September 21, 2016

The merit review procedures for the Bauer College of Business are comprised of two documents (both attached). The Annual Faculty Merit Review Policies and Procedures define the structure of the process and the numerical system used for evaluations. The second document, titled Merit Review Administrative Guidelines, provides guidance on the details needed for implementation of the process.

Tenure-track faculty members in all departments within the Bauer College are evaluated jointly by the Bauer College Administrative Committee under these procedures every year. Results are communicated in writing to individual faculty members at the conclusion of the process. Faculty members who wish to challenge their evaluation may do so through the Bauer College Grievance Committee described in the Bauer College By-Laws.

Annual Faculty Merit Review
Policies and Procedures
(Revised Version, September 2016)

I.   GENERAL OBJECTIVES

    A.   The purpose of these policies and procedures is to encourage planned progress by individual faculty members toward university, college, and department goals.

    B.   This purpose, in turn, requires that criteria for judging performance be set in advance, that they be known to the persons to whom they apply, and that they be uniform and equitably applied.

    C.   These policies and procedures recognize that teaching and research are primary responsibilities of all faculty members, and they reward other activities to the degree that they contribute to:

        1.   the development and diffusion of knowledge, and
        2.   the accomplishment of College goals and objectives.

    D.   All members of the College faculty, other than the Dean and Associate Dean(s), are covered by these procedures and are eligible for one or both of the following types of increment:

        X increments. Based on annual review of faculty and chairperson performance.

        Y increments. To adjust for major inequities.

    E.   All changes to these policies and procedures must be approved by a vote of the College faculty.

II.   PROCEDURES- ADMINISTRATION OF SYSTEM

    A.   Faculty

        1.   Before January 15 of each year, the faculty member will prepare a Professional Data Report (PDR) for the prior three years. This report prepared using the College's ePDR System.

        2.   Final faculty merit recommendations to the Dean will come from the College Administrative Committee. These recommendations will be based on careful review and discussion. Each chairperson will insure that all relevant contributions are considered in the committee evaluation of faculty members in his/her department.

3. The guidelines for merit increases are necessarily flexible; and, consequently, legitimate differences in opinion may arise regarding 1) the level of performance achieved and 2) the relative weight which various factors shall receive in evaluation. In this event, the faculty member has the right to an appeal hearing before the College Grievance Committee. Both the appealing faculty and the appropriate chairperson shall testify to the committee. This committee, constituted as prescribed by University policy, will be activated upon written notice to the Dean that an appeal is requested. The results of each such hearing will be forwarded to the Dean in the form of a recommendation for/or against adjustment of the original "X" evaluation.

4. Final Bauer College increment recommendations will be forwarded by the Dean to the Provost and Chancellor.

B. Chairperson Evaluation

1. Prior to January 15th, each departmental chairperson shall submit to the Dean a PDR for the prior three years.

2. Using the evaluation instruments prescribed by the Dean, the departmental faculty shall individually and anonymously evaluate the chairperson's performance for the year.

3. These evaluations will be forwarded to the Dean who will take them into account when determining recommended increments for the chairperson.

4. The Dean will provide sufficient opportunity for discussions with departmental faculty interested in personally commenting on the chairperson's performance and departmental accomplishments.

5. Administrators who wish to appeal their recommended increments will utilize the same procedures as those available to non-administrative members.

C. A listing of all individual member's X-ratings by category, individual overall X-ratings, recommended faculty X- and Y- increments, and individual PDR's will be kept in the Office of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and the Office of the Chairperson of the Faculty's Department. These files will be available for examination to any evaluated faculty member for a 60- day period following the communication of the X- ratings and following the communication of the X- and Y- increments, respectively, to the Faculty. Requests for examination must be made in writing to the Chair or the Associate Dean.

III. PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

A. General

1. The annual faculty review process shall cover a 36-month performance period. Exceptions to this policy are:

    a. All new Assistant Professors hired in the CBA who have completed the doctorate and not held a tenure-track position at another university may elect to receive a 2X evaluation during the first two yearly evaluation periods.

    b. All new faculty with previous professional rank at another university may elect to receive a 2X evaluation during the first year of evaluation.

    c. Faculty on leave-of-absence of less than one academic year shall be evaluated in the same way that he/she would have been evaluated if he/she had not been on leave. Faculty on a leave-of-absence of at least one academic year shall be required to submit a Professional Data Report (PDR) before January 15 of any year encompassed by that leave. This report shall be the same as the report that would have been required if the faculty had not taken a leave. The Faculty member will be subject to the normal Merit Review evaluation during that review period.

