



Office of the Dean

Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences
College of Arts & Sciences Building
Room 448
Akron, OH 44325-1901

330-972-7880 (Office)
330-972-7222 (Fax)

MEMORANDUM

June 25, 2007

TO: Elizabeth J. Stroble
Senior Vice President, Provost and Chief Operating Officer

FROM: Ronald F. Levant
Dean, Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences

RE: **Merit Salary Guidelines and Criteria**

The attached merit salary guidelines and criteria have been approved by the Faculty of the Department of Economics on May 25, 2007. I have approved all attached guidelines and criteria.

If you concur, we ask that you also approve the guidelines and criteria.

Richard M. Strat

25 June 2007

Michael G. Hill

25 June 2007

Department Chair or Faculty Representative

Date

Alvin F. Ziegler

Dean

6/25/07

Date

Elizabeth J. Stroble

Senior Vice President, Provost and
Chief Operating Officer

7/1/07

Date

Portions of Department of Economics Bylaws pertaining to Merit Review

Article V Section 8 Merit Review Guidelines

Appendix 1: Article IV Measurement of Meritorious Activity

Appendix 2: Article V Section 1 Contents of Portfolio used in the Personnel Decisions

Appendix 3: Article VI Section 2 e Committee Structure: The Merit Advisory Committee

March 1, 2006 – BUF passed guideline revisions

March 22, 2006 – Chair forwards guidelines to dean's office

April 13, 2006 – BUF passed guideline revisions to address Dean's objections

April 17, 2006 – Chair forwards guidelines to dean's office

September 20, 2006 – BUF passed guideline revisions (reflect the AAUP/UA agreement)

September 20, 2006 – Chair forwards revisions to dean's office

March 3, 2007 – BUF passed guideline revisions (Dean's objections of October 17, 2006)

March 7, 2007 – Chair forwards revisions to dean's office

March 16, 2007 – BUF passed guideline revisions (Dean's objections of March 13, 2007)

March 16, 2007 – Chair forwards revisions to dean's office

April 13, 2007 – BUF passed guideline revisions (Provost's objections of April 1, 2007)

April 13, 2007 – Chair forwards revisions to dean's office

April 23, 2007 – BUF passed additional guideline revisions (Provost objections of April 19, 2007)

April 30, 2007 – BUF passed additional guideline revisions (Dean's objections of April 25, 2007)

April 30, 2007 – Chair forwards revisions to dean's office, transmittal sheet signed

May 4, 2007 – BUF passed additional guideline revisions (Dean's objections of May 2, 2007)

May 7, 2007 – Chair forwards revisions to dean's office

May 29, 2007 – BUF approved additional guideline revisions (Provost's objections of May 14, 2007)

May 29, 2007 – Chair forwards revisions to dean's office, transmittal sheet signed

June 25, 2007 – BUF approved additional guideline revisions (Provost's objections of June 12, 2007)

Article V Section 8 Merit Review Guidelines
Section 8. Merit Review

Section 8. Merit Review

(a) Purpose

To evaluate the faculty member's overall contributions to the Department, College, and University for the purpose of recommending meritorious salary adjustments. The quality and quantity of the candidate's record as contained in the member's portfolio for the three year evaluation period shall be the basis of decision on recommendation for salary adjustments. While annual merit pay reviews and the retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) decisions are both based on the faculty member's portfolio, the time frames and procedures used are different. Therefore, awarding of merit for excellence for salary review in one or more components in any given year(s) does not necessarily indicate that a probationary faculty member is successfully progressing toward tenure.

(b) Criteria

1. Merit compensation is based on performance in teaching scholarship, research scholarship and service as supported by the bargaining unit member's portfolio.

In accordance with Article IV and Article V above and the Collective Bargaining Agreement the Chair after reviewing the recommendation of the Merit Review Advisory Committee, shall use his or her professional judgment to assign a score (from 1.0 to 5.0) for each of the three areas (research, teaching, and service) based on the quality and quantity of activities documented in the member's portfolio.

Article IV above specifies the measures to be used in evaluating faculty performance. Article V Section 1 describes the portfolio and its contents. Article VI Section 2 (e) describes the Merit Review Advisory Committee.

2. Once each bargaining unit member has been assigned a merit value from 1.0 to 5.0, for research, teaching, and service the aggregate merit score will be calculated in accordance with Article 16 Section 8 (c) of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Weights for all faculty members are to be within the ranges listed below for the category to which the faculty member belongs; the exact weights are to be determined by the procedures described in Article V Section 8(c).

