



Department of Comparative Literature
Merit Review Procedures for
Tenure-Track Faculty (TTF) and Non Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF)

Revised and Approved by Departmental Faculty May 28, 2014

This document details the merit evaluation policies and procedures for all tenure-related (TTF) and non-tenure-related faculty (NTTF), including career, adjunct and post-doc, in the Department of Comparative Literature.

The following policies apply to all faculty members in this department:

1. Each faculty member must be evaluated for merit; no one may choose to opt out.
2. Each faculty member who meets or exceeds expectations will receive some merit increase.
3. This document clearly expresses the criteria below which a faculty member is not meeting expectations.
4. Each faculty member will be informed of her or his merit raise after it has been approved by Academic Affairs.
5. Each faculty member is eligible for consideration for the highest merit rating regardless of her or his type of appointment or FTE.

Evaluation Criteria and Procedures for TTF

1. The Department Head will identify two tenured members of the Program Faculty to advise the Department Head in the evaluation of TTF for merit increase. Provided these faculty are themselves eligible for merit increases within Comparative Literature, they will be evaluated by the Head.
2. For faculty with joint appointments in other departments, merit recommendations will be subject to any guidelines specified in the Memorandum of Understanding governing that joint appointment.
3. Each eligible faculty member will submit a current *cv* highlighting professional accomplishments, courses taught and service commitments since the last merit review, or for the period as designated by the provost. In addition, faculty are encouraged to submit a one- to two-page Report on Professional Activities highlighting specific accomplishments, as well as any special challenges and

DEPARTMENT OF COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

5242 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-5242 T (541) 346-0934 F (541) 346-3240

<http://complit.uoregon.edu/>

An equal-opportunity, affirmative-action institution committed to cultural diversity and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act

setbacks since the last review. A template for this report is provided below in Addendum #1. Course evaluations and peer teaching reviews for each faculty member will be assembled by the office staff and made available to the Head and the Merit Review Committee.

4. In the evaluation of tenure-track faculty (TTF), the following criteria, which are consistent with the departmental guidelines for tenure and promotion, will be used by the Merit Review Committee for the assessment of the relevant areas:

Research: TTF are expected to meet or exceed expectations in research, teaching, and service. In the area of research, a faculty member who is not actively involved in ongoing research projects as demonstrated by a steady rate of publications and preparation of new work for publication (whether through submission or invitation) and through presentation of new research at regional, national, and international conferences and through invited lectures, would fall below departmental expectations. Paramount in the evaluation of a faculty member's research is evidence of active and ongoing scholarship, as measured by a record of publication. A scholarly monograph published by a professionally recognized press (which may include such non-university presses as Routledge, Brill, or Palgrave-MacMillan), is of the highest value, followed by articles published in peer-reviewed journals (print or electronic format). Book chapters should appear in volumes of the same quality and visibility as the aforementioned monograph. In each instance, the significance of the contribution to the faculty member's field will be taken into account. This same criterion (impact on scholarship) will also apply to critical editions, translations, as well as electronic research projects and tools. Additionally, presentations at professional conferences and invited lectures also qualify as evidence of ongoing scholarly activity, though these carry far less weight than publications in the overall assessment of a faculty member's research.

Teaching: The Department of Comparative Literature expects strong dedicated teaching and advising at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. TTF are also expected to share responsibilities for courses taught at all levels of the curriculum. In assessing teaching quality, the Merit Review Committee will examine the entire teaching profile, including the faculty member's record of course-development activity, supervision of independent work by graduates and undergraduates, and the mentoring of Graduate Teaching Fellows. The Committee will also review all available information on teaching performance, including (but not limited to) student written evaluations (signed), peer evaluations by faculty colleagues, student numerical evaluations, not to mention teaching awards. Ranking should be determined on both quantitative and qualitative grounds. For example, numerical course evaluations shall be taken into account, but not weighted more heavily than more qualitative considerations, such as whether the class exceptionally innovative or experimental, or whether it was it a large lecture course. TTF whose teaching evaluations are consistently lower than the

departmental averages and who do not seek to improve their teaching success through participation in the Teaching Effectiveness Program or through other remedial means would fall below departmental expectations.