        However, the criteria for determining that faculty's X-rating while on leave may, at the request of the faculty member, and at the discretion of the Administrative Committee, differ from that of a faculty member not on leave. The different criteria can be chosen only if the activities performed by the faculty member while on leave differ significantly from those activities traditionally performed by faculty not on leave.

        In the first evaluation after a faculty member returns from a leave-of-absence of one year or more, that faculty may elect to receive a 2X evaluation during the first evaluation period following the leave of absence.

    d. All tenured or tenure-track faculty holding administrative positions within the Bauer College, the University or the UH System, may elect to receive a 2X evaluation during the first evaluation period immediately following the administrative appointment. For the purpose of this paragraph, administrative position is defined as Department Chairs, Deans, and other faculty members whose duties, as determined by the Administrative Committee, are mainly administrative.

2. Performance criteria and weighting options shall be reviewed each year to insure optimum fairness, incentive, and compliance with University policy.

3. Unless specifically exempted, no item or activity should be recorded in more than one year. (Double counting shall be avoided).

B.   Teaching and Student Related Activities

    1.   Actual teaching load (including consideration of large classes, etc.).

    2.   Program and course development activities.

    3.   Results of teaching effectiveness reports. For purposes of evaluation, these scores will be reported as mean adjusted raw score, rather than as a percentage ranking score.

    4.   Flexibility and versatility in teaching and scheduling requirements.

    5.   Ability, willingness, and availability to counsel and advise students and to stimulate their interest in the subject areas.

    6.   Contribution in areas of directing student research and serving on Ph.D. committees.

    7.   Other teaching related contributions.

C.   Research Productivity

    1.   Research published in refereed journals. (Evaluation emphasis on quality of research, rigor of review process, etc.).

    2.   Non-refereed journal articles, competitive papers presented at scholarly meetings and eligible for College funding and new editions.

    3.   Research funds generated for the College.

D.   Service Contributions

    1.   Commitment to Department, College, and University. Such commitment can be evidenced in many ways, including:

        a)   Quality of contribution on special projects, such as student recruiting, program coordination, symposium development, etc.

        b)   Exceptional service and contributions on Committee assignments. Committee membership does not in itself constitute service.

        c)   Overall contribution to academic development of Department, College, and University.

    2.   Significant contributions to professional organizations, such as officer, committee work, editorial review, etc.

    3.   Significant professional service activities in community.

    4.   Funds generated for department and College (does not include research grants which are part of research-related evaluation).

IV.   EVALUATION PROCEDURES

E.   "X" System

1.   Each faculty member's performance will be translated into an "X" value, ranging from a low of zero to a maximum of 4X. In the mathematical calculation of individual ratings, final "X" values will be computed and reported to two decimal places.

2.   The evaluation scales is as follows:

4.0X   Exceptional
3.5X
3.0X   Very Good
2.5X
2.0X   Good
1.5X
1.0X   Fair
0.5X
0.0X   Substandard (No merit increment)

3.   The value of an X-increment and total increment will be determined by an absolute and percentage system.

4.   Each faculty member will be notified of his/her total "X" evaluation, and the evaluation within each performance dimension: teaching, research, and service.

F.   Evaluation by Academic Rank

Faculty members will be grouped by academic rank and evaluated against other faculty within his or her rank. The same standards and procedures will be applied to all ranks.

G.   Evaluation of Service

Service will be evaluated based on a faculty member's overall contribution. (There will be no division in terms of internal versus external service).

H.   Evaluation of Teaching

1.   The teaching dimension will be evaluated in two components: (1) the teaching effectiveness questionnaire and (2) teaching activities. The scores on the two components will be added to produce the faculty member's evaluation in teaching.

2.   The average score on the teaching effectiveness questionnaire (TEQ) for the three years will be evaluated on a rating score between 0 and 2. In order for a positive score on the teaching effectiveness questionnaire to count, it must be accompanied by a positive score on the departmental teaching activities component.

3.   Each department chairperson will assign teaching activities X ratings to faculty members in his/her department. Each chairperson will be given 1.2n X's (rounded up to the nearest increment of .25X) where n is the number of department faculty members reviewed, less the number of automatic 2X's given to those faculty. Amended

>   December 5, 1985
>   May 5, 1988
>   August 24, 1988
>   August 26, 1992
>   October 23, 1998
>   December 8, 1998
>   May 8, 2000
>   February 15, 2005 (ePDR)
>   September 9, 2016 (eliminated rounding)

Appendix A
GUIDELINES FOR COMPLETING

PROFESSIONAL DATA REPORT
JANUARY 1, 1998-DECEMBER 31, 2000

I.   Research and Publication

In both A. and B. of this section, give complete citations, including the names of all authors, and, if already published, date (or volume and issue), and page numbers.