	Range	Default
Tenured Faculty		
Research	35% to 55%	45%
Teaching	30% to 45%	40%
Service	15% to 20%	15%
Probationary Faculty		
Research	35% to 55%	45%
Teaching	30% to 45%	45%
Service	10% to 20%	10%
Instructors		
Research	5% to 25%	15%
Teaching	55% to 75%	75%
Service	5% to 25%	10%
College Lecturers		
Research	0%	
Teaching	100%	
Service	0%	

3. Special cases:

- a. Newly hired assistant professors: are expected in their first year to focus on research and developing classes, not on service. Therefore for their first academic year their merit score for service area shall be at the chair's discretion.
- b. Professional Development leave: Bargaining Unit Faculty (BUF) members on professional development leave are not expected to teach or provide service during their leave. Therefore, the Merit Review Advisory Committee and the Chair will take this into consideration when determining their merit score for teaching and service.
- c. Unpaid leave: The Merit Review Advisory Committee and the Chair will take into consideration time spent on unpaid leave when determining their merit score for teaching and service.

(c) Determination of Merit Review Scores [NEW SECTION 07/01/2007]

Below we define the five generally expected performance categories for each of the three performance areas (teaching, research, and service). We include performance descriptions. These descriptions are **examples only** and other combinations might be comparable evidence for the performance rankings.

The performance ranking will be based on the quality and quantity (not on quantity alone) of the activities in the faculty member's portfolio. Activities, whether compensated or uncompensated, should be judged on the extent to which they benefit or bring recognition to the Department, the College, and the University. Contract work should be explicitly identified.

The diversity of faculty members' activities tends to make numerous interpretations possible. Therefore it is each faculty member's responsibility to summarize the information in the portfolio, providing documentation of how items relate to the performance criteria.

1. Research

As stated in Article IV Section 1 above: "It is the policy of the Department to support, promote, and reward excellence in research. Research shall include the scholarship in the discipline as well as the scholarship of teaching. The evaluation of research will be based on the quality and quantity of research as evidenced by the faculty member's portfolio."

Unsatisfactory performance (score of less than 2.0) in scholarship will be given to any bargaining-unit faculty member whose portfolio fails to demonstrate active engagement in scholarly activity by the quality and quantity of activities during the evaluation period sufficient to earn a Satisfactory rating.

Satisfactory performance (score of 2.0 to 2.9) in scholarship will be given to any bargaining-unit faculty member whose portfolio, by the quality and quantity of a mix of activities it contains, demonstrates active engagement in scholarly activity. A Satisfactory portfolio typically contains at least one item from two of the following categories of activities

- professional presentation,
- article and grant submission,
- working paper or manuscript in preparation, and/or
- non-peer reviewed publication.

Meritorious performance (score of 3.0 to 3.9) in scholarship will be given to any bargaining-unit faculty member whose portfolio, by the quality and quantity of a mix of activities it contains, demonstrates meritorious scholarly activity. Meritorious performance is demonstrated by a mix of activities during the evaluation period that exceed in quality and quantity of the activities required for a rating of Satisfactory. A Meritorious portfolio typically contains at least one item from two of the following categories of activities

- a peer-reviewed publication,
- award of a small external grant,
- a mix of non-peer reviewed publication(s), book review(s), internal grant(s), note(s) in scholarly journal(s), and/or refereeing for and/or economic journal(s)

Outstanding performance (score of 4.0 to 4.9) in scholarship will be given to any bargaining-unit faculty member whose portfolio, by the quality and quantity of a mix of activities it contains, demonstrates outstanding scholarly activity. Outstanding performance is demonstrated by a mix of activities during the evaluation period that exceed in quality and quantity of the activities required for a rating of Meritorious. An Outstanding portfolio typically contains at least one item from two of the following categories of activities

- two peer-reviewed publications,
- a sizable externally funded grant(s), and/or
- a scholarly book(s) or textbook(s).

Extraordinary performance (score of 5.0) in scholarship will be given to any bargaining-unit faculty member whose portfolio, by the quality and quantity of a mix of activities it contains, demonstrates extraordinary scholarly activity. Extraordinary performance is demonstrated by a mix of activities during the evaluation period that exceed in quality and quantity of the activities required for a rating of Outstanding. An Extraordinary portfolio typically contains at least one item from two of the following categories of activities

- publication(s) in highly ranked economics journal(s),
- the award of a prestigious externally funded grant,
- a scholarly book from a major university press, and/or
- an external research award.

