

## **Merit Document**

Department of Applied Statistics and Operations Research 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 Department of Applied Statistics and Operations Research 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 Department of Applied Statistics and Operations Research merit committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member. The merit committee consists of all bargaining unit faculty members of the Department of Applied Statistics and Operations Research.
- 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. Service report (based on the calendar year of the previous year) highlighting activities completed during the previous calendar year (and not submitted to the merit committee in previous years);
- b. An updated CV;
- c. A summary of accomplishments in each of the areas of teaching, research and service; and
- d. Any other supporting documents.

**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.

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 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 to 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.a. **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.b. **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.c. **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.d. **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.e. **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.f. **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.g. **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.a. **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.b. 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, 2015.

Approved by the Department of Applied Statistics and Operations Research at the January 28, 2015 Faculty Meeting

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name, Chair, Arthur Yeh  3/5/2015 Date 02/18/2015

Approved:  Date 2/25/15  
Raymond W. Braun, Dean of College of Business Administration

Approved:  Date 4/5/15  
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 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 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.

Evaluation Rating Category	<b>TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS</b> Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Teaching*
Exceeds expectations for merit	The teaching performance is judged <b>Exceeds Expectations</b> if the faculty has (a) achieved outstanding success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the department Chair/peers and students and (b) achieved outstanding success in non-classroom teaching/advising and/or teaching development activities. Recognitions such as awards for outstanding teaching, while not required to be rated as <b>Exceeds Expectations</b> , could be considered as evidence of excellence in teaching.	8.0 – 10.0
Meets expectations for merit	The teaching performance is judged <b>Meets Expectations</b> if, he/she: (a) achieved high success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the department Chair/peers, and students and (b) participated significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising and/or teaching development activities.	5.0 – 7.9
Fails to meet expectations for merit	The teaching performance of a candidate for reappointment is judged <b>Fails to Meet Expectations</b> if it does not meet the requirements to be classified as <b>Meets Expectations</b> .	1.0 – 4.9

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

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

	research and/or publications in quality refereed journal/conference and/or funded external grant activity and/or professional development that enhances research activities.	
Fails to meet expectations for merit	A candidate for annual performance review who does not meet the requirements for <b>Meet Expectations</b> is judged <b>Fails to Meet Expectations</b> in research.	1.0 – 4.9

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

Evaluation Rating Category	<b>SERVICE</b> Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators (or their equivalent)	Possible Merit Score for Service*
Exceeds expectations for merit	The service performance of a candidate for annual reappointment is judged <b>Exceeds Expectations</b> if he/she participated in professional and university level service activities, in addition to college, departmental governance and support activities.	8.0 – 10.0
Meets expectations for merit	The service performance of a candidate for annual reappointment is judged <b>Meets Expectations</b> if he/she participated in college, departmental governance and support activities.	5.0 – 7.9
Fails to meet expectations for merit	The service performance of a candidate for annual review is judged <b>Fails to Meet Expectations</b> if he/she does not meet expectations.	1.0 – 4.9

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 Effectiveness	Merit Score for Research	Merit Score for Service

<i>Faculty member 1</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>
<i>Faculty member 2</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>
<i>Next faculty member, etc.</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>	<i>Insert numerical score</i>

### A.1. Guidelines for Determining the Ratings for TTF Faculty

The items listed below, as components to be evaluated under teaching, research and service are not ranked. The suggested location of various activities under the categories of teaching, research and service is intended to provide general guidelines to the candidates and the **Committee**. A candidate may choose to list an activity under a category other than that suggested in this document (e.g. listing authoring of a textbook under research rather than teaching). In such cases the candidate must include documentation justifying such a classification. Each activity should be listed in only one category.

The **Committee** members must recognize that the ratings given to any faculty member's performance should be evaluated based on the established norms for the Department and independent of the performance of the other faculty members. In other words, exceptional performance by one or more faculty members should in no way decrease the rating of a good performance by another faculty member. Similarly, poor performance by one or more faculty members should in no way increase the rating of an average performance by another faculty member.

