

## **AEI Merit Review Guidelines**

Updated October 25, 2019

Revision approved by the Office of the Provost – October 31, 2019

### **Introduction**

The purpose of this document is to outline the Merit Guidelines. This document, and other review policy/procedure information, is posted in the AEI Public Folder on the AEI Server as a downloadable document. The Office of the Provost will also post this document upon approval to their website, which will be the official version.

Merit applies to both Career NTTF and Officers of Administration (OA) and is defined for these purposes as professional performance that meets or exceeds expectations. For Career NTTF , that performance is in the categories of teaching (90% of workload) and professional development/service (10% of workload). For Career NTTF holding administrative roles, FTE may be variable across teaching, administrative, and professional development/service. A scale consisting of Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations will be used.

1. All Career NTTF and OA's must be evaluated for merit. It is not permitted to opt out.
2. Each Career NTTF member and OA is eligible for the highest merit rating.
3. All Career NTTF and OAs who meet or exceed expectations will receive some merit increase.
4. Career NTTF and OAs will be informed of their raises after they have been approved by the UO administration.
5. The evaluation for merit includes review of current CV and the most recent review. This may be the Annual Review document (until 2018) or the Teaching Excellence Checklist (from the faculty review) starting in 2019.
6. In developing final recommendations for OAs, the Executive Director reviews the record of past salary increases to determine whether there are inequities in need of redress, and acts appropriately within the constraints of the funds available and other priorities. For Career NTTF, merit funds cannot be used to address equity issues in the department.
7. The documentation of the merit decisions will be tracked and maintained for NTTF by AEI's Assistant Director of HR.
8. When relevant, clarifications published by the Provost's Office will supplement this document, for example: <https://provost.uoregon.edu/process-clarification-fy-2018-faculty-merit-process>
9. Earning merit does not automatically guarantee promotion.

## **Procedure**

1. Each merit cycle, the University of Oregon will allocate specific pools of money to the AEI for merit for each job classification.
2. In years when Merit is offered, HR in AEI will share the most recent CV (submitted annually) and the most recent faculty review – either Annual Review (until 2018) or Teaching Excellence Checklist (starting 2019) on behalf of each Career NTTF with the Executive Director.
3. Using the most recent review, the Executive Director will determine merit percentages using Annual Review Scores (through 2018) or ranking the checklists into categories (exceeds in zero, one, two, or three categories) and calculating merit accordingly.
4. The Executive Director will finalize merit for the faculty during the relevant evaluation period using the “NTTF Merit Summary” form provided by the CAS Dean’s office (currently found on CASWeb at <https://casweb.uoregon.edu/nttf-merit-summary>).
5. When requested, the Executive Director will provide the department’s merit increase recommendations to the CAS Dean’s Office. The actual merit award will be based on funding availability and university criteria.
6. Upon request, the department head shall notify any Career NTTF of the composite ranking generated for that raise cycle, based on all ranking submitted by the individual faculty members and the Merit Review Committee.

## **Criteria**

The Executive Director uses the most recent review and CV. Review metrics are meant to provide guidance and are not necessarily an exhaustive list of recognized service and research/ professional development.

All faculty members are expected to meet the high standards of the AEI, in accordance with their status as Career NTTF. There is no one prescription for what constitutes “meeting the high standards of the AEI.” The wide variety of efforts in the areas of teaching and administration represented by the faculty, along with the varying significant contributions that individual faculty members make to the overall well-being of the AEI, will be considered.

### ***TEACHING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT, & SERVICE (90/10%)***

(NOTE (Added by the Office of the Provost): For all reviews to be decided Fall 2020 or later, this entire section and any other references to standards or metrics for teaching quality are replaced by Section 9 of the August 2019 MOU between the university and United Academics that defines standards for teaching quality. The standards defined in the MOU are to remain in place unless and until the unit modifies those standards in accordance with the MOU and the CBA defined process for modifying unit policies. MOU can be found at <https://hr.uoregon.edu/ua-mou-course-evaluations-article-20.pdf>)

Satisfactory teaching by faculty is assumed in the absence of recurring or numerous negative comments by students.

