

## Merit Policy

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

#### Department of Economics in the College of Business

##### 1. Preamble

Merit eligibility for faculty members will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations for merit in the Economics Department in the following areas (based on assigned responsibilities): Teaching Effectiveness, Research, and Service. Each faculty member will receive an overall merit score which will identify whether s/he had unacceptable performance, did not meet, met, or exceeded expectations for merit. A numeric score of 0 is reserved for those faculty found to be unacceptable. For faculty found to be acceptable, the overall merit score will include ten (10) categories or rating levels to allow for discrimination among levels of performance; each of the categories or rating levels on the overall merit score must clearly identify whether it does not meet expectations for merit, meets expectations for merit, or exceeds expectations for merit. For example, using the ten categories or rating levels, the following evaluation concepts would be included: 0 = Unacceptable performance; 1.0 – 4.9 = Does not meet expectations for merit; 5.0 – 7.9 = Meets expectations for merit; 8.0 – 10.0 = Exceeds expectations for merit.

##### 2. Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

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 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.

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

**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.

**Unacceptable performance:** Activities in an area reflect a pattern of performance that is unacceptable (see specific definition below).

The merit committee will then assign an overall merit rating using the approach found below. Those faculty whose performance is found to be unacceptable will be assigned a numeric value of 0. For those faculty whose performance is acceptable, the overall merit score will include ten rating levels and clearly identify whether the overall merit rating reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

## **2.1 Specific Procedures Regarding Merit Calculation According to the Department of Economics**

The merit criteria (i.e., Teaching, Research, and Service), performance indicators, expectations for the criteria, and the specific calculation of the component merit scores (i.e., Teaching, Research, and Service) are contained in the following sections. Faculty with unacceptable performance will be assigned a merit score of 0, and will not be eligible for merit. Faculty with acceptable performance will have each component of merit scored from 1-10, with 1 indicating minimal activities in the component and 10 indicating the highest rating.

The levels on each of the performance indicators should capture how the Economics Department defines exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, failing to meet expectations, and unacceptable performance.

Merit committee members will review information submitted by each faculty member to assign the numerical score for each criteria using a rating scale anchored with examples of expected levels (or their equivalent) of performance on the performance indicators. After the individual members have completed their evaluations, the Merit Committee as a whole should meet to discuss each faculty member's ratings. The purpose is to foster discussion and to avoid misunderstandings that may arise because a rater's score may have been influenced by different criteria or a misreading of the criteria.

For those faculty who may deserve an unacceptable rating, the merit committee should strive to achieve unanimity on the issue. Should unanimity be unattainable, a faculty member will be determined to be unacceptable only if greater than 50% of the voting members of the merit committee find this to be the case.

For those faculty found to be acceptable, severely divergent scores are to be reconciled. No changes in scoring are required unless the scores differ by three or more. That is, if one evaluator rates a specific faculty member as a five in teaching while another evaluator rates that same faculty member as a nine, then there needs to be further discussion within the committee to bring these two evaluation scores to within a difference of three. Once this process is complete, the mean of the evaluation for that component will be reported. These procedures constitute the Economics Department's understanding of "consensus" mentioned above.

The reported component scores may be any value (reported to 1 decimal), 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.

## 2.2 Teaching

Teaching effectiveness by faculty is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the University. Achievement in this area is of critical importance to the Department's evaluation of faculty members who are under review for merit.

All of the factors listed in this section are to be considered in the evaluation of teaching; no specific weight for any individual criterion is dictated. A teaching score of 0 is reserved for those faculty found to have unacceptable teaching performance. Each department member found to have acceptable teaching performance is to be awarded 1 to 10 points for teaching. An initial rating of 1 should be reserved for those not administering student evaluations, and an initial evaluation score of the highest rating (10) should not be permitted. The teaching workload percentage specified in a faculty member's Workload Agreement will be used as the weight assigned to teaching.

### 2.2.1 Initial Teaching Score

As described in the preamble to this document, ratings of 1.0-4.9 should be assigned to faculty who do not meet teaching expectations; ratings of 5.0-7.9 should be assigned to faculty who meet teaching expectations, and ratings of 8.0-10.0 should be assigned to faculty who exceed teaching expectations. A rating of 0 is reserved for those faculty whose teaching is judged to be unacceptable.

