


The University of Akron
College of Business Administration
Department of Finance

MERIT PAY DISTRIBUTION PROCEDURE

Approval Signature Sheet


Merit Committee Chair

1/29/08
Date


Department Chair

1/29/08
Date


CBA Dean

2/5/08
Date


University Provost

2/7/08
Date

The University of Akron
College of Business Administration
Department of Finance

MERIT PAY DISTRIBUTION PROCEDURE

The department merit pay committee met on February 17, 2006 to develop the merit pay guidelines beginning in the 2005-2006 academic year according to the terms of the recently negotiated collective-bargaining agreement. The committee then reconvened on Wednesday, October 25, 2006 to amend the merit pay guidelines. A sub-committee of Akhigbe, Kahl, Lahey, and Redle met with Dean Aggarwal on Monday, February 19, 2007 and the merit pay committee met again with Associate Dean Emore on Thursday, March 29, 2007 to negotiate a satisfactory document. Based upon feedback from the Provost's Office, the committee convened again on Wednesday, July 18, 2007, Monday, August 27, 2007, and Thursday, September 13, 2007. The document was approved on September 18, 2007. In application of the document, however, the allowance for four separate merit pools designed to accommodate the salary dispersion across instructors, law professors, finance professors and endowed chairs within the department was found to be in violation of the Collective Bargaining Agreement negotiated between AAUP and The University of Akron. The merit committee reconvened on January 7, 2008 to remove all language pertaining to the separate merit pools and to adopt minor changes that will bring the document into alignment with the approved documents from all other departments of the College. This document reflects those revisions.

1. Purpose of This Document

This document establishes criteria and parameters for use in consideration of merit pay increases pursuant to the Collective Bargaining Agreement negotiated between AAUP and The University of Akron. Nothing in this document shall be construed for any other purposes; including specifically (but not limited to), consideration, evaluation, or endorsement of a Faculty member for retention, tenure, and/or promotion evaluation. It is the intent of this document to establish a separate and independent consideration of merit pay, so that a Faculty member might receive merit pay increases pursuant to this document, yet may not receive sufficient meritorious evaluations regarding retention, tenure, or promotion.

2. Merit Raise Computation

2a. Points and Weightings

An overall score for the merit raise will be calculated based on the model and the point system developed by Akron-AAUP, under Article 16, Section 8. In accordance with University of Akron policy, a maximum of 5 points can be accumulated in each of 3 areas:

1. Teaching
2. Research
3. Service,

where the points assume the following designation: “unsatisfactory” = 1, “satisfactory” = 2, “meritorious” = 3, “outstanding” = 4, “extraordinary” = 5.

There will be a weighting distribution of 45% to research, 45% to teaching, and 10% to service expectations for full-time tenure track faculty members. Because full-time instructors have different terminal qualifications and reappointment requirements, their weighting distribution will be 10% to research, 80% to teaching, and 10% to service expectations. College lecturers will be evaluated entirely (100%) on their teaching contributions.

2b. Standards of Evaluation

For purposes of determining scores above the minimum level of 2.0 (“satisfactory”), the areas of teaching and service will be evaluated on the basis of the preceding academic year. Research will be evaluated on the basis of a three-year rolling window. That is, using the scoring system shown in Appendix C, the points awarded for the three most recent academic years will be averaged in order to calculate the research score.

1. Teaching

The teaching score will be calculated as a weighted average of the student evaluation score and a portfolio score, with a maximum of 100 points being allocated as follows:

- a. 35 points will be assigned based on the average value across all classes taught during the review period for the mean rating across questions #29, #30, and #31* of the CBA Student Course and Instructor Evaluation Form. Please refer to Appendix B for an indication of the process for distributing these 35 points. Also, refer to Appendix A for a copy of the CBA Student Course and Instructor Evaluation Form.
- b. 65 points will be assigned based on the department chair’s evaluation of the teaching portfolio submitted by each faculty member for each course taught during the prior academic year.

Please refer to Appendix B for an indication of the process for distributing these 65 points.

