

**Department of Human Physiology Merit Evaluation Procedures for
Tenure Track Faculty, Non-Tenure Track Faculty, and Officers of Administration
(Updated June 2014)**

The following paragraphs document the evaluation criteria and procedures for all faculty (i.e., tenure track faculty and non-tenure track faculty, including career, adjunct, and postdoc) within the Department of Human Physiology. This policy explicitly establishes the following:

1. All faculty will be evaluated for merit as it is not permitted to opt out. Regardless of type of appointment or FTE, each faculty member is eligible for consideration for the highest merit rating.
2. The evaluation for merit includes review of both recent performance review(s) and the current CV.
3. All faculty who meet or exceed expectations must receive some merit increase. Specifically, these are individuals ranked in Tiers 3-5 for research TTF and Career NTTF, and Tiers 2-3 for instructional and research NTTF.
4. Individuals who are placed on Administrative Leave by the University related to their job performance will be considered as not meeting expectations. In addition, individuals who are deficient in all areas of their review (Tier 1 in all applicable categories) will be considered not meeting expectations.
5. Faculty will be informed of their raises after they have been awarded.
6. Documentation of merit decisions will be tracked and maintained by the Department Head and the Department's Office Manager for both TTF and NTTF to allow for appropriate follow up or review if questions arise later.
7. Evaluation criteria and procedures vary for each class of faculty within the Department and are outlined in the following sections as follows: Officers of Administration; NTTF Career Instructors; NTTF Adjunct Instructors; NTTF Officers of Research; TTF-Assistant Professors; TTF-Tenured Faculty.

Officer of Administration Merit Increase Procedures

The Department Head will base their 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 using the Structured Approach evaluation form provided on CASweb. The review should evaluate 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 consider, when possible, feedback from relevant constituent groups both internal and external to the department or program. 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.

NTTF Merit Increase Procedures

The Personnel Committee will perform an initial evaluation of the NTTF members and make a recommendation to the Department Head. The Department Head will consider performance reviews of the NTTF during the relevant evaluation period using the HPHY department NTTF Merit Evaluation form for each of the classes of NTTF: Career Instructor; Adjunct Instructor; Officer of Research. If there has not been a performance review within the past year, the Department Head will perform such a review to evaluate the NTTF's performance of the duties and responsibilities described in their contract language and his/her current job duties. The Department Head's merit increase recommendation will be based on the extent to which the individual 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 recommendations to the CAS Dean. The actual merit award will be based on funding availability and university criteria.

Human Physiology Department Personnel Committee
Evaluation of NTTF Career Instructor Performance

Faculty member performance is evaluated in two or three areas depending on the specific duties of the NTTF member: teaching, AT program/Advising duties, and service according to the specific job description when hired and on file in the department. Teaching, program-specific duties, and service are given a weighting of 45%, 40%, 15%. Given below is a detailed analysis of how the scoring of the faculty is conducted for the annual review of faculty. For an NTTF member who has been hired predominantly to teach, the rating is shifted to 90%, 10% for teaching and service. Faculty members are rated on a percentage basis that is reflected in the overall merit evaluation document.

1. Teaching	45%	
Coursework (number of courses, students, evals)		20%
Maintaining a Laboratory/Course of Study or Program		10%
Training of Graduate and Undergrad Students		10%
Profile/visibility/invited talks, honors and awards		5%
2. AT Program/Advising	40%	
Program Evaluation/Accreditation		25%
Development of Student Opportunities		10%
Professional Advancement		5%
3. Service	15%	
Departmental/Institute		10%
University-wide		5%

The Personnel Committee meets with the department head to discuss their ratings and are available to work with the department head in determining merit increases. Teaching faculty are evaluated on a somewhat different scale than the research faculty with heavier weighting on teaching (see below). However, there remains a strong component desired from the instructional faculty to be involved in scholarly activities that assist in improvement of the educational program in the department and to be involved in professional organizations of the broader Physiology community.

