

Merit Evaluation Policy, Department of Philosophy
Approved by Faculty Committee, April 2014; revised October 2017.
Revised and approved again May 2019.
Revisions approved by the Office of the Provost June 11, 2021

Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure-Track Instructional Faculty

This document details the merit evaluation policies and procedures for all tenure-related faculty (TTF), Career faculty, and Pro Tem faculty in this department.

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

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

Department of Philosophy - Merit evaluation Instructions to faculty

Faculty are evaluated in three categories: research, teaching and service. Research has 2 areas, teaching has 2 areas, and service 1 area. Each area can receive a score between 0 and 3:

0 = performing below expectations

1 = meeting expectations

2 = performing above expectations

3 = exceptional performance

Section 1: Written Evaluation.

Each faculty member will receive a written evaluation of their work during the relevant review period. Each faculty member will provide the following information:

- a completed Merit Review Summary Sheet
- current curriculum vitae

The Merit Raise Committee (whose responsibilities, composition, and election process is described in the Department of Philosophy's Operating Paper) will review the faculty's Merit Review Summary Sheet in relation to the faculty CV, as well as peer teaching evaluations and student comments in student evaluations, and will rank the faculty work in light of the merit guidelines below. Tenure Track, Career and Pro Tem faculty will

follow the same procedure and be evaluated in the same way except as indicated in Section 4. Evaluations will be made in light of the duties and responsibilities described in the faculty member's contract (and/or in the Department policy describing professional responsibilities). Annual reviews, promotion reviews, and third and sixth year post-tenure reviews will NOT be used in preparation of the merit recommendation, though teaching data collected for these reviews can be considered.

The Department Head will review the Merit Review Summary Sheets, including those pertaining to the committee member's evaluation, will review the rankings and will write a report that summarizes the member's accomplishments and indicates the rationale for the rankings. The Head's report will be made available to the faculty member, who will have the opportunity to discuss it with the Department Head and attach a written response if she or he so desires.

Section 2: Salary Recommendations.

The Merit Raise Committee will then recommend merit raises in light of the evaluation of each faculty member (and any written response provided by the faculty member) and departmental guidelines (Sections 3 and 4).

Section 3: Departmental Merit Guidelines, Tenure Track Faculty

Scholarship (6 points total). The primary evidence of research by faculty will be their ability to share with others the results of their work.

1) Research activity (possible 3 points)

It is expected that faculty members will be actively engaged in research each year. This may involve presenting conference papers, grant applications, workshops, professional reading groups, public lectures, campus groups outside the Philosophy Department, Philosophy colloquia, and invited presentations.

2) Publications (possible 3 points)

It is expected that faculty members will be actively engaged in producing peer-reviewed publications each year. Number of publications is not to be taken as an end in itself. Of greater importance is the contribution of the faculty member's work to scholarship, research, or continuing discussion of issues in her or his field, or related fields. Publications include: books, edited volumes, articles in scholarly journals, and book chapters. Output will vary. However, it is expected that faculty members will, at a minimum, annually produce the equivalent of 1 peer-reviewed journal article/book chapter per year. Co-authored peer reviewed articles or book chapters will count the same as a solo-authored article or book chapter if the faculty member is the primary author of the article or contributed equally to it. If they are a secondary author, two such articles will count as one. Editing a book or a special volume will count the same as two peer-reviewed articles or book chapters. Two translated essays will count the same as one

authored article. A grant application, when it involves significant work to try to obtain funds external to the university, may count as one authored article. Reviewing books, journal articles, or grants; editorships and other publication-related activities are not given the same weight as refereed journal articles, book chapters, edited books, or books.

An average of two peer reviewed articles or book chapters per year (with specifications for co-authoring as above) or one substantial article or book chapter and two different paper presentations at national or international professional academic conferences per year will count as above expectations. Generally, a translated book will also be considered as above expectations.

A book or an average of three peer reviewed articles or book chapters per year (with specifications for co-authoring as above) or two substantial articles or book chapters and two different paper presentations at national or international professional academic conferences per year will count as exceptional performance.

Teaching (6 points total)

Excellence in teaching is central to the mission of the Department of Philosophy.

Teaching will

be assessed by student experience surveys, narrative evaluations, and peer reviews. For this

evaluation, two equally important dimensions are scored: scheduled courses and unscheduled teaching. It is important that all standards and metrics for teaching quality referenced herein are to be interpreted in light of Section 9 of the August 2019 MOU between the University and United Academics in which are defined standards for teaching quality.

Scheduled teaching (possible 3 points)

It is expected that faculty will teach a full complement of courses each year, or, in the case of faculty with split appointments, will teach a full complement of courses over a two to three year period. This includes willingness to teach one large class (over 80 students) and responsiveness to the curricular needs of the department. Performance above expectations might include teaching very large numbers of students, developing new courses, or offering crucial departmental courses. We also note effort to improve teaching such as participating in TEP events and incorporating changes into course design. Exceptional performance might also include receipt of teaching and curriculum development awards, development of a teaching web site, and/or preparation of teaching aides.

Unscheduled teaching (possible 3 points)

It is expected that each faculty member will be actively involved in advising graduate and undergraduate students. Performance above expectations might be measured in advising undergraduate honors theses, supervising student research, independent studies, reading and research groups, history paper advising, literature review advising, M.A. thesis advising, dissertation advising. Exceptional performance would include an above average workload in mentoring and advising on dissertations, history papers, or

undergraduate, honors, or M.A theses. Faculty with split appointments are expected to perform some such teaching within philosophy, but their overall involvement in such unscheduled teaching will be taken into account.

