

## **PRODUCT DESIGN MERIT POLICY OUTLINE**

As amended and approved by AAA Dean 5/30/14

### **PURPOSE**

This policy outlines the Product Design Program's procedures for determining and assigning merit raises, when available.

#### **1. Full Inclusion**

All Faculty members who are eligible for inclusion in a given merit process will receive an evaluation and will be given full consideration and opportunity to demonstrate individual merit. Neither an individual's FTE nor type of appointment will limit a faculty member's ability to demonstrate the highest possible merit score nor will it limit or cap a faculty member's maximum possible merit increase.

#### **2. Merit Differentiation**

It is understood that all faculty are valuable members of the department and each faculty member plays a key role in achieving departmental goals. Merit Differentiation is used strictly as a means to differentiate between varying degrees of excellence within the department. It is noted that although the Merit Differentiation criteria are similar, and in some cases parallel, to the Promotion and Tenure criteria, that the processes themselves are separate and distinct. Furthermore, the rigor applied during the Merit Differentiation process is far less than the rigor applied during the Promotion and Tenure process, and therefore, ratings received as part of Merit Differentiation are not necessarily indicative measures of how an individual faculty member rates for purposes Promotion and Tenure.

Differentiation is established through an evaluation of merit materials against criteria provided in the appropriate Merit Criteria Sheet.

#### **3. Comparative Evaluation**

Comparative Evaluation is provided by via sorting all faculty evaluations into Merit Tiers based upon scores from the Merit Score Sheets.

#### **4. Faculty Self-Assessment and Submissions**

The following documents will be submitted and/or completed by designated parties. Except for reasons of legitimate and unavoidable extenuating circumstances, the following documents must be completed, and failure to do so may negatively impact merit scores.

4.1. Activity Report – Faculty will complete and submit the departmental Activity Report most relevant to their position.

4.2. Current CV – Faculty will submit a current Curriculum Vitae.

#### **5. Criteria and Factors**

5.1. Tenure Track Faculty – Criteria is provided in the departmental Merit Criteria Sheet, listed by rank.

5.2. Non-Tenure Track Faculty – Criteria is provided in the departmental Merit Criteria Sheet, listed by rank.

## **6. Consideration of Individual Professional Responsibilities and Contributions**

Consideration of Individual Professional Responsibilities and Contributions is provided for by differentiated merit criteria for different position types. Final scores from Merit Score Sheets will be weighted based on an individual's expected appointment in terms of Teaching; Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Activities; and Service.

### **TTF**

Unless otherwise stipulated, all TTF evaluations will be weighted as 40% Teaching, 40% Research, and 20% Service. Other weightings may be applied with prior approval from the AAA Dean or designee.

### **NTTF**

Unless otherwise stipulated, all NTTF evaluations will be weighted as 100% Teaching, 0% Research, and 0% Service. Other weightings may be applied with prior approval from the AAA Dean or designee.

## **7. Evaluation of Accomplishments**

**7.1. Clarity and Transparency:** Merit Criteria Sheets include clear and unambiguous metrics by which faculty members can demonstrate meritorious contribution to the department. A weighted average of scores in each area of Teaching, Research/Creative Work, and Service relative to the prominence of each area in a faculty member's job description, determine a faculty member's final merit score. The faculty rely upon the academic judgment of the Program Director to evaluate specific accomplishments and contributions and to assign an appropriate overall rating in each merit category based off of the preponderance of accomplishments or contributions in that merit category. The Program Director recognizes the necessity to honor the trust and authority placed in him or her by operating in good faith in a collegial manner, and adhering to the guiding principles of equity, parity, and inclusiveness in performing these evaluations.

### **7.2. Collegial and Consultative**

**7.2.1. Evaluators:** The Program Director is responsible for performing merit evaluations based on the Activity Report and CV submitted, and in comparison with colleagues at similar rank.

**7.2.2. Selection of Tier Scores:** The Program Director will evaluate final scores and determine where there are meaningful breaks in the scores that can be used to establish ranges for final Merit Tiers. All individuals with scores within the established ranges will receive the same consideration for merit increase as other individuals in the same tier.