Service. The Department of Comparative Literature attempts to limit committee assignments for untenured faculty, but all TTF are expected to participate in the full range of departmental deliberations at faculty meetings and in other decision-making contexts. Members who have been promoted to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor are expected not only to shoulder a greater burden where the operation of the department is concerned but also to serve on college and university committees, as well as service to other departments (search committees, exam committees, program evaluation committees, etc.). Associate and Full Professors are expected to serve, when asked, in such crucial roles as Director of Graduate Studies, Director of Undergraduate Studies, and Director of Pedagogy. Service to the profession, which may take the form of serving on editorial boards or the boards of professional organizations, reviewing manuscripts for presses, and reviewing personnel cases at other institutions, is also expected. TTF who do not participate equitably and responsibly in department service obligations would fall below department expectations for service. TTF are also expected to extend their service beyond the department to college and university committees. Consistent failure to do so would fall below department expectations.

5. On the basis of the information collected, the appointed faculty members (or the Department Head, for members of the advisory committee) will rank each eligible faculty member's performance in the categories of teaching, research and service, according to the following scores:
 - 4 Excellent (exceeds expectations; sets the standard for excellence)
 - 3 Very good (frequently exceeds expectations)
 - 2 Good (meets and occasionally exceeds expectations)
 - 1 Satisfactory (meets but does not exceed expectations)
 - 0 Unsatisfactory (does not meet expectations)
6. These ranking scores will be tallied, *with research, teaching and service given equal weight*. Untenured faculty who have been specifically protected from overwhelming service commitments will be held "harmless" for their comparatively lighter service load.
7. The Department Head will meet with the appointed advisory faculty members to compare rankings. The Head will provide a written summary of this discussion, which will become a part of the departmental merit review file.
8. For faculty on sabbatical or research leave, including unpaid research leave, research will be evaluated as departmental merit policy dictates. For terms with

- no assigned teaching as a result of a sabbatical or funded course release (e.g. through OHC or the Dean's office) or an external grant, then the faculty member will be evaluated as meeting teaching expectations during that term. If a faculty member is on sabbatical or unpaid research leave and so has no required service, the faculty member will be evaluated as meeting expectations for service during that term, though she or he may receive a higher rating based on actual service during that period.
9. Faculty on prolonged medical or family leave will not receive a merit increase for that period. However, any research published during a medical/family leave will be taken into account during the next merit review period after the leave so that faculty who have publications during illness do not lose the benefit of them in the merit process.
 10. The total points for all faculty awarded by the advisory faculty committee is tallied and subtracted from the total maximum points (12 X number of faculty under consideration). With further consideration of each individual's professional responsibilities and total contributions, the Department Head will award these remaining points at his/her discretion. (The total points earned by one faculty member may exceed 12).
 11. The merit increase awarded to each faculty member is calculated based on their total points earned (advisory faculty-assigned + department head-assigned) relative to a percentage of their base salary. The increase for faculty with less than 1.0 FTE will be pro-rated. The method used for this calculation is outlined in Addendum #2.

Evaluation Criteria and Procedures for Career NTTF

1. In cases of Career Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF), the Head will appoint a committee consisting of at least one TTF and, when possible, one NTTF at or above the rank of those being reviewed. However, if there are only two NTTF with the same FTE, *which is our current configuration*, then neither can participate in the evaluation.
2. For faculty with joint appointments in other departments, merit recommendations will be subject to any guidelines specified in the Memorandum of Understanding governing that joint appointment.
3. Each Career NTTF will provide, along with a *cv*, an activities report, outlining his or her work and accomplishments during the reporting period. The report should be restricted to the performance of those duties specified in their job-description, as well as activities that may enhance their ability to perform those duties.

4. The Head will meet with the appointed advisory faculty members to compare rankings. The Head will provide a written summary of this discussion, which will become a part of the departmental merit review file.
5. The evaluation of Career NTTF are weighted in accordance with the specifics of the position. Areas that may be considered, depending on the individual's position description, are as follows.

