

Merit Policy Part I:
University-Wide Processes Required by the CBA
Approved February 6, 2020; Revised May 16, 2022

Preamble

This document is based on Article 17 (Compensation) of the 2019-2022 Collective Bargaining Agreement between Bowling Green State University and Bowling Green State University Faculty Association – American Association of University Professors. Please refer to Article 17 of the CBA for full details. In all instances, CBA language controls.

Merit/Fixed Market raises refer to the component of salary raises that are provided to Bargaining Unit Faculty Members (hereafter, BUFM) who meet or exceed their assigned unit performance expectations. In any given year, it is possible that all of the faculty members in an academic unit may be eligible for merit salary raises.

The timeline for merit raises is outlined in the table below. For example, merit raises for FY 2020 (i.e., Academic Year Contract 2019-2020) are calculated during Fall 2018 semester based on performance during the previous academic year (Fall 2017, Spring 2018, Summer 2018), and this merit rating is averaged with the merit ratings from the previous two merit periods to calculate a three-year rolling average that will be used to recommend merit increases. Merit salary raises are added to base salary for the ensuing fiscal year (on September 1 for 9-month contracts, and on July 1 for 12-month contracts).

Year Merit/Fixed Market Raise is Added to Base Salary	Merit/Fixed Market Increase Pool	Period of Time Included in Merit/Fixed Market Determination	When Merit/Fixed Market Review and Recommendations are Made by Academic Unit, Chair/Director, and Dean
FY 2020 (<i>i.e., Academic Year Contract 2019-2020</i>)	1.50%	AY 2017-2018 (<i>i.e., Fall 2017, Spring 2018, Summer 2018</i>), AY 2016-2017 (<i>i.e., Fall 2016, Spring 2017, Summer 2017</i>), and CY 2016 (<i>i.e., Spring 2016, Summer 2016, Fall 2016</i>)	Fall semester of AY 2018-2019
FY 2021 (<i>i.e., Academic Year Contract 2020-2021</i>)	1.50%	AY 2018-2019, AY 2017-2018, and AY 2016-2017	Fall semester of AY 2019-2020

FY 2022 (<i>i.e., Academic Year Contract 2021-2022</i>)	1.50%	AY 2019-2020, AY 2018-2019, and AY 2017-2018	Fall semester of AY 2020-2021
FY 2023 (<i>i.e., Academic Year Contract 2022-2023</i>)	1.50%	AY 2020-2021, AY 2019-2020, AY 2018-2019	Fall semester of AY 2021-2022
FY 2024 (<i>i.e., Academic Year Contract 2023-2024</i>)	1.50%	AY 2021-2022, AY 2020-2021, AY 2019-2020,	Fall semester of AY 2022-2023

Merit/Fixed Market eligibility will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations for merit in the following areas: Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service. Each BUFM will receive merit scores for the appropriate performance areas as well as an overall merit score which will identify whether the BUFM's performance was unacceptable, did not meet expectations for merit, met expectations for merit, or exceeded expectations for merit.

Receiving an evaluation of "unacceptable" from unit BUFM (not the Chair/Director) in any area of performance (teaching/librarian effectiveness, scholarly/creative activity, service) during the merit review process may initiate an Extraordinary Review (see Article 31 of the CBA). Failure to meet expectations for merit does not necessarily indicate "unacceptable" performance. An evaluation of "unacceptable" is presumed to occur infrequently as it indicates a pattern of performance that is below an ordinary and acceptable level and warrants attention. Definitions of "unacceptable" shall be determined by the unit BUFM and Chair/Director with the approval of the Dean (Article 31, Section 3.1).

For BUFMs who are deemed unqualified to teach according to unit accreditation standards or who do not maintain the appropriate level of graduate faculty status required by their unit, the following are examples of remedies that may be developed:

- Change in teaching and/or service assignment to be determined by chair/director and dean
- Scholarship/creative activity success plan developed collaboratively between the BUFM and chair/director and approved by the dean (e.g., articulation of research/creative activity currently in progress or under development; long-term plan for the next five years)
- Other remedy agreed to by the BUFM, chair/director, and dean

When BUFMs experience periods of low or no productivity in scholarly/creative activity, opportunities to regain productivity and access to merit and promotion may be explored. These discussions may be initiated by BUFMs, chairs/directors, or deans and should result in a collaboratively developed plan to support a return to productivity (e.g., scholarly/creative internal grants, temporary reduction of teaching load).

BUFMs may undertake non-traditional scholarship and/or creative activities and submit those for merit, reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion consideration. Academic units are encouraged to credit non-traditional scholarship and/or creative outcomes and activities as a component of

scholarly/creative activity achievement and effectiveness. Units should incorporate written standards and criteria for non-traditional scholarship and/or creative activities in the department's/school's "Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes" document as approved by the dean and provost (e.g., scholarship of engagement, community-based scholarship/creative work, virtual performances or exhibitions).

The three performance area merit scores as well as the overall merit score will include six or more categories or rating levels to allow for greater discrimination among levels of performance; each of the categories or rating levels on the merit score must clearly identify whether performance was unacceptable, did not meet expectations for merit, did meet expectations for merit, or exceeded expectations for merit. For example, using the six categories or rating levels, the following evaluation concepts would be included: 0 = Unacceptable; 1 = Did not meet expectations for merit; 2/3 = Met expectations for merit; 4/5 = Exceeded expectations for merit.

Both the merit committee of the academic unit and the Chair/Director may make recommendations to the Dean for allocation of merit dollars and/or percentages. However, as provided for by Section 12.3 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. Differences in recommendations for merit reviews may occur due to access of Chair/Director/Dean to documentation of performance-related issues not in the dossier but previously shared with the BUFM (e.g., outcomes of the discipline process, prior feedback on performance) directly pertaining to the BUFM's teaching/librarian effectiveness, scholarly/creative activity, and/or service. In no instances other than annual performance reviews shall the Chair, Director, Dean, or Provost letters be the first time the performance-related issue is brought to the attention of the BUFM.

1. Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations, and Calculation of Merit Scores

The merit criteria, performance indicators and expectations for the criteria, and the calculation of the component merit scores are contained in each unit's "Merit Policy Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes" document.

NOTE: *The Dean of each College will determine which of the exemplars for calculating merit scores found in Appendix A will be used by the academic units in that College.*

Each academic unit will then complete that exemplar as appropriate given the unit's discipline, mission, etc. The completed instrument will be included in each unit's "Merit Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes."

NOTE: *The merit process shall not use data from the university's online student course evaluation unless it has been adopted by an academic unit as part of their criteria, standards and procedures for merit purposes according to the procedures stated in Section 5 of this document.*

2. General Procedure for Faculty Evaluation and Score of Merit

- 2.1. Prior to the beginning of the academic year for merit/fixed market decisions made for FY 2021, and prior to the beginning of the academic year for merit/fixed market decisions made in FY 2022, each faculty member will confirm their

allocation of effort (e.g., 50/30/20 for teaching, scholarship, and service) with the Chair/Director.

- 2.2. The academic unit merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every faculty member. A description of the committee composition and the election/appointment process is outlined in each unit's "Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes" document.
 - 2.3. Faculty members who fail to submit a merit portfolio by the deadline will receive an automatic rating of "unacceptable" and will not be eligible for any salary adjustments (Article 17, Sections 3.2.1 and 3.3.1). For QRF in years one through six, a merit rating of "unacceptable" will be independent from the APR process.
 - 2.4. The submitted merit dossier must include a curriculum vitae (CV), letter of appointment, and the elements outlined in each unit's "Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes" document.
 - 2.5. A description of how the overall merit score is calculated, including how annual scores are averaged over a three-year period, can be found in each unit's "Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes" document, chosen from exemplars provided in Appendix A of this document.
 - 2.6. An academic unit may report its merit score recommendation to no greater than one-tenth of a 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
- 3.1. Significant Dates for Merit Consideration and Appeals – Merit Reviews Conducted during Fall Semester

September 7: Last date for BUFM merit dossiers to be submitted to an academic unit.

The merit committee of the academic unit is urged to work informally with all BUFM being reviewed to resolve any factual or interpretive issues in advance of making recommendations to the Chair/Director.

September 28: Academic unit faculty committee's merit score recommendation to the Chair/Director (with a copy to the BUFM).

October 5: Last date for BUFMs to appeal the committee's recommendation to the Chair/Director (with a copy to the committee).

October 19: Chair's/Director's merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copies to the committee and BUFMs).

October 26: Last date for BUFM to appeal the Chair's/Director's merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copy to the Chair/Director). The BUFM may

raise in any appeal to the Dean: (i) the Chair's/Director's merit score recommendation, and (ii) only those aspects of the committee's recommendation that the BUFM has previously raised in the BUFM's appeal to the Chair/Director. Issues related to the committee's recommendation not raised previously with the Chair/Director (where the BUFM 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.

November 15: Dean's recommendation to the Provost. Thereafter the Provost and Dean may confer through December 1.

On or about January 15: Dean or designee notifies BUFM of merit decisions.

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 2.1.7). BUFMs shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the BUFMs will include consultation with the host institution.

4.1.2. **Leaves with Extramural Salary Paid through the University Payroll System** (Article 21, Section 3.1.3) BUFMs shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the BUFMs will include consultation with the sponsoring government agency or private foundation.

4.1.3. **Unpaid Leave - 100% time** (Article 21, Section 4.5). BUFMs will not be eligible for merit in any academic 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.** 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 11.10). BUFMs who take parental leave under this Article will only be evaluated for performance during the time in which they were 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 Chair's/Director's evaluation shall include a description of the methods used for prorating.

4.1.6. **Partial Unpaid Leave – 50% time** (Article 21, Section 12.3.3) BUFMs will not be eligible for merit in any academic 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 7.3.4) BUFMs shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for BUFMs 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 BUFM Hires.** New BUFMs whose employment does not include the full year of performance on which merit is typically based 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 Chair/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 BUFM and the reputation of the institution.

5. Amendment of Merit Policy

The unit faculty may amend their unit's Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes document at any time. Amendments to the merit document must be approved by the Dean and Provost. Approved amendments to the merit policy shall not be applied retroactively in the calculation of the previous year's merit scores (i.e., an amended merit policy must be completed prior to the start of the AY contract for it to be the basis for merit/fixed market evaluation for that academic year).

Updated to comply with CBA #3 (July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2022)
Approved February 6, 2020 by Provost and President of BGSU-FA

Revised May 16, 2022

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, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service. To determine whether BUFMs 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, Scholarly/Creative Activity, 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 #1

Overview

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/Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Activity, 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 BUFM to make an evaluation rating on each performance indicator, providing some basis or justification of each rating where appropriate.

Evaluation ratings provided for all performance indicators within each performance criteria will be combined by each member of the merit committee to reach a component rating for each of the relevant performance criteria (Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service). Merit committee members will meet as a committee to review and reach consensus on component ratings for each of the relevant performance criteria, using the summary form provided. The component ratings may include any number of values or rating levels, but they must clearly identify whether the component reflects performance that is unacceptable, fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

The merit committee will then assign an overall merit rating using the approach found in Section 2.5 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 is unacceptable, fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness (fill in blanks and replace italicized information)

Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness assignment for calendar year: _____