**7.2.3. Final Assignment of Tier Increases:** The Program Director, using guidance provided by the Associate Dean for Finance, will determine appropriate raise percentages or amounts to be applied each tier, and submit those raise percentages as recommendations to the AAA Dean. The AAA Dean will consider those recommendations in determining the final merit increase amounts for each tier.

## **8. Review Periods**

Unless otherwise established by the requirements of a specific merit process, the following standard review periods will be used in evaluating Teaching, Research, and Service:

Teaching: The 12 months directly preceding the merit process

Research: May include up to a maximum of 60 months in order to establish, assess, and account for a documented significant body of work, with emphasis given to work that has been active within the prior 24 month period directly preceding the merit process

Service: The 12 months directly preceding the merit process

## **9. Merit Tiers**

The final scores will be sorted into a minimum of two Merit Tiers based on the overall differentiation of the Merit Scores. Tiers may include any of the following:

Does Not Meet Expectations (1.0-1.9): Has not demonstrated the minimum standards required to qualify as Provisionally Meets Expectations. There is no mandate for a minimum number of faculty members to be classified into this Merit Tier. Classification into this Merit Tier qualifies as “Does Not Meet” per the Collective Bargaining Agreement. All Faculty classified into this Merit Tier are ineligible to receive a merit increase.

Provisionally Meets Expectations (2.0-2.4): Has demonstrated minimum standard required to qualify as Meets Expectations, but has not demonstrated a level of meritorious contribution equal to the level of other peers in the Meets Expectations category. Classification into this Merit Tier qualifies as “Meets Expectations” per the Collective Bargaining Agreement. All Faculty classified into this Merit Tier will receive a merit increase.

Meets Expectations (2.5-3.4): Has clearly demonstrated standards required to qualify as Meets Expectations, but has not demonstrated a level of meritorious contribution high enough to qualify for Exceeds Expectations. Classification into this Merit Tier qualifies as “Meets Expectations” per the Collective Bargaining Agreement. All Faculty classified into this Merit Tier will receive a merit increase.

Exceeds Expectations (3.5-4.4): Has clearly demonstrated standards required to qualify as Exceeds Expectations, but has not demonstrated a level of meritorious contribution high enough to qualify for Highest Expectations. Classification into this Merit Tier qualifies as “Exceeds Expectations” per the Collective Bargaining Agreement. All Faculty classified into this Merit Tier will receive a merit increase.

Highest Expectations (4.5-5.0): Has clearly demonstrated standards required to qualify as Highest Expectations. Classification into this Merit Tier qualifies as “Exceeds Expectations” per the Collective Bargaining Agreement. All Faculty classified into this Merit Tier will receive a merit increase.

**10. Notification and Documentation**

- 10.1. **Notification** - All Faculty eligible for inclusion in a merit process will be notified of their new salary within one month of the closing and final acceptance of a given merit process. Notification will be provided electronically through email.
- 10.2. **Documentation** – The department will maintain the following electronic records for a period of 24 months subsequent to a given merit process:
  - 10.2.1. Each faculty member’s final score sheet, indicating the faculty member’s blended average merit score, individual component scores (Teaching, Research, Service), component weights, final merit tier assignment, and merit increase.
  - 10.2.2. The complete final merit allocation for each merit pool, including the amount allocated to each member of faculty in those pools.