The starting point for evaluation of teaching is the student evaluation rating. Recognizing the imperfect nature of the student evaluation ratings, individual members of the merit committee should initially place faculty into three categories: high, middle, and low. The mean of the department student evaluation scores and one standard deviation from the mean for the past year will be provided for guidance. Most faculty (those nearest the mean) should be placed in the middle category and should be assigned an initial evaluation value of 5-6. Outliers at the higher end of the evaluation scores will initially be assigned an evaluation of 7-8 and outliers at the lower end of the evaluation scores will initially be assigned an evaluation of 3-4.

Domains used in the evaluation of teaching include: undergraduate teaching; graduate teaching; instructional development; and other contributions to student learning including, but not limited to, connecting course content to external community problems and issues.

When assigning a score based on student evaluations, the following items may also be considered:

1. Size of class
2. Required vs. elected class
3. Proportion of majors vs. nonmajors

4. Grades given by the instructor
5. Lower division vs. upper division and graduate classes

### 2.2.2 Teaching Score Modifications

These initial scores may then be increased by demonstrating excellent performance on other measures of teaching success. Normally, an increase of the initial evaluation score should be limited to an increase of 1-2 points. However, an increase of 3 points would be appropriate under extraordinary circumstances. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to include at least two additional measures of teaching success, many but not all of which are listed below.

#### A. Supporting Documentation

1. Statements of teaching philosophy and pedagogy;
2. Special activities such as independent study, projects/competition, student research, overload teaching, etc.;
3. Course outlines, syllabi, test, projects, required writing assignments, information on testing and grading procedures not contained in the syllabi, and other items that demonstrate the nature and range of courses taught;
4. Teaching awards;
5. Statement of course outcomes and evidence of accomplishment of those outcomes;
6. Peer Evaluation (not mandatory for purposes of merit determination);
7. Teaching activities involving external groups;
8. Student enrollment and retention data;
9. Written statements from colleagues, students, and others concerning preparedness and effectiveness in teaching;
10. Support to external communities for the teaching of law or an interdisciplinary course;
11. Other teaching activities.

#### B. Instructional Development.

Departmental faculty are expected to devote professional development efforts to continuously improve the curriculum as well as their own teaching methods and effectiveness. Performance indicators that are used in the evaluation of instructional development include the following:

1. Course outlines, syllabi, and other items that demonstrate the nature of instruction and range of courses taught;
2. The development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses;
3. Conferences and workshops attended, courses taken, or other professional development activities to enhance teaching skills; and
4. Innovations in the effective use of instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning.
5. Development of educational opportunities that connect with external communities.

### C. Contributions to Student Learning

Faculty members make other contributions to student learning and development that fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction. Performance indicators that are used to evaluate such contributions include the following:

1. Academic advising services provided to students;
2. Advising the Economics Club, Omicron Delta Epsilon, or the Law Society;
3. Guidance of internships, or co-operative work experiences;
4. Involvement in clubs, organizations, and activities promoting faculty-student interaction;
5. Participation in University initiatives to create a campus wide learning community;
6. Involvement in activities to promote departmental programs and services to prospective students;
7. Participation in University, college, or departmental projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning;
8. Writing textbooks, case studies and other teaching material, and;
9. Oversight of student related activities related to community activity.
10. Other pedagogical activities that contribute to effective teaching.

In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the department consider other evidence of achievement in teaching that is appropriate to his/her specific case. The question to be considered by the department in its evaluation of teaching is this: Is the faculty member's demonstrated performance in teaching consistent with the general standards for merit, reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described in the University's governance documents and supportive of the instructional mission of the Department, College, and University?

Each faculty member should also consider including a statement of the course goals and providing evidence to demonstrate accomplishment of those goals. This approach allows us as a department to focus on outcome without creating a straight-jacket for everyone in the department.

