

## Merit Policy

### Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

Academic Unit: Applied Statistics and Operations Research

#### Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

Merit criteria are limited to three areas: Teaching Effectiveness, Research, and Service. To determine whether faculty members' performance is unacceptable, has 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 Effectiveness, Research, and Service).

Merit will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations that are assigned to the department member on the following performance criteria: Teaching Effectiveness, Research, and Service. Each of the aforementioned criteria (e.g., teaching) will be evaluated using a number of performance indicators (e.g., quantitative student evaluations of teaching). Merit committee members will review information submitted by each faculty member to assign a numerical score for each criteria using an anchored rating scale anchored with examples of expected levels (or their equivalent) of performance on the performance indicators. Merit committee members will meet as a committee to review and reach consensus on component scores for each of the relevant performance criteria. 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 is unacceptable, 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, failing to meet expectations for performance, and unacceptable 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 and discipline.

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

**Fails to meet expectations for merit:** Activities in area cumulatively do not meet expectations to be considered for merit by the department and discipline.

**Unacceptable:** Activities in area cumulatively fall below the standard levels of performance classified as "Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit" and what is minimally expected for the department and discipline.

The merit committee will then assign an overall merit rating using the approach found in a later section of this merit policy. The overall merit will include ten rating levels and clearly identify whether the overall merit rating reflects performance that is unacceptable, fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

The teaching performance indicators shown below are illustrative, not exhaustive. Nor should they be construed as mere checklists. The Merit Committee members and the Department Chair will appraise the overall levels of quality and quantity of teaching performance. The totality of evidence will inform the overall scores.

Evaluation Rating Category	<b>TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS</b> Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Teaching*
Exceeds expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructor composite scores in quantitative student evaluations that are significantly higher than the average for comparable level scores.</li> <li>• Active participation with significant contributions in non-classroom teaching activities, such as, but not limited to, student advising, new course development, course modification, and curriculum development and modification.</li> <li>• Documentation of substantial improvements to existing courses.</li> <li>• Evidence of effective integration of new technology or pedagogical approaches.</li> <li>• Teaching awards nomination and/or received.</li> <li>• Mentorship of student research.</li> <li>• Teaching leadership (e.g., mentorship, working groups).</li> <li>• Demonstration of efforts at improvement of instruction through attending working group or workshops.</li> <li>• Participation in Honors College programming or other university-wide undergraduate initiatives.</li> </ul>	8.0 – 10.0
Meets expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructor composite scores in quantitative student evaluations that are around the average for comparable level scores.</li> <li>• Participation in non-classroom teaching activities, such as, but not limited to, student advising, new course development, course modification, and curriculum development and modification.</li> </ul>	5.0 – 7.9
Fails to meet expectations for merit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear evidence of weak teaching.</li> <li>• Instructor composite scores in quantitative student evaluations that are significantly below the average for comparable level scores.</li> <li>• No participation in non-classroom teaching activities, such as, but not limited to, student advising, new course development, course modification, and curriculum development and modification.</li> </ul>	2.0 – 4.9
Unacceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor performance on instructor composite scores for quantitative student evaluations (under 2.0) for two or more courses, and no subsequent involvement in any</li> </ul>	0 – 1.9

	<p>instructional development efforts or opportunities to improve teaching performance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No participation in other non-classroom teaching activities such as, but not limited to, new course development, course modification, and curriculum development and modification.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

