

School of Business and Technology
Department of Business
Guidelines for Merit Evaluation of Research and Creative Activity
Adopted Feb. 26, 2010

These guidelines for merit evaluations of intellectual contributions have been developed so that the merit rating is a reasonable indicator of progress toward reappointment, tenure or promotion, but they do not supersede the criteria separately set out for reappointment, tenure or promotion. These guidelines are subject to periodic revision by the executive committee.

Intellectual contributions of the faculty will be evaluated in accordance with the department's mission. Scholarly contributions in business, interdisciplinary, and general education areas that are basic, applied or pedagogical in nature are all in accordance with the department's mission.

Every faculty member will list their intellectual contributions during the (two year) review period and identify the contribution as basic, applied, or pedagogical. The faculty member should also list their contributions under the categories listed on the last page. Each category has its designated merit points that the faculty member will be awarded for each item listed under the category. If the faculty member believes additional points are justified for a particular item, a separate request with supporting materials should be provided to the Executive Committee.

A faculty member may count merit points earned from a publication or presentation in either the merit review period when the work is accepted or the merit review period when the work is published.

A faculty member may receive, one time only per contribution, from .25 to 2 **post-publication merit points** for work of significant quality or influence. To receive post-publication merit points the faculty member must demonstrate superior quality or influence using objective measures. The type of measure used is at the discretion of the faculty member. The following examples are provided for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to limit the type of measures used to demonstrate quality or influence:

1. Demonstrate significant greater influence of an article or book chapter by using the frequency of citations listed in the *Social Science Citation Index* (or other source) in comparison to that of similar types of publications by UW-Parkside Department of Business faculty.
2. Demonstrate higher quality of a textbook or simulation by using market share or adoption rates.
3. Demonstrate superior quality of a case by the number or market share of textbooks publishing the case.
4. Demonstrate superior quality or influence based on the award of prizes or other types of public commendations.

A faculty member's merit rating for intellectual contributions will be calculated as follows:

Accumulation of scores in Categories I-VII
+ Post publication merit points
+ Excess points from previous merit rating

Total Score

Truncation conditions: The maximum score for research is 4.0 unless the faculty member has at least one journal article during the two year merit review period or two journal articles between this merit period and the previous merit period. The maximum score is 5.0 for faculty members who have met the journal publication criterion.

As shown in the above scoring system, points in excess of 5.00 in a merit period can be carried over to the next merit period. The excess points are determined as follows:

Accumulation of scores in Categories I-VII
+ Post publication merit points
+ Excess points from previous merit rating
- 5.00 (The maximum score)

Excess points to be used in next merit period

Truncation condition: A maximum of 5 excess points can be carried to the next merit period.

Categories

I. Acceptance of a peer-reviewed journal article **Merit points 2.00**
(previously 2.00)

The faculty member should have on file the manuscript, evidence of peer-review and the acceptance letter. A faculty member may petition for more points based upon the quality of the journal. Petitions should be accompanied by acceptance rates and other evidence that indicates the journal is considered a top journal in the field (e.g., published surveys of journal quality).

II. Acceptance of a book chapter **Merit points 1.75**
(previously 2.00)

A faculty member can petition for a score of 2.00 if the book chapter was peer reviewed and the acceptance rate was similar to a journal in the relevant academic discipline. The faculty member should have on file the manuscript, evidence of peer-review, if any, and the acceptance letter.

III. Acceptance of a peer-reviewed presentation of a paper at a scholarly/professional conference **Merit points 1.00**
(previously proceedings and a presentation were double counted; receiving 1.5 points).

The faculty members should have on file the manuscript, evidence of peer-review and the acceptance letter. If the proceedings of the conference is more selective than the conference presentation (i.e., has a lower acceptance rate than the conference), the faculty member will receive an additional .75 merit points.

IV. Acceptance of a non-peer-reviewed scholarly article **Merit points .70**

The faculty member should have on file the manuscript and the acceptance letter, or the publication itself.

V. Acceptance of a book review, magazine/newspaper/newsletter article, or similar publication **Merit points .50**

The faculty member should have on file the manuscript and the acceptance letter, or the publication, itself.

VI. Acceptance of a non-peer-reviewed presentation at a scholarly/professional forum **Merit points .30**

The faculty member should have on file the manuscript and the acceptance letter. If the complete paper is published in the proceedings, the faculty member will earn an additional .30 merit points.

VII. Others **Merit points .25-4.00 per item**

Research and Creative Activity that do not fit expressly under any of the above categories, such as textbooks, scholarly books, research monographs, research reports, case studies for instruction, computer software, grant proposals, grant awards, research notes, rejoinders, comments, research awards etc. may be listed under this category. The faculty member should have on file a copy of the manuscript/software and enough details that would enable the executive committee to judge its merit.