In assessing any of the above potential measures one should consider, to whatever extent possible, outcome measures. For example, in relation to advising a faculty member should demonstrate the consequences of the advising; in relation to special activities a faculty member might include the purpose of the special activity and papers or exams that were completed as part of the special activity; in relation to developmental activities a faculty member should demonstrate how his/her teaching has changed as a result of the activity; etc. It is not the intent of the policy to ask faculty to pad their service reports, but to provide some measure of teaching outcomes.

It is the responsibility of the members of the merit committee to examine this additional evidence of effective teaching to determine whether the initial score derived from student evaluations should be increased.

Two examples of how one might try to accomplish the above might be the following:

1. The department has approved a set of generic concepts. A faculty member might include in the annual service report an exam and a few sample answers, for example, of student work demonstrating the use of these concepts.
2. The department has worked on the general education skills of writing, problem solving, moral reasoning and critical thinking. A faculty member might include an exam and a few sample answers, for example, of student work demonstrating performance relating to any one of these skills.

### 2.3 Research

Making significant contributions to the knowledge base or the creative practice of one's discipline, and in the case of the scholarship of engagement, contributions to the external community, is a central responsibility of all tenure-track and tenured faculty members. Such contributions are important both in their own right, and because they are an essential qualification for instructing others at a university. Thus, achievement in this area is vital to the department's evaluation of the relevant faculty members who are under review for merit. Domains used in the evaluation of research include: publications, presentations, sponsored program, extramural support; and institutional outreach. As a means of facilitating the evaluation, faculty members should maintain a record of their research which addresses the performance indicators used for evaluation.

All of the factors listed below are to be considered in the evaluation of research; no specific weight for any individual criterion is dictated. A research score of 0 is reserved for those faculty found to have unacceptable research performance. Each department member found to be acceptable in research is to be awarded 1 to 10 total points. A total score of 10 points will require at least one paper and one other element in the list. A total score of 1 indicates that the individual had very minimal research activities. No individual can have a score of greater than 10. The research workload percentage specified in a faculty member's Workload Agreement will be used as the weight.

As described in the preamble to this document, ratings of 1.0-4.9 should be assigned to faculty who do not meet research expectations; ratings of 5.0-7.9 should be assigned to faculty who meet research expectations, and ratings of 8.0-10.0 should be assigned to faculty who exceed research expectations. A rating of 0 is reserved for those faculty whose research is judged to be unacceptable (see Appendix B).

#### 2.3.1 Research – Economics

The following is to guide the evaluator in scoring the research of faculty members only. A final rating of 1-10 for research is required for each acceptable faculty member.

Consideration includes:

a. Articles:

Level I article (According to department list, which is available from the department office. Please consult department office for any faculty-approved updates to this list.).

Level II article (According to department list, which is available from the department office. Please consult department office for any faculty-approved updates to this list.).

Level III article in lower refereed journals (According to department list, which is available from the department office. Please consult department office for any faculty-approved updates to this list.)

Research paper in proceedings (refereed, maximum of two per year).

Research paper in proceedings (non-refereed).

b. Presentation of written paper at professional meetings.

c. Submission of article to journal (once).

Higher points should be awarded for Level I articles over other considerations. Submissions of an article should be considered only once, not each time there is a revise-and-resubmit. Articles should be given more points than presentations.

d. Additional Activities:

1. Grants Submission.

2. Grants Funded: where the dollars for the grant come through the department or where a publication follows from a grant that did not come through the department:

- University-sponsored grants under \$5,000 (2017 dollars)
- Under \$5,000 (outside grants)
- \$5,000 or more

Note: Higher points should be awarded according to the size of the grant and the prestige of the granting agency. When evaluating a grant received by a faculty member, an evaluator may consider whether or not the Economics Department receives any payment of overhead from the grant. (A Fulbright is considered a grant.)

