

***FINAL DRAFT – 2-22-02***

**Retention, Support Committee**

**Zicklin School of Business**

**Report and Recommendations**

**February 2002**

Members:

Alvin Puryear, Committee Chair \*\*

Elliot Axelrod, Chair, Law

Albert Croker, Chair, Statistics and Computer Information Systems

Steven Lilien, Chair, Accounting

Harry Rosen, Chair, Management

Gary Soldow, Chair, Marketing

Avner Wolf, Chair, Economics and Finance

Ann Brandwein, Statistics and Computer Information Systems \*\*

Joseph Kerstein, Accounting \*\*

Gayle DeLong, Economics and Finance \*

Helaine Korn, Management \*

Terrence Martell, Economics and Finance \*

Robert Ducoffe, Acting Associate Dean

Maria DiBenedetto, Committee Staff

\* By election

\*\* Dean's appointment

## **Structure of the Report**

I.	Committee Charge and Composition	p. 3
II.	Intent of the Report	p. 4
III.	Description of Awards and Assumptions	p. 5
	1. Distribution of Awards and Amounts	p. 5
IV.	Additional Recommendations	p. 7
	1. Eligibility	p. 7
	2. Performance Criteria and Weighting	p. 7
	3. Review Process	p. 14
	4. Timing	p. 16
V.	Department Chairs	p. 17
VI.	Dean's Discretionary Fund	p. 18
VII.	Subsequent Review and Modifications	p. 19

## **I. Committee Charge and Composition**

The Retention Support Committee was established by Vice President and Dean Sidney Lirtzman to broadly represent the interests and perspectives of the Zicklin faculty in order to develop recommendations on criteria and processes by which funds are to be allocated to support and encourage performance excellence among the faculty of the Zicklin School of Business.

This report contains the recommendations of this Committee. In accordance with its charge, the Committee's recommendations are advisory to the Vice President and Dean. The Committee recommends that this report be made available for additional faculty comment.

Members of the Committee include the six Department Chairs (Elliot Axelrod, Law; Albert Croker, Statistics and Computer Information Systems; Steven Lilien, Accounting; Harry Rosen, Management; Gary Soldow, Marketing; and Avner Wolf, Economics and Finance), three members appointed by election (Professors Terrence Martell, Helaine Korn, and Gayle DeLong), three members appointed by Dean Lirtzman (Professors Alvin Puryear, Ann Brandwein, and Joseph Kerstein), with Acting Associate Dean Robert Ducoffe and Maria DiBenedetto serving as staff.

The Committee's recommendations were developed in 10 meetings held from late November 2001 to early February 2002. The Committee wishes to express its thanks for important input to these recommendations received from Dean Rick Winter, Katz Graduate School of Business, University of Pittsburgh, and Howard Frank, Dean, Robert H. Smith School of Business, University of Maryland.

## II. Intent of the Report

The Committee considers the awarding of retention support funds to be of singular importance to the morale and performance of the faculty, and to furtherance of Zicklin's aim to become a preeminent school of business.

In recent years, non-tax levy funds have been deployed to compensate for non-competitive salaries in the recruitment of new faculty. While this permits Zicklin to compete for new hires in the recruiting market, similar attention must be paid to resident faculty.

The Committee recognizes that although annual performance awards do not fully address substantial gaps in Zicklin faculty compensation relative to levels in peer institutions, they nevertheless are of high importance.

The Committee's recommendations are intended to achieve three broad outcomes:

1. To incentivize performance *excellence* among the faculty;
2. To employ performance criteria that are *clearly understood* and *explicitly defined*; and
3. To specify a process whereby performance assessment of the faculty, by the faculty, is *fair* and *transparent*.

The Committee's recommendations, once revised and adopted, should be implemented in the 2002-03 academic year.

### **III. Description of Awards and Assumptions**

Awards discussed in this report are to be given annually for exemplary performance among the faculty of the Zicklin School. An award given in one year does not entitle the recipient to subsequent annual awards, nor does it preclude them. Awards, unless otherwise specified, are based on an evaluation of faculty performance during the previous year.

The total amount of funds available for awards based on faculty performance in the 2002-03 academic year is not currently known. The available funding is dependent on the amount of additional revenue from MBA tuition that can be deployed to cover existing and planned tax-levy expenses, so that an equivalent amount of private funding from the Baruch College Fund that can be devoted to these annual awards.

Given the importance of these awards, and until such time as changes to the salary scales of Zicklin faculty are substantially increased, the Committee urges that all efforts be made to increase the amount of funding to retain and support present faculty.

