

PPPM Merit Policy

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

PURPOSE

This policy outlines the procedures of the Department of Planning, Public Policy and Management (PPPM) 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 rates for purposes Promotion and Tenure.

Differentiation is established through an evaluation of merit materials against criteria listed in the *Criteria and Factors for Merit Review*.

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 most relevant to their position. The report must summarize:

- Faculty member's calculation of weighting based on their job description (weighting of teaching, research and service totaling 100%), to the extent that the individual would like to be given consideration for something other than the standard weighting provided in section 6.
- Activity since the last review process that relates to teaching, research, service (school, university and professional) and other relevant performance.

4.2. Current CV or Resume – Faculty will submit a current Curriculum Vitae or Resume.

5. Criteria and Factors

The criteria and factors for merit review are outlined in the attachment. This attachment includes the criteria for teaching, research and service. It notes the criteria that generally apply to tenure track and non-tenure track faculty, but the applicable merit criteria will depend on job duties and responsibilities. The attachment also includes the threshold factors for activities that do not meet or partially meet the merit criteria.

5.1. Tenure Track Faculty – Criteria and factors are provided in the attachment

5.2. Non-Tenure Track Faculty – Criteria and factors are provided in the attachment

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 generally be weighted as 30% Teaching, 40% Research, and 30% Service. 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 either self-identify as undertaking significant research and/or service or have job descriptions that specifically incorporate significant portions of research or service may have evaluations weighted 80% Teaching, 20% Research/Service, as appropriate.

7. Evaluation of Accomplishments

7.1. Clarity and Transparency: Merit Criteria and Factors for Review outline the types of metrics by which faculty members can demonstrate meritorious contribution to the department. 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 in each area of Teaching, Research/Creative Work, and Service relative to the prominence of each area in a faculty member's job description, determine a faculty member's final merit score.

7.2. Collegial and Consultative

7.2.1. Evaluators: The evaluation will be carried out by the PPPM Department Head.

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.

7.2.3. Final Assignment of Tier Increases: The Department Head, using guidance provided by the Associate Dean for Finance, will determine appropriate raise percentages or amounts to be applied 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: The 12 months 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: The 12 months directly preceding the merit process

9. Merit Tiers

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

Does Not Meet Expectations (1.0-1.9): 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 will receive a merit increase.

Provisionally Meets Expectations (2.0-2.4): 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 (2.5-3.4): 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 (3.5-4.4): 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 (4.5-5.0): 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:
 - 10.2.1. 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.
 - 10.2.2. The complete final merit allocation for each merit pool, including the amount allocated to each member of faculty in those pools.

PPPM

Criteria and Factors for Merit Review

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

Teaching and Advising

Classroom Instruction: Assessment will be based on a range of information 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 and instructors are responsible for other materials. 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
- Awards, nominations and recognition of teaching

Availability: Faculty need to be available to students outside the classroom for consultation and assistance, and 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 graduate terminal projects and theses (for CRP faculty)
- Advising students undertaking theses or honors theses (all tenure track faculty)
- Advising of non-CRP masters projects and theses (all tenure track faculty)
- Academic advising of students
- Advising students through Independent Studies
- Career and professional development advising (not relevant to all positions)
- Writing student recommendation letters and employment references

Thresholds: Teaching and advising is an important role for all faculty in the PPPM 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 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 teaching evaluations
- Student evaluation comments that raise significant concerns about the dedication, competency, professionalism or conduct of the faculty member
- Consistently low evaluations related to availability outside of the classroom
- Unwillingness or lack of availability related to student academic advising
- Consistently low advising load of CRP terminal projects and theses (CRP faculty)

- Unwillingness to advise undergraduate PPPM theses (including honors theses)

Research and Scholarship

Publications and externally funded research: The PPPM Department policy on promotion and tenure provides a detailed summary of research and scholarship expectations. The merit process is designed to mirror the standards and expectations of tenure and promotion review. However, the merit review process will not use annual reviews, third year reviews or tenure and promotion reviews to determine merit, because these are not available for all faculty in all years. Most Non-tenure track faculty do not have expectations for research unless specified in their contract.