**Merit Criteria Requirements**  
PRODUCT DESIGN PROGRAM

**ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**  
TEACHING

**Does Not Meet Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Does Not Meet Expectations ratings for teaching fail to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of teaching expertise. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Consistent and pervasive negative student evaluations
- Consistent low enrollment in courses or studios relative to peer courses or studios
- Lack of formally and professionally developed standard course materials
- Lack of adherence to UO policies and standards (such as Academic Misconduct or Accessible Education) or other such specific guidance as provided by the Provost, Dean, Department Head, or Designee
- Poor peer reviews
- Lack of variety in class sizes offered
- Lack of variety in class topics offered
- No TEP or other courses on teaching efficacy taken

**Provisionally Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Provisionally Meets Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of teaching expertise, though not significantly beyond that. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Competent student evaluations
- Consistent low enrollment in courses or studios relative to peer courses or studios
- Poor peer reviews
- Poor course organization
- Lack of formally and professionally developed standard course materials
- Lack of adherence to UO policies and standards, or other such specific guidance as provided by the Provost, Dean, Department Head, or Designee
- TEP or other courses on teaching efficacy taken

**Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Meets Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of an acceptable standard of teaching expertise. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Competent student evaluations
- Professionally developed standard course materials
- Adherence to UO policies and standards (such as Academic Misconduct or Accessible Education) or other such specific guidance as provided by the Provost, Dean, Department Head, or Designee

- Teaches a variety of class sizes
- Teaches a variety of class topics
- Develops new class/es needed and/or wanted by PD faculty
- Competent peer reviews
- Advises normal load of undergraduate and graduate students
- TEP or other courses on teaching efficacy taken

**Exceeds Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Exceeds Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of teaching expertise that includes Meets Expectations indicators, and goes beyond standard course material. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Consistently high student evaluations
- Consistently high enrollment in courses or studios relative to peer courses or studios
- Extraordinary peer reviews
- Acts as Clark Honors College thesis advisor
- Develops additional new class/es needed and/or wanted by PD faculty
- Students in classes win awards and/or exhibition for their work
- Class receives award
- Secures teaching grants
- Secures corporate sponsored studios
- Publishes textbook in the field

**Highest Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Highest Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of teaching expertise that surpasses Exceeds Expectations indicators. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- International awards for teaching
- International awards and or/exhibition of student work

## RESEARCH

**Does Not Meet Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Does Not Meet Expectations ratings for research fail to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of research. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Lack of published research papers
- Lack of exhibitions of work
- Lack of presentations on research
- Lack of conference attendance
- Lack of published comment by others on research

**Provisionally Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Provisionally Meets Expectations ratings for research show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of

research, though not significantly beyond that. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Minimal quantity of published research
- Minimal quantity of exhibitions of work
- Low, local, questionable quality of publication outlets
- Low, local, questionable quality of exhibition venues
- Presentations on research
- Attendance at conferences
- Published comment by others on research

**Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Meets Expectations ratings for research show evidence of an acceptable standard of research output. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Average quantity of published research
- Average quantity of exhibitions of work
- Average quality of publication outlets
- Average quality of exhibition venues
- Presentations on research
- Attendance at conferences
- Published comment by others on research
- Secures research funding through private and government grants

**Exceeds Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Exceeds Expectations ratings for research show evidence of research expertise that includes Meets Expectations indicators, and goes beyond standard research material. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Above average quantity of published research
- Above average quantity of exhibitions of work
- Above average quality of publication outlets
- Above average quality of exhibition venues
- Above average frequency of presentations on research
- Above average quality of presentation venues
- Published comment by others on exceptional quality of research
- Secures high level of research funding through private and government grants

**Highest Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Highest Expectations ratings for research show evidence of research expertise that surpasses Exceeds Expectations indicators. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- International awards for research
- Secures high level of research funding through highly competitive private and government grants

## SERVICE

**Does Not Meet Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Does Not Meet Expectations ratings for service fail to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of service. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Lack of PD curricular development
- Non-active participation in PD Committee of the Whole
- Non-participation in PD admissions

**Provisionally Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Provisionally Meets Expectations ratings for service show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of service, though not significantly beyond that. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Minimal PD curricular development
- Minimal participation in PD Committee of the Whole
- Minimal participation in PD admissions

**Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Meets Expectations ratings for service show evidence of an acceptable standard of service. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Active participation in PD curricular development
- Active participation in PD Committee of the Whole
- Active participation in PD admissions
- PD student group faculty advisor
- Non-PD-student advising (ie. Duck Days, tours)
- PD Committee Chair for select topics
- Participation on search committees
- Associate editor of discipline's journal/s
- Juror for exhibition and/or competition

**Exceeds Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Exceeds Expectations ratings for service show evidence of service that includes Meets Expectations indicators, and goes beyond. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Exceptional participation in PD Committee of the Whole
- Search committee chair
- Creation of new service factor (ie. ad hoc committee)
- Editor of discipline's journal/s
- Lead juror for exhibition and/or competition

**Highest Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Highest Expectations ratings for service show evidence of service that surpasses Exceeds Expectations indicators.



Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- UO or external recognition of service work

## **ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

### TEACHING

**Does Not Meet Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Does Not Meet Expectations ratings for teaching fail to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of teaching expertise. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Consistent and pervasive negative student evaluations
- Consistent low enrollment in courses or studios relative to peer courses or studios
- Lack of formally and professionally developed standard course materials
- Lack of adherence to UO policies and standards (such as Academic Misconduct or Accessible Education) or other such specific guidance as provided by the Provost, Dean, Department Head, or Designee
- Poor peer reviews
- Lack of variety in class sizes offered
- Lack of variety in class topics offered
- No TEP or other courses on teaching efficacy taken
- Does not peer advise teaching techniques with PD TTF and NTTF colleagues

**Provisionally Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Provisionally Meets Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of teaching expertise, though not significantly beyond that. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Competent student evaluations
- Consistent low enrollment in courses or studios relative to peer courses or studios
- Poor peer reviews
- Poor course organization
- Lack of formally and professionally developed standard course materials
- Lack of adherence to UO policies and standards, or other such specific guidance as provided by the Provost, Dean, Department Head, or Designee
- TEP or other courses on teaching efficacy taken
- Does not peer advise teaching techniques with PD TTF and NTTF colleagues

**Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Meets Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of an acceptable standard of teaching expertise. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Competent student evaluations

- Professionally developed standard course materials
- Adherence to UO policies and standards (such as Academic Misconduct or Accessible Education) or other such specific guidance as provided by the Provost, Dean, Department Head, or Designee
- Teaches a variety of class sizes
- Teaches a variety of class topics
- Develops new class/es needed and/or wanted by PD faculty
- Competent peer reviews
- Advises normal load of undergraduate and graduate students
- TEP or other courses on teaching efficacy taken
- Peer advises teaching techniques with PD TTF and NTTF colleagues

**Exceeds Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Exceeds Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of teaching expertise that includes Meets Expectations indicators, and goes beyond standard course material. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Consistently high student evaluations
- Consistently high enrollment in courses or studios relative to peer courses or studios
- Extraordinary peer reviews
- Acts as Clark Honors College thesis advisor
- Develops additional new class/es needed and/or wanted by PD faculty
- Students in classes win awards and/or exhibition for their work
- Class receives award
- Secures teaching grants
- Secures corporate sponsored studios
- Publishes textbook in the field
- Peer advises teaching techniques with PD, UO and/or external colleagues

**Highest Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Highest Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of teaching expertise that surpasses Exceeds Expectations indicators. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- International awards for teaching
- International awards and or/exhibition of student work

## RESEARCH

**Does Not Meet Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Does Not Meet Expectations ratings for research fail to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of research. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Lack of published research papers
- Lack of exhibitions of work
- Lack of presentations on research
- Lack of conference attendance
- Lack of published comment by others on research

**Provisionally Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Provisionally Meets Expectations ratings for research show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of research, though not significantly beyond that. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Minimal quantity of published research
- Minimal quantity of exhibitions of work
- Low, local, questionable quality of publication outlets
- Low, local, questionable quality of exhibition venues
- Presentations on research
- Attendance at conferences
- Published comment by others on research

**Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Meets Expectations ratings for research show evidence of an acceptable standard of research output. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Average quantity of published research
- Average quantity of exhibitions of work
- Average quality of publication outlets
- Average quality of exhibition venues
- Presentations on research
- Attendance at conferences
- Published comment by others on research
- Secures research funding through private and government grants
- Peer advises research strategies with PD TTF and NTTF colleagues