Merit Score for Teaching Effectiveness (to be completed by merit committee member): \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation Rating Category	<b>RESEARCH WORK</b> Expected levels of accomplishment on RESEARCH performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Research*
Exceeds expectations for merit	The research performance is judged <b>Exceeds Expectations</b> if he/she provided evidence of an ongoing stream of high-quality research <b>AND</b> significant publications in high-quality refereed journal/conference, and/or funded external grant activity, and/or significant professional development that enhances research activities. Recognitions such as awards for outstanding research, while not required to be rated as <b>Exceeds Expectations</b> , could be considered as evidence of excellence in Research. Being an editor or associate editor of a journal, while not required to be rated as <b>Exceeds Expectations</b> , could be considered as evidence of excellence in Research.	8.0 – 10.0
Meets expectations for merit	The research performance is judged <b>Meets Expectations</b> if he/she provided evidence of an ongoing stream of quality research <b>AND</b> professional development that enhances research activities, and/or publications in quality refereed journal/conference, and/or funded external grant activity.	5.0 – 7.9
Fails to meet expectations for merit	The research performance is judged <b>to be Failing to Meet Expectations for Merit</b> if he/she provided <b>only</b> evidence of an ongoing stream of research.	2.0 – 4.9
Unacceptable	The research performance is judged <b>to be Unacceptable</b> if it falls below the requirements classified as “Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit”.	0 – 1.9

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

Evaluation Rating Category	<b>SERVICE</b> Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Service*
Exceeds expectations for merit	The service performance of a candidate for annual reappointment is judged <b>Exceeds Expectations</b> if he/she served in professional and/or university level committees, in addition to college and departmental committees and/or support activities, such as, but not limited to, faculty lead of consulting projects from the Center for Business Analytics, which required a considerable amount of time commitment.	8.0 – 10.0
Meets expectations for merit	The service performance of a candidate for annual reappointment is judged <b>Meets Expectations</b> if he/she served in college and departmental committees and/or support activities, such as, but not limited to, faculty lead of consulting projects from the Center for Business Analytics, which required a considerable amount of time commitment.	5.0 – 7.9
Fails to meet expectations for merit	The service performance is judged to be <b>Failing to Meet Expectations for Merit</b> if he/she <u>participated only sporadically</u> in college and departmental committees and support activities.	2.0 – 4.9
Unacceptable	The service performance is judged to be <b>Unacceptable</b> if it falls below the requirements classified as “Fails to Meet Expectations for Merit”.	0 – 1.9

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

#### Merit Committee Composition and the Election//Appointment Process

The Department of Applied Statistics and Operations Research merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. The merit committee consists of all bargaining unit faculty members of the Department of Applied Statistics and Operations Research.

### Elements of the Merit Dossier

The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements:

- a. Service report (based on the period of performance under review) highlighting activities completed during the previous calendar year (and not submitted to the merit committee in previous years);
- b. An updated CV;
- c. A summary of accomplishments in each of the areas of teaching, research and service; and
- d. Any other supporting documents.

### Calculation of Overall Merit Score

The individual component merit scores for teaching effectiveness, research, and service are combined to arrive at an overall merit score. Allocation of effort is taken into account when determining overall merit score. NTTF are normally not expected to engage in research. However, if the Workload Agreement with the NTTF faculty member includes a research allocation of effort, then research will be considered for merit. The overall merit will include ten rating levels and clearly identify whether the overall merit reflects performance that is unacceptable, fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

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

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

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation (10 point scale)
0 - 1.9	Unacceptable
2.0 - 4.9	Fails to meet basic expectation for merit; recommendation for no merit
5.0 - 7.9	Meets basic expectation for merit; eligible for merit
8.0 - 10.0	Exceeds expectations for merit; eligible for merit


The final merit score, which will be used to recommend merit increases, is calculated based on a three-year rolling average of the merit rating of current year with the merit ratings from the previous two years.

Additional Academic Unit Merit Policy Information

**AACSB Accreditation.** Being an AACSB accredited institution is vital to the mission of the College of Business. Accordingly, faculty are expected to maintain faculty qualifications under AACSB standards to be eligible for merit.

Approved by the Department of Applied Statistics and Operations Research at the April 12, 2017 Faculty Meeting

  
\_\_\_\_\_ Date 4/12/2017  
Name, Chair/Director

Approved:   
\_\_\_\_\_ Date 8/4/17  
Name, Dean of College Name

Approved:   
\_\_\_\_\_ Date 12/18/17  
Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP