

**AEI Policy and Procedures for Evaluating Performance
Spring 2014**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 0. Introduction (for merit review Spring 2014)
- 1. AEI Performance Standards
- 2. Components of the Annual Review of NTTF Career Track Faculty
 - 2.1 Personnel Responsible for Review
 - 2.2 Steps in the Review Process
 - 2.3 Contesting the Review
- 3. AEI NTTF Career Track Merit Increase Procedures
 - 3.1 AEI Career Track NTTF Merit Evaluation Form
- 4. Components of the Merit Review of Adjuncts
- 5. OA Merit Increase Procedures
 - 5.1 AEI OA Merit Evaluation Form – Structured Approach

0. Introduction

This document and other review policy/procedure information is posted on the AEI Blackboard site as a downloadable document. Since revisions will also be posted, it is advised that people always check the site for the most recent version. This document was last saved 5 June 2014. Academic Affairs will also post this document on their website upon approval.

When performance reviews are used for merit evaluations, all faculty and eligible staff will be informed of the amount of their increase (plus any COLA if any) by paper letter in the period shortly after the increase is approved. For the merit evaluations in Spring 2014, we review (whenever possible) materials documenting activity from January 1, 2008 through the end of Winter term 2014.

1. AEI Performance Standards

All faculty members are expected to meet the high standards of the AEI, in accordance with their status as adjunct or career faculty. 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 taken into account by a peer review committee and the Director. However, in general, all faculty are expected to demonstrate flexibility and versatility in teaching assignments and scheduling, as dictated by program needs; in addition, career faculty are expected to engage in activities that make a significant contribution to the field. In 2013-14, committees met to review and determine these procedures.

Performance expectations will not change unless there is specific notification to faculty at the beginning of the review cycle. In addition, individual expectations and goals are determined by each faculty member in conversation with the director at an annual review meeting so that each member of the faculty can know at the end of each review cycle what is expected of him or her.

- The following forms are meant to provide guidance and are not necessarily an exhaustive list of recognized service and research/ professional development. Each instructor’s personal narrative is also important.
- Performance is used in determining the level of merit pay increases (if any).
- 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).

2. Components of the Annual Review of NTTF Career Track Faculty

Instructor Portfolio. NTTF career track faculty must submit the following items to the peer review committee by early May of each review year. Each faculty member is responsible for making sure that the annual statement is complete and that it includes sufficient detail to let the peer review committee and the AEI Director know the nature and extent of work involved in all areas of review (teaching, administration, professional development and service). *Instructors are strongly encouraged to keep their own back-up copies of all relevant portfolio documents.*

[Note: There are sample forms for faculty use of each of the following documents, listed by document title, under Annual Review Materials on the AEI file server.]

1. **Updated vita.** Each year the University requires that an updated vita be part of each faculty member's personnel file. This information is not used for the review.
2. **In the third and sixth years, a Statement of Teaching and/or Administration, Professional Development and Service.** This report, written by the individual faculty member, supplies specific information in the areas of teaching and/or administration, professional development and service. This is necessarily of more interpretive than the vita. A sample form, with recommended areas for inclusion, is provided as a model so that faculty can uniformly supply a sufficient and appropriate level of detail. The annual statement includes self-evaluation and a description of goals.
3. **Evidence of participating in a formative teaching observation.** Each faculty member is required to participate in a formative observation (observing or being observed by a peer) each year. The formative observation may focus on a particular issue chosen by the observed or observing faculty member. A brief report should be submitted with the annual report describing the purpose of the formative observation, what was done, what was learned, who was involved, and the dates.
4. **Letters or documentation of professional work.** Any letters or documentation of professional work that the faculty member feels would provide additional relevant information to the review committee and the AEI Director, including but not limited to letters of commendation for service on a national committee, press clippings, or any other information the committee may not be aware of from the information above may be included in the review file.

In addition, the annual review committee will collect and add to the portfolio the following:

5. **Summative classroom observation(s).** The AEI has standard observation forms that are filled out by an observer from the Review Committee. These forms must be signed by both the observer and the faculty member observed. (Note that C1 and C2 instructors should have a minimum of five summative peer classroom teaching observations, ideally one per year, before going up for promotion in year 6 for Senior Instructor.) C1, C2 and C3 instructors may request additional summative observations if they have concerns about peer observations and/or student evaluations.
6. **Review(s) of Faculty by Administrators.** All directors, coordinators and advisors with administrative FTE submit completed and signed forms with comments about faculty (performance in situations where work either exceeds or falls below high expectations. In addition to being included in the annual review portfolio, copies of these forms will be given to the relevant faculty member and put in personnel files.)

7. **Review(s) of Administrators by Faculty.** All faculty are invited to fill out review forms for each individual with administrative FTE. Administrators will receive copies of these completed forms and, if the form is signed, a copy also goes into the administrator's personnel file. Unsigned forms are given to the person being reviewed. Review Committee and Director see only the signed forms, which are in the administrative faculty member's file.

Finally, the Office Manager will ensure that the following items are added to the instructor's review portfolio:

8. **Student quantitative class evaluations.** These are computerized printouts of quantitative student responses to the standard AEI student review forms passed out in all classes each term. There should be standard quantitative evaluations for each class taught.
9. **Student signed comment pages.** According to university policy, any signed student comments must be included in faculty files. (Comments that are not signed may not be included in the annual review portfolio; though front office personnel provide copies of all student comments, whether signed or not, directly to faculty.)

The peer review committee will use the annual "Statement of Teaching and/or Administration, Professional Development and Service", quantitative student class evaluation forms, signed student comment pages, summative classroom evaluations (if applicable), the Review of Faculty by Administrators form (if applicable), and the Review of Administrators by Faculty forms (if applicable) in the annual review process. All of these items must be in faculty files by early Spring so that the annual review committee can evaluate the instructors' contributions and forward a report to the Director.

2.1 Personnel Responsible for Review

Individual faculty members and the **office manager** are responsible for ensuring that individual files are complete and all materials have been submitted to the review committee by the deadline.

The annual review committee consists of four to six faculty members (see below). The review committee *implements* policy established by the AEI Director after discussion with the entire faculty. It *does not create* policy.

The AEI Director is responsible for meeting faculty members who either wish to meet with the director or who have reviews suggesting a discussion would be appropriate. The director maintains final discretionary authority over the review process and makes final decisions regarding rehiring, merit increases, and disputes arising from the review process.

2.2 Annual Review Committee

Committee membership: Every attempt is made to carry two committee members over from the previous year. All other C2, C3 and C4 faculty are listed on a ballot (unless individual circumstances prohibit someone's participation in a given year). An election is held in order to comprise a committee of 4 to 6 people. Serving on the annual review committee is valuable for both the committee members and the AEI as a whole. Committee membership provides faculty with a good overview of the wide range of teaching and administrative activities of AEI faculty, ensures that as a peer group the committee will be fair and be perceived as fair, and encourages continuous upgrading of the entire review process.

Workload: Review committee work is very time intensive. However, there is no release time from normal teaching, testing, and other faculty responsibilities, so faculty serving on the committee are encouraged to minimize other committee commitments. Participation on the review committee should be reported on the Annual Statement of Service.