When a range of points is provided, the value will be determined by quantitative and qualitative factors such as depth and breadth of material covered, resources used, incorporation of projects, etc.

* Questions #29 and #30 are based on a 5-point scale, but question #31 is based on a four-point scale. Therefore, before calculating the average of the scores, the mean rating for question #31 will first be converted to a 5-point scale using the formula: $\text{Converted Rating} = (5 \times \text{Original Rating}) / 4$.

2. Research

In order to qualify for a minimum score of 2.0 (“satisfactory”) in the area of research, tenured and tenure-track faculty members must be Academically Qualified as defined by the AACSB and as defined by the College of Business established criteria. For full-time faculty members that are still in the probationary period for retention and tenure, however, an earned Ph.D. in the last 5 academic years is sufficient for a minimum score of 2 (“satisfactory”) in the area of research. For faculty members that are still in the probationary period for retention and tenure, and who have completed all Ph.D. program requirements but their dissertation (i.e. are of ABD status), dissertation committee approval of the dissertation proposal in the last 3 academic years is sufficient for a minimum score of 2 (“satisfactory”) in the area of research. In order to qualify for a minimum score of 2.0 (“satisfactory”) in the area of research, full-time instructors must be Professionally Qualified as defined by the AACSB and as defined by the College of Business established criteria.

For full-time tenure track faculty members and full-time instructors that meet the minimum research requirement, the research score will be calculated using the values in Appendix C. When a range of points is provided, the value will be determined by quantitative and qualitative factors such as number of co-authors, quality/contribution of the project, degree of linkage to a strategic priority of the college, length of the completed project, ranking within a category, etc.

3. Service

The service score will be calculated using the values in Appendix D. When a range of points is provided, the value will be determined by qualitative factors such as the amount of time the project required, the value/contribution of the project, degree of linkage to a strategic priority of the college, etc.

4. Total

Please refer to Appendix E for an indication of how point totals from teaching, research, and service result in an overall merit score. Because the overall merit score is a weighted average of the ratings determined for teaching, research, and service, it is possible for the overall merit score to not be a whole integer. In determining the distribution of the merit pool, the overall merit scores used shall be rounded to the nearest tenth. An overall merit score of less than 2.0 shall be considered a rating of “unsatisfactory” and shall disqualify the bargaining unit faculty member from participation in the merit pool.

5. Professional Development Leave, Sick Leave, Leave of Absence

Merit evaluation for bargaining unit faculty on leave will be guided by the following:

- a. Professional development leave: Use the individual's average performance over the past three years (omitting the leave period) for teaching and service. Research accomplishments will be evaluated in the standard manner.
- b. Sick leave (for less than one semester): No special consideration.
- c. Sick leave (for one semester or more): Use the individual's average performance over the past three years (omitting the leave period) for teaching, research, and service.
- d. Leave of absence: No credit for teaching or service during the absence period. Research accomplishments will be evaluated in the standard manner.
- e. Other considerations may be taken into account by the chair in determining how teaching, research, and service accomplishments will be evaluated during periods of leave.

3. Evaluation Committee

The department chair will use the above guidelines and the scoring system as presented in the appendices to determine an overall score for each faculty member and the corresponding distribution of the merit pay pool. To facilitate the process, it is agreed that faculty members must submit their materials in the format prescribed by the document. In accordance with Department of Finance policy, an evaluation committee, comprised of at least two but not more than three bargaining unit members, will provide recommendations to the department chair based upon the previously stated guidelines.

The University of Akron

College of Business
AdministrationStudent Evaluation of Teaching
Instrument

COURSE									
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

INSTRUCTOR LAST NAME																										FI			
A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	
C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	
D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	
E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	
F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	
G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	
H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	
I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	J	
K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	K	
L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	
M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	
N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	
O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	
P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	
Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	
R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	
S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	
T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	
U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	
V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	
W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

- Use number 2 pencil only.
- Make dark marks that fill the oval completely.
- Erase cleanly any mark you wish to change.