2. Teaching

As stated in Article IV Section 2 above: "It is the policy of the Department to support, promote, and reward excellence in teaching. The evaluation of teaching will be based on the quality and quantity of teaching as evidenced by student evaluations of teaching and other items in the faculty member's portfolio." Merit evaluation should take into consideration the faculty member's assignments, including the number of preparations and level of courses.

Unsatisfactory performance (score of less than 2.0) in teaching will be given to any bargaining-unit faculty member whose portfolio fails to demonstrate active engagement in teaching and development activities to improve the quality of student learning by the quality and quantity of activities during the evaluation period sufficient to earn a Satisfactory rating.

Satisfactory performance (score of 2.0 to 2.9) in teaching will be given to any bargaining-unit faculty member whose portfolio, by the quality and quantity of a mix of activities it contains, demonstrates active engagement in teaching and development activities to improve the quality of student learning. The portfolio contains evidence that the faculty member consistently fulfills assigned teaching responsibilities such as class preparation, conducting classes professionally, treating students with respect, providing prompt assessment feedback and responding to student inquiries in a timely manner. To obtain more than a minimum score, a Satisfactory portfolio typically contains at least one item from the following categories of activities

- incorporation of departmental learning objectives into courses, and/or
- direction of independent studies.

Meritorious performance (score of 3.0 to 3.9) in teaching will be given to any bargaining-unit faculty member whose portfolio, by the quality and quantity of a mix of activities it contains, demonstrates meritorious engagement in teaching and development activities to improve the quality of student learning. Meritorious performance is demonstrated by a mix of activities during the evaluation period that exceed in quality and quantity of the activities required for a rating of Satisfactory. A Meritorious portfolio typically contains at least one item from two of the following categories of activities

- student evaluations of teaching that are at least in the average range for comparable courses,
- recruiting student,
- professional development (such as attendance at workshops on effective teaching),
- classroom innovation, and/or
- service on honors or thesis committees, or second reader for senior research projects.

Outstanding performance (score of 4.0 to 4.9) in teaching will be given to any bargaining-unit faculty member whose portfolio, by the quality and quantity of a mix of activities it contains, demonstrates outstanding engagement in teaching and development activities to improve the quality of student learning. Outstanding performance is demonstrated by a mix of activities during the evaluation period that exceed in quality and quantity of the activities required for a rating of Meritorious. An Outstanding portfolio typically contains at least one item from two of the following categories of activities

- student evaluations of teaching that are consistently above the average range for comparable courses,
- supervision of student research projects (first reader for undergraduate senior or honors projects and graduate thesis advisor),
- considerable success in recruiting students, and/or
- major revision of one or more existing courses including classroom innovation with some evidence of positive outcomes.

Extraordinary performance (score of 5.0) in teaching will be given to any bargaining-unit faculty member whose portfolio, by the quality and quantity of a mix of activities it contains, demonstrates extraordinary engagement in teaching and development activities to improve the quality of student learning. Extraordinary performance is demonstrated by a mix of activities during the evaluation period that exceed in quality and quantity of the activities required for a rating of Outstanding. An Extraordinary portfolio typically contains at least one item from two of the following categories of activities

- student evaluations of teaching that are consistently among the best in the department for comparable courses,
- major revisions of one or more courses including innovation with documentation of enhanced student learning,
- development of a new course, and/or
- official recognition of teaching (a teaching award, alumni recognition, student presentation to an external audience).

3. Service

As stated in Article IV Section 3 above: "It is the policy of the Department to support, promote, and reward excellence in service. Faculty service is required at the departmental level. Every member of the Department is expected to contribute to the governance of the Department. The evaluation of service will be based on the quality and quantity of service as evidenced by the faculty member's portfolio. Service is to be judged by the extent to which it brings recognition to and its impact on the Department, the College, the University, the profession, and the community at large."

Unsatisfactory performance (score of less than 2.0) in service will be given to any bargaining-unit faculty member whose portfolio fails to demonstrate active engagement in the governance of the Department, the College, or University or in professional service activities in the discipline or the larger community by the quality and quantity of activities during the evaluation period sufficient to earn a Satisfactory rating.

Satisfactory performance (score of 2.0 to 2.9) in service will be given to any bargaining-unit faculty member whose portfolio, by the quality and quantity of a mix of activities it contains, demonstrates active engagement in the governance of the Department, the College, or University or in professional service activities in the discipline or the larger community. The portfolio contains documentation that the faculty member consistently fulfills assigned service responsibilities such as constructive participation in department governance, providing requested reports, data, and forms in a timely manner, and commencement participation in accordance with departmental policy. To obtain more than a minimum score, a Satisfactory portfolio typically contains at least one item from the following categories of activities

- departmental committee participation, and/or
- college committee participation.