The following categories are used to group faculty:

- 5 – Outstanding: exceeds expectations in all areas
- 4 – Excellent: exceeds expectations in at least one area, meets expectations in other areas
- 3 – Good: meets expectations in all areas
- 2 – Fair: does not meet expectations in at least one area
- 1 – Poor: does not meet expectations in more than one area

Summary of Criteria for Faculty Performance Evaluation

I. Teaching:

- (1) The overall quality of teaching of classroom instruction including careful presentation of course material and effectiveness of presentation.
- (2) Stimulation of student interest in doing high-quality work and maintenance of appropriate standards of student performance.
- (3) Supervision and evaluation of student research at both the undergraduate and graduate level including student review committees.
- (4) Revision of courses to keep them updated.
- (5) Development and implementation of effective teaching techniques.
- (6) Development of educational objectives and developing teaching and evaluation materials reflecting current scholarship in the discipline and in educational theory.

II. Program Specific Duties and Scholarly Activities

- (1) Education of Graduate Students (AT Program) or Undergrads
- (2) Overall Success of Program or Advising
- (3) External Notoriety of program
- (4) Participation and attendance at conferences, seminars and professional meetings
- (5) Invited Seminars, Presentations, Visits to other Institutions

III. Leadership in Academic and Administrative Service

- (1) Departmental/Institute administration and curriculum, personnel and policy committees or activities.
- (2) College of Arts and Sciences, University, or State system committees or activities.
- (3) Service and activities on behalf of the larger community (local, state, national and international governmental bodies etc) as they are related to teaching or research.

Human Physiology Department Personnel Committee
Evaluation of NTTF Adjunct Instructor Performance

Faculty member performance is evaluated in two areas specific to the duties of the NTTF member: teaching and service according to the specific job description when hired and on file in the department. Given below is a detailed analysis of how the scoring of the faculty is conducted for the annual review of faculty. Faculty members are rated on a percentage basis that is reflected in the overall merit evaluation document.

I. Teaching:

- | | |
|--|-----|
| (1) The overall quality of teaching of classroom instruction including careful presentation of course material and effectiveness of presentation. | 60% |
| (2) Stimulation of student interest in doing high-quality work and maintenance of appropriate standards of student performance. | 10% |
| (3) Revision of courses to keep them updated. | 10% |
| (4) Development and implementation of effective teaching techniques. | 10% |
| (5) Development of educational objectives and developing teaching and evaluation materials reflecting current scholarship in the discipline and in educational theory. | 10% |

The Personnel Committee meets with the department head to discuss their ratings and are available to work with the department head in determining merit increases. There remains a strong component desired from the instructional faculty to be involved in scholarly activities that assist in improvement of the educational program in the department and to be involved in professional organizations of the broader Physiology community.

The following categories are used to group faculty:

- 3 – exceeds expectations
- 2 – meets expectations
- 1 – does not meet expectations

Human Physiology Department Personnel Committee
Evaluation of NTTF Officer of Research Performance

The Department Head of Human Physiology will base his/her merit increase recommendation on the performance reviews of the Non-Tenure Track Faculty-Officers of Research (NTTF-OR, which include career, adjunct or postdoc) during the relevant evaluation period. All NTTF-OR will be reviewed annually by their immediate faculty supervisor (in most cases not the Department Head) using the “HPHY Officer of Research-Coordinator or Post-Doc Performance Evals Template-HPHY 2014” form, based on the OA evaluation form developed by the UO Office of Research, Innovation and Graduate Education. This review will evaluate the performance of duties, tasks, and responsibilities described in the contract language and job descriptions for each position.

The faculty supervisor will discuss with the Department Head his/her ratings and propose a merit raise. The Department Head’s merit increase recommendation will be based on the extent to which the NTTF-OR member has met or exceeded expected performance of her/his duties and responsibilities, as indicated by the relevant performance review.

When requested, the Department Head will provide the department’s merit increase recommendations to the CAS Dean. The actual merit awards will be based on funding availability and university criteria.

