

Department of Linguistics Merit Raise Review 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.
Revisions approved by the Office of the Provost March 17, 2021

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

The current merit increase process will take in to 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 faculty 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 their merit raise after it has been approved by Office of the Provost.

Each faculty member is eligible for consideration for the highest merit rating regardless of their 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 career faculty whose teaching evaluations indicate a lack of engagement and responsiveness to feedback would fall below departmental expectations. TTF and career faculty 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 the principal areas of academic performance: research and teaching, and service. For strong faculty in a strong department it is expected that one will develop a

record of superior scholarly research and engaged teaching, and strength in institutional and public service.

Research

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 approximately 6-8 substantive articles. Additional evidence of scholarly excellence includes successful grant efforts and research products such as dictionaries and archives that broaden research impact.

Meeting expectations in research is defined by the rule-of-thumb publication requirement of 2 articles per year. Details regarding how to “count” publications are provided in the governance document on tenure-track faculty professional responsibilities under C.3. “Policy for distributing any additional course releases.”

Exceeding expectations in research requires not only that the publication expectations are met, but also that the faculty member **either** secures external funding in the form of grants or research awards to improve the financial health of the department **or** engages in broader impact activities that result in important research products (e.g., archives), improved education and educational development outside of the academy (e.g., dictionaries), or in substantive partnerships with non-academic constituencies.

Teaching

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: teaching materials provided by the instructor; student course experience surveys; written reflections by the instructor; peer review of teaching effort; participation and effectiveness in individual student supervision, especially at the graduate level; preparation of published and unpublished teaching materials.

Evaluation of teaching will be assessed using the university standards described in the August 2019 MOU between the University and United Academics.

Meeting expectations in teaching is defined as follows: engaging in reflection and responding to student and peer feedback by evolving course design and content; showing evidence of experiential learning in at least some courses; and showing evidence of good/thoughtful course design in syllabi and assessment materials.

Exceeding expectations in teaching requires meeting expectations for all courses and also taking external steps to continue to evolve one’s teaching by seeking out development opportunities (e.g., workshop attendance).

Service

The department expects its members to participate responsibly and cooperatively when called upon for service in the department. They are also expected to engage in service to the university and to the field. Untenured faculty are not expected to take on very much service work and so 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, such as director of undergraduate studies, director of graduate studies, as well as work on standing and ad hoc committees that contribute to the smooth and efficient running of the department matters.

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 CAS or UO Curriculum Committees represents particularly important service contributions to the larger university.

Service in the field is also important. The department recognizes grant reviewing, 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.

Personnel committee: The department head polls the faculty for nominations to a two-person personnel committee. The nominations are taken under advisement, and a committee is appointed. This committee is then charged to evaluate individual performance in research, teaching, and service based on materials provided by each faculty member.

Materials: Each faculty member submits an up-to-date vita and a brief report of research, teaching, and service accomplishments for the period since the last merit raise evaluation. The report is structured according to a template provided for the purpose of merit review.

Evaluation: The personnel committee reviews the submitted materials with reference to the guidelines set out above. The committee then rates each faculty member's performance of comparative effort in research, teaching, and service along a continuous 5-point scale that is anchored as follows: Exceeds expectations (= 5); Meets expectations (= 3); Fails expectations (= 1).

Next, a weighted overall score is computed from the ratings. Research is weighted to be 40% of the total score. The default weighting of teaching and service contribution is 40% and 20% of the total score, respectively. This weighting can be adjusted, however, to reflect the relative effort devoted to each. This weighting should be designed to avoid a situation where, for example, excellent teaching given a heavy load is valued the same as excellent teaching given a light load. Similarly, where a light teaching load is the result of significant service, the weighting should reflect an appreciation of this service.

Finally, the committee prepares a brief written justification of their rating for each faculty member. The justification will also explain how the relative weighting of teaching and service was established for each faculty member.

Recommendation: 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 according to the evaluation procedure described above. The head will also review and may adjust for clearly-articulated reasons 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 under “allocation” below.

Allocation: Dollars allocated to the department are divided by the number of eligible faculty to determine the average increase. Deviations in dollars from this average amount will be calculated in steps equal to the number of faculty eligible for merit increases. CAS requires that the recommended merit increase for the department head be the average amount, and so the department head will occupy the middle slot. Remaining faculty will be arrayed in steps above and below this spot based on a median split of the ranked faculty.

Criteria and Procedures for Merit Evaluation for Career Faculty

Career 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 career faculty assignment, but professional development activities are encouraged and can be considered in evaluating merit.

Career faculty who are full-time faculty in the American English Institute, but who also teach one or two courses as needed in the Language Teaching Specialization MA program, will be evaluated by the AEI; Linguistics will provide evaluations of these faculty only at the request of the AEI. Such evaluation will conform to the guidelines for Merit Evaluations of career faculty in Linguistics.

NTTFs whose appointments are fully in Linguistics may have significant administrative as well as teaching responsibilities, e.g. the Director of the LTS MA program. Thus, the relative weighting of teaching, service, and professional development in the merit evaluation 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. See above under “Teaching” for details regarding teaching review and expectations.
- 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

If career faculty evaluations for merit increases occur at the same time as TTF evaluations for merit increases, then the procedures will be similar to merit review of TTF. Specifically, each career faculty will submit a statement addressing teaching, service, and professional development to the personnel committee using the template provided for this purpose.

Performance reviews proceed differently from a merit increase reviews. Performance reviews are conducted by the Department Head in accordance with College policies. The Department Head will discuss the performance review individually with each career faculty at the time of review.

Recommendation to CAS

The Department Head submits formal merit raise recommendations to the College. These are reviewed by CAS and the Provost's Office, which is responsible for assigning the actual merit increases. Once assigned, the Department Head will convey the increase in writing to each faculty member and will meet with each at their 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.