APPENDIX B

Merit Pay Review Evaluation Process

Robert H Smith School of Business

May 12, 2011

I. Principles Underlying Process Development:

A. Purpose:
   1) Elevate stature and visibility of school by incentivizing appropriate behaviors;
   2) Provide useful developmental feedback to faculty.

B. Design Principles:
   1) Faculty (not the Dean's Office) has final decision-making responsibility over distribution of available merit funds.
   2) Fair, equitable and transparent process.
   3) Heterogeneity of contributions is recognized.
   4) Process enhances morale of those reviewed
   5) Faculty are evaluated holistically.
   6) The process is dynamic, evolving with changes in School's priorities and strategy.

II. Review Committee Structure

There will be two different College-wide salary review committees (SRCs) and an individual SRC within each department. All votes discussed below shall be by secret ballot.

1) Committee to Review Tenured Faculty composed of six members, three associate professors and three full professors and the Associate Dean of Faculty in an ex-officio role. Area representatives will be elected by the Area members. Assistant Professors shall not serve on this committee.

2) Committee to Review Non-Tenure Track Faculty including Tyser Teaching Fellows, Research Professors, Professors of Practice, Lecturers & Adjuncts—composed of six members, one from each department, also with the Associate Dean of Faculty participating in ex-officio capacity. Area representative will be elected by the Area members. Assistant professors shall not serve on this committee. Five committee members shall be non-tenure track faculty, i.e. faculty of the type being reviewed. The sixth shall be an Associate or Full
Professor. The department from which the Associate or Full Professor is chosen shall rotate.

3) The home Area of assistant professors will complete their annual merit review as part of each individual’s annual development review. The three person committee reviewing an Area’s assistant professors shall be elected by the tenured/tenure track faculty. Assistant professors’ scores will not be integrated with those of tenured associates or full professors. Instead, determination of the overall salary pool available for assistant professors and the allocation of funds across areas shall be coordinated by the Dean’s Office. The Dean’s Office will take into consideration the fact that differences in the assistant professor merit pool across areas should be supported by factual indicators of area differences in assistant professor quality and performance and/or clear market differences in the changes in assistant professor salaries each year.

Note that the Dean’s office will review the gender and racial balance of the membership on the various SRCs over time and if it is found any of the SRCs has not had an adequate level of diversity over time then steps will be taken to rectify the situation.

III. Faculty Merit Review Information

A. Merit Review Forms:
Currently faculty provide their performance information using the Smith School Faculty Merit Review Form (see attachment) – note that there are two versions, one for tenured and tenure-track faculty and one for Tyser Teaching Fellows. Note also that the forms contain performance information from the previous three years. Faculty are also required to fill out the University Faculty Activity Report. The Associate Dean for Faculty shall oversee a process to insure faculty fill out the form in a timely manner.

B. Changes to Forms:
Changes to the form can be made with approval of the Smith School Executive Committee.

III. Linking evaluations to salary

A. Evaluation Bands:
The SRCs shall determine merit increases for each evaluation band, considering 6 - 8 bands for the evaluation. The department SRCs need not abide by any particular structure as they will typically have small numbers of faculty to evaluate.
B. Faculty Meetings with Area Chairs and Feedback Process

The SRCs shall convey to the Area Chairs, the ranking of each faculty member in their area as well as scores in individual categories. Further, the two School-wide SRCs shall prepare reports given to the Chairs that will include a discussion of criteria used in the overall evaluation and an explanation of differences in “bands”. The SRCs may provide other information as they see fit. The specific content and format of these reports will be evaluated and continuously improved over time.

The SRCs may provide other information as they see fit. The specific content and format of these reports will be evaluated and continuously improved over time.

The Area Chairs shall meet with each faculty member and provide feedback on each individual's evaluation after the SRC has determined its evaluations but prior to the determination of the final salary figures. During this meeting the faculty member may provide evidence and arguments as to why the SRC evaluation may not be accurate. The faculty member may also provide such feedback to the chair up to a week after the meeting. After these meetings and feedback period, the area chairs will meet again with the various SRCs and provide to the SRCs the feedback provided by the faculty as well as any other comments that the chair might have. The SRCs will then reconsider their rankings based on the feedback they receive from the area chairs. The SRCs will then determine their final rankings and salary allocation.

