

## Clark Honors College

### Merit Process

Revised June 2014, May 2016, May 2019

Initially Approved by the Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs: October 12, 2016

Revision Approved by the Office of the Provost September 9, 2019

#### Assumptions:

1. Merit pay will follow guidelines established by the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and the Office of the Provost.
2. The “faculty,” unless otherwise specified, is defined as tenure related (TTF) and non-tenure track Career faculty (Career NTTF).
3. The CHC Dean will make the final decisions, guided by CHC Merit Review Committee rankings and by evaluation of research by relevant departments/schools closest to the CHC faculty member’s discipline (see below #6 in Process section).
4. All TTF and Career NTTF faculty will be evaluated for merit, not just bargaining unit members.
5. Regardless of type of appointment or FTE, each TTF and Career NTTF faculty member is eligible for consideration for the highest merit rating.
6. The evaluation for merit will include any performance review(s) since the last merit raise.
7. All faculty who meet or exceed expectations will receive some merit increase. A faculty member must receive at least a “satisfactory” in every category under review to be considered as having met expectations.
8. For Faculty in Residence whose appointments are held outside the CHC, teaching and service will be evaluated according to the process in the CHC and the results of the evaluation, including both scoring and ranking relative to other CHC faculty, will be forwarded to the faculty member’s home unit along with a copy of this document for consideration in their merit process. The CHC neither determines nor is responsible for how the material furnished to the home unit is utilized for the purposes of merit.
9. Merit decisions for Faculty-in-Residence with appointments outside the CHC will be reviewed by the Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

#### Process:

1. A CHC Merit Review Committee will be formed to offer the Dean guidance on merit decisions.
2. The Merit Review Committee is composed of the Associate Dean for Faculty and senior faculty members (tenured associate and full professors) drawn from the CHC executive committee, including Faculty-in-Residence. If both faculty ranks (associate and full professors) are not represented on the executive committee, the dean will appoint a faculty member in the unrepresented rank. The additional member will become a full member of the Merit Review Committee. A Career NTTF at or above the rank of Career NTTF being reviewed will participate on the committee in the merit review of other Career NTTF.
3. All CHC faculty will provide to the Executive Assistant to the Dean a CV and short personal statement (2-3 pages) highlighting their accomplishments for the period under review.

4. CHC evaluation criteria for tenure-related faculty and Career NTTF are determined according to individual contract terms and related professional responsibilities unit policies.
  - A. Research. Faculty will be evaluated using standards of excellence drawn from international and national norms developed in the scholarly fields hosted in the appropriate University of Oregon disciplinary research departments in the humanities, social sciences and natural sciences. Research evaluations will be solicited from the relevant disciplinary department(s) for eligible CHC Core Faculty members whose primary appointment is in the CHC. Research evaluations for Faculty-In-Residence with primary appointments outside the CHC will be performed in the unit in which their appointment is held.
  - B. Teaching. The committee will evaluate teaching using a range of measures and instruments, including course evaluations, when included in the review period, student experience surveys, peer reviews, evidence of curricular innovation, willingness to tackle new course assignments, teaching awards, and commitment to advising and mentoring. Advising and student interaction in co-curricular activities will also be taken into account.
  - C. Service. Senior faculty members (tenured associate and full professors) are expected to provide evidence of leadership in significant, non-trivial service to the bargaining unit member's scholarly field, the university, and college. Probationary faculty members are expected to provide modest service. NTTF, Professors of Practice, etc., may also have different levels of service expectation depending on the individual contract or MOU, consistent with the CHC's NTTF Professional Responsibilities document and the CBA.
5. Faculty will be evaluated in each category (e.g., teaching, research and service, depending on their contract) based on the following scoring system:

4 Outstanding

3 Excellent

2 Satisfactory

1 Needs Improvement

0 Unsatisfactory

6. Faculty research will be assessed for faculty whose primary appointment is in CHC first by non-CHC disciplinary peers using the departmental committee in the research department/school closest to the faculty member's specialty. When a CHC faculty member shares an affinity with more than one department/school, the department/school to assess research will be chosen by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the CHC dean. The CHC dean will ask the research department/school to assess the research activity of CHC faculty affiliated with that department/school based on the CHC's point scale (outlined above) and to provide a short written review, including a ranking of their research within the department/school. These assessments are considered advisory to the CHC dean. The scholarly productivity of resident TTF faculty should parallel closely in quality, quantity, and pace that of tenure-related appointments in the relevant corresponding units, taking into consideration the specific teaching and service obligations of Honors College faculty members insofar as they differ from those of the corresponding units. Departmental/School assessments are separate and independent from the Merit Review Committee scoring and ranking. These scores are incorporated into the overall review as in point #9, below.

7. Research, teaching, and service will be assessed by the Merit Review Committee using the 0-4 point scale provided above.
8. The Merit Review Committee excludes itself from rating its members. The Dean compiles a separate rating on the same basis for each peer committee member.
9. Scores will be summed as follows using the proportion of the contract in each of the three possible (research, teaching, and service) categories:

$$\text{Total} = (\text{Research score} \times \text{Proportion Research}) + (\text{Teaching Score} \times \text{Proportion Teaching}) + (\text{Service score} \times \text{Proportion Service})$$

Individual sums will generate a ranked list of merit raise candidates.

Example:

Category	Research	Teaching	Service	
Weight	40%	40%	20%	
Prof X	2	2	1	
	(2 x 40%)	(2 x 40%)	(1 x 20%)	= .8 + .8 + .2 = <b>1.8</b>

10. The Merit Review Committee then meets and discusses this ranked list, analyzing each case and amending the ranking by vote, if necessary. The resulting ranking is then divided into ranking groups according to the increments of merit increase available. It is also divided into the distinct pools for each group of bargaining unit members.
11. The Merit Review Committee forwards its recommendation to the CHC Dean for consideration.
12. The CHC Dean makes the final decision on the distribution of merit pay, subject to the approval of the Provost.
13. Faculty will be informed of their merit increase after they have been approved.
14. Tracking of merit decisions will be conducted by the CHC Dean's office. Consistent with university records retention policies, the Dean's office will retain and store the materials associated with the merit review, which will include:
  - Evidence submitted by faculty and outside reviewers
  - Decisions of the peer evaluation committee
  - Decisions made by the Dean
15. Upon request, individual faculty members may obtain her/his own ranking as determined by the Merit Review Committee.