2.3 Steps in the Review Process

1. The committee meets, reviews the information from each portfolio, and transfers pertinent information to the final review form.
2. The committee determines whether the faculty member's performance meets or does not meet expectations in the areas under review (teaching and/or administration, professional development, and service).
3. The committee gives written comments about strengths and areas for improvement, if applicable, in the key areas on the form. The committee members must sign the report.
4. The review is given to the faculty member for response and a required signature. There are two options for signing:
 - "I have read and accept the Review Report."
 - "I have read and do not accept the Review Report", which would be accompanied by reasons for the disagreement.
5. Once the review is signed by the faculty member, it is returned to the Annual Review Committee Chair. The original signed review form, whether accepted or not accepted by the individual being reviewed, must be returned to the committee by the time designated by the committee.
6. The annual review file including all reports is then passed on to the AEI Director.
7. The Director reviews the file and then drafts his/her own review report, schedules a meeting with the faculty member to discuss the review, and to set goals and directions for the coming year. After the meeting, the director finalizes his/her review report and gives it to the faculty member for response and signature. The same signature options apply as in point 4. Once signed, the Director's review report is placed in the professional file along with the committee's report.
8. Separately from the preceding steps, the annual review committee submits to the Director a tiered ranking of career instructors based on performance reviews for the year for the purpose of awarding merit raises should they become available.

2.4 Contesting the review

If a faculty member has questions or comments about the content of the Annual review Committee's report, the following should be done before passing the file on to the AEI Director (i.e. before point 6 just above).

The contesting faculty member should notify the review committee head within the time designated by the committee as specified in point 5 just above.

If relevant information has been omitted from the instructor's portfolio that could have affected the evaluation, this should be brought to the attention of the committee. Instructors are responsible for reporting all relevant information on their original annual statements; however, if they have overlooked something the omission can be corrected at this time. The committee will decide whether this additional information can be included after the fact and if it will change the final rating.

If a faculty member believes that the review report does not represent his/her real performance over the last year, he/she can do one of two things:

- Sign the line which specifies "I have read it and do not accept", document the concerns in writing at the bottom of the Review Report, and return it for inclusion in the personnel file
- Sign the line which specifies "I have read it and do not accept", document the concerns in writing at the bottom of the review report, and put a request for reconsideration in writing to the annual review committee chair along with a copy of the report.

Upon receiving a documented concern, the annual review committee chair will talk with the rest of the committee to see if reconsideration seems warranted. If so, the committee may make the change, ensuring that such a change does not require re-review of all other faculty. The changed form will then go back to the instructor and a copy will put into the instructor's file.

If the committee feels the review was fairly given and should not be changed, the faculty member will be notified in writing and a copy of the annual review report will be submitted to the personnel file.

Finally, the review committee report, and whatever additional memos the instructor, or review committee would like to see included, are added to the review file.

If the recipient is not satisfied with the AEI Director's review report (i.e. stemming from point 7 above), the following procedure should be followed:

1. The faculty member follows the signature options described above and gives a written request to the AEI Director, specifying the area(s) of dispute and requesting reconsideration. This may include another meeting with the Director.
2. The Director reads through the file again and decides whether to change the report or let it stand.
3. The faculty member must then sign, but may append a statement.
4. If the faculty member is still not satisfied, he/she may pursue the matter through the university grievance procedure outlined by Academic Affairs (cf. the Provost's office).

3. AEI NTTF Career Track Merit Increase Procedures *(not including those reclassified from Adjunct status in AY13-14)*

The Associate Department Head and Program Director 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 Program Director 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 Associate Department Head or Program Director'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 Associate Department Head or Program Director 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.

**3.1 AEI Career-track NTTF Merit Evaluation Form
Faculty Evaluation Process 2013-2014**

	(3) Exceeds Expectations	(2) Meets Expectations	(1) Below Expectations	Weight (Must = 100%)
Teaching				70%
Service				15%
Professional Development*				15%
Other **				

** Please describe _____
Avg.

The typical AEI career-track NTTF appointment at 1.0 FTE is weighted as 67% for Teaching and a combination of expected service and expected professional development should equal 33%.

A full administrative appointment at 1.0 FTE is weighted as : 67% for “Other” (i.e the administrative duties).

Any other combination of teaching/administration at 1.0 FTE is weighted based on the individual’s FTE for each area. For example, an individual might have 33% for teaching, 33.5% for administration, and 33% for Professional Development/service outside the administrative duties.