C. Meeting with Dean's Office and Final Salary Notification

The Dean’s Office will then meet individually with each chair. The meeting will start with a discussion of the overall salary profile of the faculty area. Issues such as the degree to which “compression” has occurred, i.e. little difference between the salary ranges for the various ranks, the degree to which one faculty area has fallen behind others, the degree to which salaries in the faculty area are behind the external market as well as other similar topics. Any problems identified will be taken into account in the subsequent discussion of specific salary levels and also may be noted as guidance for future years.

After this initial discussion, Dean's Office will give its recommendation for the Dean's merit increase component for each faculty member. The Deans and the chair will then consider the total salary increase to be provided to each faculty. The chair will provide his or her views on the level of the increase. Based on this conversation a final raise will be determined for each faculty member.

At the end of the meeting, written notes will be generated to be used as guidance for salary goals in future years. Specifically, these will reflect any structural problems with the overall salary profile of the faculty area that need to be addressed in future years.

The Dean's Office will then convey to each faculty member in writing their merit increase. Any individual faculty member will have the right to request an additional meeting with his or her area chair to receive a clarification of the justification for his or her merit increase.
IV. Assessment Categories

The assessment categories and their descriptions shall apply to all faculty types, except where exceptions and elaborations are listed for the specific type of faculty.

A. Research (R)

Research will be evaluated predominantly on the basis of peer reviewed research articles and refereed conference proceedings, as well as scholarly third party grants. Books, monographs and book chapters will be factored in based on a faculty member’s case for their inclusion. Assessments should also take into account research impact as evidenced in citations, publication awards, best papers, etc. Area norms for the top business schools should be factored into the overall assessment.

B. Teaching (T)

Teaching will be evaluated on the basis of student ratings, and teaching awards. The SRC should take into consideration the level (graduate, undergraduate) as well as type (core/elective), size, as well as the breadth of different courses across one’s teaching load, whether this is a new preparation for the instructor, evidence of course innovation and development, exposure to external companies and projects, teaching publications and cases, and participation in program development.

C. Service (S)

Service is of two types: external service and Internal Community Building and Citizenship Behavior.

External service includes activities such as journal reviewing, editorial boards, conference participation at officer and board levels, membership on corporate/organizational boards, positive appearances in media of all types, conference keynote presentations, etc.

Internal community building and citizenship behavior can include a wide range of contributions. Included is committee membership at the area, Smith School or University levels. Support for students could involve advising students, mentoring student clubs, organizing student events, supporting College recruiting activities, etc. Participation in various events that build community, such as luncheons, evening dinners and activities, special seminars or community-building events, etc. also represents a contribution in this area.
V. Merit Pay Criteria & Relative Weights: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (Tyser Teaching Fellows (TTF), Distinguished Tyser Teaching Fellows (DTTF), Professors of Practice (PoP) and Research Professors (RP)).

A. Special Considerations

1) In all cases below, the evaluation process should take into account the specific, sometimes unique, roles these faculty are expected to play. For example, if appropriate expectations set forth in appointment letters should be provided to guide the evaluation.

2) The research assessment of Research Professors should take into account, on a case by case basis, the particular role they are expected to play, e.g. if they are expected to help bring in research contracts then this aspect would be weigh heavily in their evaluation, or if they were expected to publish in practitioner outlets in order to help expose a line of research to the business community then such publications would be rated highly for them.

B. Weights for Different Faculty Groups:

Each SRC member will assign a score to each of the three categories given in Section IV. These scores shall be combines using weights to determine an overall score. The weight for the various faculty groups are given below.

**TTF, DTTF:**
R: 0%; T: 70%; S: 30%.

**Research Professors:**
R: 20%; T: 50%; S: 30%.

**Professors of Practice:**
T: 50%; Practice: 50%.

**Assistant Professors**
R: 60%; T: 30%; S: 10%

**Associate and Full Professors**
R: 50%; T: 30%; S: 20%; or
R: 40%; T: 30%; S: 30%;

Here the weighting scheme that yields the highest overall score shall be used for each faculty member being evaluated.