from Bae 2/14/17

Merit Document

Department of Finance
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 Department of Finance 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 – 1.9 = Unacceptable; 2.0 - 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 Department of Finance merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. The Department

Merit Committee will consist of all tenure-track faculty (TTF) and non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) in the department, excluding the department chair. Every TTF member will rate all TTF and NTTF members of the department, including himself or herself, but every NTTF member will rate all NTTF members only, including himself or herself. For a given year, any member may opt out of the evaluation process. However, the choice to not evaluate one member means that the member opting out does not evaluate any member, nor does the opting out member have the right to vote on any appeals. Opting out is automatic for any member who does not keep with the deadlines outlined below in Section 2.3.

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 all relevant elements as outlined in Appendix B (e.g., updated CV highlighting activities completed during the previous calendar year and not submitted to the merit committee in previous years, student teaching evaluations from the previous calendar year, etc.). Each faculty member will be evaluated on the basis of information provided in the merit dossier. However, all information included in the dossier must have supportive documentation on file in the department office. Such documentation would include course syllabi, letters from journal editors, conference and program chairperson, committee chairperson, grants officers and the like, indicating acceptance for publication or participation or awarding of grant, respectively. Each member will be evaluated using the attached Peer Evaluation Sheet for Annual Merit Review in Appendix. Each member will turn a completed rating sheet into the committee chair in a sealed envelope. The faculty member's signature will be across the seal. The rating sheet is identified only by a predetermined, faculty specific number which is known only to the committee chair.

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, 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 fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

Upon receipt of all rating sheets or immediately after the due date specified below, whichever comes first, the committee chair and department secretary will open the envelopes and compile all of the evaluations on the Peer Evaluation Master Sheet (revised due to appeals, as appropriate). By looking at the Master Sheet one can see how each rater evaluated each member of the department. Copies of the Master Sheet will be distributed to all members of the department. However, individual rating sheets will not be made available to department members. In the calculation of the average rating by area for the evaluative year, one high and one low evaluation score received by a faculty member in each of the areas of teaching, research (if applicable), and service will be dropped.

Once the component average merit scores on each performance area (Teaching Effectiveness, Research, and Service) for the evaluative year are completed, the overall merit score for the evaluative year is computed using a simple algorithm taking into account the weighted allocation of effort for each performance area:

[Teaching Effectiveness Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] +
[Research Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] +
[Service Merit Score * Allocation of Effort] = Overall Merit Score for the evaluative year

Lastly, the final merit allocation percentages in a given year shall be determined based upon the merit allocation percentages over the most recent three-year period including the evaluative year and previous two years on a rolling basis. Hence, each year new information is added to the file for the most recent year, and information for the oldest year is eliminated from the file. This will help to reduce inequities that can result both from differences in the merit funds available each year and from fluctuations in performance that may occur from year to year.

Overall Merit Score	Interpretation (10 point scale)
1.0 – 1.9	Unacceptable; recommendation for no merit
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

Along with the final overall merit scores ranging from 1.0 to 10.0, the Department will also present the final merit allocation percentages of all faculty members. The proportional distribution of merit monies for those who meet or exceed department expectations will be on the basis of the EXCESS over the required 5.0 average.

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 an academic unit. The merit committee of the academic unit is urged to work informally with all faculty being reviewed to resolve any factual or interpretive issues in advance of making recommendations to the chair.

February 28: Academic unit faculty committee's merit score recommendation to the chair (with a copy to the faculty member).

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

March 31: Chair's merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copies to the committee and faculty members).

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

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

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

4. Special Circumstances

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

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

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

4.1.3. Unpaid Leave - 100% time (Article 21, Section IV: subsection 5). Faculty members will not be eligible for merit in any calendar year for which 100% unpaid leave was taken that is unrelated to 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 unit faculty may amend performance indicators, performance expectations, and the methods for combining this information into both component and overall merit scores at any time. Amendments to the merit policy must be approved by the Dean and Provost/SVPAA. Approved amendments to the merit policy shall not be applied retroactively in the calculation of the previous year's merit scores.

