

# Principles and Procedures for Determining Salary Increases Department of Biology

July 2019

Revision approved by Office of the Provost October 25, 2019

## (1) Background

On March 29, 2000, the University Senate approved a document entitled “University Senate Budget Committee White Paper: A Plan for Sustained Competitive Parity in Instructional Faculty Compensation”. The White Paper includes implementation guidelines for the distribution of salary improvement funds, including instructions on how funds shall be partitioned into cost-of-living adjustments (COLA) and merit increases. COLA increases are to be awarded to all faculty who perform satisfactorily. Merit increases are to be distributed based on “systemic principles and procedures” in each unit, consistent with goals set forth in the White Paper. These principles and procedures are to be developed by each unit and approved by the College of Arts and Sciences and Provost’s office. This document describes principles and procedures in the Department of Biology.

This document explicitly establishes the following:

- All faculty must be evaluated for merit. It is not permitted to opt out.
- Regardless of type of appointment or FTE, each faculty member is eligible for consideration for the highest merit rating.
- All faculty who meet or exceed expectations will receive some merit increase.
- The cut-off below which a faculty member is not meeting expectations is defined in section 2.
- Faculty will be informed of their raises after they have been approved.
- The evaluation for merit includes review of both recent performance review(s) and the current CV.

Documentation of salary increase decisions will be maintained in the Business Manager office via online and/or hard copy records to allow for appropriate follow up or review if questions arise.

## (2) TTF Reviews: Role of Personnel or Executive Committee

The evaluation of faculty for merit raises will be carried out by the Executive Committee, or by an ad hoc committee constituted specifically to deal with raises. The committee that will have the responsibility will be determined by the department faculty in discussion with the Head. The Executive Committee comprises the heads of each of the four research units within the department (Ecology and Evolution, Neuroscience, Marine Biology, Molecular Biology) or an appropriate representative appointed by the department head should

the research unit head not be a Biology faculty member. When salary improvement funds are made available by the administration, the evaluating committee (hereafter called simply the Committee) shall determine: (1) the period of time over which faculty shall be evaluated (e.g., the past three years), unless the review period is defined by the College or the Office of the Provost; (2) the relative weighting to be assigned to research, service and teaching in evaluating faculty performance; and (3) the format of the material to be submitted for evaluation (e.g., current CV, statement of accomplishments, etc.).

Explicit information regarding items 1 and 2 shall be provided in writing to faculty at the time that evaluative materials are solicited.

For most faculty, all three categories of performance (research, teaching and service) will be relevant for evaluation. However, the Committee may take into account special circumstances such as the rank of the individual, career awards or special administrative assignments. For example, junior faculty are not expected to be involved in college or university-wide committees (although they may choose to participate). Likewise, teaching load reductions for faculty on research career development awards shall be taken into account during merit evaluations.

The Committee shall determine the specific mechanisms for evaluating materials (e.g., numerical rating systems), but it shall be required that at least two Committee members read each individual's file, and each individual being evaluated shall be discussed at a special meeting of the Committee. If both COLA and merit funds are available for salary improvement, the recommendations conveyed to the Department Head shall be of two types: (1) An assessment of whether an individual's performance is satisfactory (i.e., appropriate for a COLA increase). The criteria for satisfactory performance shall be determined by the Committee and shall reflect performance above certain minimum criteria in the areas of research, teaching and service; (2) The individual's merit rating, based on the time period evaluated and the weighting of research, service and teaching as described above. The ratings by the Committee regarding faculty performance shall be provided in writing to the Department Head.

For faculty with administrative appointments (e.g., the Department Head), the Committee shall provide its recommendations directly to the College of Arts and Sciences. The Committee may choose to evaluate its own members, in which case the identity of the evaluators shall remain unknown to the individuals being evaluated and the recommendations shall be conveyed directly to the Department Head by the evaluators. Alternatively, the Committee may request that the Department Head evaluate Committee members.

### **(3) TTF Evaluation Criteria**

The general criteria used in the Biology Department to evaluate performance are similar to those used to evaluate faculty in connection with renewal of appointments, promotion, tenure

and post-tenure review. (see Department of Biology Promotion and Tenure review guidelines document)

The following issues are particularly relevant to Biology faculty.

### **(3.1) Research and Scholarly Activities**

- a. Publications of significance and quality.
- b. Recognized evidence of research excellence, including research grants, special awards and invitations to participate in research programs elsewhere.
- c. Invited participation in conferences, seminars, and professional meetings.
- d. Holding offices in professional societies or serving on professional committees or editorial boards.

### **(3.2) Teaching**

**(NOTE (Added by the Office of the Provost): For all reviews to be decided Fall 2020 or later, any 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>)**

- a. The overall quality of classroom instruction, including careful presentation of course materials, effectiveness of presentation, etc.
- b. Stimulation of student interest in doing high-quality work and maintenance of appropriate levels of student performance.
- c. Supervision and mentorship of students at the undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral levels.
- d. Revision of courses to keep them updated.
- e. The development of educational objectives and teaching and evaluative materials reflecting current scholarship in the discipline and in educational theory.
- f. Special recognition of teaching contributions, such as university or department teaching awards, or invitations to teach in nationally or internationally recognized programs.
- g. Student course evaluations if administered during the review period, including quantitative scores and written comments, and information from Student Experience Surveys if administered during review period. Numerical student ratings shall not serve as the sole evidence used to determine whether teaching is meritorious. Please also consider peer reviews and the faculty member's teaching statement (or any Instructor Reflections available) in addition to student comments from the old Course Evaluations or from the pilot Student Experience Survey, if available.

### **(3.3) Leadership in Academic and Administrative Service**

- a. Departmental, Institute or Group committees and activities.
- b. College of Arts and Sciences, University, or State system committees and activities.
- c. Service at the national or international level.

- d. Community services related to teaching or research (e.g., outreach activities).

#### **(4) Non Tenure Track Faculty Reviews and Evaluation Criteria**

Career Non tenure track faculty (and pro tem, and postdoc appointments if they are eligible for merit increases) may be asked to submit the following materials for review, as appropriate:

- a. An updated CV
- b. A listing of courses taught and description of notable curriculum development activities
- c. Service at the Institute/Program, Department, University, and national or international level
- d. One page summary of accomplishments

In addition, the Department Head will consider performance reviews of the NTTF during the relevant evaluation period. If there has not been a performance review within the past three years, the Department Head, with input from the Curriculum Director or supervising faculty member(s), 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.

#### **(5) Officers of Administration Reviews and Evaluation Criteria**

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 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 his/her 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 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 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.

#### **(6) Role of Department Head**

The Department Head shall be responsible for assessing recommendations from the Committee and making recommendations to the College of Arts and Sciences and Provost's Office regarding salary increases. The Department Head shall take into account the goals set forth in the Principles document and White Paper as approved by the University Senate.

**(7) Approval**

This document was originally approved by the full department faculty in October 2007. Changes to items specific to Officer of Administration and Non Tenure Track Faculty increases

were made in April 2013. Additional changes were made in April 2014 to further clarify the role of the Personnel or Executive Committee, and who is responsible for NTTF reviews. This document was reviewed and approved by the full department faculty in June 2014.



23 April 2014

---

Department Head Signature

---

Date