

Department of Linguistics Salary Increase Procedures

Approved by the Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs: October 19, 2016

Updated January 3, 2017 by adding final section on procedures for OA.

Approved by the Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs: January 4, 2017.

This document will be available to all Linguistics TTF and NTTF in the Department office.

The current merit increase process will take into account activity since the last merit evaluation.

The Department of Linguistics maintains internal policy and procedures aimed at an equitable and merit-oriented salary distribution, while responding well to retention issues, compression issues, and other long-term concerns in a flexible and responsible manner. The process described below is consistent with both Senate Budget Committee recommendations on salary increases and with general UO criteria for excellence in research, teaching, and service.

Preamble

The following policies apply to all Career NTTF and TTF faculty members in this department/program: Each faculty member must be evaluated for merit; no one may choose to opt out. Each faculty member who meets or exceeds expectations will receive some merit increase.

This document clearly expresses the criteria below which a faculty member is not meeting expectations.

Each faculty member will be informed of her or his merit raise after it has been approved by Academic Affairs.

Each faculty member is eligible for consideration for the highest merit rating regardless of her or his type of appointment or FTE.

Criteria: Research, Teaching, and Service

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. TTF and 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. TTF and 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.

Merit Criteria for TTF

Merit-based salary increases for TTF in the Department of Linguistics require demonstration of genuine achievement in each of the traditional areas of academic performance: research, teaching, and service. For strong faculty in a strong department it is expected that one will develop a record of superior scholarly research, excellence in teaching, and strength in institutional and public service.

Research (40%)

It is expected that a tenured or tenure-track faculty member will develop a mature program of independent, scholarly research. The most important evidence to demonstrate achievement in scholarly research is a series of quality publications that are judged significant through peer review and publications in appropriate, strong venues. In our field, it is ordinarily expected that one would publish at a rate of about two substantive articles per year. Book publication would be equivalent to something like 6-8 substantive articles. Secondary evidence of scholarly excellence includes successful grant efforts and invited lectures and conference participation.

Teaching (40%)

The department values good teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate level; moreover the department expects that faculty will share department responsibilities for classes taught at all levels.

In assessing teaching quality, the department relies on a variety of sources: numerical data compiled from student course evaluations; signed written comments on student evaluations; peer review of teaching effort; participation and effectiveness in individual student supervision, especially at the graduate level; preparation of published and unpublished teaching materials.

Service (20%)

The department expects its members to participate responsibly and cooperatively when called upon for service in the department, but in the end service counts significantly less in consideration for salary increases than the other areas. Still, all faculty should contribute to the service needs of the department, the university,

and the field at large. Untenured faculty are not expected to take on very much service work; average or satisfactory service at the junior level is set at a lower threshold than for tenured faculty.

Service in the department includes formal roles of undergraduate advisor, graduate advisor, and admissions work as well as contributions to the smooth and efficient running of the department matters, including participation in department meetings, and various ad hoc activities as needed.

Service to the university includes participation in elected and appointed CAS and university committees. It is recognized that service on the DAC, FPC, FAC, University Senate and such represents a particularly important service contribution to the larger university.

Service in the field is also important. The department recognizes grant reviews, manuscript evaluation, conference organization, and service on national committees as good examples of service to the field.

Procedures for Merit Evaluation for TTF

In general, the department uses a two-step process with a recommendation to the head from a department personnel committee followed by a recommendation to CAS from the department head.

(1) The faculty select by consensus a personnel committee composed of two faculty typically one senior and one more junior faculty member. This committee reviews materials provided by each faculty member and makes a recommendation on the increase for each faculty member along with a brief evaluation of performance for the review period in each of the three areas: research, teaching, and service.

(2) Each faculty member submits to the head an updated vita and a brief report of service for the period since the last merit raise evaluation. The head conveys this material to the personnel committee.

