

MERIT PAY EVALUATION PROCEDURE AND CRITERIA
M. E. RINKER, SR. SCHOOL OF BUILDING CONSTRUCTION

To satisfy the University's requirement that the merit pay award process should be transparent with full faculty participation, the BCN Merit Pay Committee developed the following procedure and criteria that were discussed and approved by the BCN faculty in their March 11, 2005 meeting.

(1) General Procedure:

Each Committee member will independently evaluate each faculty member (based on the faculty's self-evaluation form) and assign them a score from 0 to 10, for each of the following categories:

- (i) Teaching and Advising Activities;
- (ii) Research and Scholarly Activities;
- (iii) Service Activities.

The Committee will then meet and compare their evaluations – if there are any significant discrepancies in the scores assigned to a faculty member then the Committee will discuss those scores. Following this discussion, each Committee member may change their score. The Committee members' scores are then averaged for each faculty in each category. These averages are then weighted as follows:

For tenured and tenure accruing faculty, the weights for each category are:

- (i) Teaching and Advising Activities 40%;
- (ii) Research and Scholarly Activities 40%;
- (iii) Service Activities 20%,

providing a base score for the faculty member, for that year, between 0 and 10.

For lecturers, the weights for each category are:

- (i) Teaching and Advising Activities 67%
- (ii) Service Activities 33%,

providing a base score for the faculty member, for that year, between 0 and 10.

Note, the above percentage weights do not necessarily reflect the distribution of faculty annual assignments. Nevertheless, if exceptional circumstances prevail for a faculty member (as determined by the Committee), the distribution of these weights may be changed on a case-by-case basis. However, for faculty members where the percentage weights are changed, there will be a corresponding change in the performance expectations within each category.

The final score for each faculty will be measured as 30% of his/her base score from the previous year, plus 70% of the base score for the current year. If a faculty member does not have a base score from the previous year then the final score will be 100% of the base score for the current year.

Following the above process, the Committee will determine the cut off score at which they consider faculty members are surpassing expectations (and thus worthy of merit pay), and the corresponding merit pay awards.

(2) Evaluation Criteria for Tenure and Tenure Accruing Faculty:

When the Committee members make their evaluations of tenure and tenure accruing faculty, they will be taking the following criteria into account:

- (i) Teaching and Advising Criteria:
 - Teaching Load;
 - Student Evaluations;
 - Teaching Awards;
 - Chair/Co-Chair PhD/MS Committees;
 - Member PhD/MS Committees;
 - Advising undergraduate honors papers;
 - Advising undergraduates;
 - New course preparation and innovative methods;
 - Other valid items listed by the faculty member

- (ii) Research and Scholarly Criteria:
 - Books;
 - Refereed Journals;
 - Conference articles;
 - Other publications;
 - Invited presentations (for example, keynote speaker);
 - Other presentations;
 - Editorships and Editorial Board memberships;
 - Review of scholarly works;
 - Member of technical committees for scientific conferences
 - Research Awards and Honors;
 - Numbers of research proposals submitted;
 - Number of research proposals and \$ value awarded;
 - Number of GRA's supported;
 - Other valid items listed by the faculty member.

- (iii) Service Criteria:
 - Research Center Activities;
 - University/College/School Committees (Chair, Member);
 - Professional Society Committees (Chair/Officer, Member);
 - Community Service
 - Coaching student teams in regional and national competitions
 - Advising student clubs
 - Participation in the School activities
 - Other valid items listed by the faculty member.

In evaluating performance for these criteria, the Committee members will look at quantity, quality, and the international component. For example, being the first author of a paper in an international refereed journal is significantly more valuable than being the third author for a paper in a local conference. Also note, a faculty member does not have to perform well under every criteria listed in order to receive a high evaluation.

(3) Evaluation Criteria for Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Master Lecturers

When the Committee members make their evaluations of lecturers, they will be taking the following criteria into account:

(i) Teaching and Advising Criteria:

Teaching Load;
Student Evaluations;
Teaching Awards;
Chair/Co-Chair Graduate Committees;
Member Graduate Committees;
Advising undergraduate honors papers
Advising undergraduates;
New course preparation and innovative methods;
Other valid items listed by the faculty member

(ii) Service Criteria:

University/College/School Committees (Chair, Member);
Professional Society Committees (Chair/Officer, Member);
Community Services
Coaching student teams in regional and national competitions
Advising student clubs
Participation in the School activities
Publications in educational and trade journals
Presentations at professional conferences
Other valid items listed by the faculty member.