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

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (Circle One)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
<i>Insert Performance Indicator #1</i>	• <i>Insert Highest Rating Level</i> • <i>Insert Next Highest Rating Level</i> • <i>Etc.</i> • <i>Insert Next Lowest Rating Level</i> <i>Fair</i> • <i>Insert Lowest Rating Level</i>	
<i>Insert Performance Indicator #2</i>	• <i>Insert Highest Rating Level</i> • <i>Insert Next Highest Rating Level</i> • <i>Etc.</i> • <i>Insert Next Lowest Rating Level</i> <i>Fair</i> • <i>Insert Lowest Rating Level</i>	
<i>Insert Performance Indicator <u>n</u></i>	• <i>Insert Highest Rating Level</i> • <i>Insert Next Highest Rating Level</i> • <i>Etc.</i> • <i>Insert Next Lowest Rating Level</i> <i>Fair</i> • <i>Insert Lowest Rating Level</i>	

Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness <i>(insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 6-7 on a 7-point scale)</i>	<i>Insert Definition and Description that defines what is expected to receive a merit score that “Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness”</i>
Meets Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness <i>(insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 3-5 on a 7-point scale)</i>	<i>Insert Definition and Description that defines what is expected to receive a merit score that “Meets Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness”</i>
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness <i>(insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 1-2 on a 7-point scale)</i>	<i>Insert Definition and Description that defines what is expected to receive a merit score that “Fails to meet Expectations for Merit in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness”</i>

Unacceptable Performance in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness <i>(insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., less than 1 on a 7-point scale)</i>	<i>Insert Definition and Description that defines what is expected to receive a merit score of “Unacceptable in Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness”</i>
---	--

Merit Score for Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness

(to be completed by merit committee member): _____

Scholarly/Creative Activity (fill in blanks and replace italicized information)

Pre-specified allocation of effort for Scholarly/Creative Activity: _____%

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (Circle One)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
<i>Insert Performance Indicator #1</i>	• <i>Insert Highest Rating Level</i> • <i>Insert Next Highest Rating Level</i> • <i>Etc.</i> • <i>Insert Next Lowest Rating Level</i> <i>Fair</i> • <i>Insert Lowest Rating Level</i>	
<i>Insert Performance Indicator #2</i>	• <i>Insert Highest Rating Level</i> • <i>Insert Next Highest Rating Level</i> • <i>Etc.</i> • <i>Insert Next Lowest Rating Level</i> <i>Fair</i> • <i>Insert Lowest Rating Level</i>	
<i>Insert Performance Indicator <u>n</u></i>	• <i>Insert Highest Rating Level</i> • <i>Insert Next Highest Rating Level</i> • <i>Etc.</i> • <i>Insert Next Lowest Rating Level</i> <i>Fair</i> • <i>Insert Lowest Rating Level</i>	

Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Scholarly/Creative Activity <i>(insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 6-7 on a 7-point scale)</i>	<i>Insert Definition and Description that defines what is expected to receive a merit score that “Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Scholarly/Creative Activity”</i>
Meets Expectations for Merit in Scholarly/Creative Activity <i>(insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 3-5 on a 7-point scale)</i>	<i>Insert Definition and Description that defines what is expected to receive a merit score that “Meets Expectations for Merit in Scholarly/Creative Activity”</i>

Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Scholarly/Creative Activity <i>(insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 1-2 on a 7-point scale)</i>	<i>Insert Definition and Description that defines what is expected to receive a merit score that “Fails to meet Expectations for Merit in Scholarly/Creative Activity”</i>
Unacceptable Performance in Scholarly/Creative Activity <i>(insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., less than 1 on a 7-point scale)</i>	<i>Insert Definition and Description that defines what is expected to receive a merit score of “Unacceptable in Scholarly/Creative Activity”</i>

Merit Score for Scholarly/Creative Activity

(to be completed by merit committee member): _____

Service (fill in blanks and replace italicized information)

Pre-Specified Allocation of Effort for Service_%

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (Circle One)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
<i>Insert Performance Indicator #1</i>	• <i>Insert Highest Rating Level</i> • <i>Insert Next Highest Rating Level</i> • <i>Etc.</i> • <i>Insert Next Lowest Rating Level</i> <i>Fair</i> • <i>Insert Lowest Rating Level</i>	
<i>Insert Performance Indicator #2</i>	• <i>Insert Highest Rating Level</i> • <i>Insert Next Highest Rating Level</i> • <i>Etc.</i> • <i>Insert Next Lowest Rating Level</i> <i>Fair</i> • <i>Insert Lowest Rating Level</i>	
<i>Insert Performance Indicator <u>n</u></i>	• <i>Insert Highest Rating Level</i> • <i>Insert Next Highest Rating Level</i> • <i>Etc.</i> • <i>Insert Next Lowest Rating Level</i> <i>Fair</i> • <i>Insert Lowest Rating Level</i>	

Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Service <i>(insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 6-7 on a 7-point scale)</i>	<i>Insert Definition and Description that defines what is expected to receive a merit score that “Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Service”</i>

Meets Expectations for Merit in Service <i>(insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 3-5 on a 7-point scale)</i>	<i>Insert Definition and Description that defines what is expected to receive a merit score that "Meets Expectations for Merit in Service"</i>
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Service <i>(insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 1-2 on a 7-point scale)</i>	<i>Insert Definition and Description that defines what is expected to receive a merit score that "Fails to meet Expectations for Merit in Service"</i>
Unacceptable Performance in Service <i>(insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., less than 1 on a 7-point scale)</i>	<i>Insert Definition and Description that defines what is expected to receive a merit score of "Unacceptable in Service"</i>

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/ Librarian Effectiveness	Merit Score for Scholarly/ Creative Activity	Merit Score for Service
Faculty member 1	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score
Faculty member 2	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score
Next faculty member, etc.	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score

EXEMPLAR #1 EXAMPLE (for illustrative purposes only):

The following rubrics indicate a hypothetical unit's approved performance indicators used to evaluate faculty performance expectations in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. Merit committee members will individually review the BUFM's merit dossier, provide a rating for each performance indicator, and note in the "Basis of the Evaluation Rating" any evidence or accomplishment to justify their rating. Each merit committee member would then assign a component rating in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service.