The Executive Director will use either Annual Review's (until 2018) or Teaching Excellence Checklist's (starting 2019) criteria to determine if the Career NTTF under review exceeds expectations in three, two, one or no categories, and then assigns a rating of "Below, Meets or Exceeds expectations" accordingly. The Teaching Excellence Checklist is included as an addendum to this document.

The details of activities are still held to be important (e.g. for purposes of determining merit, presenting at a national conference may be considered more prestigious than presenting at a local conference, or a short review or teaching tip-type publication may be considered less prestigious than a journal publication).

### ***FACULTY ADMINISTRATION OR PROJECTS (variable FTE)***

Faculty holding administrative roles or project assignments are using their unique skills or talents, expertise, educational insight, and/or student connections to succeed in their roles. Performance of faculty administrators will be based on the feedback received during the annual review of their roles. Performance on projects will be evaluated based on the successful progress or completion of the assigned task(s). These duties may include a grant, curriculum development project, or program development, for example.

#### **Adjustments for Faculty with Varying Types of Appointments**

1. New appointments will be eligible for merit but may receive less merit because they do not have as much performance to review.
2. Faculty on joint appointments will be evaluated according to the percentage of their work dedicated to AEI in the MOU. Merit reviews for salary increases are conducted separately in each department according to each department's internal procedures, and the amount of merit increase determined in each unit will be applied in proportion to the faculty member's appointment in each unit, respectively.
3. Faculty on professional leave (Fulbright, special projects abroad, etc.) will be judged as having met teaching expectations during the terms of their leave in which they have no assigned teaching in the program. Faculty members who are on leave and have no required service will be evaluated as having met service expectations during the terms of the leave.

### ***OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION***

The Executive Director (or other OA supervisors) will base merit increase recommendations on the most recent annual performance review, a current CV, and any pertinent materials submitted that were not captured during the OA's relevant evaluation period.

The merit increase recommendation for each of the department's OAs will be based on the extent to which the OA has met or exceeded expected performance of their assigned duties and responsibilities, as indicated by the relevant performance reviews. The Executive Director will provide the department's merit increase recommendation to the CAS Dean.

The Executive Director's merit recommendation will be based on the extent to which the individual has met or exceeded expected performance of their assigned duties and responsibilities, as indicated by the relevant performance review.

## **ADDENDUM**

### **Teaching Excellence Checklist**

**Purpose** = To determine the degree to which a faculty member has met the criteria of teaching excellence. Forms the basis for conversation between faculty member and Executive Director and subsequent letter sent to CAS and also as input for contract renewal and merit.

**Process** = This needs to be completed and submitted once per contract period by each faculty member; PDF that is standardized and fillable (online document to be created by AEI HR; forthcoming.) so that everyone is using the same format; if less than 1.0FTE on average for the contract period, the items will be prorated in the Engaged Teaching & Service section.

**Source** = Based on UO's Teaching Engagement Program & Senate Task Force Teaching Excellence Criteria and customized for AEI's departmental needs.

<https://tep.uoregon.edu/teaching-excellence>

#### **1. Inclusive Teaching**

**Inclusive teaching is defined by the following teaching behaviors:**

- A. conveying that each student matters and brings valuable assets to the class ("yes" is enough)
- B. ensuring that the course materials reflect racial, ethnic and gender diversity (one example that is summarized in a few sentences)
- C. recognition and inclusion of the contested and evolving status of knowledge in the discipline (one example that is summarized in a few sentences)
- D. knowing students' goals for their learning and finding ways to explicitly link the coursework to students' own interests and concerns (one example that is summarized in a few sentences)
- E. maximizing student motivation by ensuring students are both challenged and supported ("yes")
- F. using student's preferred names ("yes")
- G. using multiple modes of communication (one example that is summarized in a few sentences)
- H. showing sensitivity to cultural backgrounds (one example that is summarized in a few sentences)
- I. other

**Criteria for evaluation:**

*Below Expectations:* There is evidence for four or fewer of the described inclusive teaching behaviors and/or there is little to no evidence of continual improvement in this area of teaching.

*Meets Expectations:* There is evidence for five or more of the described inclusive teaching behaviors in most courses and/or there is substantial evidence of continual improvement in this area of teaching.