3. Articles in books or lower level non-refereed Journals.

4. Book length research monograph (Guideline: 100 pp. depending on type).

5. Published Book Reviews.

6. Comments and notes in Levels I, II, and III journals.

7. Completion of dissertation.

8. Working Paper (in formal series).

9. Discuss Paper at Professional Meetings.

10. Citations of Papers in Social Science Citation or other professional publications.

11. Receipt of Research Honors and Awards. To be credited the year of receipt of the award.

Additional Comments:

1. New journals and non-economics journals will be added to the list over time as people submit to and publish in them. The Chair, in consultation with the tenure-track and tenured faculty, will decide on a rating for the journal using the input of the faculty member.
2. Copies of papers must be on file with the department. It is very difficult to have any idea what is being done in some papers in non-standard journals without seeing a copy of the paper.
3. Each faculty member has the right to determine when each article will be counted. He/she may select to have his/her article counted at one of the three following dates: 1) date of unconditional acceptance, 2) date of publication, 3) date of actual distribution.

Only publications which are to be counted during that evaluation period should be listed on the service report.

4. The Department of Economics advocates joint research efforts. Individual raters are encouraged to give full credit to publications which are written by more than one author and to base research ratings on the quality of the publication rather than the number of authors.
5. Some papers presented at national meetings (AEA) or in especially prestigious books (NBER), may warrant a higher score. This is to distinguish them from papers delivered at regional or state meetings and non-economics meetings. The individual faculty member would have to make a case.

### 2.3.2 Research – Legal Studies

A copy of all publications to be considered must be on file in the department office prior to the time the annual service reports are to be distributed, or it will not be considered.

#### a. Publications/Presentations

Publications, and presentations are the primary products of any research and thus central to its evaluation. Publications in peer-reviewed journals, law reviews or symposium volumes are especially significant. So too are publications such as books, monographs, other publications, and presentations. Research should show evidence of originality and importance. This is demonstrated by the prestige of the setting, the quality of the specific article, and the impact on the work of others in the discipline. Journal rankings and department research guidelines where appropriate will be used in assessing quality.

#### (i) Refereed Publications

- (a) Refereed Articles, no maximum number. Refereed publications include the following:
  - (1) ABLA Journal (According to department list, which is available from the department office. Please consult department office for any faculty-approved updates to this list.).
  - (2) ABLA Regional journals (According to department list, which is available from the department office. Please consult department office for any faculty-approved updates to this list.).
  - (3) All law journals (According to department list, which is available from the department office. Please consult department office for any faculty-approved updates to this list.).
  - (4) All other articles for which there is a blind review process. In the event the publication is not a recognized law journal or law review, it is incumbent upon the writer of the article to submit evidence of the review process, preferably a letter from the editor of the journal explaining the process. A copy of the statement of the review process which appears in the publication is also acceptable.
- (b) In the case of the scholarship of engagement the external community served may



also have a role in assessing how much the engagement research has met a community need.

- (ii) Books (not text books); to be credited during the year of distribution or copyright, so long as copies of the actual book are available.
  - (a) Treaties/reference works
  - (b) Scholarly books (not textbooks)
  - (c) Anthologies and all edited texts designated as such
  - (d) Chapters of books (not textbooks)
  - (e) Indexes and bibliographic text
  - (f) Monographs
- (iii) Refereed Proceedings;
  - (a) ABLA Proceeding of meeting at the national or regional Academy of Legal Studies in Business.
  - (b) Other Proceedings (It is incumbent upon the writer to submit evidence of the review process, preferably a letter from the editor of the publication explaining the process.)
- (iv) Nonrefereed Publications.
  - (a) Articles
  - (b) Book reviews
  - (c) Book review essays
  - (d) Other publications
- (v) Paper Presentations.
  - (a) Sponsored Programs/Extramural Support for Research
    - (1) Research Grant Submission.
    - (2) Editorships. It is incumbent upon the editor to explain the nature of the work which he/she has done.
    - (3) Article/Paper Reviewer. It is incumbent upon the reviewer to explain the nature of the work which he/she has done, including the number of articles or papers reviewed.
    - (4) Receipt of Research Honors and Awards. To be credited the year of receipt of the award.
    - (5) Reprints of Refereed Publications. To be credited the year of the reprint.
    - (6) Institutional Outreach.

Participation in institutionally-initiated University, college, or department outreach activities through centers, institutes or alliances/partnerships and in applied research and private consulting may be a significant component of a faculty member's outreach. This activity must result in research that is evidenced by publication in peer-reviewed journals, law reviews or symposium volumes. Institutional outreach activities that do not result in publication will be considered as service. Performance indicators include the following: significance and scope of the activity; role of the faculty member in the activity; documentation of specific contributions and accomplishments; and the assessment of any external community served.