Teaching

Teaching Assignment for calendar year: **Spring: 1010, 2020 (two sections); Fall: 1010, 4050, 7000**

Pre-specified allocation of Effort for teaching: **50 %**

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (Circle One)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
Quantitative ratings of teaching effectiveness. Student ratings of teaching effectiveness for all courses	- Excellent - Good - Fair	Average 4.7 on 5-point scale

taught during the preceding 12 months	• Poor	
<i>Qualitative ratings</i> of teaching effectiveness. Representative sampling and overview of themes and comments from students' open ended feedback	• Highly positive • Positive • Neutral • Negative • Not included in portfolio	Mostly positive comments
<i>Peer reviews</i> of teaching effectiveness	• Excellent • Good • Fair • Poor • N/A*	Two extremely positive peer reviews
<i>Instructional development.</i> Analysis of teaching performance and subsequent documented improvements in teaching performance as evident through teaching philosophy.	• In depth, thoughtful, shows improvement where needed. • Thoughtful analysis, implementation for efforts to improve. • Some analysis and awareness of need to improve. • Limited analysis; no evidence of needed improvement efforts. • No self-analysis of teaching performance.	Limited documentation of student performance on learning outcomes
<i>High impact learning activities</i> (Examples include – service-learning; undergraduate research; active learning; novel approaches to teaching)	• High level of activity—2 or more • Moderate level of activity—1 • Training to incorporate high impact activities (e.g., learning community participation) • No high impact activities	No evidence presented
<i>Non classroom teaching</i> in addition to teaching assignment (Examples include – thesis and dissertation direction; honors project direction; graduate student mentoring; guest lecturing; peer mentoring)	• Very high level of activity—3 or more with leadership roles • High level of activity—2 or more, OR 1 with leadership role • Moderate level of activity—1, no leadership role • No involvement in non- classroom instruction • N/A	Chairing three theses and serving on two doctoral/masters committees

Other (Examples of other evidence for teaching effectiveness: student performance/success; teaching awards; active engagement in continuing education to support teaching effectiveness; development of new courses).	• Superior • Good • Fair • Poor	n/a
---	--	-----

Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Teaching (6-7)	Preponderance of ratings are in the highest categories OR preponderance of ratings are in the upper-middle categories with one aspect rated as truly exceptional Innovative teacher; provides leadership in instructional development
Meets Expectations for Merit in Teaching (3-5)	Preponderance of ratings are in the middle to upper middle categories Meets obligations well
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Teaching (1-2)	Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories Minimally meets expectations for performance but not to the level deserving of merit Substandard and ineffective teacher
Unacceptable Performance in Teaching (less than 1)	Majority of ratings are in the lowest categories Does not meet expectations for performance ineffective teacher and in need of professional development

Merit Score for Teaching (to be completed by merit committee member): **5.5**

Scholarly/Creative ActivityPre-specified allocation of effort for scholarly/creative activity: 30%

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (Circle One)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
<i>Research & Scholarly Dissemination</i> 1. Peer-reviewed papers accepted 2. Books and book chapters 3. Non-peer reviewed papers 4. Manuscripts under review 5. Peer-reviewed presentations, selective conferences OR invited presentation, national or international 6. Peer-reviewed presentations, less selective conference 7. Invited presentations (regional/local)	• Superior. 4+ examples, with at least 2 from category 1 OR 3+ examples in top 2 categories • <u>Excellent</u> 4+ examples, with at least one from category 1 OR 2 examples in category 1. • Very good. 3 examples, at least 1 of which is from categories 1-4. • Good. 2 examples from any of categories 2 through 7. • Fair. 1 Example. • Poor. No activity to report. NOTE: Multiple examples in one category are considered positively in overall evaluation. The committee will consider information on the selectivity of journals in making its overall evaluation.	Peer reviewed paper, multiple conference presentations

<i>Research funding</i> 1. Significant external grant activity (for example, award of external grants, \$25K and up; may be claimed in multiple years for multiple year grants) 2. Awarded external grant, <\$25K 3. Awarded internal grant, \$5K and up 4. Awarded internal grant, <\$5K 5. Applied for category 1 grant 6. Applied for category 2 grant 7. Applied for category 3 grant 8. Applied for category 4 grant 9. Plan for applying for external funding 10. Plan for applying for internal funding	• Superior. Category 1. • Excellent. Category 2 or 3. • Very good. Category 4, 5, and/or 6 • <u>Good</u>. Category 7 or 8 • Fair. Category 9 or 10 • No activity. Activities as PI most highly ranked, but subcontracts, consultancy, and other collaborative efforts resulting in funding are eligible to be considered in categories 1 and 2.	Applied for internal grant to support graduate student
<i>Ongoing research</i> 1. Project being written for peer-reviewed publication 2. Project being written for peer-reviewed conference presentation 3. Project in data analysis 4. Project in data collection 5. Project in development (e.g., HSRB protocol in preparation or pilot work being planned)	• <u>Excellent</u>. Category 1 activity reported and at least 1 from categories 2-4. • Good. 2 activities reported, from 2-4. • Fair. 1 activity reported, from 2- 5. • Poor. No activity. NOTE: The committee is directed to recognize that some projects may change status over the course of the year; the BUFM should make clear their research trajectory. The committee can consider overall number and stages of development of projects in its overall assessment.	Two articles for peer-reviewed pubs and two peer-reviewed conference papers underway

<i>Research infrastructure</i>	• Good. A clear pattern of multiple activities to develop a functioning lab or project, including setting up &/or learning new equipment, software, &/or procedures, recruiting and training lab assistants, devising successful protocols. Evidence presented of benchmarks met (e.g., purchase of start-up equipment and training in its use). • Adequate. Some activities, as listed above, either lesser in extent or somewhat less clear in terms of evidence presented. • Poor. Expected benchmarks not met (e.g., failure to develop a functioning lab during start up period). • N/A. Lab is at high performance already with no need for development OR research not conducted in a lab environment.	n/a
<i>Intellectual property</i>	• Superior. Significant ongoing work leading to intellectual property, with clear evidence of outcomes achieved (e.g., patent application file, copyright registered for the university, or licensing agreement signed) • Good. Some evidence of work leading to the above. • N/A. NOTE: Most will be scored here. This category is not to be scored except for those who have relevant activities.	n/a

Other	• Superior • Good • Fair • Poor Examples include but are not limited to: awards and recognitions for research activities (editor's awards, university recognition, fellowship in professional and scholarly societies); substantial service that is scholarly in nature (e.g., editorship of journals, invitations to participate in reviewing activities); publications in highly selective venues or invitations to keynote at prestigious conferences; outstanding mentorship of students in research (may overlap with teaching but if relevant may be included in scholarly portfolio).	Associate editor appointment in top journal
-------	--	---

Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Scholarly/Creative Activity (6-7)	Preponderance of ratings are in the highest categories OR preponderance of ratings are in the upper-middle categories with one aspect rated as truly exceptional Clear line of inquiry and established scholarly/creative activity program, meaningful integration and application
Meets Expectations for Merit in Scholarly/Creative Activity (3-5)	Preponderance of ratings are in the middle to upper middle categories Active scholarly/creative activity
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Scholarly/Creative Activity (1-2)	Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories Minimally meets expectations for performance but not to the level deserving of merit Limited or no scholarly/creative activity program
Unacceptable Performance in Scholarly/Creative Activity (Less than 1)	Majority of ratings in the lowest categories Does not meet minimal expectations No scholarly/creative activity program

Merit Score for Scholarly/Creative Activity (to be completed by merit committee member): **6.2**

Service

Pre-Specified Allocation of Effort for Service **20%**

Performance Indicators (description)	Evaluation Rating (Circle One)	Basis of the Evaluation Rating (evidence, accomplishment, etc.)
<i>Faculty Advising</i>	• Acceptable. Is regularly available, provides appropriate advising for student success. • Unacceptable. Fails to be available; refuses to schedule advising appointments when requested; fails to respond to emails); and/or regularly fails to provide appropriate advising • <u>N/A. No advising responsibilities.</u>	n/a
<i>Participation in Department Service</i>	• Superior. Attends faculty meetings, supports student recruitment events, participates successfully in 3 or more committees/activities AND/OR chairs 1 heavy responsibility committee. • Excellent. Attends faculty meetings, supports student recruitment events, participates successfully in 2 or more committees/activities. • <u>Good. Attends faculty meetings, supports student recruitment events, participates successfully in 1 committee.</u> • Fair. Record of attendance at faculty meetings is inconsistent, &/or does not support student recruitment events. Participates in 1 committee, minor role. • Poor. Fails to meet standards for "fair" rating as listed above. • N/A	Attends open houses; member of curriculum committee



<i>College and University Service</i>	• Superior. Participates in 2 or more college or university committees/efforts with a leadership role in one. • Excellent. Participates in two college or university committees/efforts OR chairs one OR participates in exceptionally heavy workload committee (e.g., HSRB). • Good. Participates in at least one college or university committee/effort with significant workload. • Fair. Participates in one college or university committee with minimal workload. • Poor. No college or university service. OR • N/A Service not required in early years on tenure track OR not required of NTTF.	Member college PTRC
<i>Service to the Profession</i>	• Superior--High level of activity—3 or more activities, and a leadership role • Excellent. 3 or more activities OR leadership role in 1. * • Good. 2 activities. • Fair. 1 activity. • Poor. No service to the profession.** OR • N/A. Service to the profession not expected.	Reviewed several submissions to regional conference
<i>Community Service</i>	• Superior--High level of activity—3 or more activities, plus leadership role(s) • Excellent. 3 or more activities. • Good. 2 activities. • Fair. 1 activity. • Poor. No service to the community.** OR • N/A. Service to the community not expected.	Presentation to Kiwanis on recent book chapter: mental health trends

<i>Other</i> Other evidence for effectiveness submitted by the BUFM to be rated here, including but not limited to: awards for service; unusual amount of service for rank/years in rank; exceptional leadership and/or unique projects with high impact; high visibility in state and national service, etc. BUFM should provide sufficient information so that the committee can determine what the role was that the BUFM played.	Evaluation of additional evidence • Superior • Good • Fair • Poor	Nothing submitted
---	--	-------------------

Merit Score (point allocation)	Definition
Exceeds Expectations for Merit in Service (6-7)	Preponderance of ratings are in the highest categories OR preponderance of ratings are in the upper-middle categories with one aspect rated as truly exceptional
Meets Expectations for Merit in Service (3-5)	Preponderance of ratings are in the middle to upper middle categories
Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit in Service (1-2)	Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories Minimally meets expectations for performance but not to the level deserving of merit
Unacceptable Performance in Service (Less than 1)	Majority of ratings are in the lowest categories Does not meet minimal expectations Is not engaging in service activities

Merit Score for Service (to be completed by merit committee member): 3.5

SUMMARY FORM

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

Faculty Member	Merit Score for Teaching	Merit Score for Scholarly/Creative Activity	Merit Score for Service
Alpha, J	5.5	6.2	3.5
Next faculty member			
Next faculty member			

EXEMPLAR #2**Overview**

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/Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Activity, 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 BUFM to make an evaluation rating on each performance indicator.