**Exceeds Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Exceeds Expectations ratings for research show evidence of research expertise that includes Meets Expectations indicators, and goes beyond standard research material. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Above average quantity of published research
- Above average quantity of exhibitions of work
- Above average quality of publication outlets
- Above average quality of exhibition venues
- Above average frequency of presentations on research
- Above average quality of presentation venues
- Published comment by others on exceptional quality of research
- Secures high level of research funding through private and government grants

- Above average peer advisory duties for research strategies with PD TTF and NTTF colleagues

**Highest Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Highest Expectations ratings for research show evidence of research expertise that surpasses Exceeds Expectations indicators. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- International awards for research
- Secures high level of research funding through highly competitive private and government grants

## SERVICE

**Does Not Meet Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Does Not Meet Expectations ratings for service fail to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of service. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Lack of PD curricular development
- Non-active participation in PD Committee of the Whole
- Non-participation in PD admissions
- Lack of participation on AAA committees

**Provisionally Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Provisionally Meets Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of teaching expertise, though not significantly beyond that. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Minimal PD curricular development
- Minimal participation in PD Committee of the Whole
- Minimal participation in PD admissions
- Minimal participation on AAA committees

**Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Meets Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of an acceptable standard of teaching expertise. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Active participation in PD curricular development
- Active participation in PD Committee of the Whole
- Active participation in PD admissions
- PD student group faculty advisor
- Non-PD-student advising (ie. Duck Days, tours)
- PD Committee Chair for select topics
- Participation on search committees
- Active participation on AAA committees
- Associate editor of discipline's journal/s
- Juror for exhibition and/or competition

- Professional leadership external to UO

**Exceeds Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Exceeds Expectations ratings for service show evidence of service that includes Meets Expectations indicators, and goes beyond. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Exceptional participation in PD Committee of the Whole
- Search committee chair
- Creation of new service factor (ie. ad hoc committee)
- Editor of discipline’s journal/s
- Lead juror for exhibition and/or competition
- Professional leadership external to UO recognized

**Highest Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Highest Expectations ratings for service show evidence of service that surpasses Exceeds Expectations indicators. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- UO or external recognition of service work

## **CAREER INSTRUCTOR**

### **TEACHING**

**Does Not Meet Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Does Not Meet Expectations ratings for teaching fail to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of teaching expertise. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Consistent and pervasive negative student evaluations
- Consistent low enrollment in courses or studios relative to peer courses or studios
- Lack of formally and professionally developed standard course materials
- Lack of adherence to UO policies and standards (such as Academic Misconduct or Accessible Education) or other such specific guidance as provided by the Provost, Dean, Department Head, or Designee
- Poor peer reviews
- No TEP or other courses on teaching efficacy taken

**Provisionally Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Provisionally Meets Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of teaching expertise, though not significantly beyond that. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Competent student evaluations
- Consistent low enrollment in courses or studios relative to peer courses or studios
- Poor peer reviews

- Poor course organization
- Lack of formally and professionally developed standard course materials
- Lack of adherence to UO policies and standards, or other such specific guidance as provided by the Provost, Dean, Department Head, or Designee
- TEP or other courses on teaching efficacy taken

**Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Meets Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of an acceptable standard of teaching expertise. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Competent student evaluations
- Professionally developed standard course materials
- Adherence to UO policies and standards (such as Academic Misconduct or Accessible Education) or other such specific guidance as provided by the Provost, Dean, Department Head, or Designee
- Develops new class/es needed and/or wanted by PD faculty
- Competent peer reviews
- Advises normal load of undergraduate and graduate students
- TEP or other courses on teaching efficacy taken
- Peer advises teaching techniques with PD TTF and NTTF colleagues

**Exceeds Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Exceeds Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of teaching expertise that includes Meets Expectations indicators, and goes beyond standard course material. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Consistently high student evaluations
- Consistently high enrollment in courses or studios relative to peer courses or studios
- Extraordinary peer reviews
- Develops additional new class/es needed and/or wanted by PD faculty
- Students in classes win awards and/or exhibition for their work
- Class receives award
- Secures teaching grants
- Secures corporate sponsored studios
- Publishes textbook in the field
- Peer advises teaching techniques with PD TTF and NTTF colleagues

**Highest Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Highest Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of teaching expertise that surpasses Exceeds Expectations indicators. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- International awards for teaching
- International awards and or/exhibition of student work

## RESEARCH

Career Instructors are not normally contracted inclusive of their research and are therefore not evaluated for merit on their portfolio of active research. If a Career Instructor were contracted inclusive of their research, these guidelines would be used for merit evaluation.