The Committee recommends that a date be established before which, each year, the total amount of funds available for these purposes is decided through consultation between School and College officials. This date should proceed the beginning of the process for evaluation of faculty performance each year.

#### **III.1 Distribution of Awards and Amounts**

Given limited funding, the available monies must be targeted to recognize performance excellence among the faculty. This requires objectively ranking faculty members in terms of their performance on a school-wide basis.

Constraints on the number of faculty who will share in these awards annually are the overall amount of funds to be disbursed and the size of individual awards. If the annual

awards are to serve the stated purposes, e.g. to retain faculty and recognize performance excellence, the amounts must be sufficiently high to retain faculty members who are most likely to leave for other opportunities.

The Committee recommends setting a substantial, minimum annual award amount. Beginning from the top performer among the faculty, individual awards will be calibrated proportionately downward on the basis of relative performance until the available funds are exhausted. If, for example, the top performer's score as captured by their performance index, is twice the raw score of the last faculty member due an award based on the available funds, this top award should be double the size of the latter amount.

While the amounts forecast to be available through this process are not, by their nature and size, sufficient to address market compensation gaps across the entire faculty, the Committee believes they are sufficiently meaningful to tie increases to performance excellence among a sufficient number of faculty members to propel the Zicklin School forward.

## **IV. Additional Recommendations**

### **IV.1 Eligibility**

Only full-time faculty members will be eligible for awards. Specifically, all tenured and tenure-track, Full, Associate, and Assistant Professors are eligible for consideration. In addition, all full-time Lecturers including both holders of Certificates of Continuing Employment (CCE) and non-CCE holders are eligible for awards. Participation in the program is voluntary.

The Dean, Associate Dean, and Assistant Dean are not eligible for these awards.

### **IV.2 Performance Criteria and Weights**

The Committee recommends that decisions regarding faculty support should be made on the basis of the three factors recognized by the Board of Trustees--Research, Teaching, and Service--defined in the paragraphs below.

It is recommended that, in each area, faculty members' performance be evaluated based on all submitted documentation and scored using the following simple numeric scheme:

<b>4</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Very Good</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Good</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Fair</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>Poor</b>

## Research

The traditional measures of research output, such as articles in refereed journals, papers delivered at academic conferences, books, book chapters, and monographs will be considered.

The quality of the above accomplishments will be an explicit part of the evaluation process. Journals and conferences will be ranked to reflect the challenge to acceptance for either publication or presentation. The six departments will provide these rankings and appropriate support for their validity.

Information on faculty accomplishments will be collected annually employing existing categories for this purpose as follows on the next page:

## INFORMATION FOR ANNUAL REPORT ON RESEARCH

### PUBLICATIONS IN FIELD OF EXPERTISE:

- A. Books: [Give full name of co-author (if any); complete title of the book (underlined); editor (if any); edition (if other than the first); facts of publication—city where published, publisher, date of publication; volume number (if any); page number(s)]
- B. Chapters in books: [Give title of chapter/s (in quotes); title of book (underlined); editor (if any); page numbers; city where published; publisher; year of publication]
- C. Government reports of monographs: [Give title (in quotes); organization; date; page numbers]
- D. Papers in professional journals:
  - (1) Articles: [Give full name of co-author (if any); title of the article (in quotes), name of the periodical; volume (and number) of the periodical; date of the volume or issue; page number(s)]
  - (2) Refereed proceedings: [Give title (in quotes); name of conference; city and state (or country) where held; date]
  - (3) Papers under review: [Give title (in quotes); where submitted; date of submission; status, if known]
  - (4) Research in progress: [Give working title (in quotes) and the approximate completion date]
- E. Paper(s) presented at professional meetings: [Give title(s) in quotes; name of conference, city and state (or country) where held; when held].
- F. If you were a reviewer or if you held an editorship during the period, please list position and journals.
- G. If you received any honors, grants, or fellowships, please list them.

## Teaching

The Committee considers teaching as the one criterion that is invariant across rank. As such, it should be understood that teaching is considered to be a very important and central activity at all stages of a faculty member's career. Teaching is conceptualized as any activity that fosters and enhances transmission of knowledge to students.

Accordingly, teaching represents more than simply classroom contact hours. What happens outside of the classroom is also important. Such outside classroom activities include new curriculum and program development, creation of course materials, planning and adoption of innovative approaches to teaching, and utilization of technology to facilitate student learning.