(3) The personnel committee evaluates the efforts of each faculty member in each of the three traditional areas of activity: research, teaching, and service. As it reviews the submitted materials, the personnel committee prepares a written evaluation of performance along with a qualitative analysis of comparative effort on a simple three point scale: **AVERAGE, SIGNIFICANTLY ABOVE AVERAGE, SIGNIFICANTLY BELOW AVERAGE.**

(4) Dollars allocated to the department are divided into three pools: 40% for research, 40% for teaching and 20% for service. Each pool in turn is divided by the number of eligible faculty to determine an average increase for that area of activity. Thus, if there were \$20,000 available for salary increases, then \$8,000 would be devoted to research, \$8,000 to teaching, and \$4,000 to service. With 8 eligible faculty, the average increase in each area respectively would be \$1,000, \$1,000, \$500.

(5) The department head arrives at dollar recommendations as follows. Any performance in an area rated significantly below average receives no increase for that area. Any performance rated average in an area receives an increase for that area, though this may be pro-rated as follows. Any performance that is rated significantly above average receives a larger than average increase for that area, where the dollars for this are drawn first from dollars available from below average ratings and secondarily by reducing somewhat the size of average increases.

(6) The department head receives the recommendations of the personnel committee for further review. The head conducts a performance review of the two members of the personnel committee and adds this to the overall summary of performance. This performance review will take into account the annual review of non-tenured faculty, and 3-year reviews of senior TTF, which are conducted by the Department Head in accordance with College policies. The head will also review and may adjust for good reason the recommendations of the personnel committee. The head then makes final recommendations for salary increases based on this overall analysis and consistent with the process for dollar applications described in (5).

Criteria and Procedures for Merit Evaluation for NTTF

Non-tenure-track faculty in Linguistics have specific job assignments which differ in the proportion of teaching and service obligations required. Research in the traditional sense is not part of any existing NTTF assignment, but professional development activities are encouraged and can be considered in evaluating merit.

The majority of NTTF's teaching in linguistics are full-time NTTF in the American English Institute who teach one or two courses as needed in the Language Teaching Specialization MA program. These faculty have their full-time home in the AEI, and will be evaluated there; at the request of the AEI Linguistics will provide evaluations of their teaching in Linguistics according to the same criteria as other faculty.

NTTF's whose appointments are fully in Linguistics have significant administrative as well as teaching responsibilities, e.g. the Director of the LTS MA program, or faculty responsible for language programs housed in Linguistics such as Swahili. For each position merit will be assessed based on the criteria of teaching, service, and professional development, but weighting of these criteria will differ for different positions. For example, Swahili Instructor is primarily a teaching position, and administration of the program, while important, is expected to require less time and effort than teaching. LTS Director, on the other hand, has specific teaching requirements, but the primary responsibilities of the position are administrative.

Criteria: Teaching, Service, and Professional Development

- Evaluation of teaching is based on quality of classroom teaching, teaching-related duties, and materials development.
- Examples of professional development activity include: writing a resource book or having articles or reviews accepted in edited books, professional journals, professional online teaching-related sites, editing journals and books, writing language textbooks, presentations at conferences, grant activity.
- Service includes contributions to the administrative needs of the language program the individual teaches in, service to the University of Oregon, service to national and/or international professional organizations.

Procedures

NTTF will submit a personal statement addressing teaching, professional activities, service, and administration, as relevant, to the Department Head. The Department Head will prepare a performance review based on the personal statement and the regular performance review(s) of NTTF conducted by the Department Head in accordance with College policies. The Department Head will discuss the performance review individually with each NTTF before determining a recommendation for merit increase.

Recommendation to CAS

The head submits formal recommendations to the College. After approval of the increases by CAS and the Provost's Office, the head will convey the increase in writing to each faculty member and will meet with each at his or her request to discuss the increase and the department reasoning that led to it.

All documentation relevant to the merit process, including faculty self-reports, faculty committee reports, and Department Head's recommendations, will be kept on file in the Department for appropriate follow up or review.

Criteria and Procedures for Merit Evaluation for Officer of Administration

The Department of Linguistics maintains internal policy and procedures aimed at an equitable and merit-oriented salary distribution for the Officer of Administration. The process is described below.

Supervisor Evaluation (50%): The increase will be based on the OA's most recent performance appraisal.

Accomplishments within last 12 months of review (50%): The increase will be based on OA's accomplishments in the areas of finance administration, office administration, supervision, projects, and professional development.