Correct Mark

Incorrect Marks



This instrument contains several items that identify activities, experiences, and outcomes that may occur in a class. For each item, please darken the numbered oval that you feel best describes your overall experience in this class. Except when indicated, the scale for all items ranges from **strongly agree (5)** to **strongly disagree (1)**. Responses should reflect your experience throughout the class, and not isolated incidents. If you feel you do not have sufficient experience or that an item does not apply, **please darken the N/A oval**.

1. Are you taking this course because it is required for your major, minor or certificate? (1) No (2) Yes

2. What is your class standing?

- (1) Freshman (2) Sophomore (3) Junior (4) Senior (5) Post baccalaureate (6) Graduate

3. What is your current grade point average at UA?

- (1) Below 2.0 (2) 2.0 - 2.49 (3) 2.5 - 2.99 (4) 3.0 - 3.49 (5) 3.5 - 4.0

4. What is your expected grade in this class?

- (0) F (1) D (2) C (3) B (4) A

	DOES NOT APPLY	STRONGLY DISAGREE	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
5. The instructor started and ended class on time						
6. I was able to see the instructor during his/her scheduled office hours						
7. When necessary, I was able to set up an appointment with the instructor outside of his/her scheduled office hours						
8. The instructor responded to my e-mail, phone calls, and other correspondence in a timely manner						
9. The instructor explained and clarified the broad goals and learning objectives of the course						
10. The course content related well with the course learning objectives						
11. The instructor was well organized						
12. The instructor was prepared for class						
13. The instructor presented course material in a manner that I was able to understand						
14. The instructor spoke audibly and clearly						
15. The instructor used examples and illustrations to clarify material						
16. The instructor encouraged student questions and participation						
17. The instructor responded well to student questions						
18. The instructor appeared to recognize when students had difficulty with a concept						

	DOES NOT APPLY	STRONGLY DISAGREE	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
19. The instructor clarified difficult-to-understand concepts						
20. The instructor explained and clarified grading policies						
21. The instructor gave assignments, examinations, and projects that reflected aspects of the course he/she emphasized						
22. The instructor used a variety of formats (e.g., cases and problems, oral presentations, projects, essays, etc.) for determining grades						
23. The instructor returned exams, projects, and other assignments in a timely manner						
24. The instructor provided clear feedback on exams, projects, and other assignments						
25. The instructor generally followed the plan of the course as established in the syllabus						
26. The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching this course						
27. Exams, projects, and other assignments challenged me to apply and extend course concepts.						
28. This class required a great deal of time and effort						
29. I learned a lot in this class						
30. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher						

31. Considering that the level of learning that takes place in a classroom may be classified along a continuum that goes from rote memorization (the lowest level of learning) to application and critical thinking (the highest level of learning), how would you describe your level of learning in this class?

- (1) memorization of concepts (2) understanding of concepts (3) understanding of concepts plus ability to apply concepts to simple situations (4) understanding of concepts, plus ability to think of them critically and apply them to complex situations

TURN
OVER

Appendix B: Teaching Performance

	Available Points	Awarded Points
Student Evaluation		
Median Scores for Questions #29 - #31		
1.00 – 1.99	0-9	
2.00 – 2.99	10-18	
3.00 - 3.99	19-27	
4.00 – 5.00	28-35	
Teaching Portfolio Evaluation		
On-Going Classroom Activities/Accomplishments		
A syllabus for each course, additional description of material used in the classroom, and a brief assessment of the currency of the material Up to 50% of the available 50 points	0-50	
Examples of assignments given and the quality of feedback provided to students Up to 50% of the available 50 points		
Description of classroom enhancement and a self-evaluation of how the enhancements helped to improve students' learning Up to 50% of the available 50 points		
Discrete Accomplishments		
Effectiveness in supervising honors projects, independent study projects, and other similar projects that involve student-faculty scholarship Up to 50% of the available 15 points	0-15	
Effectiveness of faculty who teach (a) more than three preparations per academic year, (b) higher level classes (junior, senior or graduate), (c) classes that use non-traditional delivery modes (e.g., distance learning, web-based), and/or (d) large classes Up to 50% of the available 15 points		
Development of a new course or significant revision of an existing course Up to 50% of the available 15 points		
Evidence of faculty development activities geared to improving faculty teaching effectiveness Up to 30% of the available 15 points		
External recognition of teaching effectiveness (e.g. teaching awards) Up to 50% of the available 15 points		
Other activities that contribute to effective teaching and learning in the college or the university Up to 100% of the available 15 points		
Total		