The following categories are used to rank research non-tenure track faculty:

- 3 – exceeds expectations
- 2 – meets expectations
- 1 – does not meet expectations

Summary of Criteria for Instructional NTTF-OR Performance Evaluation

These can vary markedly from person to person depending upon the duties, tasks, and responsibilities described in the contract language and job descriptions for each position. The criteria will be listed in the “HPHY Officer of Research-Coordinator or Post-Doc Performance Evals Template-HPHY 2014”.

Tenure Track Faculty Merit Increase Procedures

The Personnel Committee will perform an initial evaluation of the Tenure-Track Faculty members and make a recommendation to the Department Head. The Personnel Committee is comprised of tenured faculty members. The Department Head will consider performance reviews of the TTF during the relevant evaluation period using the HPHY department TTF Merit Evaluation form. There are separate criteria for pre-tenured (Assistant Professor) and post-tenured faculty (Associate and Full Professors). If there has not been a performance review within the past year, the Department Head will perform such a review to evaluate the TTF members performance of the duties and responsibilities. The Department Head's merit increase recommendation will be based on the extent to which the individual 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 recommendations to the CAS Dean. The actual merit award will be based on funding availability and university criteria.

Human Physiology Department Personnel Committee
Evaluation of Assistant Professor Tenure-Track Faculty Performance

Faculty performance is evaluated in three areas: research, teaching and service. Research, teaching and service are given a weighting of 60%, 30%, and 10%. The weighting is more heavily skewed towards research than for tenured faculty to emphasize the need for the junior faculty (Assistant Professors) to be successful in this area for tenure and promotion consideration. While value is still placed on service to the Department and the greater university committee, the expectation in this area is less than for tenured faculty. When one takes into account that much of the research effort overlaps with the teaching effort because of the faculty/student interactions in the laboratory, teaching and research have some overlap. If a faculty member uses research funds to buy-out of teaching (or has a research training grant such as an NIH K-award), the weighting will be scaled appropriately. Given below is a detailed analysis of how scoring of the faculty members is conducted for the annual review. The faculty members are rated on a percentage basis by the Personnel Committee.

1. Research	60%	
Publications and research productivity		25%
Funding from external sources		15%
Training of laboratory personnel (postdocs, gs, ugs)		10%
Profile/visibility/invited talks, honors and awards		10%
2. Teaching	30%	
Coursework; Student and Peer Reviews;		20%
Commitment to Teaching Mission of the Department		10%
3. Service	10%	
Departmental/Institute		5%
University-wide		5%

The Personnel Committee (consisting of tenured faculty only) meets with the department head to discuss their ratings and are available to work with the department head in determining merit increases.

The following categories were used to group faculty:

- 5 – Outstanding: exceeds expectations in all areas
- 4 – Excellent: exceeds expectations in at least one area, meets expectations in other areas
- 3 – Good: meets expectations in all areas
- 2 – Fair: does not meet expectations in at least one area
- 1 – Poor: does not meet expectations in more than one area

Summary of Criteria for Faculty Performance Evaluation

I. Teaching:

- (1) The overall quality of teaching of classroom instruction including careful presentation of course material and effectiveness of presentation.
- (2) Stimulation of student interest in doing high-quality work and maintenance of appropriate standards of student performance.
- (3) Supervision and evaluation of student research at both the undergraduate and graduate level including student review committees.
- (4) Revision of courses to keep them updated.
- (5) Development and implementation of effective teaching techniques.
- (6) Development of educational objectives and developing teaching and evaluation materials reflecting current scholarship in the discipline and in educational theory.

