

**Merit and Equity Evaluation and Raise Procedures
Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies
Department**

**Policy reviewed and approved unanimously with
only minor changes in faculty meeting on
October 8, 2019**

**Revision approved by the Office of the Provost
October 17, 2019**

This document explains the procedures for evaluation of Tenure-track faculty (TTF), Non-tenure track-faculty (NTTF), and Officers of Administration (OAs) in the Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies Department at the University of Oregon for the purposes of distributing merit and/or equity raises. These policies supplement, and are intended to be consistent with, the policies set by the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the University of Oregon and United Academics. Where conflicts arise, these higher-level rules and policies apply. This document was created through considerable discussions in March and April of 2014 and adopted by the Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies Department in April 2014. It is modeled after policies in place in the Departments of Philosophy, International Studies, Anthropology, and other units.

Officers of Administration

The Department Head will request from the OA a statement of their most important accomplishments since the last raises were awarded. The Department Head will base the 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 will undertake such a review. The review should evaluate the OA's performance of the duties and responsibilities described in the OA's position description and their current job duties. While OA reviews are conducted by the Department Head, they should also consider, when possible, feedback from relevant constituent groups both internal and external to the Department. The Department Head's merit increase recommendation should 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.

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

Core Faculty

When the Dean authorizes performance-based (merit) and/or equity raises, WGSS will implement the following procedures for evaluation of core faculty members (TTF and Career NTTF):

Per our bylaws, a merit/equity review committee will include the department head

and two tenured faculty members. Core Faculty members will vote on the addition of the two tenured faculty members by paper ballot at a faculty meeting. The Department Head will collect and count the ballots at the meeting. Only in rare cases, and in consultation with the faculty, will exceptions be made to this process.

1. All WGSS faculty (with full or partial FTE) eligible for merit salary increases from the Department will submit a current CV that highlights activities since the last merit review period and a summary of no more than 1,000 words of activities in research, teaching, and service during that period. In the case of faculty with joint appointments who are evaluated in WGSS, all of their research, teaching, and service should receive full consideration. [see further explanation of this process below]
2. The merit/equity review committee will be convened by the Department Head and provided with the assembled files submitted by faculty, including faculty members' CV and summaries. The committee will review teaching evaluations and peer evaluations of teaching for each faculty member.
3. Based on this information, each member of the merit/equity review committee will evaluate faculty members' activity reports and use the scoring below on the WGSS merit evaluation worksheet to assess if faculty are below, meeting, or exceeding standards in each of three categories: research, teaching, and service.

1 = Does not meet/below expectations
2 = Meets expectations
3 = exceeds expectations
Total scores can range from 3 to 9.

The following metric will constitute the categories for the WGSS merit evaluation worksheet to be used by the individual members of the merit/equity committee and the committee deliberations:

Research

Publications (books, articles, etc.)
Research Activity (ongoing scholarship, public scholarship, etc.)
Professional Engagement (grants, conferences, papers, reviews, etc.)

Teaching

Service classes (large classes, FIGS, Gen Ed classes, etc.)
Teaching Innovation (new ways of teaching, grants, awards)
Teaching Awards
Evidence of successful teaching

Service

Departmental and University Committees
National and/or International Service (manuscript reviews for journals or presses, Tenure and Promotion cases for other universities, etc.)
Civic Engagement

4. The merit review committee will then meet to discuss, compare, and document their assessments, and they will decide on the final point-based scores in each category for every faculty member. The three scores will then be used to generate a total score. Each score will be based not in comparison with other faculty, but in relation to the general expectations for the relevant classification of faculty as stated in this document. The sum total score will determine the size of the recommended raise. Each of the three categories will be scored according to the metric on the WGSS merit evaluation worksheet described above.

5. This will result in a scoring table (see below). The tally will yield a total score for each faculty member that can then be transferred to a ranked list of merit candidates.

| | Evaluation (1, 2, 3) |
|----------|----------------------|
| Research | |
| Teaching | |
| Service | |
| Total | ----- |

OR:

*Research: 3
 2
 1
 *Teaching 3
 2
 1
 *Service 3
 2
 1
 Total: (sum of 3 scores)*

*Each faculty member will have only one score in each category, three scores to be totaled.

6. The committee will add up all the points for everyone in the pool and calculate a percentage score for each faculty member (the individual score divided by the total points in the pool). This percentage will then be multiplied by the total merit dollars available to determine the merit increase for each faculty member. All faculty meeting or exceeding expectations in one or more category will be eligible for a merit raise.

Example:

Person X: 2 for research
 2 for teaching

2 for service
Total = 6

Total points for pool (example): 30 points
Total merit dollars available (example): \$6293.00
Person X: 20% (6/30) .2 x 6293=\$1258.60 merit increase

7. Raises will be distributed by score, irrespective of the faculty member's base salary. With regard to merit, one's base salary is not a relevant variable, but it would become one if a merit increase, based on one's total score, were to be awarded as a percentage of a faculty member's current salary. Therefore, merit raises will typically be determined in dollar amounts and added to the base salary of individual faculty members, except when the committee agrees that percentage allocation, or a combination of percentage and dollar amounts, will aid efforts to avoid inversion or compression. All faculty members meeting or exceeding expectations in one or more category will be eligible for merit increases.
8. Each member of the merit/equity review committee excludes their self from these ratings. The Department Head will compile a separate rating based on the same criteria for each member of the committee.
9. If separate funds related to equity are made available to the Department, the Department Head will consult the committee to consider equity within ranks, across ranks, and between WGSS and comparator institutions.
10. The Department Head will use the results of these tabulations as the basis for their recommendation to the Dean for all pay raises based on merit and equity.
11. The Department Head and merit/equity committee will share the aggregated results of their evaluations and their recommendations to the Deans with the faculty. In addition, each faculty member will be informed of the dollar amount increase to their base salary that is a result of merit and/or equity. The committee will also let the faculty know the aggregate scores of the entire faculty, anonymously.

