations</i>	<i>Superior</i> <i>Positive</i> <i>Neutral</i> <i>Negative</i>	Judgment of merit committee based on their categorization of the preponderance of the comments
<i>Syllabi and course materials showing high impact teaching practices</i>	<i>Highly positive: two or more examples of high impact</i> <i>Positive: one or more example</i> <i>Neutral: no high impact activities but sound pedagogy</i> <i>Negative: no high impact activities and problems with pedagogy</i>	Judgment of the merit committee based on their analysis of course materials presented.
<i>Teaching in addition to teaching assignment, including guest lectures, team teaching, service on exam/thesis committees, etc.</i>	<i>Very high level</i> <i>High level</i> <i>Moderate level</i> <i>None</i>	Judgment of the merit committee based on the time and effort devoted to supplemental teaching activities
<i>Teaching awards or recognitions</i>	<i>Yes</i> <i>No</i>	Merit committee evaluates based on the significance and prestige of award/recognition.

Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Teaching Score of 4-5	<i>Quantitative teaching evaluation level 4 or 5 and a preponderance of positive evaluations in other categories. (Merit committee may recommend a change of one level up or down based on their evaluation of evidence of teaching effectiveness other than the quantitative evaluations).</i>
Meets Expectations for Merit in Teaching Score of 2-3	<i>Quantitative teaching evaluation level 2 or 3 and a preponderance of positive evaluations in other categories. (Merit committee may recommend a change of one level up or down based on their evaluation of evidence of teaching effectiveness other than the quantitative evaluations).</i>

Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Teaching
Score of 1

Quantitative teaching evaluation level 1 (Merit committee may recommend a change of one level up or down based on their evaluation of evidence of teaching effectiveness other than the quantitative evaluations).

¹Calculation of levels for quantitative teaching evaluations:

Based on criteria outlined below, a level (1-5) is assigned to faculty for each course. A faculty member's overall teaching level for quantitative evaluations is calculated by averaging the levels assigned for each course taught during the year (rounded to the nearest whole number). Please note that the scale on department evaluation forms rates 1 as the highest level of achievement and 5 as lowest.

Level 1:

The threshold is an average across the 14 questions currently used from the Bowling Green State University Department of Political Science Student Course Evaluation (questions 1-11, 13, 15, 16) of greater than the following for each course taught at each numerical level:

1000/2000: 2.50
3000/4000: 2.25
5000 & +: 1.75

Level 2:

The threshold is an average across the 14 questions currently used from the Bowling Green State University Department of Political Science Student Course Evaluation (questions 1-11, 13, 15, 16) of less than or equal to the following for each course taught at each numerical level:

1000/2000: 2.50
3000/4000: 2.25
5000 & +: 1.75

Level 3:

Faculty must be at Level 2 and must average less than or equal to the following thresholds on questions 7, 8 (pedagogy for critical thinking) 15 and 16 (course/faculty comparison) for each course taught at each numerical level:

1000/2000: 2.50
3000/4000: 2.25
5000 & +: 1.75

Level 4:

The threshold is an average across the 14 questions now used on the student teaching evaluation of less than or equal to the following, for each course taught at each numerical level:

1000/2000: 2.0
3000/4000: 1.75
5000 & +: 1.50

Level 5:

Faculty must be at level 4 and must average less than or equal to the following thresholds on questions 7, 8 (pedagogy for critical thinking) 15 and 16 (course/faculty comparisons) for each course taught at each numerical level:

1000/2000: 2.0
3000/4000: 1.75
5000 & +: 1.50

Note: The thresholds for each teaching level are based on historical trends which clearly show that 1000/2000 level courses consistently score worse than 3000/4000 level, and that graduate (5000+) courses regularly achieve the (best) scores.

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

Research

Pre-specified allocation of effort for Research: ____ %

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (Circle One)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
<i>Scholarship: publications and presentations</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Superior: Similar to "High" level but either greater in quantity or of a national/ international impact; may also be awarded for a single book of superior quality</i> • <i>High: Multiple articles, chapters, and/or other similar works; Published book manuscript</i> • <i>Significant: Peer-reviewed article; substantive book chapter, or similar works</i> • <i>Satisfactory: Research presentation; convention paper; book review; encyclopedia entry, article/chapter under submission; or other similar works</i> • <i>None: No demonstration of research activity</i> 	Judgment of the Merit Committee. Rating may be moved up or down the scale based on significance and impact of the scholarship.
<i>Grant activity¹</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Superior: External grant(s) greater than \$40,000</i> • <i>High: External grant(s) greater than \$2,500 but less than \$40,000</i> • <i>Significant: Internal grant(s) or external grant(s) of less than or equal to \$2,500</i> • <i>Satisfactory: Activity evident but all applications denied or pending.</i> • <i>None: No activity</i> 	Judgment of the Merit Committee. Ratings may be moved up the scale based on significance, impact, and/or degree of difficulty obtaining the grant.
<i>Applied research and scholarship of Engagement²</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Superior: Significant and substantial local/national/international impact</i> • <i>High: Significant and substantial impact in a local/regional community</i> • <i>Significant: important substantial impact</i> • <i>Satisfactory: Minimal impact</i> • <i>None: No work in this area</i> 	Judgment of the Merit Committee. This category cannot lower an overall merit rating but may move it up beyond what is accomplished in the other categories.

<i>Research awards and recognitions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Superior: National or international award</i> • <i>High: External Award, Professional or regional award</i> • <i>Significant: Internal Award or recognition</i> • <i>None: No Award</i> 	Judgment of the Merit Committee. Awards may be moved up or down the scale based on significance and impact. This category cannot lower an overall merit rating but may move it up beyond what is accomplished in the other categories.
---	---	--

¹ The full amount of multi-year grants may be count for each year of the grant.