Teaching. The Department of Comparative Literature expects strong and dedicated teaching and advising at both the undergraduate and, where relevant, graduate levels. The Committee will also review all available information on teaching performance, including (but not limited to) student written evaluations (signed), evaluations by faculty colleagues, student numerical evaluations, not to mention teaching awards. Ranking should be determined on both quantitative and qualitative grounds. For example, numerical course evaluations shall be taken into account, but not weighted more heavily than more qualitative considerations, such as whether the class exceptionally innovative or experimental, or whether it was a large lecture course. NTTF whose teaching evaluations are consistently lower than the departmental averages and who do not seek to improve their teaching success through participation in the Teaching Effectiveness Program or through other remedial means would fall below departmental expectations.

Service. For Career NTTF whose position includes a service component, signs of satisfactory performance include a readiness to share in departmental duties such as committee work and student advising. Service on committees and work on projects or conferences within or beyond the department are deserving of special merit. Career NTTF who do not participate equitably and responsibly in department service obligations would fall below department expectations for service. TTF are also expected to extend their service beyond the department to college and university committees. Consistent failure to do so would fall below department expectations.

Professional Enhancement. This may take the form of research but also participation in forums, such as national conferences and workshops, that contribute to and enhance the individual's pedagogical or service profile.

6. On the basis of the information collected, the committee will rank each eligible NTTF's performance in the relevant categories according to the following scores:
 - 4 Excellent (exceeds expectations; sets the standard for excellence)
 - 3 Very good (frequently exceeds expectations)
 - 2 Good (meets and occasionally exceeds expectations)
 - 1 Satisfactory (meets but does not exceed expectations)
 - 0 Unsatisfactory (does not meet expectations)

7. The Department Head will meet with the appointed advisory faculty members to compare rankings. The Head will provide a written summary of this discussion, which will become a part of the departmental merit review file.
8. The Department Head's merit increase recommendation will be based on the extent to which the individual has met or exceeded expected performance of his or her 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.
9. The proportion of points earned by each career NTTF to possible points will be calculated. The amount of the merit increase will then be determined by the relative proportion of points earned and their relative proportional FTEs.

Evaluation Criteria and Procedures for Non-Career NTTF

The evaluation of Non-Career NTTF, including post-doctoral adjunct instructors, will follow the same criteria and procedures that apply to Career NTTF, with performance weighted in accordance with the specifics of their job-description.

Addendum #1

Professional Activities Report

Name

Present rank

Date appointed to this rank

Courses taught during the reporting period

Course development

Graduate-student committees

As chair

As member

Ungraduate-student committees

As chair

As member

Publications

Books

Edited Volumes

Articles

Work in Progress.

Papers presented at conferences

Invited Lectures

Awards

Service for the Department

Service to the College and University

Service to the Profession

Service on Editorial Boards (and related activities)

Addendum #2

The percentage of merit increases will be calculated as follows:

- A. The maximum number of points under consideration by the committee for each faculty member (“FAC POINTS”) is multiplied by the number of faculty.
- B. The total number of points awarded by the committee for all faculty is subtracted from A. The difference equals the number of points to be assigned at the department head’s discretion.
- C. The total points for each faculty member (awarded by the committee + awarded by the department head) is calculated.
- D. The “point proportion” is calculated for each faculty member as the total points earned (committee + dept. head) divided by “FAC POINTS.”
- E. The “effective proportional increase” is calculated:
 1. Each faculty member's salary is multiplied by the “point proportion” earned by that faculty member
 2. The sum of the salaries calculated in “(1)” is calculated.
 3. The amount of funds allocated to COLT for the merit increases is divided by “(2)” to calculate the “effective merit pool percentage.”
- F. Each faculty member's merit percentage increase in salary is equal to the “effective merit pool percent” times the “point proportion” as calculated in “D.” The sum of these increases will equal the amount of the merit increase pool.
- G. The amount of each faculty member’s increase is calculated by multiplying the percentage increase calculated in “F” by their base salary.
- H. The sum of these increases calculated in “G” will equal the amount of the merit increase pool.