6. Additional Information

6.1. 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.

6.2. This merit document will be effective through December 31, 2017.

Approved by the Department of Finance at the March 14, 2017 Faculty Meeting

Date: March 14, 2017

Sung C. Bae, Chair

Approved: _____ Date 3/15/17

Raymond W. Braun, Dean of College of Business Administration

Approved: _____ Date 3/15/17

Rodney Rogers, Provost/ Senior VP

Attachments:

- **Appendix A: Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations, and the Calculation of Component Merit Scores**
- **Appendix B: Annual Merit Review Criteria Guidelines**
- **Appendix C: Journal Article Classifications and Guidelines**
- **Peer Evaluation Sheet for Annual Merit Review – For Tenure-Track Faculty**
- **Peer Evaluation Sheet for Annual Merit Review – For Non Tenure-Track Faculty**
- **Peer Evaluation Master Sheet for Annual Merit Review - For Tenure-Track Faculty**
- **Peer Evaluation Master Sheet for Annual Merit Review – For Non Tenure-Track Faculty**

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 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 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 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, and unacceptable 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.

Unacceptable for merit: Activities in area cumulatively lack any accomplishment and fall far 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 is unacceptable, fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

Evaluation Rating Category	TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Teaching*
Exceeds expectations for merit	Consists of "A" level work based on all relevant information (See Section I in Appendix B); Quantitative student evaluations regularly exceed departmental averages for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are general positive. Observations by peers indicate highest levels of excellence in the classroom. Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are regularly introduced and evaluated. Regular engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness.	*8.0 – 10.0*
Meets expectations for merit	Consists of "B" level work based on all relevant information (See Section I in Appendix B); Quantitative student evaluations approximate departmental averages for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are general positive. Observations by peers indicate high levels of performance in the classroom. Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are occasionally introduced with some assessment of their impact. Modest engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness.	*5.0 – 7.9*
Fails to meet expectations for merit	Consists of "C" level work based on all relevant information (See Section I in Appendix B); Quantitative student evaluations are among lowest in department for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are mixed. Observations by peers indicate significant opportunities for improvement. Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are generally absent and rarely evaluated. Limited or no engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness.	*2.0 – 4.9*
Unacceptable	Consists of "D" level work based on all relevant information (See Section I in Appendix B); Quantitative student evaluations are the lowest in department for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are negative. Observations by peers indicate unacceptable. Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are absent. No engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness.	*1.0-1.9*

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

Evaluation Rating Category	RESEARCH WORK Expected levels of accomplishment on RESEARCH performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Merit Score for Research*
Exceeds expectations for merit	Consists of at least one refereed published article in A-level journal or multiple articles in B-level journals plus on-going research activities (See Section II in Appendix B).	*8.0 – 10.0*
Meets expectations for merit	Consists of at least one refereed published article in an accepted journal plus on-going research activities (See Section II in Appendix B).	*5.0 – 7.9*

Fails to meet expectations for merit	Consists of on-going research activities but no refereed published article in an accepted journal (See Section II in Appendix B).	*2.0 – 4.9*
Unacceptable	No discernable on-going research activities (See Section II in Appendix B).	*1.0-1.9*

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

Evaluation Rating Category	**SERVICE** Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Merit Score for Service*
Exceeds expectations for merit	Consists of norm performance plus committee membership in at least two different levels beyond the department (college, university, external professional), and officeholder in at least one of those committees (See Section III in Appendix B).	*8.0 – 10.0*
Meets expectations for merit	Consists of maintaining a normal share of all departmental activities, plus performance in one university or college committee (See Section III in Appendix B).	*5.0 – 7.9*
Fails to meet expectations for merit	Consists of maintaining a normal share of departmental activities only (See Section III in Appendix B).	*2.0 – 4.9*
Unacceptable	No participation in any department or college activities (See Section III in Appendix B).	*1.0 – 1.9*