The faculty being reviewed must provide all of the information on research and scholarship for merit consideration. This information should include details about impact and significance of the work. Evidence of impact and significance may include: citations, journal rankings, media citations, citation or endorsement by government and nonprofit organizations, and breadth of distribution through media outlets. There may be adjustments for quality and significance of the work, co-authorship and collaborative work. We recognize that developing a book manuscript may result in a lower number of refereed article publications for a period of time. For assistant professors, research and creative activity evaluation criteria also may accommodate evidence of substantive work in progress. Multi-phase, team-based, or externally funded (etc.) projects are also noted as evidence of productive work in progress. Research contributions may include:

- Refereed publications
- Books and monographs
- Grant funding of research
- Conference presentations
- Book chapters
- Reports
- Other publications
- Awards, nominations and recognition of research
- Other research

Thresholds: Research is highly valued in the PPPM Department and the University of Oregon. Most non-tenure track faculty do not have research expectations, but it is a significant component of merit for all tenure track faculty. Factors that may result in an evaluation of “does not meet expectations” or “provisionally meets expectations” may include::

- Consistent underperformance in research output: journal articles, books, research publications
- Consistent underperformance in research activities: research grants, research projects

Service

University service is important for the operation of the Department, School and the University. NTTF faculty may not have service responsibilities if they hold teaching only appointments. 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, whether it is voluntary or assigned service. As per the Department's tenure and promotion policy, service for untenured faculty is expected to be limited, and is expected to increase after promotion and tenure. The University also expects a significant increase in service activities for promotion to Full Professor. Service factors will include:

- Participation in PPPM Department meetings
- Program and department leadership
- Participation in Department meetings, retreats and events
- Participation on disciplinary PPPM committee (required for all tenure track faculty)
- Participation on other PPPM committees
- Other service duties to 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 more 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 (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. Most non-tenure track faculty do not have service expectations, but all tenure track faculty are expected to provide service. As noted above, these expectations are limited at the Assistant Professor rank, but 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 PPPM meetings, committees and events
- Lack of willingness to serve on PPPM committees
- 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

PPPM Department Merit Activity Report 2013-2014

Instructions:

Complete this activity report to the best of your ability. In submitting this report, you are agreeing that all of the information it contains is an accurate reflection of your work and activities.

Review Period

Teaching: The 12 months 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 that has been active within the prior 24 month period directly preceding the merit process

Service: The 12 months directly preceding the merit process

| | |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Name | |
| Title | |
| Position | <input type="radio"/> Tenure track faculty <input type="radio"/> Non-tenure track faculty <input type="radio"/> Adjunct faculty <input type="radio"/> Other: |

FTE and Duties

- Complete shaded area if unchanged over review period; otherwise fill out year-by-year
- Most non-tenure-track faculty are 100% teaching; if not sure leave blank
- FTE Notes
 - Duties are based on job description (total of teaching, research and service should equal 100%)
 - For tenure track faculty, adjustments to weighting will include:
 - Teaching buyout for research: 8% shift of load from teaching to research
 - Teaching reduction for administrative duties: 8% shift of load from teaching to service
 - Overload duties not compensated (e.g., extra teaching) are handled on case by case basis

| IF Unchanged | | If Variable | | | | | |
|---------------|-------------------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | All Years | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 |
| TOTAL FTE | | | | | | | |
| Duties | Weight (%) | | | | | | |
| Teaching | | | | | | | |
| Research | | | | | | | |
| Service | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 100% | | | | | | |

Notes: Add any relevant explanatory notes

POSSIBLE ADDITION:

Self Evaluation

According to the PPPM Merit Policy, faculty are evaluated based on the following tiers:

Does Not Meet Expectations: Has not demonstrated the minimum standards required to qualify as Provisionally Meets Expectations. This Merit Tier is ineligible for merit increase, although 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.

Provisionally Meets Expectations: 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.

Meets Expectations: 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.

Exceeds Expectations: 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.

