

Merit Document

Department of Economics in the College of Business Administration

Preamble

Merit raises refer to the component of salary raises that are provided to department bargaining unit faculty members who meet or exceed their assigned unit performance expectations. In any given year, it is possible that all of the Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in an academic unit may be eligible for merit salary raises. Merit is calculated during spring semester based on performance during the previous calendar year. Merit salary raises are added to base salary for the ensuing fiscal year (on September 1 for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members on 9-month contracts, and on July 1 for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members on 12-month contracts).

Merit eligibility for faculty members will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations for merit in the Economics Department in the following areas: Teaching Effectiveness, Research, and Service. Each faculty member will receive an overall merit score which will identify whether s/he did not meet, met, or exceeded expectations for merit. The overall merit score will include 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: 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.

Both the merit committee of the academic unit and the chair of the department may make recommendations to the Dean for allocation of merit dollars and/or percentages. However, as provided for by Section 11.2 of Article 17 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the Dean is not bound by such recommendations and the determination of the actual merit increase is within the Dean's reasonable discretion.

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

The merit criteria (i.e., Teaching Effectiveness, Research, and Service), performance indicators and expectations for the criteria, and the calculation of the component merit scores (i.e., Teaching Effectiveness, Research, and Service) are contained in **Appendix A**.

2. General Procedure for Faculty Evaluation and Score of Merit

- 2.1. **Allocation of Effort.** Prior to the beginning of the calendar year, each faculty member will confirm his/her allocation of effort (e.g., 50/30/20 for teaching, scholarship, and service) with the chair.
- 2.2. **Merit Committee.** 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).
- 2.3. Failure to Submit.** Faculty members who fail to submit a complete merit dossier by the deadline will receive an automatic rating of "does not meet expectations" and will not be eligible for a merit salary increase or the market adjustment from the Fixed Market Pool (Article 17, section 7.1).
- 2.4. 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.
- 2.5. Overall Merit.** 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, the NTTF faculty member can request that research is considered for merit, if research is part of their work. The overall merit will include ten rating levels and clearly identify whether the overall merit reflects performance that 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 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)
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

- 2.6. Decimal Convention.** An academic unit may report its merit score recommendation to no greater than one-tenth decimal place (for example, a unit may assign a score of 3.1 or 5.9 but may not assign a score of 3.15 or 5.975).

3. Significant Dates for Merit Consideration and Appeals

January 31: Last date for faculty merit dossiers to be submitted to the Department.

Following this date, and before submitting the committee's merit score recommendation to the chair, the merit committee is urged to work informally with all faculty being reviewed to resolve any factual or interpretive issues.

February 28: The Economics Department merit committee submits their merit score recommendation to the chair (with a copy to the faculty member).

March 7: Last date for faculty members to appeal the committee's recommendation to the chair (with a copy to the committee).

March 31: The chair of the Economics Department submits a merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copies to the committee and faculty members).

April 7: Last date for faculty member to appeal the chair's merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copy to the chair). The faculty member may raise in any appeal to the Dean: (i) the chair's merit score recommendation, and (ii) only those aspects of the committee's recommendation that the faculty member has previously raised in the faculty member's appeal to the chair. Issues related to the committee's recommendation not raised previously with the chair (where the faculty member either knew or through the exercise of reasonable diligence should have known) are not preserved for appeal to the Dean, shall not be considered by the Dean, and shall not be the basis or grounds for any grievance by the BGSU-FA.

April 30: Dean's recommendation to the Provost. Thereafter the Provost and Dean may confer through on or about May 19.

On or about May 20: Dean issues final determination regarding merit.

4. Special Circumstances

4.1. Consideration of Special Circumstances as Required by the Collective Bargaining Agreement

4.1.1. Faculty Exchange Leave (Article 21, Section II: subsection 1.7). Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consultation with the host institution.

4.1.2. Leaves with Extramural Salary Paid through the University Payroll System (Article 21, Section III: subsection 1.3) Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consultation with the sponsoring government agency or private foundation.

4.1.3. Unpaid Leave - 100% time (Article 21, Section IV: subsection 5). Faculty members will not be eligible for merit in any calendar year for which 100% unpaid leave was taken that is unrelated to Family Medical Leave. If related to Family Medical Leave, performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.

4.1.4. Sick Leave (Article 21, Section VIII: subsection 9.1). Performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated for faculty members on sick leave for 40 or more days during the calendar year.

