



“PINK”

November 2005

HASKAYNE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS GUIDELINES FOR THE ALLOCATION OF MERIT INCREMENTS

The contents of this document represent policies of the Haskayne School of Business. These policies have been developed within the framework of University policies as given in the University’s Procedures Pertaining to Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Staff (APT) and the Manual of Policies and Procedures for the Annual Assessment of Academic Staff (GPC). In the event of conflict between University and School policies, University policies have priority.

Guidelines Approved at Haskayne School of Business Council October 27, 2000
Revised June 15, 2001, October 26, 2001, December 20, 2001, March 2002, November 2003, April 2004,
November 26, 2004, November 25, 2005
Approved by the Provost on December 9, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. MEMBERSHIP OF FACULTY MERIT COMMITTEE	1
3. PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PROCESS	2
4. MERIT ASSESSMENT FORM.....	4
5. CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL PERFORMANCE	4
6. CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT OF SCHOLARLY PERFORMANCE	5
7. CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT OF SERVICE PERFORMANCE.....	7
8. METHOD OF DERIVING OVERALL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT.....	8

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1. This document has been prepared with two purposes in mind:
 - 1.1.1 To provide faculty members with a basic reference document explaining the procedures and criteria used in merit assessment in each of the areas of academic responsibility; namely teaching, scholarship, and service.
 - 1.1.2 To provide Area Chairs, members of the Assessment Review Committee (ARC), and members of the Faculty Merit Committee (FMC) with a set of guidelines to be used in the allocation of merit increments in concert with the University's Appointment Promotion and Tenure procedures.
- 1.2 Document is a Guideline Only

Faculty are reminded that the information herein is only a guideline. Faculty should make written representation to the Committee in relation to any specific achievement where necessary to ensure that the contribution will be appropriately acknowledged. Area Chairs and committees may deviate from these guidelines where appropriate.

Faculty members are also reminded that the assessment of merit is a process separate from the processes for determining appointments with tenure, promotions, and renewals. Therefore, satisfactory performance in the yearly assessment of merit is not necessarily an indication of satisfactory career progress toward an appointment with tenure, promotion to a higher rank or renewals of positions.

2. MEMBERSHIP OF FACULTY MERIT COMMITTEE

2.1 Faculty Merit Committee (FMC)

FMC membership and voting status is as follows:

Dean (or designate)	Chair, voting only to break a tie
1 Male Faculty member (any rank on continuing, contingent term, or limited term appointment) elected by Faculty Council	Voting
1 Female Faculty member (any rank on continuing, contingent term, or limited term appointment) elected by Faculty Council	Voting
Faculty Association Representative	Non-voting
Dean's Appointee	Voting
Haskayne School program directors who are not on the ARC	Voting
Student Representative *	Voting
Dean's Secretary	To record minutes of the meeting; non-voting

Both genders must be present as voting members of the FMC Committee.

No members of the FMC can have involvement in the initial assessment of merit scores, or in the Assessment Review Committee.

* The Dean (or delegate) will select one student from the list of undergraduate and graduate members of the Haskayne School of Business Council to serve at each morning or afternoon session of the committee or all the committee deliberations. Attendance of the student member is not mandatory for the deliberations to proceed. The student member of the committee must be informed by the committee Chair or delegate about the confidentiality requirement, conduct involving conflict of interest, and the need to abstain if a matter arises for which the student has not had the opportunity to become sufficiently familiar with the documentation.

Quorum: At least 51% of voting members, including the Dean (or designate) who votes only to break ties, must be present to constitute a quorum.

3. PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PROCESS

- 3.1 The Dean will delegate the responsibility for providing a recommended merit score for each faculty member to the member's Area Chair.
- 3.2 Individual academic appointees will submit their Merit Assessment Forms to their Area Chairs based on information consistent with that provided in the Academic Annual Report required by the University. Academic Annual Reports will be made available to Area Chairs, the Assessment Review Committee, and the FMC. Unlike the Academic Annual Report, information in the Merit Assessment form must not be overlapping with information submitted in reports from prior years, excepting those activities which span more than one year such as service on Editorial Boards, etc. They may also submit any other supporting material that they choose and comment on any aspects of the USRI student evaluations that are not adequately captured by the average (unweighted arithmetic means) of all the response items. Area Chairs will review the information provided by the individual faculty member. The Area Chair will then recommend an assessment for teaching, research, and service for each academic appointment resulting in an overall merit score, with an accompanying narrative that highlights any aspects of the USRI student evaluations that are not adequately captured by the overall average. The Area Chair is expected to place the information provided by the faculty member in the context of the normal expectations in their academic field, and in relation to other members of the Area. Area Chairs will provide this advice to the Assessment Review Committee together with each individual's Merit Assessment Form and all submitted supporting material.
- 3.3 The Assessment Review Committee will consist of two program directors (e.g., B.Comm, M.B.A., PhD), the Associate Dean (Research), and will be chaired by the Vice Dean (or designate). Individual members will assume primary responsibility for reviewing assessments in the 3 components of merit (teaching, scholarship, and service).
- 3.4 The Assessment Review Committee will meet with each Area Chair to review the recommended merit assessments of teaching, research, and service for each academic appointment, and the overall merit scores for each appointee. They shall have the responses on all items of the USRI student evaluations for each faculty member and shall explicitly consider any indication that the course averages do not adequately represent all the information provided by the USRI scores. The ARC may make adjustments to the initial scores or narratives to ensure faculty-wide equity in the scoring process. Following this review, the Chair of the ARC shall transmit a written recommendation to each faculty member at least one week prior to a meeting of FMC.
- 3.5 An academic appointee is entitled to meet and discuss the initial recommended increment and/or narrative assessment with the chair of the ARC prior to consideration by FMC. The Chair of the ARC

- may amend or change the ARC recommendation following such discussions and before the recommendation is considered by FMC.
- 3.6 The ARC will submit an overall merit recommendation to FMC for each academic appointee.
- 3.7 Where the recommendation of the ARC is for the award of a zero increment, the Vice-President (Academic) shall also be notified in writing before the above meeting of FMC. The Committee will pay special attention to such a recommendation.
- 3.8 Merit Review and Appeals
- 3.8.1 The Dean (or designate) of the Faculty will chair the meeting of the FMC to review the assessment of every faculty member and to consider appeals of the increment and/or narrative assessments made by the ARC. The ARC members are not members of the FMC and shall only attend upon request of FMC. The FMC shall have available to it the merit forms, annual reports, and responses on all items of the USRI student evaluations of all faculty members under review.
- 3.8.2 Grounds for appeal should be submitted in writing to the Dean as Chair of the Faculty Merit Committee. The appeal should contain pertinent information related to the faculty member's own assessment of his/her teaching, research or service contributions for the year under consideration.
- 3.8.3 When an appeal is being considered, the appellant and a member of the ARC shall be invited to be present together and to provide only such factual information as other members of the Faculty Merit Committee may request. If necessary, the Chair of the ARC may invite other members of the ARC with special knowledge or expertise in the area of appeal to accompany him/her. Neither the appellant nor members of the ARC shall be present when the Faculty Merit Committee deliberates and votes on the appeal.
- 3.8.4 FMC shall consider each case individually and may accept, increase, or reduce the merit recommended by the ARC. The FMC's judgments constitute recommendations to the Dean regarding the merit increment and appeal assessments of individual faculty members.
- 3.8.5 Within the Faculty, the Dean has the final responsibility and authority for making merit recommendations. Hence, following FMC's deliberations, each individual will be notified in writing of the Dean's recommendation concerning his or her case (as well as the outcome of any appeal).
- 3.8.6 The Dean shall inform individual faculty members, as well as the members of the FMC and GPC, if the Dean's recommended merit increment is lower than that suggested by the FMC.
- 3.8.7 After the FMC meeting, every faculty member whose case was appealed will be advised in writing by the Dean of the recommendation being carried forward to the General Promotions Committee. This will be done at least one week before the appeal deadline of the General Promotions Committee (GPC). A faculty member may initiate a formal appeal regarding the increment recommended, the narrative assessment, or both; a faculty member may also initiate a formal appeal to GPC in the first instance if the recommendation of the FMC or Dean to GPC lowers the recommendation of the ARC (APT 6.6.3). Such an appeal, and the grounds, shall be in writing to the Chair of the General Promotions Committee. However, if a faculty member does not appeal the recommendation of the ARC to the FMC, and the FMC and Dean follow the recommendation of the ARC, no appeal to the GPC will be heard (APT 6.6.2). Upon receipt of an appeal, the Chair of the GPC shall ensure that the Dean is provided with a copy of the appeal; the Dean at his/her discretion may discuss the appeal with the ARC.