> **EXAMPLE:**   First I.M. & Second, U.R., "Trading in Blueberry Pancake Futures: Should Special Accounting Rules Apply?," Journal of Irrelevant Results, March 1997, pp. 1-19

Copies of all entries in this section must be provided to your Department Chair. In the case of articles **unconditionally accepted for publication**, but not yet published, a copy of the letter of acceptance must also be provided.

A. Refereed Journal Articles

Articles must appear in only one year on your PDR. For example, if an article was reported on a previous PDR in 1998, it must appear under 1998 on your current PDR. For articles in less widely known journals, please provide your Department Chair with a copy of listing of the Editorial Board.

B. Other Publications

Entries in this section include non-refereed journal articles, papers presented at **competitive conferences eligible for College funding**, and new editions of books. Please indicate the type of publication (e.g., non-referred article, competitive conference, or book) with each entry. Do not include noncompetitive and invited papers. These should be listed under Section II B.

C. Research Funds Generated for the College

List contacts and grants actually funded by external agencies. Include the amount and type of funding (e.g., salaries, equipment, travel). **Do not include** CBA or University-awarded grants, such as CBA Summer Research Awards, and University RIG Grants. Proposals and contacts that have been submitted but not funded should be listed in Section II D.

II.   University, Professional, and Community Service

Please note that **Departmental** contributions should be listed in Section III.

A.   College and University Committee Assignments

Indicate whether the committee is a University (U) or College (C) Committee. If your service on a particular committee was for less than a full year, please indicate when you began and/or completed serving on that committee.

B.   Participation in Special Programs and Seminars

In this section, you should include invited and noncompetitive paper presentations as well as participation in programs such as those offered by the Center for Executive Development. Indicate with a **NP** if the participation in these programs was **non-paid**.

C.   Service to the Professional Community

Entries in this section would include active service to professional organizations (describe any offices held and/or committees chaired); formal editorial responsibilities (indicate journal and term); ad hoc refereeing for journals or conferences (if you reviewed more than one paper for each journal or conference, **indicate the number of papers reviewed for each)**

D.   Other Service to National, State, Local, or University Community

List other **non-departmental** service contributions not included in any category above. Examples include performing special administrative assignments, submitting research grants proposals, (that have not been funded), assisting in special faculty or student recruiting activities, and organizing special lecture series.

Community service related **to your professional role in the University** should be listed here. Other service should not be listed.

Example: <u>List</u> if your membership in a Governor's Task Force is related to your professional training or expertise, or you are formally advising the United Way in areas related to your specialty.

<u>Do not list</u> professionally unrelated, but otherwise meritorious, activities such as coaching Little League and serving as a Sunday School Board member.

III.   Departmental Service

A.   Committee Assignments

For any Departmental Committee assignments, indicate whether you served as a chair of that committee. Also, if service on a particular committee was for less than the full year, please indicate when you began and/or completed serving on that committee.

B.   **Special Departmental Assignments**

This section would include departmental service other than committee assignments. Examples would include serving as coordinator of a departmental course, assisting your department in recruiting, and providing service in other departmental activities.

IV.   **Teaching and Student-Related Activities**

A.   **Actual Teaching Load**

Include all courses taught during the two-year time period in this section. Information should include the course number and the class size. If less than six hours of classes are indicated in any semester (other than summer), indicate the nature of any release time provided.

B.   **Special Course Advising**

C.   **Graduate Student Committees**

For all Graduate Student Committees on which you have served, classify the committee as a thesis committee (T), dissertation committee (D), or advisory committee (A). Also, indicate whether service on that committee was as Chair.

Indicate any Graduate Student Committees that have been listed in previous PDRs by an asterisk (*).

D.   **Significant Curriculum and Course Development**

This section is limited to **major** curriculum or course development, such as initiating a new course or **significantly** revising the content and focus of an existing course. Do not include ordinary course preparation and/or updating in this section.

E.   **Other Student-Related Activities**

This section would include activities such as participating in the CBA mentors program, providing counseling or tutorial services, serving as faculty advisor to student organizations, and receiving teaching or other instruction-related awards.

