

# **AAA MERIT POLICY OUTLINE**

## **DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE**

As amended and approved by AAA Dean 5/30/2014

### **PURPOSE**

This policy outlines the Architecture Department'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 will be evaluated for purposes of Promotion and Tenure.

Differentiation is established through an evaluation of merit materials based on criteria provided in the appropriate Merit Criteria document.

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

Comparative Evaluation is provided 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 with the information 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 are provided in the departmental Criteria and Factors for Merit Review, Tenured & Tenure Track Faculty document.

**5.2. Non-Tenure Track Faculty** – Criteria are provided in the departmental Criteria and Factors for Merit Review, Non-Tenure Track Faculty document.

## **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. Evaluations for TTF with significant administrative appointments will be weighted according to their specific administrative responsibilities. 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. Those NTTF who have job descriptions that specifically incorporate significant portions of research or service and/or do not include teaching assignments will have evaluations weighted according to their specific administrative responsibilities.

## **7. Evaluation of Accomplishments**

**7.1. Clarity and Transparency:** It is understood that the field of Architecture encompasses a wide variety of activities including research, professional practice, and creative work. This broad range allows the opportunity for faculty to demonstrate meritorious contribution to the department in a variety of ways. The Merit Criteria documents outline the types of metrics by which faculty members can demonstrate meritorious contribution to the department. Due to the wide variety of recognized accomplishments in the field, the faculty rely upon the academic judgment of the Department Head to differentiate between relative levels of meritorious contribution of faculty members. The Department Head 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. A weighted average of scores applied per Section 6 determine a faculty member's final merit score.

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

**7.2.1. Evaluators:** The Department Head 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 Department Head 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. There will be a minimum of two and a maximum of five Merit Tiers assigned in each merit process for both the TTF and NTTF pools.
- 7.2.3. Final Assignment of Tier Increases:** The Department Head will use guidance provided by the Associate Dean for Finance to determine appropriate raise percentages to be applied to 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: May include up to a maximum of 36 months in order to establish, assess, and account for a documented significant body of work, with emphasis given to work within the prior 12 month period 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 within the prior 24 month period directly preceding the merit process.
- Service: May include up to a maximum of 36 months in order to establish, assess, and account for a documented significant body of work, with emphasis given to work within the prior 12 month period directly preceding the merit process.

## 9. Merit Tiers

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

Does Not Meet Expectations (1.0-2.4): 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 (2.5-4.4): 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 (4.5-6.4): 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 (6.5-8.4): 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 (8.5-10.0): 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:
  - 10.1.1. 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.
  - 10.1.2. The complete final merit allocation for each merit pool, including the amount allocated to each member of faculty in those pools.

## ARCHITECTURE

### Criteria and Factors for Merit Review, Tenured & Tenure Track Faculty

As amended and approved by AAA Dean 4/30/2014

The department head will rank individuals against the criteria outlined below, and will calculate scores. Each individual's summary score (total) is calculated by multiplying each category score by its respective weight and then summing over all categories. Weights in each of the categories will be assigned as provided for in Section 6 of the Architecture Department Merit Policy.

#### Score Sheet

Category	Total Weight (%)	Scale: (low) 1 to 10 (high)
Teaching	40%	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Research	40%	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Service	20%	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Scores are generally interpreted as:

**1-2: Does not meet expectations**

**3-4: Provisionally meets expectations**

**5-6: Meets expectations**

**7-8: Exceeds expectations**

**9-10: Highest expectations**

#### CRITERIA

##### Teaching and Advising (Teaching)

*Classroom Instruction:* Assessment will be based on a range of information in order to judge the quality of teaching, taking into account factors such as: class size, elective vs. required classes, lab and workshop classes, and teaching assistant roles. The Department will assemble student evaluations. Assessment data may include:

- Student evaluation of courses: numerical scores and written evaluations
- Peer reviews of teaching
- Awards, grants and special recognition for teaching
- Participation in workshops by entities like the Teaching Effectiveness Program (TEP)
- Enrollment trends and student demand
- Quality of syllabus and teaching materials
- Student complaints or concerns
- Quality and consistency of submitted written studio evaluations
- Incorporates current technology into teaching methods
- Course content reevaluated and updated based on new scholarship and developments in the profession
- New course content developed to meet departmental needs

