

Merit Evaluation Policy, Department of Philosophy
Approved by Faculty Committee, 11 April 2014; revised 27 May 2014

Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure-Track Instructional Faculty

This document details the merit evaluation policies and procedures for all tenure-related faculty (TTF) and non-tenure-related faculty (NTTF), including career and adjunct, in this department.

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

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

Section 1: Written Evaluation.

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

- a summary of her or his activities in teaching, research, and service for the relevant period.
- current curriculum vitae.

The Department Head will prepare a report taking into account the faculty member's summary, quantitative and qualitative teaching evaluations, plus any peer teaching evaluations available. Tenure Track and Non-Tenure Track 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 Merit Raise Committee (whose responsibilities, composition, and election process is as described in the Department of Philosophy's Operating Paper) will review the faculty summaries, the Department Head's reports, including those pertaining to their own evaluation, and rate faculty work in light of the merit guidelines below. The Head's report and the ratings determined by the Merit Raise Committee 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

Teaching. Performance in teaching will be assessed from multiple angles, including student evaluations, peer evaluations, and the faculty member's summary (Section 1). Student evaluations, both quantitative and qualitative, will be interpreted in the light shed by the most recent high-quality meta-analysis of the reliability, validity, and potential biases of these evaluations. Attention will be paid not just to the valence of comments, but also to their content, with an eye to the presence of comments that reflect on challenge and learning, not merely enjoyment, teacher agreeableness, or other factors. Quantitative evaluations should not be relied on exclusively for assessing the faculty member's teaching. Peer evaluations will be used as a measure of the care and effort an instructor puts into teaching and course design. Other possible indications of merit include teaching awards, willingness to develop or to teach new courses, major revisions of course contents and materials, attempts at new teaching methods or use of new technologies, and use of time-tested and effective, but labor-intensive, methods. None of these should be regarded as necessary or sufficient for exemplary teaching, however. Undergraduate thesis and graduate advising (including MA thesis and dissertation advising, as well as dissertation committee membership) will be considered under teaching.

Scholarship. 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 Philosophy Department, or Philosophy colloquia). 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.

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. 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.

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.

Section 4: Departmental Merit Guidelines, Non-Tenure Track Faculty.

The procedure for determining the merit of Adjunct and Career NTTF will be the same as the procedure for TTF. The NTT 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 and NTTF whose teaching evaluations are consistently lower than the departmental averages 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 NTTF (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 5: Principles of Weighting and Rating Metric.

For tenure-track faculty, teaching, scholarship, and service are treated as equal in weight, in recognition that the well-being of the Program and its mission depends equally on ongoing, high quality scholarship, excellence in and commitment to teaching, and willingness to do one's part in a wide range of service and administrative capacities. Non-tenure track 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 = Does not meet expectations
- 2 = Meets expectations
- 3 = exceeds expectations

Total scores can range from 0 to 9. 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.