BAUER

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

UNIVERSITY *of* HOUSTON

MERIT REVIEW ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES
(Revised 2016)

These guidelines are designed for the annual Merit Review evaluation. Evaluation for promotion and tenure is done independently.

I.   **Research Evaluation** The research evaluation results in an 'X' score (or rating) on a scale from 0 to 4. The research score is based on (1) research published in refereed journals, (2) non-refereed journal articles, papers presented at academic conferences, and books and book chapters (including textbooks and monographs), and (3) research funds generated for the College. The specific scores for these research activities are determined by the Administrative Committee that is composed of the Dean, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and the department chairs. The research scoring system typically evolves over time and will be summarized in the current Guidelines.

A.   *Journal Articles* The faculty in each department will rank their journals as follows:

Tier 1
Tier 2
Tier 3
Tier 4

This ranking results in the Department Journal List (DJL) for each department. [1] The DJL is periodically updated by the department's faculty and communicated to the Dean. Each department's list will contain no more than 5 tier 1, 5 Tier 2 journals, and 10 Tier 3 journals. The Dean can request external validation of the DJL.

The college will maintain a separate list, called the Supplemental Journal List (SJL), which will contain journals that do not appear on the DJLs, but otherwise are well respected in allied fields or among business practitioners. The purpose of this list is to expedite the evaluation process by having pre-established rankings for journals in which faculty members have published or might publish, apart from journals on the DJLs. There is no limit to the number of journals on the SJL. The Administrative Committee places journals on the SJL.

Articles published in journals not on any list are assigned to the "Others" category; we note that this category is limited to refereed journal publications.

Faculty will be given credit for publishing in journals on any DJL or the SJL. In the event that a journal appears on more than one DJL, the highest weight listed for that journal will be used in research evaluations.

---

[1] DISC has separate lists for MIS and SCM journals.

Faculty can choose to record a journal article in the ePDR in the year of acceptance or the year of the publication, *but not both*. A journal article cannot be recorded in the ePDR after the year of the publication. For evaluating the research score, the classification of the journal at the time that the article was recorded will be used. *Example:* An article in the *Journal of Sublime Intelligence* was accepted for publication in 2007 and recorded by the faculty member in that year. In year 2007, JSI was a Tier 2 journal, but it was classified as a Tier 1 journal in 2008. For the research score calculation of this article, however, the Journal will still be counted as Tier 2.

B.   **Textbooks** Faculty may record a textbook if it was published during the year, either as a new publication or as a new edition.

C.   **Book Chapters and Research Monographs** Faculty may record research monographs or chapters in books newly published during the year.

D.   **Conferences** Faculty may only record conference presentations in the year in which they are made.

E.   **Current Research Rating Counting Rules** The current research rating counting guidelines are summarized in the table below. These guidelines build on the following rules.

1. A 4.0 rating can only be obtained by publishing at least 2 articles in Tier 1 journals.
2. A maximum of 1.5 can be obtained from journals in the "Tier 4" and "Others" categories.
a. A maximum of 1.0 can be obtained from the "Others" category. *Example*: If a faculty member has three "Tier 4" journal articles, he or she will receive a 1.5. If a faculty member has one "Tier 4" journal article and five "Other" publications, he or she will receive a 1.5 (1.0 for the Tier 4 article and 0.5 for the other publications).
3. A maximum of 0.25 can be obtained for presentations at conferences.
4. A maximum of 0.5 can be obtained for textbooks, chapters in textbook, and research monographs.
5. Scores for external research funds generated are based on a case-by-case evaluation.

        Note: The journal scores shown in the Table below are for full-length, main section articles; other types of publications (e.g., comments, notes, errata, etc.) will typically receive lower scores.

	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4	Other	Conf	Books	BC/RM	X
Tier 1	2+								4.00
Tier 1	1	1+							3.75
Tier 1	1		1+						3.50
Tier 1	1			1+					3.25
Tier 1	1								3.00
		Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4	Other	Conf	Books	BC/RM	X
Tier 2		3+							3.00
Tier 2		2							2.75
Tier 2		1	1						2.50
Tier 2		1		1+					2.25
Tier 2		1							2.00
			Tier 3	Tier 4	Other	Conf	Books	BC/RM	X
Tier 3			4+						2.75
Tier 3			3						2.50
Tier 3			2	1+					2.25
Tier 3			2		1+				2.25
Tier 3			2						2.00
Tier 3			1	1+					1.50
Tier 3			1		1+				1.25
Tier 3			1						1.00
				Tier 4	Other	Conf	Books	BC/RM	X
Tier 4				3+					1.50
Tier 4				2	1+				1.25
Tier 4				2					1.00
Tier 4				1	1+				0.75
Tier 4				1					0.50
					Other	Conf	Books	BC/RM	X
Other					4+				1.00
Other					3				0.75
Other					2				0.50
Other					1				0.25
						Conf	Books	BC/RM	X
Conf						1+			0.25
							Books	BC/RM	X
Books							1+		0.50
BC/RM							1+		0.50