*Availability:* Faculty need to be available to students outside the classroom for consultation and assistance; maintaining regular office hours or consultation periods is expected of all faculty. The information used for this assessment may include:

- Responses to “communication outside the classroom” questions on student evaluations
- Written comments about availability in student evaluations
- Regular posting of and availability during office hours

*Advising:* Advising students on academics and research is an important role for TTF faculty. The information used for this assessment may include:

- Advising students undertaking theses or honors theses
- Advising of non-architecture masters projects and theses
- Academic advising of students
- Advising students through Independent Studies
- Career and professional development advising
- Writing student recommendation letters and employment references

*Thresholds:*

Teaching and advising are important roles for all TTF faculty in the Architecture Department, and all faculty are expected to perform to the best of their ability given the teaching setting. Factors that may result in an evaluation of “does not meet expectations” or “provisionally meets expectations” may include:

- Consistently low scores on student teaching evaluations
- Consistently poor peer evaluations
- Student evaluation comments that raise significant concerns about the dedication, competency, professionalism or conduct of the faculty member
- Unwillingness or lack of availability related to student academic advising
- Does not consistently submit detailed written studio evaluations
- Does not update and continuously reevaluate course content based on new scholarship and developments in the profession
- Consistently low enrollment trends and student demand for classes
- Poor quality or lack of available syllabus and other teaching materials
- Consistent and legitimate student complaints or concerns
- 

### **Research and Scholarship, Professional Practice, and Creative Work (Research)**

The Architecture Department recognizes a broad range of research, practice, and creative activities in accord with the scope and diversity of the field of architecture, as provided for in our Promotion and Tenure Policy. This entails an unusually broad range of activities that may be evaluated for meritorious faculty achievement and makes the articulation of complete and rigorous performance criteria challenging, and subject to adaptive interpretation and periodic revision. Judgments while applying the merit evaluation criteria found in this policy must be made with an understanding of these circumstances and an awareness of the different modes of inquiry found across our diverse individual faculty members.

Evidence of recognized contributions in research and scholarship, professional practice, and creative work will all be considered in evaluating faculty in their research endeavors. Evaluation of research, practice, and creative activity may also include consideration of evidence of substantive work in progress; this may encompass multi-phase, team-based, or externally funded (etc.) projects as well as individual efforts. Contributions may include:

- Refereed publications

- Books and monographs
- Book chapters
- Reports
- Published criticism
- Conference presentations
- Grant funding of research
- Consulting work on professional projects
- Awards, nominations and recognition of research
- Other research
- Curated exhibits
- Exhibition catalogs
- Awards for a body of scholarship and research or professional and creative work
- Awards for specific professional or creative work
- Public exhibition of professional or creative work
- Publication of professional or creative work

*Thresholds:*

Research and scholarship, professional practice, and creative work are highly valued in the Architecture Department and the University of Oregon. Factors that may result in an evaluation of “does not meet expectations” or “provisionally meets expectations” may include:

- Consistent underperformance in research dissemination: journal articles, books, research publications, exhibits, conferences
- Consistent underperformance in research activities: research grants, research projects
- Consistent underperformance in recognized professional or creative activities: consulting work, architecture practice, urban design studies

**Service**

University service is important for the operation of the Department, School and the University. Faculty with service roles are responsible for providing documentation and details of all service activities, including information about work load and individual contributions.