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

SUMMARY FORM

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

Faculty Member	Merit Score for Teaching	Merit Score for Research	Merit Score for Service
Faculty member 1	*Insert numerical score*	*Insert numerical score*	*Insert numerical score*
Faculty member 2	*Insert numerical score*	*Insert numerical score*	*Insert numerical score*
Next faculty member, etc.	*Insert numerical score*	*Insert numerical score*	*Insert numerical score*

APPENDIX B

ANNUAL MERIT REVIEW CRITERIA GUIDELINES

Faculty who qualify for merit by meeting or exceeding department expectations in their annual performance reviews have developed and executed effective teaching and research programs and have been actively involved in service to departments, or to the profession outside of the University, or to both, in a manner consistent with creating an environment that fosters excellence in scholarship, teaching, and service.

I. Criteria Applied to Annual Merit Review of **Teaching**

Teaching involves activities both inside and outside the classroom. While the greatest weight is given to classroom teaching, the following performance indicators will be considered.

1. Classroom Teaching
   Student and peer evaluations are required measures
2. Non-classroom Teaching/Advising, e.g.,
   Advising students
   Guiding GBA 691 and thesis research
   Teaching independent studies
   Teaching special studies
   Advising/mentoring student clubs, special projects/competition
3. Contributions to the Scholarship of Engagement
   Oversight of student activities related to service learning
   Efforts to incorporate external community problems and issues into the course content
   Provision of educational opportunities to the external community in the areas of corporate finance, international finance, financial institutions, financial planning and/or investment advice
4. Teaching Support Activities, e.g.,
   Course development
   Curriculum/program development
   Participation on curriculum activities
   Innovative teaching methods development
   Professional development related to teaching
   Textbooks/instructional materials development
   Assessment information, including supportive letters

Professional judgment is applied in the evaluation of faculty members' teaching performance.

Please note that case studies may, in certain situations, be considered as either teaching related activity or research related activity, depending on the material covered in those cases. Unless otherwise adequately explained by the faculty member, case studies will be considered teaching related activity, and therefore should be reported in that category of activities.

While student evaluations are important indicators of effectiveness in the classroom, factors such as the level of the course, whether the course is required or elective, graduate or undergraduate, size, time of day, and nature of the evaluation instrument can all affect student ratings. Therefore, judgment is applied in the interpretation of student evaluations and comparisons between faculty members and departments are made cautiously.

In addition to student evaluation of the faculty member's performance as a teacher, evaluation of the faculty member's teaching performance by the peers is extremely important in providing appropriate evidence of the faculty member's ability as a teacher. These evaluations will include written evaluation of the faculty member's classroom performance and teaching materials, as well as other teaching related activities appropriate to the evaluation period.

II. Criteria Applied to Annual Merit Review of **Research**

A. General Guidelines

Faculty members must show evidence of an ongoing research program resulting in scholarly publications and presentations at scholarly meetings. Particular emphasis is placed upon publications and presentations juried by professional peers at the regional and national levels. The evaluation of research involves assessing both the quantity and quality of research activity and output. Evidence of research productivity includes the following performance indicators:

1. Publications
   - Books (non-textbooks)
   - Journal articles
   - Monographs
2. Publications and presentations resulting from applied research, consulting, outreach, and engagement activities
3. Presentations
   - Papers presented at meetings of professional associations not included in the proceedings
   - Proceeding publications
4. Other Contributions
   - Published book reviews
   - Published cases
5. Research Recognition
   - Appointment to editorial board of refereed journals
   - Appointment to editorships of refereed journals
   - Attainment of research grants
   - Receipt of research honors and awards
6. Research Support Activities
   - Miscellaneous research support activities
   - Reviewing for journals/conferences
7. Professional Development Activities Related to Research
8. Work under Review
9. Work in Progress

Greatest weight will be given to journal publications. In general, refereed publications are given greater weight than non-refereed publications; individually authored articles are given greater weight than co-authored articles; articles published in top quality journals are given more weight than articles published in good quality or average quality journals; long articles are given greater weight than short research notes. A quality journal may be a mainstream journal in the faculty member's discipline, a specialized journal in the faculty member's discipline, a journal from another discipline which relates to work in the faculty member's discipline, or an interdisciplinary journal.