*Exceeds Expectation:* There is evidence for all of the described inclusive teaching behaviors in almost every course regardless of class size and content area.

## 2. Engaged Teaching & Service

**Engaged teaching is defined by the following behaviors:**

- A. inviting and responding to a Midterm Student Experience Survey (yes)
- B. completing Instructor Reflection (yes- This is the same thing as what's required for Faculty Review piece #2)
- C. attending a workshop or presentation about teaching (list all or the most impactful)
- D. serving as a teaching mentor for a junior faculty or graduate student (explain)
- E. hosting classroom observers (who/when)
- F. performing a peer evaluation for another's class (who/when)
- G. inviting additional peer evaluation of your class beyond minimum expected (who/when)
- H. Self-evaluation of teaching using a video recording of your class (when-- This could be the same thing as what's required for Faculty Review piece #3)
- I. participation in teaching related journal club, book club, lesson study, or other group (list all or the most impactful)
- J. serving as an active member of the Provost's Teaching Academy or TEP faculty learning community fellow (specify which)
- K. new course development, or conversion of face to face class to hybrid or online experience (specify)
- L. curriculum development or renewal (specify)
- M. provided campus, national, or international workshop or presentation of current teaching practices (specify)
- N. involved in publishing scholarship of teaching and Learning (SoTL) or discipline-based education research (DBER) (specify)
- O. participation on unit or university committee, or involvement in professional organization (list all or the most impactful)
- P. teaching more than two preps in a term (which term and which preps)
- Q. teaching more than three new preps over the course of the academic year (which new preps)
- R. grant writing (list all or the most impactful)
- S. other

**Criteria for evaluation:**

*Below Expectations:* There is evidence for the following number of described engaged teaching & service behaviors per contract period:

- @ .1-.49FTE, below 2
- @ .5-.67FTE, below 3
- @ .68-1.0FTE, below 4

*Meets Expectations:* There is evidence for four of the described engaged teaching behaviors per contract period.

- @ .1-.49FTE, 2 would meet
- @ .5-.67FTE, 3 would meet
- @ .68-1.0FTE, 4 would meet

*Exceeds Expectations:* There is evidence for six or more of the described engaged teaching behaviors per contract period, or participation in the equivalent of a 5-day intensive teaching development program.

- @ .1-.49FTE, 3 would exceed
- @ .5-.67FTE, 5 would exceed
- @ .68-1.0FTE, 6 would exceed

### **3. Research-led Teaching**

**Research-led teaching is defined by the following behaviors:**

- A. communicating compelling goals for student learning and designing courses tightly aligned with those goals (backward design) (yes)
- B. clearly conveying the compelling purpose, process for completion, and criteria for evaluation of class assignments before students begin work (transparency) (yes)
- C. building occasions for student reflection about their own learning process, challenges, and growth (metacognition) (one example that is summarized in a few sentences)
- D. infusing the course with your own experience as a scholar and cutting-edge research (applying current research findings to your classroom) (one example that is summarized in a few sentences)
- E. engaging students in a course-based research experience (yes)
- F. using students' time in and out of class strategically by (check off which of the following you use)
  - i. assigning preparatory work to get more out of class time
  - ii. using class time to harness the power and energy of the peer community to share demonstrations, real- time experiences, new scenarios, problems, artifacts, and complications that put students' knowledge and skills to the test
  - iii. following class with opportunities for reinforcement and reflection
  - iv. giving students simple, helpful feedback on low-stakes practice
- G. helping students understand the process of inquiry and expert thought through think-a-loud protocols (modeling your own thought processes for students) (yes)
- H. redesigning aspects of courses based on evidence of student learning (yes)
- I. other

**Criteria for evaluation:**

*Below Expectations:* There is evidence for four or fewer of the described research-led teaching behaviors and/or there is little to no evidence of continual improvement in this area of teaching.

*Meets Expectations:* There is evidence for five of the described research-led teaching behaviors in most courses and/or there is substantial evidence of continual improvement in this area of teaching.

*Exceeds Expectation:* There is evidence for six or more of the described research-led teaching behaviors.