BC/RM : Book Chapters and Research Monographs

II. **Service Evaluation**
A faculty member's service evaluation will be based on the following suggested guidelines. Please note that these are only guidelines; a number of factors must be considered in completing the evaluation and may result in the final evaluation being different than that suggested by the following standards. Also, not all possibilities may be covered by these guidelines and the Administrative Committee will evaluate these instances.

A. *Editorial and Reviewing Activity*

Editor of Tier 1 Journal	up to 2.0x per journal	2.5x maximum
Editor of Tier 2 Journal	up to 1.5x per journal	2.0x maximum
Editorial Review Board for Tier 1 and Tier 2 Journals	up to 1.0x per journal	1.5x maximum
Ad hoc reviewing for Tier 1 and Tier 2 Journals	Low/None: Moderate: High:	0.0x 0.5x 1.0x

B. *Service to Academic Organizations*

Major national professional assignments	up to 1.0x per assignment	1.5x maximum
Other national assignments	up to 0.5x per assignment	1.0x maximum

C. *Other Service Activities*

Active College and University Activities (beyond first committee)	2.5x maximum
Community Activities (Related to University Role)	0.5x maximum

Note: Successful generation of funds for the College will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

D. *Other Guidelines*

The maximum College Service Score is 2.50x.

III. **Teaching Evaluations**
The maximum College Teaching score is 2.00x. In order for a positive score on the teaching effectiveness questionnaire to count, it must be accompanied by a positive score on the departmental teaching activities component.

IV. **Departmental Evaluations**

A. Teaching

For each faculty member in a department, the department chair is given 1.2x to allocate among departmental faculty members. In the event that the departmental allocation is not an even multiple of .25, the department chair may round up the total departmental teaching Xs to the nearest increment of .25. Allocations are made to faculty members in 0.25 increments. The total teaching Xs given to an individual faculty member (college + department) cannot exceed 4.0x. In the event that a department chair gives 0.00X in departmental teaching the corresponding college teaching score is also set to zero. The overall ordering of the teaching evaluations for college teaching purposes does not change.

B. Service

For each faculty member in a department, the department chair is given 1.0x to allocate among departmental faculty members. Allocations are made to faculty members in 0.25 increments. The total service Xs given to an individual faculty member (college + department) cannot exceed 4.0x.

V.   Option Selection and Evaluation

A. Options

When submitting their data for evaluation, faculty must select an option that will be used to evaluate their performance. The following table summarizes their options and the weights for the teaching, research and service categories

	Teaching	Research	Service
Option 1	30%	60%	10%
Option 2	30%	50%	20%
Option 3	40%	40%	20%
Option 4	50%	30%	20%
Option 5	60%	10%	30%

B. Application of Weights

The weights are applied as follows:

Teaching Weight	×	(College Teaching X + Departmental Teaching X)	+
Research Weight	×	Research X	+
Service Weight	×	(College Service X + Departmental Service X)	=
Total Raw Score			

The Total Raw Score may be adjusted as discussed in D below. After adjustment (if any), the Total Raw Score becomes the Final Score. According to College policies, the Final Score is used in the calculation of an individual faculty member's merit-based raise.

C. Restrictions

Option selection is limited as follows: All non-tenured faculty in the tenure track, independent of rank, must choose option 1. Tenured faculty can choose options 1, 2, or 3. Tenured faculty may choose option 4 or 5 with the approval of the department chair. These options are typically associated with increased teaching loads.

D. Faculty Letters

Beginning 2006-2007, letters sent to faculty members whose Research Score is less than 1.0, shall have the following text inserted into the Merit Review letter that comes from the

department chair: "Because your research rating is below 1.0, College policies indicate that you and I should meet soon to discuss your teaching load for the coming academic year."

Revised: February 27, 1994
January 16, 1997
January 15, 1998
December 13, 1999
January 10, 2001
February 11, 2005
March 4, 2005
June 21, 2005
January 24, 2007
March 21, 2007
January 15, 2009
February 25, 2011
January 14, 2013
September, 2016 (eliminated rounding)