II. Research and Scholarly Activities

- (1) Publications of significance and quality.
- (2) Research in progress and substantially planned work.
- (3) External funding of research program.
- (4) Participation and attendance at conferences, seminars and professional meetings
- (5) Invited Seminars, Presentations, Visits to other Institutions
- (6) Holding offices in professional societies or serving on professional committees, editorial boards and science advisory boards.
- (7) Awareness of current developments in the faculty member's profession.
- (8) Recognized evidence of scholarliness such as special awards, lectureships and scholarly citations.
- (9) Education of research personnel and execution of responsibilities associated with supervising research theses and projects of undergraduate students, graduate students and postdoctoral associates.

III. Leadership in Academic and Administrative Service

- (3) Departmental/Institute administration and curriculum, personnel and policy committees or activities.
- (4) College of Arts and Sciences, University, or State system committees or activities.
- (3) Service and activities on behalf of the larger community (local, state, national and international governmental bodies etc) as they are related to teaching or research.

Human Physiology Department Personnel Committee
Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Performance

Faculty performance is evaluated in three areas: research, teaching and service. Research, teaching and service are given a weighting of 50%, 35%, and 15%. When one takes into account that much of the research effort overlaps with the teaching effort because of the faculty/student interactions in the laboratory, teaching and research have some overlap. If a faculty member uses research funds to buy out of teaching, the weighting will be scaled appropriately. Given below is a detailed analysis of how scoring of the faculty members is conducted for the annual review. The faculty members are rated on a percentage basis by the Personnel Committee.

1. Research	50%	
Publications and research productivity		20%
Funding from external sources		10%
Training of laboratory personnel (postdocs, gs, ugs)		10%
Profile/visibility/invited talks, honors and awards		10%
2. Teaching	35%	
Coursework; Student and Peer Reviews;		25%
Commitment to Teaching Mission of the Department		10%
3. Service	15%	
Departmental/Institute		10%
University-wide		5%

The Personnel Committee will evaluate each other, but these evaluations are only disclosed to the department head. The committee meets with the department head to discuss their ratings and are available to work with the department head in determining merit increases. Teaching faculty are evaluated on a somewhat different scale than the research faculty with heavier weighting on teaching. However, there remains a strong component desired from the instructional faculty to be involved in scholarly activities that assist in improvement of the educational program in the department and to be involved in professional organizations of the broader Physiology community.

The following categories were used to group faculty:

- 5 – Outstanding: exceeds expectations in all areas
- 4 – Excellent: exceeds expectations in at least one area, meets expectations in other areas
- 3 – Good: meets expectations in all areas
- 2 – Fair: does not meet expectations in at least one area
- 1 – Poor: does not meet expectations in more than one area

Summary of Criteria for Faculty Performance Evaluation

I. Teaching:

- (1) The overall quality of teaching of classroom instruction including careful presentation of course material and effectiveness of presentation.
- (2) Stimulation of student interest in doing high-quality work and maintenance of appropriate standards of student performance.
- (3) Supervision and evaluation of student research at both the undergraduate and graduate level including student review committees.
- (4) Revision of courses to keep them updated.
- (5) Development and implementation of effective teaching techniques.
- (6) Development of educational objectives and developing teaching and evaluation materials reflecting current scholarship in the discipline and in educational theory.

II. Research and Scholarly Activities

- (1) Publications of significance and quality.
- (2) Research in progress and substantially planned work.
- (3) External funding of research program.
- (4) Participation and attendance at conferences, seminars and professional meetings
- (5) Invited Seminars, Presentations, Visits to other Institutions
- (6) Holding offices in professional societies or serving on professional committees, editorial boards and science advisory boards.
- (7) Awareness of current developments in the faculty member's profession.
- (8) Recognized evidence of scholarliness such as special awards, lectureships and scholarly citations.
- (9) Education of research personnel and execution of responsibilities associated with supervising research theses and projects of undergraduate students, graduate students and postdoctoral associates.

III. Leadership in Academic and Administrative Service

- (1) Departmental/Institute administration and curriculum, personnel and policy committees or activities.
- (2) College of Arts and Sciences, University, or State system committees or activities.
- (3) Service and activities on behalf of the larger community (local, state, national and international governmental bodies etc) as they are related to teaching or research.