The assessment of research quality involves substantial judgment on the part of other members of the department. Quality is difficult to assess, and involves consideration of the research itself, the

channel in which the research is published, and the review process it has undergone. This process requires a careful examination and synthesis of information provided by the faculty member regarding activities and publications in addition to knowledge of the quality of the publication outlet. In those instances in which the faculty member has performed research involving the scholarship of engagement, assessment from community members may also be considered to determine the level of impact of the research.

B. The faculty member may choose which year he/she reports an article for annual merit review. A particular article can only be reported once, i.e., the acceptance of an article and its publication are one event.

C. The department's guidelines and classification of journals are in Appendix C.

III. Criteria Applied to Annual Merit Review of Service

Participation in activities that benefit students, faculty, the programs, and the mission of the department and/or College and/or University, as well as service to the candidate's profession/discipline and to the external community evolves during the probationary period. While it is generally expected that junior faculty will have less service activity than more senior faculty members, evidence of interest and contributions in this area must be provided. Service should be recognized for faculty member's committee participation at department, college, university, and external professional levels. Activities considered in the evaluation of the service component include:

1. University Governance (not related to either research or teaching)
   - Leadership positions
   - Membership on College committees
   - Membership on department committees
   - Membership on University committees
   - Other University governance activities
2. Professional Activities
   - Involvement in activities of professional organizations at the local, regional, and national levels
   - Leadership positions in professional organizations
   - Membership in professional organizations
3. External Community Service and Engagement
   - Paid and unpaid professional service to public and private sector organizations
   - Professional service that contributes to the needs and growth of civic and community groups
4. Service Recognition Awards
5. Other Service Activities
   - Administrative assignments
   - Advising student clubs, special projects/competitions
   - Editorial boards
   - Unpaid professional consulting to government or other nonprofit organizations

Please note that serving on editorial review boards may in certain situations, be considered as either research related activity or service related activity, depending on the nature of the work. Unless otherwise adequately explained by the faculty member, service on editorial review boards will be considered service related activity and therefore should be reported in that category of activities.

In general, the weight given to any particular University governance activity, professional activity, or other service activity varies by the nature of the assignment, the degree of involvement/time required by the faculty member, the level of involvement, and the tasks/accomplishments of the committee. In general, major committees are those that involve a substantial time commitment. Further, significant participation can be defined in terms of quantity and quality of service activities.

APPENDIX C

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE
JOURNAL ARTICLE CLASSIFICATIONS AND GUIDELINES
For Promotion, Tenure, Three-Year Review, Annual Review, and Merit
(Updated: January 31, 2017)

CLASSIFICATION 'A'

1) In general, the following guidelines are used in the classification of A journals:
   - top quality perceived by both academics and practitioners.
   - leading, highly-regarded editorial board.
   - blind peer-review process (both external and internal).
   - lower acceptance rate.

2) Journal names

   - **Corporate Governance: An International Review (added 1/31/17)**
   - **Financial Analysts Journal (added 2/21/07)**
   - **Financial Management**
   - **Financial Review**
   - **International Review of Economics and Finance (added 1/31/17)**
   - **Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance**
   - **Journal of Applied Corporate Finance (added 2/21/07)**
   - **Journal of Banking and Finance**
   - **Journal of Business**
   - **Journal of Business Ethics (added 1/31/17)**
   - **Journal of Business Finance and Accounting**
   - **Journal of Corporate Finance**
   - **Journal of Derivatives (added 2/21/07)**
   - **Journal of Empirical Finance**
   - **Journal of Finance**
   - **Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis**
   - **Journal of Financial Economics**
   - **Journal of Financial Intermediation**
   - **Journal of Financial Markets (added 2/21/07)**
   - **Journal of Financial Research**
   - **Journal of Financial Services Research**
     Journal of Financial Stability (added 4/10/15)
   - **Journal of Futures Markets**
   - **Journal of International Money and Finance (added 2/21/07)**
   - **Journal of Money, Credit and Banking**
   - **Journal of Portfolio Management (added 2/21/07)**
   - **Mathematical Finance (added 1/31/17)**
   - **Pacific-Basin Finance Journal (added 2/21/07)**
   - **Review of Finance (added 2/24/10)**
   - **Review of Financial Studies**
   - **Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting**

CLASSIFICATION 'B'

1) In general, the following guidelines are used in the classification of B journals:
   - good quality perceived by both academics and practitioners.
   - recognizable editorial board.
   - low acceptance rate.
   - blind peer-review process (both external and internal).