Highest Expectations: Has clearly demonstrated standards required to qualify as Highest Expectations. Classification into this Merit Tier qualifies as “Exceeds Expectations” per the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Please complete the following self evaluation of your work according to the tiers listed above

Self Evaluation

| Category | Evaluation and Notes Evaluation should be limited to: does not meet expectations, provisionally meets expectations, meetings expectations, exceeds expectations, highest expectations or does not apply |
|----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Teaching | |
| Service | |
| Research/Scholarship | |

Teaching

The PPPM Department will be using numeric student evaluation scores and written comments signed by students. Please review this and add any explanatory notes you believe are relevant to an evaluation of teaching.

| Category | Explanatory notes or corrections |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Classes Review list of student evaluations to ensure they are accurate. Please describe any special issues or circumstances related to evaluations, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• New course• Large class• GTF difficulties• Other issues | • |
| Advising Review list of PPPM advisees for accuracy and add any relevant notes. | • |
| External Activities: List any relevant external advising or teaching activities since July 1 of last year | • |
| Awards: Awards or nominations for teaching and advising excellence | • |
| Other Notes | • |

Service

Note: This section only relevant for those faculty with service responsibilities

Leadership (Department or University)

| Leadership Role (e.g., leadership position) | Duties and responsibilities | Special activities or assignments |
|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | • | • |
| | • | • |

Department Service

| PPPM Committee | Meetings During Year (% attended) | Role (chair, member) | Special activities or assignments |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Department | 12 (%) | Member | • |
| | | | • |
| | | | • |
| | | | • |

AAA and University Committees

| Committee | Meetings During Year (% attended) | Role (chair, member) | Special activities or assignments |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | | | • |
| | | | • |

Special University Project or Initiatives

| Project or Initiative | Intensity of work (e.g. hours/week) | Role (project lead, member of project team) | Tasks and activities |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| | | | • |
| | | | • |

Other Service

| Description | Explanatory Notes |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Academic service since July 1. List service and level of work example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Journal X reviewer (2 articles) • Journal Y editorial board • Conference committee • Site visitor | • |
| Other service or recognition for service since July 1. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency committee: describe role • Nonprofit board: describe role • Awards or recognition | • |

Research/Scholarship

- This section only relevant for those with research responsibilities
- 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 that has been active within the prior 24 month period directly preceding the merit process. **See examples in red.**

Refereed Publications (see example)

| Published/ Accepted | Full reference | Evidence of Impact |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2013 | Smith, J. and Jones, G. 2011. Effective Department Committees. Journal of Higher Education Policy. 201(3): 210-211. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smith is masters student co-author • Journal is xx ranked journal in education policy |
| | | • |

Other Publications

| Published/ Accepted | Full reference | Evidence of Impact |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2012 | Smith, J. and Jones, G. 2011. Department Committees. US Department of Education. Report #02134. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smith is masters student co-author • Report publicized on USDE web site |
| | | • |

Research Grants

Quality notes should indicate factors such as:

- Source
- Scope: UO, state, national
- Competitive grant, contract, other award
- Peer review process

| Years | PIs | Funding | Title | Notes on Quality |
|---------|---------|-----------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2012-13 | G Jones | \$475,000 | Effective Department Meetings | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US Dept. of Education • Nationally competitive • Peer reviewed: double blind and panel |
| | | | | • |

Conference and Public Presentations

Quality notes should indicate factors such as:

- Prominence of conference or event
- Refereed submission
- Special roles or other information: keynote, funded by conference, etc.

| Conference or Presentation | Notes on Quality |
|----------------------------|------------------|
| | • |

Other

Note: you may list other work in progress or projects in development. Following tenure and promotion guidelines, these generally will not be given much consideration. Special circumstances might be: unfunded projects generating data or leading to a publication; applied research with an agency that is not funded; book manuscript with preliminary publisher support. This category should include awards or

recognition related to scholarship. If in doubt—include it for consideration. Please provide some information about quality or significance of the work.

| Activity, Awards or Recognition | Notes on Quality or Significance |
|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| | • |
| | • |