**Does Not Meet Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Does Not Meet Expectations ratings for research fail to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of research. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Lack of published research papers
- Lack of exhibitions of work
- Lack of presentations on research
- Lack of conference attendance
- Lack of published comment by others on research

**Provisionally Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Provisionally Meets Expectations ratings for research show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of research, though not significantly beyond that. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Minimal quantity of published research
- Minimal quantity of exhibitions of work
- Low, local, questionable quality of publication outlets
- Low, local, questionable quality of exhibition venues
- Presentations on research
- Attendance at conferences
- Published comment by others on research

**Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Meets Expectations ratings for research show evidence of an acceptable standard of research output. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Average quantity of published research
- Average quantity of exhibitions of work
- Average quality of publication outlets
- Average quality of exhibition venues
- Presentations on research
- Attendance at conferences
- Published comment by others on research
- Secures research funding through private and government grants

**Exceeds Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Exceeds Expectations ratings for research show evidence of research expertise that includes Meets Expectations

indicators, and goes beyond standard research material. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Above average quantity of published research
- Above average quantity of exhibitions of work
- Above average quality of publication outlets
- Above average quality of exhibition venues
- Above average frequency of presentations on research
- Above average quality of presentation venues
- Published comment by others on exceptional quality of research
- Secures high level of research funding through private and government grants

**Highest Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Highest Expectations ratings for research show evidence of research expertise that surpasses Exceeds Expectations indicators. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- International awards for research
- Secures high level of research funding through highly competitive private and government grants

## SERVICE

Career Instructors may be contracted for service. If a Career Instructor is contracted for service, these guidelines would be used for merit evaluation.

**Does Not Meet Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Does Not Meet Expectations ratings for service fail to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of service. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Consistent and pervasive negative student evaluations in the area contracted
- Consistent and pervasive negative peer evaluations in the area contracted
- Contracted service incomplete at end of contract

**Provisionally Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Provisionally Meets Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of teaching expertise, though not significantly beyond that. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Competent student evaluations in the area contracted
- Competent peer evaluations in the area contracted
- Contracted service low-quality at end of contract

**Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Meets Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of an acceptable standard of teaching expertise. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Positive student reviews in the area contracted
- Positive peer reviews in the area contracted



- Contracted service high-quality at end of contract

**Exceeds Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Exceeds Expectations ratings for service show evidence of service that includes Meets Expectations indicators, and goes beyond. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Contracted service officially recognized by UO or external organization

**Highest Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Highest Expectations ratings for service show evidence of service that surpasses Exceeds Expectations indicators. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Contracted service given highest level of recognition by UO or external organization

## **ADJUNCT INSTRUCTOR**

### **TEACHING**

**Does Not Meet Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Does Not Meet Expectations ratings for teaching fail to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of teaching expertise. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Consistent and pervasive negative student evaluations
- Consistent low enrollment in courses or studios relative to peer courses or studios
- Lack of formally and professionally developed standard course materials
- Lack of adherence to UO policies and standards (such as Academic Misconduct or Accessible Education) or other such specific guidance as provided by the Provost, Dean, Department Head, or Designee
- Poor peer reviews
- No TEP or other courses on teaching efficacy taken

**Provisionally Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Provisionally Meets Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of teaching expertise, though not significantly beyond that. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Competent student evaluations
- Consistent low enrollment in courses or studios relative to peer courses or studios
- Poor peer reviews
- Poor course organization
- Lack of formally and professionally developed standard course materials
- Lack of adherence to UO policies and standards, or other such specific guidance as provided by the Provost, Dean, Department Head, or Designee