2) Journal names:

   - **Advances in Financial Economics**
   - **Advances in Quantitative Analysis of Finance and Accounting (added 2/21/07)**
   - **Applied Financial Economics**
   - **Asia Pacific Journal of Financial Studies (added 1/12/09)**
   - **Corporate Finance Review**
   - **Corporate Governance: An International Review (added 2/21/07)**
   - **Emerging Markets Finance and Trade Journal (added 1/12/09)**
   - **Emerging Markets Review (added 2/21/07)**
   - **European Financial Management (added 2/24/10)**
   - **Finance Research Letters (added 2/21/07)**
   - **Financial Counseling and Education**
   - **Financial Markets and Portfolio Management (added 2/21/07)**
   - **Financial Services Review**
   - **Global Finance Journal**
   - **International Journal of Banking, Accounting, and Finance (added 2/24/10)**
   - **International Journal of Finance**
   - **International Journal of Finance & Economics (added 2/21/07)**
   - **International Review of Applied Financial Issues and Economics (added 2/24/10)**
   - **International Review of Economics and Finance**
   - **International Review of Finance (added 1/12/09)**
   - **International Review of Financial Analysis**
   - **Journal of Accounting, Finance & Business Studies**
   - **Journal of Accounting and Finance Research**
   - **Journal of Applied Business Research**
   - **Journal of Applied Finance (formerly Financial Practice and Education)**
   - **Journal of Asia Economics**
   - **Journal of Banking Regulation (added 2/24/10)**
   - **Journal of Business Research**
   - **Journal of Cash Management**
   - **Journal of Corporate Ownership and Control (added 9/26/06)**
   - **Journal of Economics and Business**
   - **Journal of Economics and Finance**
   - **Journal of Emerging Market Finance (added 2/21/07)**
   - **Journal of Emerging Markets (2/21/07)**
   - **Journal of Finance Case Research**
   - **Journal of Financial and Economic Practice (added 2/21/07)**
   - **Journal of Financial and Strategic Decisions**
   - **Journal of Financial Education**
   - **Journal of Financial Engineering**

- **Journal of Financial Planning**
- **Journal of Financial Stability (added 2/21/07)**
- **Journal of Fixed Income**
- **Journal of Insurance and Finance**
- **Journal of International Financial Management**
- **Journal of International Financial Management and Accounting**
- **Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money**
- **Journal of Investing**
- **Journal of Multinational Financial Management**
- **Journal of Small Business Finance**
- **Journal of Taxation of Investments**
- **Managerial Finance (added 4/10/15)**
- **Mathematical Finance**
- **Mid-American Journal of Business**
- **Midwestern Journal of Business & Economics**
- **Multinational Business Review**
- **Multinational Finance Journal (added 2/24/10)**
- **North America Review of Economics and Finance**
- **Quarterly Journal of Business & Economics**
- **Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance**
- **Review of Asset Pricing Studies (added 9/14/16)**
- **Review of Corporate Finance Studies (added 9/14/16)**
- **Review of Financial Economics**
- **Review of Futures Markets**
- **Review of Business & Economic Research**
- **Review of Business Studies**
- **Review of Pacific-Basin Financial Management and Policies (added 2/24/10)**
- **Review of Pacific Basin Financial Markets and Policies (added 2/21/07)**
- **Southern Business and Economic Journal**
- **The Financier (added 1/29/07)**

CLASSIFICATION 'C'

1) In general, the following guidelines are used in the classification of C journals:
   - regional editorial board.
   - do not necessarily require blind peer-review process.
   - many are practitioners-oriented, quazi-magazines.

2) Journal names:

   - **AAII Journal**
   - **ABA Banking Journal**
   - **American Banker**
   - **Appraisal Journal**
   - **Bank Marketing**
   - **The Banker**
   - **Bankers Magazine**
   - **Bankers Monthly**
   - **Benefits Quarterly**
   - **Cashflow Magazine**

- **Commercial Lender's Review**
- **CPCU Journal**
- **Credit**
- **Credit & Financial Management**
- **Credit World**
- **Employee Benefit Journal**
- **Financial Executive**
- **Housing Finance Review**
- **Insurance Review**
- **Investment Guide**
- **Issues in Bank Regulation**
- **Journal of Commercial Banking Lending**
- **Journal of Corporate Taxation**
- **Journal of Insurance Issues and Practices**
- **Journal of Insurance Regulation**
- **Journal of Pension Plan and Compliance**
- **Journal of Retail Banking**
- **Pension World**
- **Risk Management**
- **Savings Institutions**
- **Three Banks Review**
- **United States Banker**
- **On-line Version of Journal of Financial Planning (Between the Issues)**

Note: Journals may be added to, deleted from, or reclassified within the above list at any time on demand by simple majority vote of faculty. It is the faculty's intention that requests for change be made prior to submission of the manuscript for publication. All requests must be made prior to consideration for merit.

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE **RATER NO.______**

PEER EVALUATION SHEET FOR ANNUAL MERIT REVIEW

<u>FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY</u>

INSTRUCTIONS: Circle the number you think most closely reflects the performance level of the peer under review for each category considered. Place the completed sheet in the enclosed envelop and return the sealed envelope, with your signature across the seal, to the department office by the time due.

FACULTY RATED	TEACHING	RESEARCH	SERVICE
________	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
________	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
________	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
________	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
________	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
________	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE RATER NO._____
PEER EVALUATION SHEET FOR ANNUAL MERIT REVIEW

FOR NON TENURE TRACK FACULTY

INSTRUCTIONS: Circle the number you think most closely reflects the performance level of the peer under review for each category considered. Place the completed sheet in the enclosed envelop and return the sealed envelope, with your signature across the seal, to the department office by the time due.

FACULTY RATED	TEACHING	SERVICE
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
_____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE
PEER EVALUATION MASTER SHEET FOR CALENDAR YEAR_____

FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

TENURE-TRACK FACULTY RATED

TEACHING: 40%								
R A								
A B								
T C								
E D								
R E								
F								
EVALUATIVE YEAR MEAN-TEACHING								
RESEARCH: 40%								
R A								
A B								
T C								
E D								
R E								
F								
EVALUATIVE YEAR MEAN-RESEARCH								
SERVICE: 20%								
R A								
A B								
T C								
E D								
R E								
F								
EVALUATIVE YEAR MEAN-SERVICE								
EVALUATIVE YEAR MEAN-OVERALL								
ONE YEAR PREVIOUS MEAN-OVERALL								
TWO YEAR PREVIOUS MEAN-OVERALL								
OVERALL MERIT ALLOCATION PERCENTAGE								
* High Score								
** Low Score								

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE
PEER EVALUATION MASTER SHEET FOR CALENDAR YEAR_____

FOR NON TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

NON TENURE TRACK FACULTY RATED

TEACHING: 80%								
	A							
R	B							
A	C							
T	D							
E	E							
R	F							
	G							
EVALUATIVE YEAR MEAN-TEACHING								
SERVICE: 20%								
	A							
R	B							
A	C							
T	D							
E	E							
R	F							
	G							
EVALUATIVE YEAR MEAN-SERVICE								
EVALUATIVE YEAR MEAN-OVERALL								
ONE YEAR PREVIOUS MEAN-OVERALL								
TWO YEAR PREVIOUS MEAN-OVERALL								
OVERALL MERIT ALLOCATION PERCENTAGE								
*	High Score							
**	Low Score							