Meritorious performance (score of 3.0 to 3.9) in service will be given to any bargaining-unit faculty member whose portfolio, by the quality and quantity of a mix of activities it contains, demonstrates meritorious engagement in the

governance of the Department, the College, or University or in professional service activities in the discipline or the larger community. Meritorious performance is demonstrated by a mix of activities during the evaluation period that exceed in quality and quantity of the activities required for a rating of Satisfactory. A Meritorious portfolio typically contains at least one item from the following categories of activities

- directing the undergraduate or graduate program,
- serving as the chair of one or more departmental committees,
- advising a student organization, and/or
- serving as a session discussion or chair at a professional conference.

Outstanding performance (score of 4.0 to 4.9) in service will be given to any bargaining-unit faculty member whose portfolio, by the quality and quantity of a mix of activities it contains, demonstrates outstanding engagement in the governance of the Department, the College, or University or in professional service activities in the discipline or the larger community. Outstanding performance is demonstrated by a mix of activities during the evaluation period that exceed in quality and quantity of the activities required for a rating of Meritorious. An Outstanding portfolio typically contains at least one item from the following categories of activities

- serving as the chair of one or more college or university committees,
- serving as a reviewer for an external tenure or promotion decision, and/or
- serving as a member of the advisory board of a professional organization.

Extraordinary performance (score of 5.0) in service will be given to any bargaining-unit faculty member whose portfolio, by the quality and quantity of a mix of activities it contains, demonstrates extraordinary engagement in the governance of the Department, the College, or University or in professional service activities in the discipline or the larger community. Extraordinary performance is demonstrated by a mix of activities during the evaluation period that exceed in quality and quantity of the activities required for a rating of Outstanding. An Extraordinary portfolio typically contains at least one item from the following categories of activities

- serving as a member of the review panel for a federal agency,
- organization of a conference, and/or
- receiving a professional service award.

(d) Typically a bargaining unit member that is assigned a higher performance rating will also meet the requirements for lower performance ratings; however, there may be exceptions. In general, considerable discretion should be given to the Chair in assessing each portfolio and determining the performance ranking consistent with the criteria listed above.

(e) Merit Review Procedure

1. The Department Chair makes merit pay decisions after reviewing the recommendations of the Merit Review Advisory Committee, in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Each individual bargaining unit faculty member shall meet with the department chair at the beginning of the

fall term to determine the weighting for research, teaching, and service from the ranges listed in Article V Section 8(b)(2).¹ The sum of the percentages must add to one hundred percent (100%). If no choice is made, the weightings will be the default for the category to which the faculty member belongs.

2. The Department Chair will request information on a standard form from each bargaining unit faculty member concerning his/her teaching, research and service activities for the review period. The Merit Review Advisory Committee shall review these forms and each faculty member's portfolio before making any salary recommendations to the Department Chair. The Department Chair shall review these forms, each faculty member's portfolio, and the recommendation from the Merit Review Advisory Committee before making final recommendations to the Dean.
3. After conducting the evaluations, the Department Chair shall send to each Member of the Bargaining Unit a copy of his or her evaluation along with the evaluation of the Merit Review Advisory Committee. Any member who disagrees with the Chair's evaluation may submit a written response to the chair in accordance with Article 16 Section 8B of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
4. Merit evaluations will be based on the information in the faculty member's portfolio for the most recent three academic years.

(f) Separation of Merit Pay from RTP

The criteria, weights, and processes for determining merit level are different from the processes retention, tenure and promotion. It is possible for a faculty member to receive merit pay scores of "satisfactory" or even "meritorious" in research (scholarship), teaching and/or service and still not be retained, promoted, or tenured.

¹ For the 2005-2006 year only, faculty members may select their individual weightings which will apply to achievements that have already been accomplished. For academic years commencing 2006-2007, all individual choices must be made prior to the second Friday of Fall semester, or two weeks after the approval of the initial guidelines, whichever is later.

Appendix 1: Article IV Measurement of Meritorious Activity

Measurement of Meritorious Activity

Section 1. Research

It is the policy of the Department to support, promote, and reward excellence in research. Research shall include the scholarship in the discipline as well as the scholarship of teaching. The evaluation of research will be based on the quality and quantity of research as evidenced by the faculty member's portfolio.

