



“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)

Association Representative Non-voting

- 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).

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

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

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

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 with Unsatisfactory. (1/1/2005)

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.