

**Principles and Procedures Used in the Department of Anthropology for Recommending Salary  
Increases, Merit and Equity Pay Increases (with instructions October 2019)**  
**Revision approved by the Office of the Provost on October 24, 2019**

Faculty in the Department of Anthropology have developed and follow the university guidelines that salary raises be allocated according to systematic principles and procedures determined in each unit with the approval of the Dean and the Provost. Instructional faculty (TTF and Career NTTF) and OAs shall be considered for merit raises. For TTF, merit increases shall be distributed on the basis of performance in the three realms of scholarship, teaching and service, in accordance with individual workload allocations. For Career NTTFs and OAs, performance will be rated according to contracted duties.

We make public the criteria and information on which salary increase recommendations are based; all TTF faculty members have developed their own information bases in accordance with the categories outlined in the Faculty Activity Report. The model for the Faculty Activity Report is periodically re-evaluated to ensure that it continues to serve as a useful model for understanding faculty accomplishments in the three areas of scholarship, teaching and service.

Procedures we follow for purposes of determining salary raise allocations are:

1. All eligible faculty must be evaluated for merit. It is not permitted to opt out.
2. Regardless of type of appointment or FTE, each faculty member is eligible for consideration for the highest merit rating.
3. All faculty who meet or exceed expectations will receive some merit increase.
4. Faculty will be informed of their raises after they have been approved.
5. The evaluation for merit includes review of both recent performance review(s) and the current CV.
6. The documentation of the merit decisions will be tracked and maintained for both TTF and NTTF.
7. A merit/equity raise (depending on specific circumstances) committee is named by the Chair of the Department; often the Executive Committee serves as the Merit Committee. The Merit committee in conjunction with the Chair of the Department makes available to the TTF the Faculty Activity Report guidelines, instructions for ranking eligible faculty members on their performance in the areas of research, teaching, and service, and merit rating sheet (attached). In addition, instructions are provided regarding which faculty are eligible for raises.
8. Rankings are based purely on perceived merit. The committee uses information for ranking that is provided by each TTF member in the Faculty Activity Report.
9. The merit/equity/raise committee ranks all eligible TTF members except themselves and the department chair and makes a recommendation to the chair for the distribution of funds.
10. The ranking and evaluation of merit/equity/raise committee members is done by the chair using advisory rankings provided by the merit committee.
11. The department chair is ultimately responsible for the department's recommendations to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.
12. Upon request, the department head shall notify any faculty member of the composite ranking generated for that raise cycle, based on all ranking submitted by the individual faculty members and the raise/merit/equity committee.

13.

### **OA Merit Increase Procedures**

The Department Head will base his/her merit increase recommendation on the performance reviews of the OA during the relevant evaluation period. If there has not been a performance review within the past year, the Department Head or Program Director will undertake such a review using the Structured Approach evaluation form provided on CASweb. The review should evaluate the OA's performance of the duties and responsibilities described in the OA's position description and his/her current job duties. While OA reviews are conducted by the Department Head, he/she should also consider, when possible, feedback from relevant constituent groups both internal and external to the department or program. The Department Head's merit increase recommendation should be based on the extent to which the OA has met or exceeded expected performance of her/his assigned duties and responsibilities, as indicated by the relevant performance reviews.

When requested, the Department Head or Program Director will provide the department's or program's merit increase recommendation to the CAS Dean. The actual merit award will be based on funding availability and university criteria.

### **NTTF Merit Increase Procedures**

The Department Head will consider performance reviews of the NTTF during the relevant evaluation period using the NTTF Merit Evaluation form found on CASweb. If there has not been a performance review within the past year, the Department Head will perform such a review to evaluate the NTTF's performance of the duties and responsibilities described in their contract language and his/her current job duties. The Department Head's merit increase recommendation will be based on the extent to which the individual has met or exceeded expected performance of her/his assigned duties and responsibilities, as indicated by the relevant performance reviews.

When requested, the Department Head will provide the department's merit increase recommendations to the CAS Dean. The actual merit award will be based on funding availability and university criteria.

Merit review will evaluate faculty for the period since the last merit review.

Merit review points are awarded as described in the instructions to Faculty below.

## **Department of Anthropology - Merit evaluation Instructions to faculty**

Faculty are evaluated in three categories: research, teaching and service. Research has 3 areas, teaching has 2, and service is a single area. Each area can receive a score between 0 and 3 (fractions of points are possible):

0 = performing below expectations

1 = meeting expectations

2 = performing above expectations

3 = exceptional performance

Expectations are based on the departmental guidelines for tenure and promotion.

### **RESEARCH (total possible 9 points)**

An active program of research is fundamental to a solid Department of Anthropology. Research, of course, pulls together different activities: the search for funding, gathering and analyzing data, and disseminating the findings. Each of these activities is valuable, and should be taken into account when rating the research efforts of faculty members.

#### **1) Grants, grant-writing, and awards (possible 3 points)**

It is expected that faculty members will be actively engaged every year in overseeing the administration of funded and on-going research, or in seeking funding for future research. Some credit should be given for submitted proposals, even if not funded. Awards from professional organizations and from the UO are evidence of exceptional merit.

#### **2) Research activity (possible 3 points)**

It is expected that faculty members will be actively engaged in research each year. This may involve data collection, data analysis and/or manuscript preparation, regularly presenting conference papers, and invited presentations. Consultancies, and other similar activities, are valuable; they may not, however, be given the same weight as academic research.

#### **3) Publications (possible 3 points)**

It is expected that faculty members will be actively engaged in producing peer-reviewed publications each year. Publications include: books, edited volumes, articles in scholarly journals, and book chapters. Output will vary. However, it is expected that faculty members will annually produce the equivalent of 1-3 peer-reviewed journal articles/book chapters. Site reports; technical reports; annual reports to granting agencies; reviewing books, journal articles or grants; editorships and other publication-related activities are not given the same weight as refereed journal articles, book chapters, edited books, or books.

### **TEACHING (total possible 6 points)**

Excellence in teaching is central to the mission of the Department of Anthropology. Good teaching can be assessed in myriad ways such as via numerical and narrative evaluations and peer reviews. For this

evaluation, two equally important dimensions are scored: scheduled courses and unscheduled teaching.

**4) *Scheduled teaching (possible 3 points)***

(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>)

It is expected that faculty will teach a full complement of courses each year, including one large class (over 120 students), responding to the curricular needs of the department. Exceptional performance might include teaching very large numbers of students, developing new courses, or offering crucial departmental courses. We also note effort to improve teaching such as participating in TEP events. Exceptional performance might also include receipt of teaching and curriculum development awards, development of a teaching web site, and/or preparation of teaching aides such as laboratory manuals or PLEs.

**5) *Unscheduled teaching (possible 3 points)***

It is expected that each faculty member will be actively involved in advising graduate and undergraduate students and serving on graduate student advising committees. Exceptional performance might be measured in co-authoring grants or papers with graduate students, advising undergraduate honors theses, or supervising student research.

**SERVICE (total possible 3 points)**

**6) *Service (possible 3 points)***

A strong Department of Anthropology must possess a viable committee structure; faculty are assessed on their quality participation in the university and department committee structure, professional organizations, and our non-academic communities. It is expected that all faculty members, regardless of rank, will participate in departmental committees and service activities. Additionally, all members of the department should serve the University through participation in University Governance activities or academic committees. Exceptional performance might include major leadership roles in the University, holding an office in a national professional organization (or section of such organization), serving on a committee for a conference organization, participating in community organizations, or giving educational public presentations. The quality of service is also evaluated.