- TEP or other courses on teaching efficacy taken

**Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Meets Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of an acceptable standard of teaching expertise. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Competent student evaluations
- Professionally developed standard course materials
- Adherence to UO policies and standards (such as Academic Misconduct or Accessible Education) or other such specific guidance as provided by the Provost, Dean, Department Head, or Designee
- Develops new class/es needed and/or wanted by PD faculty
- Competent peer reviews
- Advises normal load of undergraduate and graduate students
- TEP or other courses on teaching efficacy taken

**Exceeds Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Exceeds Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of teaching expertise that includes Meets Expectations indicators, and goes beyond standard course material. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Consistently high student evaluations
- Consistently high enrollment in courses or studios relative to peer courses or studios
- Extraordinary peer reviews
- Develops additional new class/es needed and/or wanted by PD faculty
- Students in classes win awards and/or exhibition for their work
- Class receives award
- Secures teaching grants
- Secures corporate sponsored studios
- Publishes textbook in the field

**Highest Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Highest Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of teaching expertise that surpasses Exceeds Expectations indicators. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- International awards for teaching
- International awards and or/exhibition of student work

## RESEARCH

Adjunct Instructors are not normally contracted inclusive of their research and are therefore not evaluated for merit on their portfolio of active research. If an Adjunct Instructor were contracted inclusive of their research, these guidelines would be used for merit evaluation.

**Does Not Meet Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Does Not Meet Expectations ratings for research fail to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of research. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Lack of published research papers
- Lack of exhibitions of work
- Lack of presentations on research
- Lack of conference attendance
- Lack of published comment by others on research

**Provisionally Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Provisionally Meets Expectations ratings for research show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of research, though not significantly beyond that. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Minimal quantity of published research
- Minimal quantity of exhibitions of work
- Low, local, questionable quality of publication outlets
- Low, local, questionable quality of exhibition venues
- Presentations on research
- Attendance at conferences
- Published comment by others on research

**Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Meets Expectations ratings for research show evidence of an acceptable standard of research output. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Average quantity of published research
- Average quantity of exhibitions of work
- Average quality of publication outlets
- Average quality of exhibition venues
- Presentations on research
- Attendance at conferences
- Published comment by others on research
- Secures research funding through private and government grants

**Exceeds Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Exceeds Expectations ratings for research show evidence of research expertise that includes Meets Expectations indicators, and goes beyond standard research material. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Above average quantity of published research
- Above average quantity of exhibitions of work
- Above average quality of publication outlets
- Above average quality of exhibition venues
- Above average frequency of presentations on research

- Above average quality of presentation venues
- Published comment by others on exceptional quality of research
- Secures high level of research funding through private and government grants

**Highest Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Highest Expectations ratings for research show evidence of research expertise that surpasses Exceeds Expectations indicators. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- International awards for research
- Secures high level of research funding through highly competitive private and government grants

## SERVICE

Adjunct Instructors may be contracted for service. If an Adjunct Instructor is contracted for service, these guidelines would be used for merit evaluation.

**Does Not Meet Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Does Not Meet Expectations ratings for service fail to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of service. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Consistent and pervasive negative student evaluations in the area contracted
- Consistent and pervasive negative peer evaluations in the area contracted
- Contracted service incomplete at end of contract

**Provisionally Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Provisionally Meets Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of teaching expertise, though not significantly beyond that. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Competent student evaluations in the area contracted
- Competent peer evaluations in the area contracted
- Contracted service low-quality at end of contract

**Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Meets Expectations ratings for teaching show evidence of an acceptable standard of teaching expertise. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Positive student reviews in the area contracted
- Positive peer reviews in the area contracted
- Contracted service high-quality at end of contract

**Exceeds Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Exceeds Expectations ratings for service show evidence of service that includes Meets Expectations indicators, and goes beyond. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Contracted service officially recognized by UO or external organization

**Highest Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Highest Expectations ratings for service show evidence of service that surpasses Exceeds Expectations indicators. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Contracted service given highest level of recognition by UO or external organization