*Service to UO:* The factors considered in the assessment of service may include: work load of the service role, role in the assignment, relationship of the service to the Department’s or School’s mission, and whether it is voluntary or assigned service. As per the Department’s tenure and promotion policy, service for untenured faculty is expected to be less extensive than that for faculty who have achieved promotion and tenure. The University also expects a significant increase in service activities for promotion to Full Professor. Service factors may include:

- Participation in department meetings
- Program and department leadership
- Participation in department retreats and events
- Participation in department committees
- Other service duties for the department (tasks, assignments, ad hoc committees)
- AAA level committees and service roles
- UO level committees and service roles
- Special projects and initiatives

- Awards and special recognition of University service
- Advising student groups

*External Service:* Community and professional organization service is considered in evaluations. In general, external service evaluations will give varying weight based on impact and prominence. For example, there would be ascending merit for service based on its impact at the local, state and national level. At the Associate Professor and Professor levels, high-profile professional leadership is valued to promote the reputation of the Department. Service factors may include:

- Service to journals or research funders (reviewer, editorial board, etc.)
- Service to academic and research organizations (committees, conferences, etc.)
- Service to the profession (committees, conferences, etc.)
- Service to government and nonprofit organizations (appointments, committees, pro bono work, etc.)
- Awards and special recognition of external service
- Other service

*Thresholds:*

Service is important for the functioning of the department and the university, and the external reputation of the department. As noted above, these expectations are lower at the Assistant Professor rank and increase at the Associate and Professor ranks. Factors that may result in an evaluation of “does not meet expectations” or “provisionally meets expectations” may include:

- Consistent lack of participation in architecture department meetings and events
- Lack of willingness to serve on architecture department committees and failure to complete committee assignments
- Lack of service work at the AAA and UO levels
- Lack of significant external service
- Consistent lack of leadership roles appropriate to level and position



## ARCHITECTURE

### Criteria and Factors for Merit Review, Non-Tenure Track Faculty

As amended and approved by AAA Dean 4/30/2014

The department head will rank individuals against the criteria outlined below, and will calculate scores. Each individual's summary score (total) is calculated by multiplying each category score by its respective weight and then summing over all categories. Weights in each of the categories will be assigned as provided for in Section 6 of the Architecture Department Merit Policy.

#### Score Sheet

Category	Total Weight (%)	Scale: (low) 1 to 10 (high)
Teaching	0 - 100%	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Research	0 - 100%	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Service	0- 100%	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Scores are generally interpreted as:

**1-2: Does not meet expectations**

**3-4: Provisionally meets expectations**

**5-6: Meets expectations**

**7-8: Exceeds expectations**

**9-10: Highest expectations**

#### CRITERIA

##### Teaching and Advising (Teaching)

*Classroom Instruction:* Assessment will be based on a range of information in order to judge the quality of teaching, taking into account factors such as: class size, elective vs. required classes, lab and workshop classes, and teaching assistant roles. The Department will assemble student evaluations. Assessment data may include:

- Student evaluation of courses: numerical scores and written evaluations
- Peer reviews of teaching
- Awards, grants and special recognition for teaching
- Participation in workshops by entities like the Teaching Effectiveness Program (TEP)
- Enrollment trends and student demand
- Quality of syllabus and teaching materials
- Student complaints or concerns
- Quality and consistency of submitted written studio evaluations
- Awards, nominations and recognition of teaching
- Incorporates current technology into teaching methods
- Course content reevaluated and updated based on new scholarship and developments in the profession
- New course content developed to meet departmental needs

*Availability:* Faculty need to be available to students outside the classroom for consultation and assistance; maintaining regular office hours or consultation periods is expected of all faculty.

The information used for this assessment may include:

- Responses to “communication outside the classroom” questions on student evaluations
- Written comments about availability in student evaluations
- Regular posting of and availability during office hours

*Advising:* Advising students on academics and research is an important role for faculty. This role may not apply to NTTF faculty who are not contracted to take on this advising work. The information used for this assessment may include:

- Advising students undertaking theses or honors theses
- Advising of non-architecture masters projects and theses
- Academic advising of students
- Advising students through Independent Studies
- Career and professional development advising
- Writing student recommendation letters and employment references

*Thresholds:*

Teaching and advising are important roles for faculty in the Architecture Department, and all faculty are expected to perform to the best of their ability given the teaching setting. Some factors apply to all faculty (teaching) and others only apply to tenure track faculty with a wider range of teaching duties (academic and thesis advising). Factors that may result in an evaluation of “does not meet expectations” or “provisionally meets expectations” may include:

- Consistently low scores on student teaching evaluations
- Consistently poor peer evaluations
- Student evaluation comments that raise significant concerns about the dedication, competency, professionalism or conduct of the faculty member
- Unwillingness or lack of availability related to student academic advising
- Does not consistently submit detailed written studio evaluations
- Does not update and continuously reevaluate course content based on new scholarship and developments in the profession
- Consistently low enrollment trends and student demand for classes
- Poor quality or lack of available syllabus and other teaching materials
- Consistent and legitimate student complaints or concerns
- Lack of attention to providing student recommendation letters and employment references

### **Research and Scholarship, Professional Practice, and Creative Work (Research)**

The Architecture Department recognizes a broad range of research, practice, and creative activities in accord with the scope and diversity of the field of architecture, as provided for in our Promotion and Tenure Policy. This entails an unusually broad range of activities that may be evaluated for meritorious faculty achievement and makes the articulation of complete and rigorous performance criteria challenging, and subject to adaptive interpretation and periodic revision. Judgments while applying the merit evaluation criteria found in this policy must be made with an understanding of these circumstances and an awareness of the different modes of inquiry found across our diverse individual faculty members.

Evidence of recognized contributions in research and scholarship, professional practice, and creative work will all be considered in evaluating faculty in their research endeavors. Evaluation of research, practice, and creative activity may also include consideration of evidence of substantive work in progress; this may encompass multi-phase, team-based, or externally funded (etc.) projects as well as individual efforts. It is understood that for Research Faculty meritorious work may be evaluated based on their contributions to research and scholarship, professional and creative work accomplishments in the labs in which they are employed.

Contributions may include:

- Refereed publications
- Books and monographs
- Book chapters
- Reports
- Published criticism
- Conference presentations
- Grant funding of research
- Consulting work on professional projects
- Awards, nominations and recognition of research
- Other research
- Curated exhibits
- Exhibition catalogs
- Awards for a body of scholarship and research or professional and creative work
- Awards for specific professional or creative work
- Public exhibition of professional or creative work
- Publication of professional or creative work

*Thresholds:*

Research and scholarship, professional practice, and creative work are highly valued in the Architecture Department and the University of Oregon. Factors that may result in an evaluation of “does not meet expectations” or “provisionally meets expectations” may include:

- Consistent underperformance in research dissemination: journal articles, books, research publications, exhibits, conferences
- Consistent underperformance in research activities: research grants, research projects
- Consistent underperformance in recognized professional or creative activities: consulting work, architecture practice, urban design studies

## **Service**

University service is important for the operation of the Department, School and the University. Faculty with service roles are responsible for providing documentation and details of all service activities, including information about work load and individual contributions.

*Service to UO:* The factors considered in the assessment of service may include: work load of the service role, role in the assignment, relationship of the service to the Department’s or School’s mission, and whether it is voluntary or assigned service. Service factors may include:

- Participation in department meetings
- Program and department leadership
- Participation in department retreats and events
- Participation in department committees

- Other service duties for the department (tasks, assignments, ad hoc committees)
- AAA level committees and service roles
- UO level committees and service roles
- Special projects and initiatives
- Awards and special recognition of University service
- Advising student groups

*External Service:* Community and professional organization service is considered in evaluations. In general, external service evaluations will give varying weight based on impact and prominence. For example, there would be ascending merit for service based on its impact at the local, state and national level. Service factors may include:

- Service to journals or research funders (reviewer, editorial board, etc.)
- Service to academic and research organizations (committees, conferences, etc.)
- Service to the profession (committees, conferences, etc.)
- Service to government and nonprofit organizations (appointments, committees, pro bono work, etc.)
- Awards and special recognition of external service
- Other service

*Thresholds:*

Service is important for the functioning of the department and the university, and the external reputation of the department. Factors that may result in an evaluation of “does not meet expectations” or “provisionally meets expectations” may include:

- Consistent lack of participation in architecture department meetings and events
- Lack of willingness to serve on architecture department committees and failure to complete committee assignments
- Lack of service work at the AAA and UO levels
- Lack of significant external service
- Consistent lack of leadership roles appropriate to level and position