4.1.5. Parental Leave (Article 21, Section IX: subsection 3). Unit Faculty Member who takes parental leave under this Article will only be evaluated for performance during the time in

which he or she was not on parental leave (including use of sick leave in addition to parental leave). Performance expectations for merit evaluations that are expressed quantitatively shall be prorated. The Department Chair's/School Director's evaluation shall include a description of the methods used for prorating.

4.1.6. Partial Unpaid Leave – 50% time (Article 21, Section X: subsection 3.3) Faculty members will not be eligible for merit in any calendar year for which 50% unpaid leave was taken that is unrelated to Family Medical Leave. If related to Family Medical Leave, performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.

4.1.7. Faculty Improvement Leave (Article 22, Section 7.3.3) Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consideration of the report submitted to the President detailing accomplishments during the FIL.

4.2. Consideration of Other Special Circumstances

4.2.1. New Faculty Hires. New faculty members whose employment begins in the fall semester shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. Performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.

4.2.2. The unit's faculty advisory body may also consider special circumstances not covered in 4.1 above and make a recommendation to the unit chair or director. Such exceptional circumstances might include a leave without pay to take a short-term research appointment, a leave without pay to participate in professional development, or other leave without pay that enhances the productivity of the faculty member and the reputation of the institution.

5. Amendment of Merit Policy

The Economics Department Faculty may amend performance indicators, performance expectations, and the methods for combining this information into both component and overall merit scores at any time. Amendments to the merit policy must be approved by the Dean and Provost/SVPAA. Approved amendments to the merit policy shall not be applied retroactively in the calculation of the previous year's merit scores.

6. Additional Information

6.1. 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.

Approved by the Department of Economics via email ballot after a January 27, 2015 Faculty Meeting.
Editorial adjustments agreed to at a February 17, 2015 Faculty Meeting.

Mary Ellen Benedict Date 3/23/15
Mary Ellen Benedict, Chair

Approved: [Signature] Date 3/31/15
Raymond W. Braun, Dean of College of Business Administration

Approved: [Signature] Date 4/15/15
Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP

Appendix A

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

Merit criteria are limited to three areas: Teaching Effectiveness, Research, and Service. To determine whether faculty members have failed to meet, met, or exceeded expectations for merit, a merit system should identify performance indicators and expected levels of performance for each of the relevant areas noted above. The merit system should also describe how information on the various performance indicators is 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 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 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.

A-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. Each component of merit will be scored from 1-10, with 1 indicating no 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, and failing to meet expectations for performance. A general description of these performance terms appears above, and specifics appear in each section of this appendix.

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. 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. This procedure is the Economics Department's understanding of the "consensus" mentioned in section 2.5 of this document and at the beginning of this appendix. 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 fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

A-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 below are to be considered in the evaluation of teaching; no specific weight for any individual criterion is dictated. Each department member being evaluated 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.

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.

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.

A. Undergraduate and graduate teaching.

When assigning a score to 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

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.

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.

A-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. Each department member being evaluated 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 did not make any contributions to research. 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.

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 faculty member.

Consideration includes:

- a. Articles:
 - Level I article (see department list).
 - Level II article (see department list).
 - Level III article in lower refereed journals (see department 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) (maximum of 1 point for all submissions)

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 (2014 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 publish in them. The Chair, in consultation with the tenure-track and tenured faculty, will decide on a rating for the journal with the input of the faculty member whose article was published by the journal.**
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.**

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 (See Journal list)
- (2) ABLA Regional journals (See Journal list)
- (3) All law journals (See Journal 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?

A-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. The service workload percentage specified in a faculty member's Workload Agreement will be used for 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 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.

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?

All of the foregoing are factors to be considered in evaluation of service. Each member is to be awarded from 1 to 10 points for service. Lack of evidence of any service is awarded one point; awarding ten points requires at least two service elements of extensive time and importance.

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 have 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, and Does Not Meet Expectations.

Evaluation Rating Category	TEACHING Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Teaching
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.	5-7.99
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.	1-4.99

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

Evaluation Rating Category	RESEARCH Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Score for Research
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.	5-7.99
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 – 4.99

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

Evaluation Rating Category	SERVICE Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Merit Score for Service
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.	8.0-10.9
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.	5.0-7.99
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 – 4.99

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

SUMMARY FORM

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:

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

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.				

Merit document passed by department faculty vote, 1/29/15.

Editorial changes approved by department consensus, 2/17/15, 2/24/15.