

Merit Review Procedures

Department of German and Scandinavian
University of Oregon

I. Introduction

The policies and procedures described in this document, which was crafted by members of the Department of German and Scandinavian, representing all ranks of the teaching faculty, are intended to be consistent with the policies of the University of Oregon, as posted by the Office of Academic Affairs, and of the College of Arts and Sciences, and with the various requirements of the Collective Bargaining Agreement between United Academics and the University of Oregon. It is understood that internal merit review procedures and any policies developed through internal governance, both within this unit and as specified in the CBA, are subject to the approval of the appropriate dean and the Provost or designee.

The stipulations, procedures, and processes articulated in this document may be amended or replaced by a majority vote of the TTF and regular Career NTTF members of the faculty. The proposed changes will be circulated to the faculty in writing at least two weeks before any meeting at which the question of changing aspects of this document is discussed with a view to attaining a decision through a vote. We retain the right to regularly revisit this document to ensure that it is congruent with the needs of the department, the students, and the University.

II. Composition of the Review Committee

Merit Raises are determined by the Head in consultation with two other faculty members (at least one Full Professor), to be appointed by the Head. No committee member will deliberate on his/her own raise. The committee will seek consensus, but the Head is responsible for the final evaluation. The deliberations of the committee shall remain confidential. The Head submits the final recommendation to the Dean. The review of the Head is conducted by the Associate Dean.

III. Procedures

No faculty member may opt out of the Merit Review process.

III.a TTF

TTF submit an Activity Report as well as current CV to the Head and the committee.

III.b NTTF

NTTF submit an Activity Report as well as current CV to the Head and the committee.

III.c OA

The Department Head, in consultation with the committee, will base his or her merit increase recommendation 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 review will be conducted according to the Structured Approach / Performance Management Planning and Review Form issued by the Department of Human Resources, and amended as needed. The OA will be invited 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) that the Head and the committee will take into account in making their recommendation.

IV. Criteria and Guidelines

IV a. TTF Criteria:

- Tenured: 40% Research/40% Teaching/20% Service

The Department recognizes the primacy of research and teaching among the professional responsibilities of TTF. This policy also recognizes the considerable service demands in a small department, and incentivizes wide distribution of these duties, particularly among tenured faculty members. To this effect, the Head retains the discretion to adjust the above percentages within limits (by no more than 10% per category) to accommodate particular circumstances, taking into account input by the faculty member in question on their Activity Report.

- Non-Tenured: 50% Research/40% Teaching/10% Service

Faculty on the tenure-reduction program (TRP) will be evaluated according to the criteria agreed upon in their TRP appointment.

Faculty on joint appointments will be evaluated according to the MOU to which both departments have agreed.

IV. b. NTTF Criteria: 60% Teaching/30% Service/10% Professional Development and Research

The Head retains the discretion to adjust the above percentages within limits (by no more than 10% per category) to accommodate particular circumstances, taking into account input by the faculty member in question on their Activity Report. In such cases, no single category may exceed 60%, nor may any category fall below 10%.

For TTF and NTTF, the individual Activity Report will include the following categories:

1. Name
2. Present rank
3. Date appointed to this rank
4. Courses taught during the period
5. Graduate-student committees
 - A. As chair
 - B. As member
6. Course development
7. Publications
 - A. Appeared
 - B. Accepted
8. Work in Progress (including work submitted)
9. Papers presented at conferences
10. Invited lectures
11. Grants
12. Honors, awards, recognitions
13. Service for the Department
14. Service for the College and University
15. Service for the Profession
16. Service on Editorial Boards
17. Other activities

Guidelines for Assessing TTF and NTTF

The following general guidelines will be followed in assessing each of the three areas of professional responsibility:

Research

The primary evidence of research by faculty will be their ability to share with others the results of their work. This will be determined primarily by the quantity and quality of publications in recognized journals or publication houses. A secondary consideration will be presentation of papers to interested groups (e.g., papers delivered at

conferences, other universities, public lectures, campus groups outside the German and Scandinavian Department, or German/Scandinavian colloquia).

Teaching

Satisfactory teaching by faculty is assumed in the absence of recurring low teaching evaluations or numerous negative comments by students. Weighting adjustments are employed to correct for the fact that evaluations tend to be lower in some classes such as very large introductory or general education courses. Above-average performance can be established on the basis of favorable student evaluation, peer evaluation, and teaching awards. Other possible indications of merit in this area might be willingness to develop new courses to meet student interests and needs, major revision of course content and materials, and experiments with new methods of teaching or new media or technologies and the variety of courses taught (see above), or to serve on committees for B.A. honors theses, M.A. theses, and dissertations as director or committee member. However, none of these activities should be regarded as either necessary or sufficient to demonstrate exemplary teaching.

Service

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 or Director of Undergraduate Studies will be an indication of above average service, although the individual's contribution will be evaluated in relation to any course release time that might be given for the service or administrative work.

Also of special merit will be the 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, etc.

IV c. 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.

V. Scoring

Numerical scores will be assigned for each category as follows:

- 0 Unsatisfactory
- 1 Satisfactory
- 2 Good
- 3 Very Good
- 4 Excellent

Total scores can range from 0 – 12. Merit raises will be distributed by this score, irrespective of the faculty member's base salary.

The three scores will be weighted according to the relevant percentages (see Section IV.) to generate a total weighted score. The weighted scores of all faculty members will be totaled, and the percentage of each weighted score relative to whole will be determined. This figure will be used in determining the exact dollar amount out of the total dollar amount available for all faculty members.

For a merit review period totaling more than two years, time of service of each faculty member will be considered in 2-year increments within that total time period and be factored into the calculation of the recommended increase. For this particular merit review, applicable in FY15, the criteria for allocating the merit pool shall take into account all teaching, research, and service accomplishments since January 1, 2008.

VI. Documentation

Subsequent to approval by the Office of Academic Affairs, all faculty will be informed of their respective merit raises in writing by the Department Head.

The Department Administrator will retain the tabulation of numerical scores and corresponding dollar amounts as documentation of the merit review process for at least five years.

This Merit Raise Policy will be made available by the Department Administrator upon request. *June 1, 2014*