The Committee recommends that Teaching evaluation be comprised of the following dimensions:

1. The classroom
  2. Curriculum
  3. Teaching materials
  4. Innovative approaches and the use of technology
- 
1. With respect to the classroom, the essential metric is student evaluations of the instructor. While an imperfect instrument, it does have some degree of validity and is used in most academic institutions. As well, peer evaluations, also imperfect, may be submitted as additional evidence of good teaching.
  2. Curriculum involves developing new courses and programs or improving upon current courses and programs. Typically this requires attention to what other schools of business are doing as well as how to accommodate to the changing demands of the marketplace.

3. Teaching material involves preparation of course materials such as syllabi, cases, written learning aids, audio and visual learning aids. Such material is intended for local distribution (i.e., Baruch College) and may be for the purposes of teaching one's own courses or for colleagues to use in the teaching of their courses. This does not include textbooks, which are considered to be part of scholarship.

4. Innovative approaches entail new forms of course delivery or course structure. Integrating technology involves such things as the use of distance education, Blackboard, using the internet to interact with students or providing one's lecture notes on the internet. Such innovative approaches and/or the use of technology will have a significant and positive effect on student performance.

Evaluation of teaching will therefore involve an assessment of a faculty member's *portfolio* of teaching accomplishments.

### Service

Service, broadly defined, refers to all activities faculty members engage in that are neither teaching nor research. Service ranges from things as simple and straightforward as making a presentation at an MBA open house, to something as complicated as chairing a search committee. A challenge for any process that attempts to rank faculty performance is to properly evaluate faculty service.

The significance of any service contribution must be evaluated within the context of the period in which it was performed. Serving on or even chairing a committee, can vary widely from year to year in time commitment and contribution depending upon what is on the agenda.

The Committee recommends that service be broken into the five currently employed categories: 1) Service to the Department; 2) Service to the School; 3) Service to the

College; 4) Service to the University; and 5) Service to the Community. Faculty members will list and describe service accomplishments by category on a form to be developed.

The Committee also recommends that the form be used to delineate any special duties the faculty member performed, e.g. chairing a committee, mentoring junior faculty, etc., to provide information that would ensure service is evaluated in the context of the particular year in question. This will permit the faculty member to explain any unusual responsibilities or duties the service entails in a given year.

With regard to the category “Service to the Community” this category is recommended to cover unpaid service to the academic community, broadly defined, such as assuming leadership roles in regional, national and international professional societies, and civic organizations

The Committee’s intention is that faculty who maintain a consistent presence in the School and work to build its reputation are deserving of recognition.

**Note on First Year Evaluation of Research, Teaching, and Service**

The Committee recommends, *for the initial year only*, that the previous three years of a faculty member’s performance be considered as a totality. In subsequent evaluations, while documentation on performance dating back three years will be submitted, only the previous year’s achievements will be considered.

Weights

The Committee recommends that the relative emphasis given to evaluation factors should change as a faculty member's career advances. The recommended weights for Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor ranks are presented below. Importance weights are based on a 10-point scale. For each rank, the weights sum to 10. A faculty member's performance score (4 through 0) in each area will be multiplied by the designated weight and summed to derive an overall performance index. This index, in comparison with the indices of other faculty, will determine the size of the annual award.

The Committee believes that, as an academic career develops, more emphasis should be placed on service, and less on measurable research output. *However, the Committee notes that the important contribution of mentoring research has been defined as a Service activity.*

The Committee also wishes to emphasize that these are *relative weights*. Thus, research, though always important, is assigned less value as compared with service commitments as a career develops. The Committee wishes to reward *leadership* in senior faculty.

**WEIGHTS**

	<b>Research</b>	<b>Teaching</b>	<b>Service</b>
Assistant Professor	5	4	1
Associate Professor	4	4	2
Full Professor	3	4	3

### **IV.3 Review Process**

The Committee's recommendations are intended to yield a review process that is voluntary, fair, depends to the extent possible on the use of objective criteria, and permits faculty performance to be evaluated on a school-wide basis.

A two-step evaluation process is recommended, the first step at the Department level, and the second at the School level.

The outcome of this process will be a school-wide ranking of faculty based on their performance indices, and a corresponding listing of faculty awards. The award amounts will be assigned, beginning with the top performer among the faculty, with additional awards calibrated proportionately downward to the minimum on the basis of relative performance, until the available funds in a given year are exhausted.