- 3.8.8 When the GPC is likely to recommend an academic appointee be reduced to a zero merit, the applicant and the Dean shall be given one week to respond to the Chair of GPC and invited to discuss the original recommendation (APT 6.6.6.1).

4. MERIT ASSESSMENT FORM AND INITIAL ASSESSMENT PROCESS

- 4.1 A merit assessment form must be completed by each individual being assessed. The form contains spaces on which each faculty member is asked to indicate his or her contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. Faculty members who do not submit this form to their Area Chairs at least fifteen (15) working days prior to the meeting of the Assessment Review Committee may be assigned an initial merit assessment of zero. Faculty members are also asked to submit a narrative description of their activities for the year to their Area Chairs and to comment on any aspects of the USRI that are not adequately captured by the use of the overall course averages of all response items.
- 4.2 Each individual's Area Chair will provide a recommendation to the ARC and provide information in order to place each faculty member's assessment in a broader context. The Area Chair must provide the individual with a copy of the Area Chair's initial merit score and narrative and discuss the advice with the individual before forwarding it to the Assessment Review Committee.
- 4.3 Area Chairs must provide their written recommendations to the ARC at least five (5) working days prior to the meeting of the ARC.

5. CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL PERFORMANCE

5.1 Teaching Evaluations Required for Merit Consideration

- 5.1.1 Consideration for merit for instructional performance for on-load teaching duties in degree-granting programs will take place only where FMC has received the results of student evaluations using the GFC-approved instrument. Initial assessment shall be based on the overall average of all items of the USRI, but the Area Chairs and Initial Assessment Committee shall have access to all scores on the instrument and may take into account additional student evaluation items. The submission of no evidence or only partial evidence may result in a zero or reduced increment for instructional activities.
- 5.1.2 Under normal circumstances, teaching evaluations are required of courses taught as part of an individual's assigned load or any other teaching done on behalf of the Haskayne School. Contributions to degree-granting programs, Executive Programs, the E-MBA, and customized programs will be considered for allocation of merit, using results from the appropriate evaluation instruments.

5.2 Other Factors in the Evaluation of Teaching for Merit Consideration

Many contributions to the Faculty's teaching efforts that are not adequately reflected in student teaching evaluations. These include but are not limited to graduate student and directed studies supervision, multiple section course coordination, new course development, number of preparations, type of course (core vs. elective), teaching large classes, awards or nominations for teaching performance, letters from students, etc.

These "Other Teaching Activities" will be categorized as "fails to meet expectations", "meets expectations", "exceeds expectations", or "greatly exceeds expectations". In deciding on each category, consideration will be given not only to the quantity of such contributions (e.g., the number of directed studies or the number of

students taught) but also the quality and type of service performed (e.g., graduate supervisor, course coordinator, course development, membership on a thesis committee, internationalization of course, etc.). The Committee will follow University policy of expecting more from senior faculty members than from junior ones. The advice of the Area Chairs, who have the appropriate knowledge about the members of their Areas, may be sought in establishing a fair assessment.