#### A.1.1. Teaching

It is recognized that teaching is multidimensional, involving activities both inside and outside the classroom. While student teaching evaluations are an important and required indicator of teaching effectiveness, factors such as the level of the course, whether the course is required or elective, graduate or undergraduate, size of class, time of day, and nature of the evaluation instrument can all have an impact on a candidate's student evaluations. Therefore, judgment should be applied in the interpretation of student evaluations. In any case, student evaluations should receive no more than 50% weight in rating a faculty member's teaching performance. While greatest weight will be given to classroom teaching, the following unranked components should be used in rating a faculty member's teaching performance.

##### a) Undergraduate Teaching

- i) Student evaluation of teaching (required measure)
- ii) Peer observations and evaluations of teaching
- iii) Contributions to recruitment, retention, advising, and placement of undergraduate students
- iv) Self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness
- v) Documentation of student learning outcomes



- vi) Independent or special study courses taught
- vii) Teaching awards and distinctions
- viii) Written statements from colleagues, students, and others concerning preparedness and effectiveness in teaching

b) Graduate Teaching

- i) Student evaluation of teaching (required measure)
- ii) Peer observations and evaluations of teaching
- iii) Advisement of MS(AS) projects
- iv) Service on other thesis and dissertation committees
- v) Participating in conducting comprehensive exams
- vi) Arranging for the comprehensive examinations (as opposed to participating in conducting comprehensive exams)
- vii) Contribution to recruitment, retention, advising, and placement of graduate students
- viii) Orientation for the incoming students
- ix) Extramural support secured for graduate students
- x) Self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness
- xi) Documentation of student learning outcomes
- xii) Independent or special study courses taught
- xiii) Teaching awards and distinctions
- xiv) Written statements from colleagues, students, and others concerning preparedness and effectiveness in teaching

c) Instructional Development

- i) Nature of instruction and range of courses taught
- ii) Development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses
- iii) Curriculum/program development activities
- iv) Professional development activities to enhance teaching
- v) Assessment of student activities
- vi) Innovations in the effective use of instructional technology and resources
- vii) Development of textbooks and other instructional materials.

d) Other Contributions to Student Learning

- i) Support of internships and co-operative work experiences for students
- ii) Advisement of student clubs, professional organizations, or competitions
- iii) Involvement in clubs, organizations, and activities prompting faculty-student interaction
- iv) Involvement in activities to promote Department programs and services to current and prospective students
- v) Participation in University, College, or Department projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning
- vi) Participation and leadership in Department, College or University committees, task forces, governing bodies, councils, and review teams related to teaching
- vii) Other activities that contribute to effective teaching

A rating for teaching effectiveness will be determined using the criteria listed in (a)-(d) above. Student evaluations should receive no more than 50% weight in rating a faculty member's teaching performance.

### A.1.2. Research

The members of the Committee will give greatest weight 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 candidate's discipline, a specialized journal in the candidate's discipline, a journal from another discipline that relates to work in the candidate's discipline, or an interdisciplinary journal.

The Department provides the faculty some flexibility in reporting their research output to compensate for the uncertainties of the reviewing process for journal publications. A faculty member may report an acceptance either in the year it is accepted for publication or in the year the paper appears in print. Submissions must be reported during the year they occur. In general, it is not possible to objectively evaluate research work in progress. Thus, work in progress will not be given any credit in the performance evaluation. While greatest weight will be given to refereed journal publications, the following unranked items should also be considered in rating a faculty member's research performance.

#### a) Publications, Presentations, and Other Scholarly Activities

- i) Scholarly books
- ii) Monographs
- iii) Proceedings publications
- iv) Papers presented at meetings of professional associations not included in the proceedings
- v) Presentations resulting from applied research and consulting
- vi) Published book reviews
- vii) Published cases
- viii) Reviewing for professional conferences and journals
- ix) Serving as paper discussant or program chair for professional conferences
- x) Appointment to editorial board of refereed journal
- xi) Appointment to editorship of refereed journal
- xii) Receipt of research honors and awards
- xiii) Professional development activities related to research
- xiv) Work under review by conferences and refereed journals
- xv) Participation and leadership in Department, College or University committees, task forces, governing bodies, councils, and review teams related to research
- xvi) Contributions to the Center for Business Analytics, advising students on consulting projects

b) Sponsored Program Extramural Support for Research and Scholarly Work

- i) Grant applications submitted
- ii) Agency reviewers' evaluations of the proposal(s)
- iii) Significance and scope of the project(s)
- iv) Research funds awarded
- v) Performance of duties as principal investigator
- vi) Research fellowships awarded

c) Institutional Outreach

- i) Participation in University, College, or Department outreach activities
- ii) Private consulting

d) Research honors and awards received

A rating for research will be determined using the criteria listed in (a)-(d) above.