² Applied research involves the application of scholarship to address the needs of the broader community. Scholarship of engagement is similar except it makes contributions to the community of scholars in addition to the broader community. Normally, both applied research and scholarship of engagement include a written component and involve intellectual content and dissemination that are comparable to traditional academic research. As such it can be evaluated based on its intellectual quality and impact. If the impact of the work is solely in the non-academic arena of public policy makers, public administrators, and other public institutions, then it is applied research. If, in addition, the work has an impact on others in the academic discipline, then it is scholarship of engagement. Like outlets for traditional research, one form is not inherently superior to the other, but rather each should be judged based on its intellectual quality and impact. Examples of such scholarship include, but are not limited to: reports, surveys, or analysis provided to units of government, government agencies, nonprofit groups, or other public sector entities; expert testimony delivered to legislatures or the courts; research projects conducted with a community partner organization. The impact of SoE and applied research is determined by sets of indicators including but not limited to: the readership of reports; number of people and organizations affected; levels of government affected; policies affected, etc.

Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Research <i>Score of 5</i>	<i>An evaluation level of "superior" in either Scholarship or Grant Activity. (Merit committee may recommend a change of one level up based on their evaluation of other categories).</i>
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Research <i>Score of 4</i>	<i>An evaluation level of "high" in either Scholarship or Grant Activity. (Merit committee may recommend a change of one level up based on their evaluation of other categories).</i>
Meets Expectations for Merit in Research/Creative Work <i>Score of 2-3</i>	<i>An evaluation level of "satisfactory" or "significant" in either Scholarship or Grant Activity. (Merit committee may recommend a change of one level up based on their evaluation of other categories).</i>
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Research/Creative Work <i>Score of 1</i>	<i>An evaluation level no greater than "none" in either Scholarship or Grant Activity. (Merit committee may recommend a change of one level up based on their evaluation of other categories).</i>

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

Service

Pre-Specified Allocation of Effort for Service ___ %

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (Circle One)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
<i>Department service</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Superior; e.g. chairing search committee or especially time-consuming leadership on department committees, or</i> 	Judgment of the Merit Committee based on the time, effort, significance, quality, quantity, and substance of the

	<p><i>equivalent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>High; e.g. active search committee membership or equivalent</i> • <i>Significant; e.g. leadership on department committees or equivalent</i> • <i>Moderate; e.g. attendance at department and committee meetings</i> • <i>Poor or None: Failure to meet minimum requirements (e.g. not attending department and committee meetings)</i> 	service.
College, university and/or BGSU-FA service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Superior; e.g. leadership role on major College or University committee, especially time-consuming committee service (such as PTRC), senior leadership role in FA, or equivalent</i> • <i>High; e.g. faculty senate leadership role, or equivalent</i> • <i>Significant; e.g. leadership role on a College or University committee; faculty senate, or equivalent</i> • <i>Moderate; e.g. membership on a College or University committee, or equivalent</i> • <i>Poor or None; e.g. failure to perform committee duties or to attend meetings, or equivalent</i> 	Judgment of the Merit Committee based on the time, effort, significance, quality, quantity, and substance of the service.
Professional service, including professional organizations and AAUP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Superior; e.g. senior leadership role in AAUP or professional organization, or equivalent</i> • <i>High; e.g. leadership role not reaching the "superior" category, or equivalent</i> • <i>Significant; e.g. membership on professional organization or FA committees, or equivalent</i> • <i>Moderate; e.g. serving as journal article reviewer, book reviewer, or equivalent</i> • <i>Poor or None; e.g. failure to perform duties voluntarily agreed to, or equivalent</i> 	Judgment of the Merit Committee based on the time, effort, significance, quality, quantity, and substance of the service.

<p><i>Community service or work related to the discipline of Political Science or Public Administration</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Superior; e.g. extensive service to the community such as top leadership role in relevant community organization, especially numerous media interviews, highly time-consuming service learning projects serving community organizations, or equivalent.</i> • <i>High; e.g. leadership role in relevant community organization, service learning projects serving community organizations, or equivalent</i> • <i>Significant; e.g. numerous public talks, service learning projects for on-campus clients, or equivalent</i> • <i>Moderate; e.g. active participation in relevant community organizations, public talks, or equivalent</i> • <i>Poor or None; e.g. failure to perform agreed to community service duties, or equivalent</i> 	<p>Judgment of the Merit Committee based on the time, effort, significance, quality, quantity, and substance of the service.</p>
---	---	--

Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description
<p>Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Service Score of 4-5</p>	<p><i>An evaluation level of "superior" or "high" in 1 or more categories and a level of at least "moderate" in departmental service (Merit committee may recommend a change of one level up based on a strong evaluation in multiple categories).</i></p>
<p>Meets Expectations for Merit in Service Score of 2-3</p>	<p><i>An evaluation level no greater than "moderate" or "significant" in any of the categories and a level of at least "moderate" in departmental service. (Merit committee may recommend a change of one level up based on a strong evaluation in multiple categories).</i></p>
<p>Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Service Score of 1</p>	<p><i>An evaluation level of "moderate" or "poor/none" in the preponderance of the categories. (Merit committee may recommend a change of one level up based on a strong evaluation in a single category).</i></p>

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

SUMMARY FORM

(to be completed based on a majority vote of the merit committee):

Faculty Member	Merit Score Teaching	Allocation of effort Teaching	Merit Score Research	Allocation of effort Research	Merit Score Service	Allocation of effort Service	Final Merit Level

<i>Faculty member 1</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert fraction</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert fraction</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert fraction</i>	
<i>Faculty member 2</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert fraction</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert fraction</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert fraction</i>	
<i>Next faculty member, etc.</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert fraction</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert fraction</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert fraction</i>	