(a) Quality Indicators

In a field as dynamic as economics, the quality of the research should be judged by the extent of its impact on the Department, the College, the University, the profession, and the community at large. In the absence of any universally accepted, objective measures of quality, each faculty member will ultimately evaluate the quality of a body of work using her or his own professional judgment. Though the following list is not exhaustive, Department members agree that some proxies used to determine quality are:

- Quality and reputation of journal and nature of authorship for articles;
- Quality of manuscript, reputation of publisher and type of publication for books;
- Source of funding for grants;
- Reputation of the professional organization for presentations;
- Professional recognition (for example, awards, citations) of any research.

Section 2. Teaching

It is the policy of the Department to support, promote, and reward excellence in teaching. The evaluation of teaching will be based on the quality and quantity of teaching as evidenced by student evaluations of teaching and other items in the faculty member's portfolio.

(a) Quality Indicators

Quality of teaching includes command of the subject, skills, and good judgment in organizing courses and presenting material, enthusiasm, intellectual integrity, rapport with students, and conscientious administration. In the absence of any universally accepted, objective measures of quality, each faculty member will ultimately evaluate the quality of a faculty member's teaching record using her or his own professional judgment. Though the following list is not exhaustive, Department members agree that some proxies used to determine quality are:

- Student evaluations of teaching;
- Alumni evaluations;
- Frequency of unsolicited student comments, both praise and valid complaints;
- Use of innovative teaching techniques;
- Professional recognition (for example, awards and honors) of teaching.

Section 3. Service

It is the policy of the Department to support, promote, and reward excellence in service. Faculty service is required at the departmental level. Every member of the Department is expected to contribute to the governance of the Department. The evaluation of service will be based on the quality and quantity of service as evidenced by the faculty member's portfolio. Service is to be judged by the extent to which it brings recognition to and its impact on the Department, the College, the University, the profession, and the community at large.

Appendix 2: Article V Section 1 Contents of Portfolio used in the Personnel Decisions

Section 1. Contents of Portfolio used in the Personnel Decisions

Each faculty member shall maintain a portfolio in the department that accurately reflects her or his scholarly activity. Its purpose is to provide the Department with sufficient information to accurately evaluate performance. The contents of the portfolio will be the primary source of information on the research, teaching, and service activity used in reappointment, tenure, promotion, and salary decisions. Each faculty member can place any documentation into the portfolio that he/she deems will aid the Department's evaluation of their performance. Recommended items to be placed in each faculty member's portfolio are listed below. This list is not exhaustive, but it is representative of items that faculty have found useful.

(a) Research Scholarship

- Description of research agenda.
- Copies of publications, including the date and place of publication.
- List of grants received, including the funding agency and the dollar amount of the grant.
- Copies of grant reports with any comments made by the funding agency,
- Copies of grant proposals with any comments from referees or the granting agency.
- Copies of papers identifying the intended journal, book, or publisher and including any comments from referees.
- Copies of presentations.
- Professional recognition of any research.

(b) Teaching Scholarship

- Description of teaching philosophy and goals.
- History of courses and sections taught, including representative course syllabi, course descriptions, indications of course size, and general comments that the candidate desires to include.
- Description of new curricular development and/or new course preparation.
- Results of teaching evaluations.
- Information on a faculty member attracting and/or retaining majors or minors to the department.
- Examples of best teaching efforts. This could include a discussion of innovative pedagogical techniques, or innovative course design, *et cetera*.
- A self study of the relationship between the faculty member's teaching philosophy and the results of his/her teaching effectiveness as demonstrated by the data contained in student evaluations, *et cetera*.
- Professional recognition of teaching.

(c) Service

- A statement of Department, College, and University committee assignments. A statement by the faculty member or others indicating the committee's accomplishments and the faculty member's contribution to the committee.
- Documentary evidence of the service activities to the professional organizations and the community at large. A statement by the faculty member or others indicating the amount and quality of the service endeavor.
- Evidence of other service activity.
- Consulting, whether paid or unpaid, is considered service activity when it has a direct or indirect benefit to the Department, College, or University. Paid consulting should be explicitly identified.

**Appendix 3: Article VI Section 2 e Committee Structure: The Merit
Advisory Committee**

- (e) The Merit Review Advisory Committee is composed of two bargaining unit faculty members from the department. Members are chosen for two year staggered terms from the rotation list created by the bargaining unit faculty and maintained by the chair. Faculty members are not eligible in their first two years of service.