Evaluation ratings provided for all performance indicators within each performance criteria will be combined by each member of the merit committee to reach a component rating for each of the relevant performance criteria (Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service). Merit committee members will meet as a committee to review and reach consensus on component ratings for each of the relevant performance criteria using the summary form provided. The component ratings may include any number of values or rating levels, but they must clearly identify whether the component reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

The merit committee will then assign an overall merit rating using the approach found in Section 2.5 of the merit policy. The overall merit score may include any number of values or rating levels, but it must clearly identify whether the overall merit score reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness: Performance Indicators

Performance Indicator	Unacceptable (Less than 1)*	Does Not Meet Expectations for Merit (1-2)*	Meets Expectations for Merit (3-5)*	Exceeds Expectations for Merit (6-7)*	ASSIGNED RATING:	WEIGHTS (sum to total number of Performance Indicators)	WEIGHTED RATING ON EACH PERFORMANCE INDICATOR (Assigned Rating * Weight)
<i>Insert Performance Indicator #1</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>		<i>Insert Weight for this Performance Indicator</i>	
<i>Insert Performance Indicator #2</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>		<i>Insert Weight for this Performance Indicator</i>	
<i>Insert Performance Indicator #n</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>		<i>Insert Weight for this Performance Indicator</i>	
						Σ weights =	Σ Weighted Ratings =

MERIT RATING FOR TEACHING:

(weighted ratings/weights)

*Insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 1-7point scale.

Scholarly/Creative Activity: Performance Indicators

Performance Indicator	Unacceptable (Less than 1)*	Does Not Meet Expectations for Merit (1-2)*	Meets Expectations for Merit (3-5)*	Exceeds Expectations for Merit (6-7)*	ASSIGNED RATING:	WEIGHTS (Must sum to total number of Performance Indicators)	WEIGHTED RATING ON EACH PERFORMANCE INDICATOR (Assigned Rating * Weight)
Insert Performance Indicator #1	Insert Expected Level of Performance	Insert Expected Level of Performance	Insert Expected Level of Performance	Insert Expected Level of Performance		Insert Weight for this Performance Indicator	
Insert Performance Indicator #2	Insert Expected Level of Performance	Insert Expected Level of Performance	Insert Expected Level of Performance	Insert Expected Level of Performance		Insert Weight for this Performance Indicator	
Insert Performance Indicator #n	Insert Expected	Insert Expected	Insert Expected	Insert Expected		Insert Weight for this	
	Level of Performance	Level of Performance	Level of Performance	Level of Performance		Performance Indicator	
						Σ weights = _	Σ Weighted Ratings = _
						MERIT RATING FOR SCHOLARLY/ CREATIVE ACTIVITY: _____ (weighted ratings/weights)	

*Insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 1-7point scale.

Service: Performance Indicators

Performance Indicator	Unacceptable (Less than 1)*	Does Not Meet Expectations for merit (1-2)*	Meets Expectations for Merit (3-5)*	Exceeds Expectations for Merit (6-7)*	ASSIGNED RATING:	WEIGHTS (Must sum to total number of Performance Indicators)	WEIGHTED RATING ON EACH PERFORMANCE INDICATOR (Assigned Rating * Weight)
<i>Insert Performance Indicator #1</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>		<i>Insert Weight for this Performance Indicator</i>	
<i>Insert Performance Indicator #2</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>		<i>Insert Weight for this Performance Indicator</i>	
<i>Insert Performance Indicator #n</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>	<i>Insert Expected Level of Performance</i>		<i>Insert Weight for this Performance Indicator</i>	
						Σ weights = _____	Σ Weighted Ratings = _____
						MERIT RATING FOR SERVICE: _____ (weighted ratings/weights)	

*Insert score values on a scale that includes at least five numerical values, e.g., 1-7point scale.

SUMMARY FORM

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

Faculty Member	Merit Score for Teaching/ Librarian Effectiveness	Merit Score for Scholarly/ Creative Activity	Merit Score for Service
Faculty member 1	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score
Faculty member 2	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score
Next faculty member, etc.	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score	Insert numerical score

EXEMPLAR #2 EXAMPLE (for illustrative purposes only):

The following rubrics indicate a hypothetical unit's approved performance indicators used to evaluate faculty performance expectations in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Merit committee members will individually review the BUFM's merit dossier and provide a rating for each performance indicator in each of the areas of teaching, research, and service. (Note: While the component rating categories shown here include seven levels, any number of values or rating levels five or more may be used; the only requirement is that they clearly identify whether the rating/value reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.) Each component merit rating (teaching, research, and service) would be calculated by multiplying the rating on each performance indicator by its assigned weight (which were approved previously by the unit BUFM).

Teaching: Performance Indicators

Performance Indicator	Unacceptable (Less than 1)*	Does Not Meet Expectations for Merit (1 -2)	Meets Expectations for Merit (3-5)	Exceeds Expectations for Merit (6-7)	ASSIGNED RATING:	WEIGHTS (sum to total number of Performance Indicators)	WEIGHTED RATING ON EACH PERFORMANCE INDICATOR (Assigned Rating * Weight)
Quantitative		average below 3.0 out of 4	most between 3.0 and 3.5 out of 4,	most above 3.5 out of 4,		2	
Student Evaluations	ADD		average above 3.0	average above 3.5	5		10
Qualitative Student Evaluations	ADD	less than 50% positive comments	50% - 74% positive comments	75% - 100% positive comments	6	1	6
Peer Reviews(at least one required using dept form)	ADD	either no peer review or Poor-Fair peer review	good peer review(s)	excellent peer review(s)	6.5	1	6.5
Professional Development	ADD	no PD activities	one PD activity (or equivalent)	more than one PD activity (or equivalent)	0	.5	0
High Impact Practices	ADD	no HI practices	one HI practice (or equivalent)	more than one HI practice (or equivalent)	4	.5	2

Instructional Development	ADD	no ID activities	one ID activity (or equivalent)	more than one ID activity (or equivalent)	5.5	1	5.5
Non-Classroom Teaching (e.g., theses, dissertations, honors project direction)		no NCT activities	average number of NCT activities (or equivalent)	above average number of NCT activities (or equivalent)	7	1	7
						Σ weights = 7	Σ Weighted Ratings = 37.0
						MERIT RATING FOR TEACHING: (weighted ratings/weights)	5.3