In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the department consider other evidence of achievement in research that is appropriate to his/her specific case. The question to be considered by the department in its evaluation of research is this: Is the faculty member's performance in research consistent with the general standards for merit, contract renewal, promotion, or tenure as described in University governance documents and specified by the department?

#### 2.4. Service.

Service contributions by faculty at the department, college, and University, external community, and professional levels are critical to the overall mission of the University. Faculty seeking merit, tenure, contract renewal, or promotion shall provide evidence of appropriate service to the University community or to the profession.

Economics defines service as performance of departmental, collegiate, University, external community, and professional activities which fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance; professional expertise shared with the external community; and contributions to a faculty member's profession. In presenting their records of service, faculty members should include documentation which provides evidence of their activities and contributions and which address the performance indicators used for evaluation. All of the factors appearing below are to be considered in evaluation of service. The service workload percentage specified in a faculty member's Workload Agreement will be used for the weight.

A service score of 0 is reserved for those faculty found to have unacceptable service performance. Each department member found to be acceptable in service is to be awarded 1 to 10 total points. A service score of 1 indicates that the individual had very minimal service activities, while awarding ten points requires at least two service elements of extensive time and importance. No individual can have a score of greater than 10.

As described in the preamble to this document, ratings of 1.0-4.9 should be assigned to faculty who do not meet service expectations; ratings of 5.0-7.9 should be assigned to faculty who meet service expectations, and ratings of 8.0-10.0 should be assigned to faculty who exceed service expectations. A rating of 0 is reserved for those faculty whose service is judged to be unacceptable.

### I. Definition of Service Domains

#### A. Internal University Service

These activities include participation in departmental, college, or University committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like. University service also includes performance of any assigned administrative service responsibilities including those duties handled by faculty serving as center directors, program directors, department chairs, associate deans, and the like. Performance indicators

used to evaluate internal service include the following: records of membership and attendance at committee and organizational meetings; amount of time devoted to activities; significance and scope of activities; degree of active involvement; documentation of significant contributions; leadership positions held; professionalism and dependability in performing assignment; collegiality in working with others and sharing responsibilities; testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs, and others. Performance indicators used to evaluate administrative service include the following: significance and scope of assignment; amount of time devoted to assignment; evidence of collegiality in working with others; documentation of specific contributions and accomplishments; evaluations by constituents, public served, and others.

Ad hoc committees, other committees, or other professional services not listed here should be ranked based on a statement submitted by the faculty person. Faculty members are encouraged to submit statements and supporting documentation about their service activities in cases where assignments went beyond the usual duties of the committee or service. The statement should indicate the nature and time commitment. Chairs and secretaries of committees and a President of Professional Society should receive additional credit above their membership, with additional points added based on the time commitment of that committee.

#### Typical Committees:

Committee Type	Committee Name	Committee Name
Department	Tenure, Promotion	Merit Advisory
	Student Grievance Committee	Colloquium Coordinator
	Recruitment & Student Asst Comm	ODE Advisor
	Evaluation of the Dept. under Leadership of the Chair	Econ Club Advisor
	Curriculum Committee	Graduate Committee
	Ad Hoc Committee	Graduate Coordinator/Director
	Scholarship Committee	Chair of APR, EPR, & P&T Mtgs.
	Library Representative	
College	Faculty Council	Faculty Achievement Comm.
	Undergrad Curriculum & Learning Assessment	Student Achievement Comm.
	Graduate Advisory Council	Task Force – Technology
	Task Force – Student Engagement	Task Force – Assessment
	Chairs Council	
University	Social Sciences Divisional Curriculum Committee (A&S)	Undergraduate Council
	Graduate Council	Faculty Research Committee
	Faculty Development	Strategic Planning Committee
	Faculty Senate	Academic Honesty

	Asian Studies Advisory Committee	University Council of Chairs and Directors
	Economic Development Council	