**A.1.3. Service**

The following are examples of activities in the areas of Service that should be considered in rating a faculty member's performance.

a) Internal Affairs and Institutional Governance

- i) Participation and leadership in Department, College or University committees, task forces, governing bodies, councils, and review teams not related to teaching or research
- ii) Performance of assigned administrative responsibilities
- iii) Honors and awards received
- iv) Graduate Coordinator
- v) Director of Center for Business Analytics

b) External Community Service

- i) Paid and unpaid professional consulting to public and private sector organizations
- ii) Contributions to the Center for Business Analytics, advising students on consulting projects
- iii) Professionally related civic and community service
- iv) Honors and awards received

c) Professional Service

- i) Membership and involvement in professional organizations at the local, state, regional, national, or international levels
- ii) Leadership positions in professional organizations
- iii) Organization of professional meetings and conferences
- iv) Honors and awards received

A rating for service will be determined using the criteria listed in (a)-(c) above.

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 candidate, 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 any particular University governance activity, professional activity, or other service activity will vary by the nature of the assignment, the degree of involvement/time required by the candidate, 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.

## **A.2. Guidelines for Determining the Ratings for NTTF Faculty**

The NTTF faculty members typically contribute only in the areas of teaching and service. The NTTF faculty members are not expected to conduct research or engage in scholarly activities. Hence, their performance evaluation is based entirely on teaching and service related activities. Thus, the weight assigned to research for NTTF faculty members is, in most cases, 0. A NTTF faculty member can choose to conduct research or scholarly activities. In this case, a proper weight assigned to research will be developed and approved by the Dean for each NTTF faculty member who chooses to conduct research and scholarly related activities. The procedures for the determination of ratings for teaching, research (if chosen) and service related activities of NTTF faculty members are identical to that for TTF faculty members.

The items listed below, as components to be evaluated under teaching, research (if chosen) and service are not ranked. The suggested location of various activities under the categories of teaching, research (if chosen) and service is intended to provide general guidelines to the candidates and the Committee. A candidate may choose to list an activity under a category other than that suggested in this document (e.g. listing authoring of a textbook under research rather than teaching). In such cases the candidate must include documentation justifying such a classification. Each activity should be listed in only one category.

The Committee members must recognize that the ratings given to any NTTF faculty member's performance should be evaluated based on the established norms for the Department and independent of the performance of the other NTTF faculty members. In other words, exceptional performance by one or more NTTF faculty members should in no way decrease the rating of a good performance by another NTTF faculty member. Similarly, poor performance by one or more NTTF faculty members should in no way increase the rating of an average performance by another NTTF faculty member.

### **A.2.1. Teaching**

It is recognized that teaching is multidimensional, involving activities both inside and outside the classroom. While student teaching evaluations are an important and required indicator of teaching effectiveness, factors such as the level of the course, whether the course is required or elective, graduate or undergraduate, size of class, time of day, and nature of the evaluation instrument can all have an impact on a candidate's student evaluations. Therefore, judgment should be applied in the

interpretation of student evaluations. In any case, student evaluations should receive no more than 50% weight in rating a faculty member's teaching performance. While greatest weight will be given to classroom teaching, the following unranked components should be used in rating a faculty member's teaching performance.

a) Undergraduate Teaching

- i) Student evaluation of teaching (required measure)
- ii) Peer observations and evaluations of teaching
- iii) Contributions to recruitment, retention, advising, and placement of undergraduate students
- iv) Self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness
- v) Documentation of student learning outcomes
- vi) Independent or special study courses taught
- vii) Teaching awards and distinctions
- viii) Written statements from colleagues, students, and others concerning preparedness and effectiveness in teaching

b) Graduate Teaching (if applicable)

- i) Student evaluation of teaching (required measure)
- ii) Peer observations and evaluations of teaching
- iii) Advisement of MS(AS) projects
- iv) Service on other thesis and dissertation committees
- v) Contribution to recruitment, retention, advising, and placement of graduate students
- vi) Extramural support secured for graduate students
- vii) Self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness
- viii) Documentation of student learning outcomes
- ix) Independent or special study courses taught
- x) Teaching awards and distinctions
- xi) Written statements from colleagues, students, and others concerning preparedness and effectiveness in teaching

c) Instructional Development

- i) Nature of instruction and range of courses taught
- ii) Development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses
- iii) Curriculum/program development activities
- iv) Professional development activities to enhance teaching
- v) Assessment of student activities
- vi) Innovations in the effective use of instructional technology and resources
- vii) Development of textbooks and other instructional materials.

d) Other Contributions to Student Learning

- i) Support of internships and co-operative work experiences for students
- ii) Advisement of student clubs, professional organizations, or competitions

- iii) Involvement in clubs, organizations, and activities prompting faculty-student interaction
- iv) Involvement in activities to promote Department programs and services to current and prospective students
- v) Participation in University, College, or Department projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning
- vi) Participation and leadership in Department, College or University committees, task forces, governing bodies, councils, and review teams related to teaching
- vii) Other activities that contribute to effective teaching

A rating for teaching effective will be determined using the criteria listed in (a)-(d) above. Student evaluations should receive no more than 50% weight in rating a faculty member's teaching performance.

#### A.2.2. Research (if chosen)

The members of the Committee will give greatest weight 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 candidate's discipline, a specialized journal in the candidate's discipline, a journal from another discipline that relates to work in the candidate's discipline, or an interdisciplinary journal.

The Department provides the faculty some flexibility in reporting their research output to compensate for the uncertainties of the reviewing process for journal publications. A faculty member may report an acceptance either in the year it is accepted for publication or in the year the paper appears in print. Submissions must be reported during the year they occur. In general, it is not possible to objectively evaluate research work in progress. Thus, work in progress will not be given any credit in the performance evaluation. While greatest weight will be given to refereed journal publications, the following unranked items should also be considered in rating a faculty member's research performance.

##### a) Publications, Presentations, and Other Scholarly Activities

- i) Scholarly books
- ii) Monographs
- iii) Proceedings publications
- iv) Papers presented at meetings of professional associations not included in the proceedings
- v) Presentations resulting from applied research and consulting
- vi) Published book reviews
- vii) Published cases
- viii) Reviewing for professional conferences and journals
- ix) Serving as paper discussant or program chair for professional conferences
- x) Appointment to editorial board of refereed journal
- xi) Appointment to editorship of refereed journal
- xii) Receipt of research honors and awards

- xiii) Professional development activities related to research
- xiv) Work under review by conferences and refereed journals
- xv) Participation and leadership in Department, College or University committees, task forces, governing bodies, councils, and review teams related to research
- xvi) Contributions to the Center for Business Analytics, advising students on consulting projects

b) Sponsored Program Extramural Support for Research and Scholarly Work

- i) Grant applications submitted
- ii) Agency reviewers' evaluations of the proposal(s)
- iii) Significance and scope of the project(s)
- iv) Research funds awarded
- v) Performance of duties as principal investigator
- vi) Research fellowships awarded

c) Institutional Outreach

- i) Participation in University, College, or Department outreach activities
- ii) Private consulting

d) Research honors and awards received

A rating for research will be determined using the criteria listed in (a)-(d) above.

### A.2.3. Service

The following are examples of activities in the areas of Service that should be considered in rating a faculty member's performance.

a) Internal Affairs and Institutional Governance

- i) Participation and leadership in Department, College or University committees, task forces, governing bodies, councils, and review teams not related to teaching or research
- ii) Performance of assigned administrative responsibilities
- iii) Honors and awards received

b) External Community Service

- i) Paid and unpaid professional consulting to public and private sector organizations
- ii) Contributions to the Center for Business Analytics, advising students on consulting projects
- iii) Professionally related civic and community service
- iv) Honors and awards received

c) Professional Service

- i) Membership and involvement in professional organizations at the local, state, regional, national, or international levels
- ii) Leadership positions in professional organizations
- iii) Organization of professional meetings and conferences
- iv) Honors and awards received

A rating for service will be determined using the criteria listed in (a)-(c) above.

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 candidate, 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 any particular University governance activity, professional activity, or other service activity will vary by the nature of the assignment, the degree of involvement/time required by the candidate, 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.