Appendix C: Research Performance

Contribution	Available Points	Awarded Points
Refereed Journal Publications*		
Acceptance for publication of articles in peer-reviewed journals (PRJ) or cases in refereed publications	20-120	
Acceptance for publication in Law Reviews and Journals	20-120	
Refereed Conference Proceedings		
International/National	5-10	
Regional	0-5	
Other Reviewed Publications		
New textbook or new scholarly book	5-10	
Revision of a scholarly book or textbook, compile readings, cases and/or articles into book form	0-5	
New instructor manual, new study guide, new textbook supplement (no credit for revision)	0-5	
New book chapter, new reading in a book of readings or mono-graph	0-5	
Book review published in a journal	0-5	
Conference Activity		
Presenter at international or national conference	10	
Presenter at regional or local conference	5	
Reviewer/discussant at a conference	5	
Editorial/Review Activities		
Editor or associate editor of a PRJ	20	
Editor of a special issue of a PRJ, or member of a PRJ's editorial review board	5-10	
Ad-hoc reviewer for conferences	5	
Ad-hoc reviewer for journals	10	
Reviewer of textbook	0-5	
Awarded Grants	0-50	
Other Recognitions		
Best paper at an international, national, or regional conference	5	
Best paper at a peer-reviewed journal	10	
Outstanding researcher (college, university, external)	10-20-20	
Other	0-10	
Research Total		

* Acceptance for publication and the publication appearing in print are considered to be one performance event, and may not be counted as two separate performance events.

Appendix D: Service Performance

Contribution (3 possible activity levels: low, medium, high)	Available Points	Number	Awarded Points
University Service			
Department, College, and University Committees			
Member	5-10-15		
Chair	10-20-30		
Student organization advisor	10-20-30		
Extraordinary university service	0-30		
Professional Service			
Board of director membership (low, medium, high)	5-10-15		
Association/Organization Involvement			
Officer	4-8-12		
Board member	3-6-9		
Committee member	2-4-6		
Speaker or other participation	1-2-3		
Conference/Seminar/Meeting Involvement			
Program chair	10-20-30		
Track chair/Program committee	4-8-12		
Session chair	2-4-6		
Panel member	1-2-3		
Extraordinary professional service	0-30		
Public Service (related to discipline)			
Charity/Civic Organization			
Board member/officer	2-4-6		
Committee member or other participation	1-2-3		
Specific Event Involvement			
Sponsor/planner/miscellaneous	1-3-5		
Extraordinary public service	0-20		
Other Recognition (Outstanding service, etc.)	3-6-9		
Service Total			

Appendix E: Translation of Performance Category Scores into Merit Scale Values

Teaching:

Teaching Performance Score	Merit Value	Merit Classification
< 60	1	Unsatisfactory
60-69	2	Satisfactory
70-79	3	Meritorious
80-89	4	Outstanding
90-100	5	Extraordinary

Research:

Research Performance Score	Merit Value	Merit Classification
0-19	1	Unsatisfactory
20-39	2	Satisfactory
40-69	3	Meritorious
70-99	4	Outstanding
>= 100	5	Extraordinary

Service:

Service Performance Score	Merit Value	Merit Classification
0-19	1	Unsatisfactory
20-34	2	Satisfactory
35-59	3	Meritorious
60-89	4	Outstanding
>= 90	5	Extraordinary

Overall Merit Score:

Performance Category	Merit Value	Endowed Chairs Finance Faculty Law Faculty Weight *	Weighted Value
Teaching		45%	
Research		45%	
Service		10%	
Total		100%	

* Faculty holding an endowed chair shall be evaluated in accordance with the provisions of the endowment and consistent with the certificate of appointment.