- Professional Development is defined as: Presentations at a conference or workshop, publications, doctoral studies, university coursework, and significant continuing education.

The complete forms for the annual Review Committee are found on the AEI Blackboard site.

4. Components of the Merit Review of Adjunct (and those recently reclassified to Career Track) for Spring 2014

AEI Adjunct Instructors are hired to fulfill temporary teaching needs of the AEI, typically on a term by term basis. To receive a new contract, satisfactory peer and student teaching evaluations, and evaluation of fit with the mission and needs of the AEI, are critical. At the conclusion of each academic year, an annual review is conducted prior to determining whether another contract will be issued. Renewal is also contingent on program enrollment and need. Note that those who have recently been reclassified to a career-track appointment from an adjunct contract status will be evaluated at this time by the same standards as those not being reclassified as both were fulfilling the same job descriptions during the period of evaluation.

For the annual review process, NTTF adjunct and reclassified faculty submit the following by 9 May for inclusion in their professional files. This will initially be evaluated by a committee of career-track AEI instructors -- both those newly reclassified (recusing themselves as appropriate) and those already holding career-track appointments

- An updated CV, dated and signed
- A narrative summarizing teaching and related activities as well as future goals

The following documents are also included in the professional files:

Summative classroom observation(s): NTTF adjunct faculty have one or more summative teaching observations by a Summative Observation Committee (comprised of career track faculty) each year. If the instructor is in the Intensive Program, the instructor typically has a summative observation in both an Oral Skills and a Reading/Writing/Grammar course. If the instructor is in the Academic English for International Students Program, the instructor typically has a summative in a writing course as well as one other non-writing course.

Formative observation forms: NTTF adjunct faculty are also required to participate in a formative observation (observing or being observed by a peer) each year. The formative observation may focus on a particular issue chosen by the observed or observing faculty member. A brief report is submitted with the annual report describing the purpose of the formative observation, what was done, what was learned, who was involved, the dates, and signatures.

Student quantitative class evaluations: These are computerized printouts of quantitative student responses to the standard AEI student review forms or University of Oregon online evaluation process. The director submits these to be included in the instructor's professional file at the end of each term.

Student signed comment pages: According to university policy, any signed student comments must be included in faculty files. The director submits these to be included in the instructor's professional file at the end of each term.

In May of each year, the director reviews the adjunct faculty member's file. If there is any perceived need to meet or if the faculty member wishes a meeting, the director schedules a meeting with the faculty member to discuss his/her teaching and teaching related activities at the AEI and future goals. After the meeting, the director writes a summary of the discussion, provides a copy to the instructor, and places the original in the instructor's professional file. The faculty member has the option of submitting a written response to the director, which is also included in the professional file.

The complete forms for the Review Committee are found on the AEI Blackboard site. Please note that the merit evaluation form is for Spring 2014. A faculty committee will form and recommend changes in the next academic year.

5. OA Merit Increase Procedures

The Associate Department Head of Linguistics and the AEI Program Director base their merit increase recommendation on the performance reviews of the OA during the relevant evaluation period. AEI OA reviews are a combination the UO Human Resources Conversation Approach and the Structured Approach evaluation procedures. The review evaluates 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 Program Director, they also consider, when possible, feedback from relevant constituent groups both internal and external to the department or program. The Associate Department Head and the AEI Director’s merit increase recommendation is 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 AEI 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.

**5.1 AEI OA Merit Evaluation Form – Structured Approach
OA Evaluation Process 2012 – 2013**

Performance Rating	3 Exceeds Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	1 Below Expectations	Weight (must = 100%)
Overall Performance Rating that best reflects combined performance and results		2+		100%

Criteria for exceeds, meets or below expectations are defined on the UO Human Resources “Structured Approach Performance Management Planning and Review Form”.

The merit rating (somewhere between 1, 2, 3) will be based on calculating an average of the individual assessments from the "Structured Approach" form available on CASWeb, and [if necessary] rounding to the nearest whole number.