Scholarly/Creative Activity: Performance Indicators

Performance Indicator	Unacceptable (Less than 1)*	Does Not Meet Expectations for Merit (1-2)	Meets Expectations for Merit (3-5)	Exceeds Expectations for Merit (6-7)	ASSIGNED RATING:	WEIGHTS (Must sum to total number of Performance Indicators)	WEIGHTED RATING ON EACH PERFORMANCE INDICATOR (Assigned Rating * Weight)
Peer-reviewed journal articles & conference papers accepted (or equivalent)	ADD	0 articles or papers at all; some nonpeer-reviewed articles or papers	1 peer-reviewed journal article and 1 peer-reviewed conference paper	2 or more peer-reviewed articles plus 1 or more conference papers	6	2	12
Published book review and/or Proceedings publications (or equivalent)	ADD	0	1	2 or more	3	.5	1.5

Ongoing Research (manuscripts under review, in final stages of writing, writing, in data collection phase) (or equivalent)	ADD	no activity	1-2 new activities (i.e., not included in previous year merit submission)	2 or more new activities (i.e., not included in previous year merit submission)	7	.5	3.5
Research Funding (or equivalent)	ADD	no activity; plans for applying for internal or external funding	some activity; is preparing or has submitted internal or external grants; internal award	high activity; external (\$25K+); multiple year awards may be claimed across multiple merit years	2.5	1.5	3.8
Other (Applied research projects, commercialization of intellectual property, research recognition, or equivalent)	ADD	no activity/accomplishments or recognition/awards	some activity/accomplishments or recognition/awards	high activity/accomplishments or recognition/awards	4.5	.5	2.3
						Σ weights = 5	Σ Weighted Ratings = 23.1
						MERIT RATING FOR RESEARCH: 4.6 (weighted ratings/weights)	

Service: Performance Indicators

Performance Indicator	Unacceptable (Less than 1)*	Does not Meet Expectations for Merit (1-2)	Meets Expectations for Merit (3-5)	Exceeds Expectations for Merit (6-7)	ASSIGNED RATING:	WEIGHTS (Must sum to total number of Performance Indicators)	WEIGHTED RATING ON EACH PERFORMANCE INDICATOR (Assigned Rating * Weight)
Department Service & Committees	ADD	Limited to no engagement (no advising or committees; limited attendance at faculty meetings)	Chairs one committee, serves on at least one more active committee, volunteer service and advising (or equivalent)	Chairs two or more committees and serves on at least one more active committee, volunteer service and advising (or equivalent)	7	1.5	10.5
College Committees	ADD	No participation on college committees or events	Serves on at least one committee, volunteer involvement at college level (or equivalent)	Chairs at least one or serves on two or more committees, heavy volunteer involvement at college level (or equivalent)	3.5	1	3.5
University Committees	ADD	No participation on university committees or events	Serves on at least one committee, faculty senator, volunteer involvement at university level (or equivalent)	Chairs at least one or serves on two or more committees, heavy volunteer involvement at university level (or equivalent)	1	1	1

Professional Organizations	ADD	No participation	Serves on at least one committee, volunteer services (or equivalent)	Chairs at least one or serves on two or more committees, heavy volunteer involvement (or equivalent)	4.5	1	4.5
Community Service (Related to BGSU Faculty Appointment)		Limited (1 brief activity) or no participation	2 -3 significant community service activities, 1 of which is extensive/ongoing	More than 3 significant community service activities, 2 or more of which are extensive/ongoing	6.5	1	6.5
Other (e.g., awards for service; exceptional leadership and/or unique projects with high impact; high visibility in state and national service, etc.)	ADD	Nothing submitted	1 example of service award, leadership, high impact practice, or high visibility service (or equivalent)	2 or more examples of service award, leadership, high impact practice, or high visibility service (or equivalent)	1	.5	.5
						Σ weights = 6	Σ Weighted Ratings = 26.5
						MERIT RATING FOR SERVICE: 4.4 (weighted ratings/weights)	

SUMMARY FORM

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

Faculty Member	Merit Score for Teaching	Merit Score for Scholarly/ Creative Activity	Merit Score for Service
Bravo, T	5.3	4.6	4.4
Next faculty member			
Next faculty member			

Exemplar #3

Overview

Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the BUFM on the following performance criteria: Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Activity, 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 BUFM 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.

The merit committee will then assign an overall merit rating using the approach found in Section 2.5 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/LIBRARIAN EFFECTIVENESS Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Teaching*
Exceeds expectations for merit	<i>(insert expectations here)</i>	3.6 – 5.0
Meets expectations for merit	<i>(insert expectations here)</i>	1.6 – 3.5
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<i>(insert expectations here)</i>	1.0 – 1.5
Unacceptable	<i>(insert expectations here)</i>	Less than 1

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

Merit Score for Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness
(to be completed by merit committee member): ____

Evaluation Rating Category	SCHOLARLY/CREATIVEACTIVITY Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Scholarly/Creative Activity*
Exceeds expectations for merit	<i>(insert expectations here)</i>	3.6 – 5.0
Meets expectations for merit	<i>(insert expectations here)</i>	1.6 – 3.5
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<i>(insert expectations here)</i>	1.0 – 1.5
Unacceptable	<i>(insert expectations here)</i>	Less than 1

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

Merit Score for Scholarly/Creative Activity (to be completed by merit committee member): ____

Evaluation Rating Category	SERVICE Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Service*
Exceeds expectations for merit	<i>(insert expectations here)</i>	3.6 – 5.0
Meets expectations for merit	<i>(insert expectations here)</i>	1.6 – 3.5
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<i>(insert expectations here)</i>	1.0 – 1.5
Unacceptable	<i>(insert expectations here)</i>	Less than 1

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

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/ Librarian Effectiveness	Merit Score for Scholarly/ Creative Activity	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>

EXEMPLAR #3 EXAMPLE (for illustrative purposes only):