### B. External Service.

Faculty members are encouraged to lend their professional expertise to support external organizations, projects, and programs. To be considered as external service appropriate for merit, contract renewal, tenure, or promotion considerations, such activities must draw upon a faculty member's expertise and must be recognized by the department, college, or University as qualifying. All faculty members are encouraged to participate fully in civic and community life as citizens, but they need to recognize that not all such activities will be viewed as directly related to their professional expertise. Performance indicators used to evaluate external service include the following: records of relevant activities and professional contributions; degree of active involvement; significance and scope of involvement in each activity; evidence of contributions and achievements; leadership positions held; professionalism and dependability demonstrated in performing activities; community awards and other recognitions; written statements or testimonials.

### C. Professional Service.

These activities include a faculty member's membership and active involvement with professional organizations connected to his/her discipline at the local, state, national, or international levels. Performance indicators used to evaluate professional service include the following: records of affiliations with appropriate professional associations; records of service to private or extramural funding agencies; attendance at professional meetings and conferences; leadership positions held in professional associations; time spent on fulfilling professional service obligations; professionalism and dependability demonstrated in performing activities; professional recognitions; organization of professional conferences, symposia, and the like; conference or sessions moderated that contribute to the profession. In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the department consider any other evidence of achievement in service that is appropriate to his/her specific case. The question to be considered by the department in evaluating service is this: Is the faculty member's performance in service consistent with the general standards for merit, contract renewal, promotion, or tenure as described in University governance documents and as specified by the department?

## 2.5. Definitions of Unacceptable Performance.

### Full Professors

Teaching: Student Evaluations with an average of 2 or lower (on our 1-5 scale) in multiple classes during the relevant period.

Research: No evidence of any significant research activity during the relevant period.

Service: Not serving on any committee (department/college/university), or not attending a majority of department meetings, during the relevant period.

#### Assistant and Associate Professors

Teaching: Student Evaluations with an average of 2 or lower in multiple classes, and one or more peer evaluations of “marginally unacceptable” or worse, during the relevant period.

Research: No evidence of any significant research activity during the relevant period.

Service: Not serving on any committee (department/college/university), or not attending a majority of department meetings, during the relevant period.

#### Lecturers and Instructors

Teaching: Student Evaluations with an average of 2 or lower in multiple classes, and one or more peer evaluations of “marginally unacceptable” or worse, during the relevant period.

Service: Not serving on any committee (department/college/university), or not attending a majority of department meetings, during the relevant period.

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

The Economics Department merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. The committee will consist of three tenure-track or tenured faculty members. Selection to the committee will be on a rotating basis, by choosing from the faculty who have gone the longest not serving on the committee. When possible, the committee should consist of one from each faculty rank (assistant, associate, full), and never all three from the same rank. One member will be elected as Chair of the Merit Committee from the three committee members. Each committee member will rate each faculty member on each component (however members of the committee will not evaluate themselves).

### 4. Elements of the Merit Dossier

The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements: A) A faculty service report, describing teaching, research, and service activities from the previous calendar year. B) An updated CV, highlighting activities completed during the previous calendar year. Note that in both cases, care should be taken to avoid counting the same activity in consecutive years. The Department’s administrative assistant will include supporting documentation (such as peer evaluations and student evaluations) before the committee evaluates the dossier.

### 5. 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. Generally this allocation information can be derived from workload agreements and success plans. NTTF are normally not expected to engage in research. However, the NTTF faculty member can request that research is considered for merit, if their research is beneficial to the mission of the Department and College.

If a faculty member's performance is found to be unacceptable for any component, they automatically receive an overall merit score of 0. For faculty members whose performance is found to be acceptable, and once the merit committee has reached consensus on component merit scores on each performance area (Teaching Effectiveness, Research, and Service), the overall merit score is computed using a simple algorithm taking into account the weighted allocation of effort for each performance area:

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

Once the overall merit score is computed, faculty will be categorized according to this table:

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation
0	Unacceptable performance; not eligible for merit.
1.0 – 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 numeric score for the most recent year will then be combined with scores from the previous two years to form a 3-year rolling average.