Although it is difficult to quantify the value of a faculty member's teaching contributions, the following will be used as a guideline. The typical mid-level Associate Professor will be expected to have engaged in a minimum, depending on the quality and amount of effort expended, of a least one or two of the following activities: supervision of directed studies or co-op students, Ph.D. or master's level supervision or committee participation; course coordination, development, or redesign; program development or support.

Increment to be Recommended Based on Student Teaching Evaluations and Teaching Activities

Other Teaching Activities	Average (unweighted arithmetic mean) scores on all USRI Items for all courses		
	Top 10%	Middle 80%	Bottom 10%
Greatly exceeds expectations	1.8 – 2.0	1.4 – 1.6	0.8
Exceeds expectations	1.4 – 1.6	1.0 – 1.2	0.4 – 0.6
Meets expectations	1.0 – 1.2	0.6 – 0.8	0.2 – 0.4
Fails to meet expectations	0.8	0.2 – 0.4	0.0 – 0.2

6. CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT OF SCHOLARLY PERFORMANCE

6.1 In making its judgement concerning scholarly performance, the Committee will assess both the quality and quantity of output. A particular effort will be made to recognize those scholarly efforts that achieve a high impact in enhancing the reputation of the Faculty and the University in either the academic or managerial community. The submission of no evidence or only partial evidence will result in a zero or reduced increment for scholarly activities.

Examples of such efforts include:

6.1.1 Publications in scholarly journals, thus leading to the enhancement of the academic reputation of the Faculty among peer institutions and colleagues.

6.1.2 Publications in professional journals, thus leading to the enhancement of the professional reputation of the Faculty within the managerial community in Canada.

6.1.3 Published books; particular recognition will be accorded to those works which have achieved widespread acceptance as teaching texts or major reference documents.

6.1.4 Research monographs dealing with management subjects of current relevance which achieve widespread recognition and are used as teaching materials by other colleagues and institutions.

6.1.5 Refereed case studies; particular recognition will be accorded to those works which have achieved widespread recognition and are used as teaching materials by other colleagues and institutions.

6.1.6 Presentations to academic and professional conferences; particular recognition will be accorded to those presentations which enhance the Faculty's reputation for scholarly relevance and quality in both academic and professional circles.

6.1.7 Research grants awarded to the individual or a group of researchers; particular recognition will be accorded those grants received from prestigious sources.

6.1.8 Other scholarly activities, which the individual deems relevant, such as web-based publishing, should also be submitted to the Committee for consideration.

6.2 Determination of Increments

The Haskayne School awards research merit based on the following grid. Note that (1) there is a greater incentive for quality than quantity; and that (2) expectations for performance increase through the ranks.

RANK/ITEM	Full Professors			Associate Professors			Assistant Professors			Instructors		
	Best Item	2 ND Best	Extra	Best Item	2 ND Best	Extra	Best Item	2 ND Best	Extra	Best Item	2 ND Best	Extra
1. "A" articles	1.4	0.6	0.4	1.6	0.6	0.4	1.8	0.6	0.4	1.8	0.6	0.4
2. "A-" articles	1.0	0.4	0.0	1.2	0.4	0.0	1.4	0.4	0.0	1.4	0.4	0.0
3. Books and Monographs	0.8	0.2	0.0	1.0	0.4	0.0	1.2	0.4	0.0	1.2	0.4	0.0
4. "B" Articles	0.6	0.2	0.0	0.8	0.2	0.0	1.0	0.2	0.0	1.0	0.2	0.0
5. Book chapters ("B" level)	0.4	0.2	0.0	0.6	0.2	0.0	0.8	0.2	0.0	0.8	0.2	0.0
6. Notes/comments ("B" level)	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.4	0.2	0.0	0.6	0.2	0.0	0.6	0.2	0.0
7. Papers published in the Proceedings of academic conferences; paper presentations at academic conferences; and/or, other publications (e.g., book reviews in "B" level journals, professional magazine articles)	At least TWO from 7:			Each from 7:			Each from 7:			Each from 7:		
	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.4	0.2	0.0
8. Working papers	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0
9. Other presentations	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0

Notes:

1. In all cases, merit reports must provide complete citations for all publications and presentations. Reports should be accompanied by acceptance letters and/or copies of pages from the publication in question (e.g., title pages of articles, tables of contents). In the case of books and book chapters, information regarding the reputation of the publisher, the nature of the review process (if any), the print run and other information useful in assessing the quality and impact of the work should be included.
2. Final merit awards will depend upon availability of merit in the merit pool.
3. Publications in journals may be claimed in the year of acceptance or publication. All other items can only be claimed in the year they are published or presented.

4. Bonus merit of 0.2 will be awarded for best paper awards, external research distinctions of significant merit, and major external research grants (e.g., SSHRC, NSERC).
 5. The merit provided for notes/comments and book reviews may be adjusted upward for publications in "A" or "A-" journals.
 6. The merit provided for all types of books, monographs, and book chapters may be adjusted upward if they appear in particularly prestigious outlets, based upon submission of evidence such as copies of the publication, referees' comments, post-publication reviews, or if the book is part of an ongoing, recognized series.
 7. The merit provided for refereed proceedings papers may be adjusted upward, based on evidence of the quality of the conference and the difficulty of publishing in the Proceedings.
 8. Articles in major professional journals (e.g., *Sloan Management Review*) are counted the same as academic journal articles. Publications in minor professional outlets (e.g., *CGA Magazine*) are considered "other publications".
 9. Articles are distinguished from notes and comments based on length and content. Publications in journals of at least five journal pages (including references, tables, etc.) are considered articles. Publications of less than five pages are considered notes or comments unless the content justifies counting them as articles.
 10. Cases published in refereed outlets such as *Case Research Journal* are counted the same as journal articles.
 11. Adjustments beyond those noted above may be made for sole authorship, additional publications, new and/or junior faculty, etc. based on the discretion of the Faculty Merit Committee and the Dean.
 12. In evaluating the scholarship of instructors, it shall be recognized that their focus is teaching and that they cannot be required to engage in research beyond that required to maintain currency in the field. (see Blue Book, Section 3.2.7.2).
- 6.3 Joint Authorship: In order to encourage joint efforts, each author up to three authors will receive full recognition unless there is evidence to indicate that this is not appropriate. In the case of four or more authors, the Committee may seek further elaboration in awarding increments for that work.

7. CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT OF SERVICE PERFORMANCE

- 7.1 The Committee is looking for evidence of participation in and substantial contributions to the development of the Haskayne School of Business and to the development and business of the University. The submission of no evidence or only partial evidence will result in a zero or reduced increment for service activities.

The types of service normally considered for merit increment purposes are:

7.2 Academic Service

7.2.1 Service within the University, the Faculty, or student organization. Examples include:

- Chair of a faculty or university committee.
- Membership on a faculty or university committee.

7.2.2 Service outside the University for a scholarly organization. Examples include:

- Editor, co-editor, associate editor of an academic or professional journal.
- Position on board of directors of an academic association.
- Membership on editorial review boards and refereeing activities of recognized academic and professional journals; both quality and quantity of such activities will be taken into account by the Committee.
- Organization and chairing of conferences dealing with topics of major significance to the academic and/or professional community; particular recognition will be accorded to those conferences which succeed in enhancing the reputation and renown of the Faculty.
- Participation in academic and professional conferences in roles such as paper reviewer, session chair, panel member or discussant; in this instance the Committee will be seeking evidence that such participation enhances the reputation of the individual and the image of the Faculty.

7.3 Professional Service

7.3.1 Voluntary activities clearly related to the individual's discipline and directed to a professional audience. Activities contracted for remuneration other than expenses are not rewardable although they will be included for purposes of review for promotion and appointment. Examples include:

- Service in and for professional organizations and government bodies, e.g., officer, board member and advisor.
- Public appearances, e.g., speech, broadcast, newspaper article, workshops, talks to community and professional groups.

7.4 Faculty members are again reminded that the foregoing list of types of service is suggestive only. If an individual believes that other activities merit recognition, then he/she should include such activities in their written representation to the FMC.

7.5 Service and Rank

As in other areas there is a greater expectation of performance with progress through the ranks.

8. METHOD OF DERIVING OVERALL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

8.1 Weighting of Performance Dimensions

8.1.1 While it is felt that an overall balance is desirable from the standpoint of the School, it is recognized that given the diversity of career patterns, individual professors should be allowed certain flexibility around this School ideal. At the same time, certain minimum performance levels are required on each dimension and during normal circumstances, no one dimension should be pursued exclusively at the expense of the remaining two. Accordingly, performance weightings will be optimized within the following ranges for professors with normal teaching loads (of 4 half courses per year) or instructors with normal teaching loads (of 8 half courses per year):

Teaching	Max 0.60	Min 0.30
Scholarship	Max 0.60	Min 0.30
Service	Max 0.40	Min 0.10

For Instructors the following weightings will be used:

Teaching	Max 0.80	Min 0.60
Scholarship	Max 0.30	Min 0.10
Service	Max 0.30	Min 0.10

Many scholars may not have normal teaching loads various reasons : they may be on sabbatical with no on-load teaching expectations; they may have course releases to pursue their research; they may be seconded to major service or administrative duties, they may have undertaken a higher than normal teaching load, etc. The Initial Assessment Committee will ask faculty members to describe the actual weighting of their duties, and may use that information to create a weighting that more accurately represents the actual jobs for which merit scores are being determined.

8.1.2 Derivation of Overall Assessment

The overall assessment of each individual will be arrived at by totaling the (weighting X rating) score for each of the Teaching, Scholarship, and Service dimensions. Merit increments will correspond approximately to the following scale.

Outstanding Performance	2.0
Superior Performance	1.6
Above Average Performance	1.2
Average Performance	0.8
Satisfactory Performance	0.4
Unsatisfactory Performance	0.0

It must be stressed that these labels are specified by the University's policies for merit, and do not reflect judgements about tenure, promotion or renewal. For example, a merit score of 0.4 is labeled "satisfactory" for annual performance, but a pattern of 0.4 scores may not be sufficient for tenure, promotion or renewal.

8.1.3 New Faculty

For academic appointees receiving their first merit assesment with the Haskayne School of Business, the minimum overall merit score normally will be a .8. This practice recognizes the difficulties of reorienting at a new school.

8.1.4 Course Load

In the event that an individual has been accorded a non-standard course load, the weighting given teaching, scholarship, and service will be adjusted proportionately to compensate for the non-standard teaching load, depending on the reason for the modification.

8.1.5 Unsatisfactory Performance

Performance is unsatisfactory if an overall rating of 0.0 is given. This is based on an average over the areas of teaching, research, and service where minimal or no activity may lead to a 0.0

in any given area. A 0.0 may also be given where there has been a dereliction of duty especially with respect to teaching or service obligations.

8.2 Administrative Assessment

- 8.2.1 Area Chairs will submit their own Merit and Assessment Forms to the Assessment Review Committee with initial merit recommendations.
- 8.2.2 The administrative performance of faculty members holding Associate Dean appointments will be assessed by the Dean. The Dean may ask faculty members to provide feedback on the performance of Associate Deans.
- 8.2.3 The Dean will determine an initial merit increment for Associate Deans based on administrative performance and the initial assessment of academic performance recommended by the Assessment Review Committee.
- 8.2.4 Increments determined by the Dean or Assessment Review Committee will be reviewed by, and can be appealed to, the Faculty Merit Committee.
- 8.2.5 The Dean shall appoint a member of the Haskayne School of Business Council to serve as FMC Chair during the review of the performance of any faculty members initially assessed by the Dean.

8.3 Further Adjustments to Merit

If the merit awarded to the faculty as a whole exceeds the available merit pool (which does not include the merit increments required for appeals or to reward exceptional performance), the ARC may recommend the reduction of all individual overall merit scores by an equal amount, and recommend that this adjustment not cause faculty members to receive a zero merit.