

# Physics Merit Procedure May 2014

## Glossary:

- TRF – Tenure-related Faculty, i.e. tenure-track or tenured officers of instruction
- NTTF – Non-tenure related faculty
- CINTTF – Career NTTF officer of instruction
- CAS – College of Arts and Sciences
- DH – Physics Department Head

## General Principles:

1. All faculty must be evaluated for merit. It is not permitted to opt out.
2. Regardless of type of appointment or FTE, each faculty member is eligible for consideration for the highest merit rating.
3. All faculty who meet or exceed expectations will receive some merit increase

The following describes the process used for determining merit pay raises for tenure-related and career non-tenure related faculty in the Department of Physics. The evaluation of faculty for merit is based primarily on the annual reports submitted by faculty, along with their current CV. The *Physics Department Annual Evaluation Guidelines* for producing and evaluating annual reports begins on the next.

The current merit procedure is outlined as follows:

- Reports are evaluated and merit is calculated using the period of employment starting at the time of the previous merit raise, unless there is a clear intention to do otherwise. (For example, the intended start for both the FY 2014 and 2015 merit raises is 2008.)
- The Personnel Committee (PC) evaluates faculty according to their duties. For research tenure-related faculty, the evaluation categories are (1) research, (2) teaching, and (3) service. See the Guidelines document for details. Every year, the PC determines a score of 0 to 10 with a mean of 5 in each category, and a composite score based on the ratio 2:1:1 for weighting the categories research:teaching:service. NTTF and non-research TRF are evaluated by categories and weightings consistent with their position duties and contract. When multiple years are being used to evaluate merit, the composite scores are averaged over the relevant number of years by the DH.
- Sabbaticals and leaves (from UO Policy adopted May 2014): For faculty on sabbatical or research leave, including unpaid research leave, research will be evaluated as your merit policy dictates. For terms with no assigned teaching as a result of a sabbatical or funded course release (e.g. through OHC or the Dean's office) or an external grant, then the faculty member will be evaluated as meeting teaching expectations during that term. 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 actual service during that period. Faculty on prolonged medical or family leave 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.
- In current practice, the composite score  $S$  is converted to a percentage of the current base salary, based on the formula

$$\langle R \rangle * (S - \langle S \rangle) / \sigma$$

where  $\langle S \rangle$  and  $\sigma$  are the mean and standard deviation, respectively, of the composite scores in the merit pool, and  $\langle R \rangle$  is the average percent raise of the relevant merit pool as defined by the Provost. The threshold for faculty performance which meets expectations is determined as a composite score one standard deviation below the mean. Faculty members with composite scores above this threshold are considered to be meeting or exceeding expectations. We prefer to apply the raises as a percentage of the current base salary, as opposed to a raise in absolute dollars, as a way to accelerate the effect of merit over time. It is understood that future PCs and DHs may decide to use a different method. In addition, there are reasons why it may not be possible to carry out the above verbatim. For example, we do not

award negative merit. In addition, depending on the base salary composition of the merit pool, applying merit on a strictly percentage basis may deplete the pool.

- The DH reviews the recommended raises with the chair of the PC before they are submitted to CAS.
- Once approved by CAS, the resulting merit raise for each individual eligible to receive the raise will be reported to that individual.
- Merit decisions will be tracked by storing them on the Physics server. The decisions will be stored by date and topic.

## Physics Department Annual Evaluation Guidelines

The research programs of our Department have national and international impact and competitiveness, we strive to provide excellent instruction to our undergraduate and graduate students and innovative course development, and we value high quality service to the Department, University, and external scientific community. Usually in the winter term, all Physics faculty are asked to submit an annual report that describes their activities in each of these areas for the previous calendar year. These reports are reviewed by the Physics Department Personnel Committee, which then produces annual evaluations of all faculty. Average scores, standard deviations, and histograms resulting from this process are made available to the faculty in a timely manner.

**Research evaluation:** As a research intensive department, the annual evaluation places great emphasis on scientific achievement, except in cases where the nature and intent of the appointment precludes major research activities. Factors to be considered by the Personnel Committee in the annual evaluation of research include:

- quality and number of scientific publications,
- external funding at a level required to do competitive research in the candidate's sub-discipline,
- support and supervision of graduates student in their research,
- external evidence of national and international impact demonstrated through participation in conferences and workshops, invited talks, and citation and impact rankings of publications.

**Teaching evaluation:** The Physics Department expects all faculty to spend a substantial fraction of their time on teaching-related activities, and to strive for excellence in this area. Factors to be considered by the Personnel Committee in the annual evaluation of teaching include:

- course materials, including syllabi, web pages, exams, etc.,
- developing new courses, pedagogies, demonstrations, hands-on activities,
- authoring new textbooks and other curricular materials,
- student course evaluations,
- advising undergraduate students in research,
- overload teaching, for example, in the Honors College, should be considered as a component of the teaching portfolio, but faculty members cannot be penalized for declining an overload assignment;
- peer teaching evaluations.

It is understood that faculty annual reports would include a list of courses taught, students under advisement, and any other pertinent or unusual points relevant for the evaluation of teaching. Course materials and student or peer evaluations would be collected by the Personnel Committee, as needed.

**Service evaluation:** For junior faculty substantial service activity within the Department is expected and some level of University service is encouraged though not required. For senior faculty, extensive service

within the Department and the University as well as within the faculty member's scientific community is expected. Examples of activities to be considered by the Personnel Committee in the annual evaluation of service include:

- membership on and particularly leadership of Departmental and University committees,
- membership and leadership of graduate student thesis committees,
- inviting and hosting speakers for colloquia and seminars,
- leadership of Centers and Institutes,
- other *ad hoc* service around the University,
- membership on advisory and review committees at funding agencies, foundations, societies, facilities, other universities etc.,
- editorship of scientific journals,
- review of papers submitted to journals and grant proposals submitted to funding agencies,
- organization of conferences, conference sessions, and workshops,
- general public and K-12 outreach activities,
- other scientific activities not directly related to the faculty member's research and teaching activities.

For each faculty, research, teaching, and service activities are each given a numerical ranking with a forced average of 50% of the maximum, e.g., a score between 0 and 10 with an average of 5. A composite score is then calculated. For regular tenure-related, research faculty, the customary weighting of research:teaching:service is 2:1:1.

***Exceptions and variations:***

Our mission and faculty are diverse, and we acknowledge that no single set of evaluation criteria can be exclusively applied. Exceptions to the above criteria include:

- For faculty having appointments that preclude major research activities, evaluations are based instead on teaching, service, and a third category appropriate to the appointment. For example, an instructor with duties supporting lecture demonstrations might have a third category of instructional support. An instructor undertaking significant K-12 activities could have outreach as a third category. The service category, which normally combines UO-internal and external components for faculty with appointments involving significant research, may be viewed differently for instructor rank faculty. In consultation with the Personnel Committee and the personnel involved, the Department Heat will identify and weight these categories on a case-by-case basis.
- 100-level literacy and 200-level service courses are a particularly important component of the Department's teaching portfolio. These classes are generally considered to be difficult teaching assignments. Faculty who teach these classes will have their teaching scores multiplied by factors of 1.1 and 1.2 for 100-level and 200-level classes, respectively, weighted by the number of such courses they teach during the year.