### 6. Additional Academic Unit Merit Policy Information

**AACSB Accreditation.** The Economics Faculty recognizes that 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, and the Department reserves the right to reduce the merit score recommendation for anyone not maintaining AACSB qualification, and to increase the merit score recommendation for anyone newly achieving qualification. Such adjustments will reflect the fact that research, teaching, and service are the primary bases for merit,

and will take into account the faculty member's efforts to achieve qualification. Furthermore, the faculty and chair will work with any faculty members who are not qualified towards achieving qualification. The merit committee will achieve consensus on the appropriate adjustment of this type before the recommendation is submitted.

**Forms to be used by the Department of Economics Merit Committee, describing Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations, and the Calculation of Component Merit Scores**

To determine whether faculty members' performance is unacceptable, or has failed to meet, met, or exceeded expectations for merit, the merit system in this document provides the merit committee members information on how to assess performance as Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, or has Unacceptable Performance.

<b>Evaluation Rating Category</b>	<b>TEACHING</b> <b>Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)</b>	<b>Possible Merit Score for Teaching</b>
<b>Exceeds expectations for merit</b>	Activities as described in this document cumulatively exceed expectations and indicate a level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for an individual with a given faculty rank in the department and discipline.	8-10
<b>Meets expectations for merit</b>	Activities as described in this document cumulatively meet expectations and indicate a level of accomplishment for what is normal for an individual with a given faculty rank in the department and discipline.	5-7.9
<b>Fails to meet expectations for merit</b>	Activities as described in this document cumulatively do not meet expectations and fall below the standard level of accomplishment for what is normal for an individual with a given faculty rank in the department and discipline.	1-4.9
<b>Unacceptable Performance</b>	Activities are found to be unacceptable, as described in this document.	0

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



<b>Evaluation Rating Category</b>	<b>RESEARCH Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)</b>	<b>Score for Research</b>
Exceeds expectations for merit	Activities as described in this document cumulatively exceed expectations and indicate a level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for an individual with a given faculty rank in the department and discipline.	8 - 10
Meets expectations for merit	Activities as described in this document cumulatively meet expectations and indicate a level of accomplishment for what is normal for an individual with a given faculty rank in the department and discipline.	5 - 7.9
Fails to meet expectations for merit	Activities as described in this document cumulatively do not meet expectations and fall below the standard level of accomplishment for what is normal for an individual with a given faculty rank in the department and discipline.	1.0 – 4.9
Unacceptable Performance	Activities are found to be unacceptable, as described in this document.	0

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

<b>Evaluation Rating Category</b>	<b>SERVICE Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)</b>	<b>Merit Score for Service</b>
Exceeds expectations for merit	Activities as described in this document cumulatively exceed expectations and indicate a level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for an individual with a given faculty rank in the department and discipline.	8.0 - 10
Meets expectations for merit	Activities as described in this document cumulatively meet expectations and indicate a level of accomplishment for what is normal for an individual with a given faculty rank in the department and discipline.	5.0 - 7.9
Fails to meet expectations for merit	Activities as described in this document cumulatively do not meet expectations and fall below the standard level of accomplishment for what is normal for an individual with a given faculty rank in the department and discipline.	1.0 – 4.9
Unacceptable Performance	Activities are found to be unacceptable, as described in this document.	0

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

### SUMMARY FORM

For faculty members found to have acceptable performance for each component, the Merit Committee will assign the average of each component score (Teaching, Research, and Service). The overall merit score is computed using a simple algorithm, taken into account the weighted allocation of effort for each performance area:

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


Faculty members with an unacceptable performance for any component will automatically receive a zero for that component and for an overall score.

The final scores will then be sent to the department chair, after any appeals have been considered, who will also evaluate each faculty member. The chair will then forward both the committee and chair evaluations to the College of Business Dean.

Faculty Member	Merit Score for Teaching	Merit Score for Research if applicable	Merit Score for Service	Overall Score
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				

---

Approved by the Department of Economics on August 14, 2017.

Approved:  Date 8/14/17  
Peter VanderHart, Chair/Director

Approved:  Date 8/14/17  
Ray Braun, Dean of College of Business

Approved:  Date 11/30/17  
Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP