

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.

Supervising graduate students when they are assigned responsibility for teaching a course as a sessional instructor will count significantly for faculty when determining which category a faculty member falls into for the "other teaching activities" in the grid below. Note that this consideration is for faculty members who supervise graduate students' teaching activities – these are not necessarily students' assigned program supervisors.

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 designed for a 24 month review period 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				
	Item				
	Best	2nd Best	3rd Best	4th Best	Extra
1. "A" Articles	0.9	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.1
2. "A-" Articles	0.6	0.5	0.2	0.1	0.0
3. Books and Monographs	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.0
4. "B" Articles	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0
5. Book Chapters ("B" Level)	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0
6. Notes/Comments ("B" Level)	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
	At least FOUR from 7.				
7. Proceedings/Presentations, book reviews, etc.	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

		Associate Professors				
		Item				
Rank/Item		Best	2nd Best	3rd Best	4th Best	Extra
1. "A" Articles		1.1	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.1
2. "A-" Articles		0.7	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.0
3. Books and Monographs		0.6	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.0
4. "B" Articles		0.4	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.0
5. Book Chapters ("B" Level)		0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.0
6. Notes/Comments ("B" Level)		0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0
		Each from 7.				
7. Proceedings/Presentations, book reviews, etc.		0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
		Assistant Professors				
		Item				
Rank/Item		Best	2nd Best	3rd Best	4th Best	Extra
1. "A" Articles		1.2	0.9	0.4	0.2	0.1
2. "A-" Articles		0.8	0.6	0.3	0.1	0.0
3. Books and Monographs		0.7	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.0
4. "B" Articles		0.5	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.0
5. Book Chapters ("B" Level)		0.4	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.0
6. Notes/Comments ("B" Level)		0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.0
		Each from 7.				
7. Proceedings/Presentations, book reviews, etc.		0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0
		Senior Instructors				
		Item				
Rank/Item		Best	2nd Best	3rd Best	4th Best	Extra
1. "A" Articles		1.1	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.1
2. "A-" Articles		0.7	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.0
3. Books and Monographs		0.6	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.0
4. "B" Articles		0.4	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.0
5. Book Chapters ("B" Level)		0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.0
6. Notes/Comments ("B" Level)		0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0
		Each from 7.				
7. Proceedings/Presentations, book reviews, etc.		0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
8. Working papers		0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0

Rank/Item	Instructors				
	Item				
	Best	2nd Best	3rd Best	4th Best	Extra
1. "A" Articles	1.2	0.9	0.4	0.2	0.1
2. "A-" Articles	0.8	0.6	0.3	0.1	0.0
3. Books and Monographs	0.7	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.0
4. "B" Articles	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.0
5. Book Chapters ("B" Level)	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.0
6. Notes/Comments ("B" Level)	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.0
			Each from 7.		
7. Proceedings/Presentations, book reviews, etc.	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0
8. Working papers	0.2	0.1	0.1	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. 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.
3. Bonus merit of 0.1 will be awarded for best paper awards, external research distinctions of significant merit, and principal investigators for awarded major external research grants (e.g., SSHRC, NSERC).
4. The merit provided for notes/comments and book reviews may be adjusted upward for publications in "A" or "A-" journals.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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 to be in category 7 in the grids above.
8. 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.

9. Cases published in refereed outlets such as *Case Research Journal* are counted the same as journal articles.
10. 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.
11. 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).
12. 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