The following rubrics indicate a hypothetical unit's approved performance indicators used to evaluate faculty performance expectations in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Merit committee members will individually review the BUFM's merit dossier and provide a score in each of the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. (Note: While the scores used here range from 1.0 – 5.0, any range of scores that is five or more may be used; the only requirement is that scores clearly identify whether they reflect 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	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. Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are regularly introduced and evaluated. Regular engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness	3.6 – 5.0
Meets expectations for merit	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. Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are occasionally introduced with some assessment of their impact. Modest engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness	1.6 – 3.5

Fails to meet expectations for merit	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. Limited or no engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness	1.0 – 1.5
Unacceptable	Quantitative student evaluations are among lowest in department for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are generally negative. Observations by peers indicate serious concerns and significant opportunities for improvement. Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are generally absent and rarely evaluated. No engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness.	<i>Less than 1</i>

Merit Score for Teaching (to be completed by merit committee member): 4.5

Evaluation Rating Category	SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITY Expected levels of accomplishment on Scholarly/Creative Activity performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Scholarly/Creative Activity
Exceeds expectations for merit	2 or more peer-reviewed articles + 1 or more conference papers; 2 or more active research projects that were not included in previous year merit submission; high activity in grantsmanship with external funding of \$25K+ (multiple year awards may be claimed across multiple merit years); recognition/award for research activity/accomplishments	3.6 – 5.0
Meets expectations for merit	1 peer-reviewed journal article + 1 peer-reviewed conference paper; 1-2 new active research projects that were not included in previous year merit submission; some activity in grantsmanship such as preparing/submitted internal or external grants; internal funding award	1.6 – 3.5
Fails to meet expectations for merit	No peer-reviewed articles or conference papers (but some non-peer-reviewed articles or papers); no current active research projects since last year merit submission; no active grantsmanship or clear plans for applying for internal or external funding; no recognition/ awards for research	1.0 – 1.5
Unacceptable	No evidence of continuing research activity; no current active research projects since last year merit submission; no active grantsmanship or clear plans for applying for internal or external funding; no recognition/ awards for research.	<i>Less than 1</i>

Merit Score for Scholarly/Creative Activity (to be completed by merit committee member): 2.1

Evaluation	SERVICE	
Rating Category	Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Service
Exceeds expectations for merit	Departmental service includes chairing 2 or more department committees and serving on at least 1 more active committee + volunteer service and student advising; College service includes chairing at least 1 committee or serving on 2 or more committees + heavy volunteer involvement at college level; University and/or professional service includes chairing at least 1 committee/activity or serving on 2 or more committees/activities + volunteer involvement at university level; Community service includes 3 or more significant community service activities related to faculty appointment (with 2 or more of being extensive/ongoing); 2 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	Departmental service includes chairing 1 department committees and serving on at least 1 more active committee + volunteer service or student advising; College service includes serving on 1 or more committees + some volunteer involvement at college level; University and/or professional service includes serving on at least 1 committee/activity + some volunteer involvement at university or to profession; Community service includes 1 or more significant community service activity related to faculty appointment	1.6 – 3.5
Fails to meet expectations for merit	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 brief activity or no participation);	1.0 – 1.5
Unacceptable	No engagement (no advising or committees; no attendance at faculty meetings) at departmental level; No meaningful service participation at college, university, or professional levels; limited community engagement (1 brief activity or no participation).	<i>Less than 1</i>

Merit Score for Service (to be completed by merit committee member): 1.2

SUMMARY FORM

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

Faculty Member	Merit Score for Teaching	Merit Score for Scholarly/ Creative Activity	Merit Score for Service
Charlee, F	4.5	2.1	1.2
Next faculty member			
Next faculty member			

Appendix B

Options for Determining Overall Merit Score Recommendations

The individual component merit scores for teaching/librarian effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and service are combined to arrive at an overall merit score. Allocation of effort is taken into account when determining overall merit score. The overall merit may include five or more values or rating levels than five, but it must clearly identify whether the overall merit rating reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

Three exemplars are available for adaptation and use: holistic judgment of the merit committee, a guiding rubric based on ratings in each performance area, or through the use of a simple algorithm that mathematically weights each performance criteria.

Exemplar A: Holistic Judgment of Merit Committee

The merit committee takes allocation of effort into consideration when holistically combining their consensus ratings for teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service to arrive at an overall merit score.

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation
Less than 1	Unacceptable
1 – 2	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
3– 6	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
7 – 9	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit

Exemplar B: Rubric Based on Ratings in Each Performance Area

The merit committee takes allocation of effort into consideration when holistically combining their consensus ratings for teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service to arrive at an overall merit score.

Overall Merit Score	Calculation (assumes component performance ratings made on 7-point scale)	Interpretation
< 1		Unacceptable
1-2	Receipt of ratings of 1-2 (on 7-point scale) in two or more performance areas (teaching/librarian effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Activity, or service) or rating of 1-2 in one performance area and ratings of 3 in the other performance areas	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit; Recommendation for no merit
3	Receipt of rating of 3-5 (on 7-point scale) in all three performance areas	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit

4	Receipt of a rating of 6-7 (on 7-point scale) in one performance area (for which a high allocation of effort is assigned)	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
5	Receipt of a rating of 6-7 (on 7-point scale) in two performance areas, with one performance area having a high allocation of effort assigned and one performance area having a low allocation of effort assigned	Meets basic expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
6	Receipt of a rating of 6-7 (on 7-point scale) in two performance areas, both of which have a high allocation of effort assigned	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit
7	Receipt of a rating of 6-7 (on 7-point scale) in all three performance areas	Exceeds expectations for merit; Eligible for merit

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, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service), the overall merit score is computed using a simple algorithm taking into account the weighted allocation of effort for each performance area:

$[\text{Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness Merit Score} * \text{Allocation of Effort}] + [\text{Scholarly/Creative Activity Merit Score} * \text{Allocation of Effort}] + [\text{Service Merit Score} * \text{Allocation of Effort}] = \text{Overall Merit Score}$

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation (assumes component performance ratings made on 5-point scale)
< 1	Unacceptable
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