#### Step 1: Department Level.

Faculty who wish to be considered for awards will submit the required documentation for review by his or her Department Executive Committee using the criteria and weights specified within this report. Where appropriate or desirable, the Departmental Executive Committee will solicit additional input from those who can supply information on a particular faculty member's performance. The outcome of the Departmental Executive Committee review will be a ranking of faculty based on their performance rating indices. This ranking, including the performance index in each area and the overall weighted performance index for each faculty member, and all documentation submitted by each faculty member on which the review is based, will be submitted to the school-wide Executive Committee.

Step 2: School Level.

On receipt of submissions from the Departments, the Executive Committee of the Zicklin School will invite the Department Chairs, individually, and then the Dean, to comment and/or supply any additional information on the faculty performance outcomes contained in the Departmental submissions.

The Zicklin Executive Committee will then review all submissions, produce a school-wide ranking of faculty based on performance, and assign annual awards to eligible faculty members. In completing its work, the school-wide Executive Committee will observe the following guidelines:

1. Establish minimum and maximum award amounts through consultation with the Dean;
2. Review all faculty submissions from the Departments, including performance scores in specific areas and all supporting documentation and, if changes are considered necessary, shall make such changes in scores and ensure that Department Chairs are adequately consulted;
3. Share the resulting school-wide performance ranking and award amounts for individual faculty members, with the Department Chairs and the Dean;
4. Invite the Department Chairs and the Dean, individually, to discuss faculty rankings and/or supply additional information as necessary;
5. Submit a final school-wide listing of faculty members who will receive awards and the award amounts to the Dean; and
6. Produce a school-wide listing of faculty members who receive awards without the specific award amounts, plus a summary report of the number of awards by award amount, for distribution to the faculty.

## **Note on Participation of Members of Department and School Executive Committees**

When Department Executive Committee members are considered, in their respective Departments, for ranking, they shall absent themselves from the discussion and vote on their individual cases. In the case of the Department Chairs, the Dean shall conduct the performance assessments and make the determination of the amounts, if any, of the awards.

In the case of the School-level Executive Committee, the Dean shall conduct the performance assessments and make the determination of the award amounts, if any, in these cases.

### **IV.4 Timing**

The Committee urges that these recommendations be adopted, with revisions as necessary, during the Spring 2002 semester, so that implementation of the program can begin during the 2002-03 academic year. To facilitate this, the following timeline is recommended:

September 1	Faculty notice for preparation of performance review documentation (three years in '02-'03; one year thereafter)
October 15	Deadline for faculty to submit their performance review documentation to Departmental Executive Committee
February 15	Deadline for Departmental Executive Committees to submit performance review rankings and supporting materials to Zicklin Executive Committee
April 1	Dean reports to Zicklin Executive Committee on the available funding for school-wide awards
April 15	Deadline for Zicklin Executive Committee to submit school-wide ranking to Dean
May 15	Dean reports faculty awards and amounts to Department Chairs
July 1	Faculty awards announced

## **V. Department Chairs**

Given the substantial and unique duties and responsibilities of Department Chairs in addition to their role as faculty, the Committee recommends the following:

Chairs will first receive a minimum annual amount of 2/9ths of their annual regular salary for working in the summer. This minimum amount may be increased by the Dean based upon the Dean's written annual evaluation of each Chair's performance. The evaluation shall include performance of Chairs' duties, such as, but not limited to, leadership, management, recruitment, strategic planning, and faculty development, as well as performance of faculty duties including teaching, scholarly research, and meaningful service (apart from Chairs' duties), according to the same criteria as for all other faculty.

The effect of the foregoing is to eliminate any appearance of impropriety by assuring that Chairs' performance will not in any way be determined by the Chairs themselves or anyone under their supervision.

## **VI. Dean's Discretionary Fund**

The Committee recognizes that the Dean may wish to use his or her discretion to alter the award amounts assigned to individual faculty members as a result of this process, or to make awards to faculty who do not otherwise receive them from the available funding.

In certain unusual cases, the Dean may conclude that the magnitude of a particular award is unjustified and may use his or her discretion to cancel or revise an amount. It is understood that such intervention will be rare and requires that the Dean submit in writing to the Zicklin Executive Committee the reasons for such changes.

In other cases, the Dean may decide it is advisable to make retention support awards to faculty who otherwise do not receive them from the available funding. To facilitate this, the Committee recommends that the Dean, in consultation with the Zicklin Executive Committee, reserve a fixed percentage of the available funding for this purpose.

## **VII. Subsequent Review and Modification**

The Committee recommends that it review the recommendations contained within this report, and any processes and procedures that result, annually, for the first three years once implemented to ensure that consequences, impossible to foresee at the outset, can be considered in subsequent years.