Where the assigned job duties or memorandum of understanding governing a faculty member's position does not conflict, teaching, scholarship, and service are treated as equal in weight, in recognition that the well-being of the Department and its mission depends equally on ongoing, high quality scholarship, excellence in and commitment to teaching, and willingness to do one's part in a wide range of service and administrative capacities.

The following general guidelines will be used for different classifications of faculty:

I. Tenure-track faculty
Research

The primary evidence of research by faculty will be their ability to share with others the results of their work. This will be determined primarily by the quantity and quality of publications in recognized journals or publication houses. A secondary consideration will be presentation of papers to interested groups (e.g., papers delivered at conferences, other universities, public lectures, campus groups outside the Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies Department). Number of publications is not to be taken as an end in itself. Of greater importance is the contribution of the faculty member's work to scholarship, research, or continuing discussion of issues in their field, or related fields.

Because the Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies Department includes faculty from diverse disciplines throughout the university, we will rely, if necessary, on the guidelines for scholarship that are used in each faculty member's other hiring unit or discipline.

Teaching

(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 low teaching evaluations or numerous negative comments by students. Above average performance can be established on the basis of favorable student evaluation, peer evaluation, and teaching awards. Relatively high class enrollment will be regarded as one positive factor, provided that it is not accompanied by grading above the University or Department averages or that it requires only minimal amounts of work by students.

Meritorious performance in teaching may be demonstrated in various ways:

- By a high level of teaching effectiveness, as indicated by peer and student evaluations (assessment of student evaluations will be attuned not simply to the overall satisfaction expressed, or to the absence of negative comments, but to the degree students have been challenged and have learned; peer evaluations will assess classroom skills and the care and effort put into teaching and course design).
- By the effective use of high quality, innovative or well-tested teaching materials and methods; through major revisions of course contents and materials, by attempts to incorporate new teaching methods and technologies, or by particular mastery of classic, sometimes labor intensive teaching methods, particularly those that are writing-centered.

- By significant contributions to curricular development and the willingness to develop or teach new courses.

The committee should also consider other teaching and mentoring duties (e.g. PhD dissertation committees, MA thesis committees, Honors College thesis committees, departmental thesis advising, etc.).

Faculty will be judged to have exceeded expectations if their teaching fulfills some (but not necessarily all) of the above criteria.

Service

Willingness to share in normal departmental duties such as committee assignments, student advising, etc., will constitute satisfactory service to the Department. Satisfactory performance in service is demonstrated by regular, conscientious participation in department meetings, at least modest, regular participation in departmental and university committee work, and some service activity beyond the university (as appropriate to the faculty member's rank). Even though we weight service equally with the other categories, our service expectations for junior faculty remain lower than for faculty at other ranks. Junior faculty will only be expected to meet the service obligations appropriate to their rank and will be recognized for all service, thereby receiving full consideration for the service category during the merit process.

With regard to service, the committee should consider the full range of a faculty member's contributions to the intellectual vitality of the campus. This should entail a consideration of the amount, the difficulty, and the centrality of departmental, college, and university service; and it should involve an examination of the "hidden" forms of service that faculty within WGSS are routinely expected to perform across campus.

TTF with joint positions

Minority appointment in WGSS. When those appointments are less than 0.5 FTE in Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies, or when a Memorandum of Understanding dictates, the Department Head from the faculty member's home department will send all review materials to the Department Head of WGSS, requesting information outlining the contributions of that faculty member to the teaching and service aspects of the Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies Department, as well as comments on interdisciplinary scholarship and research that may be of special importance to the Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies Department.

The Director or Head of that unit also should share with the Head of WGSS their merit evaluation prior to submitting it to the Dean of the appropriate school. If the Head of WGSS disagrees with the evaluation made by the Head of the unit with the majority appointment, the WGSS Head will consult with that Head to seek agreement, or if no agreement is reached, they will send a separate letter to the appropriate Dean regarding merit evaluation for that faculty member.

As the basis for this review, the Department Head will ask the faculty member to submit the same materials that they prepare for the tenure home department, including a current curriculum vitae. The faculty member should also submit a

short (one page) report of teaching, service, or research activities that pertain primarily to the Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies Department.

Majority appointment in WGSS. When a faculty member has an appointment that is greater than 0.5 FTE in Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies and no

Memorandum of

Understanding that states otherwise, Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies will be responsible for preparing and submitting a merit evaluation report to the dean of the appropriate school.

Each faculty member so identified will be asked to prepare a summary of their activities in teaching, research, and service for the relevant period and to provide a current curriculum vitae to the merit review committee, as described in the process above. In addition, the Department Head will solicit information from the unit in which the faculty member has a minority appointment regarding that person's research accomplishments, and their service and teaching contributions to the other unit.

The Department Head will share with the Head of the unit in which the faculty member has a minority appointment their recommendation for merit. If there is agreement between the recommendations of the two units, the Department Head will then submit a salary recommendation to the appropriate dean, when it is requested. The recommendation will be based on a review of the faculty member's teaching, research, and service.

If there is disagreement between the initial recommendations of the two unit leaders, they will seek agreement, and if no agreement is reached, each will send a separate recommendation to the appropriate dean regarding merit evaluation for that faculty member.

II. Career Non-Tenure Track Faculty

For NTTF faculty members, we will use the same criteria to judge teaching and service performance for NTTFs that we would use for TTF faculty members. These criteria, however, will be weighted in accordance with their specific job duties.

III. Pro Tempore non-tenure-track faculty

When merit increases are available for Pro Tempore faculty, the same guidelines that are used for career NTTF will be employed.