Service (3 points total). Willingness to share in normal departmental duties such as committee assignments, student advising, etc., will constitute satisfactory service to the Department. Special positions, such as Director of Graduate Studies, Director of Undergraduate Studies, or Associate Head will be an indication of above average service. Also of special merit will be participation in university, state, regional, and national committees. Credit will be given for service work performed for other University of Oregon departments and/or programs, such as serving on search committees, program evaluation committees, the faculty union, etc. Work on special projects, such as planning and running conferences or setting up new programs will be given special recognition. Exceptional performance might include major leadership roles in the University, holding an office in a national professional organization (or section of such organization), participating in community organizations, or giving educational public presentations. The quality of service is also evaluated.

Note: An assistant professor meets expectations when they fulfill normal departmental duties. Tenured faculty will meet expectations when in addition they participate in university wider service or participate in state, regional, or national committees, chair a search committee, or organize a conference. Tenured faculty will be rated as above expectations when in addition to normal departmental duties they participate in two or more of the above named activities. Tenured faculty will who participate in more than two additional activities, or provide service of an exemplary quality, may be rated with exceptional performance.

Merit calculations while on leave. For faculty on sabbatical or research leave, including unpaid research leave, research will be evaluated as above. For terms with no assigned teaching (e.g., as a result of a sabbatical, funded course release, or an external grant), the faculty member will be evaluated as meeting teaching expectations during that term, though she or he may receive a higher rating based on significant actual teaching-related activities during that period (e.g., dissertation direction, course development). 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 significant actual service during that period.

Faculty on prolonged medical or family leave for the entire duration of the merit period 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.

New faculty that did not receive years of credit toward the tenure decision will be prorated in relation to the time they served at the University of Oregon. New faculty that

did receive years of credit toward the tenure decision will be evaluated including the years of credit they received.

Section 4: Departmental Merit Guidelines, Career and Pro Tem Faculty.

The procedure for determining the merit of Pro Tem and Career Faculty will be the same as the procedure for TTF. The faculty member's report on their activities (see Section 1) may discuss research, teaching and service, but must discuss those areas that are included in her or his job description. The Merit Raise Committee will consider the faculty member's success in their primary areas of responsibility (e.g. teaching or teaching and service), but other relevant work (publications, participation in conferences, committee service) may also be considered as a positive factor in making the final salary recommendation.

Section 5: Failure to Meet Expectations.

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, Career and Pro Tem faculty whose teaching evaluations consistently reveal performance issues in at least one area outlined in the teaching standards MOU with United Academics 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 faculty (as appropriate to their contract expectations) 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.

Section 6: Principles of Weighting and Rating Metric.

Faculty are evaluated in three categories: research, teaching and service. Research has 2 areas, teaching has 2 areas, and service 1 area. Each area can receive a score between 0 and 3 (fractions of points are possible). For tenure-track faculty, teaching, scholarship, and service are treated in accordance with their duties and responsibilities, i.e. teaching and research will each count 40% and service will count 20%. Career and Pro Tem faculty work will be weighted as in Section 4. Each faculty member will be given a numerical score for each category, and then the three scores will be used to generate a total score. Each score will be based, not on comparison with other faculty, but rather relative to general expectations as stated above. The sum total score will determine the

size of the recommended raise. Each of the three categories will be scored according to the following metric:

- 0 = Below expectations
- 1 = Meets expectations
- 2 = Above expectations
- 3 = Exceptional Performance

Raises will be distributed by score, irrespective of the faculty member's base salary. With regard to merit, one's base salary is not a relevant variable, but it would become one if a merit increase, based on one's total score, were to be awarded as a percentage of a faculty member's current salary.

To calculate merit raises, the department head will divide the total amount of the merit fund allocation by the sum total of merit scores to arrive at the amount of one unit of merit allotment. Individual faculty members' merit scores will then be multiplied by this unit of merit allotment to arrive at the total amount of each merit raise.

Officers of Administration

The Department Head's merit raise recommendation will be based on the performance reviews of the OA during the relevant evaluation period. If there has not been a performance review within the past year, the Department Head will undertake such a review. The Department Head will first ask the OA to write a summary of accomplishments for each general area of job responsibilities (e.g., fiscal and operations management, payroll, conference and event planning, office management). The Department Head's review should provide a narrative evaluation of the OA's performance of the duties and responsibilities described in the OA's position description and his/her current job duties. While OA reviews are conducted by the Department Head, they should also include, when possible, written or oral feedback from co-workers, supervisees, faculty, graduate students and other administrative personnel who work regularly with the OA. The Department Head's merit increase recommendation should be based on the extent to which the OA has met or exceeded expected performance of her/his assigned 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.

Documentation of Merit Decisions

All documentation of merit decisions shall be maintained in the faculty member's or OA's departmental file and available for her or his consultation. This documentation will

include, in the case of instructional faculty, the faculty member's submitted report, the Department Head's report, the Merit Raise Committee's recommendation, and any written response by the faculty member. In the case of Officers of Administration, the documentation will include the OA's summary of accomplishments and the Department Head's review.