

## **POLITICAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT MERIT PAY PLAN**

Initially Approved by the Office of the Provost & Academic Affairs: October 19, 2017

Revision approved by the Office of the Provost on October 18, 2019

The Merit Pay Committee is elected when there is a round of merit increases. The committee consists of the department head and three faculty members. Untenured faculty are eligible to serve on the committee.

- All faculty must be evaluated for merit. 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.
- All faculty who meet or exceed expectations will receive some merit increase. All faculty in the in the Tenure-track and Tenured, and Career classifications are eligible for consideration for merit increases. "Meeting expectations" is defined as receiving at least 50% of the average number of points for rank across the areas of research, teaching, and service, in accordance with individual faculty workload expectations in those three areas.
- After all the points (evaluations) have been determined, including the discretionary adjustments (see below), each faculty member will have the opportunity to review them. Then, the total number of available merit dollars will be divided by the total numbers of points allocated to all faculty. The amount of the actual pay raise will be determined by multiplying each faculty member's points by this amount.
- As this system is based on absolute points, it naturally discounts for reductions in FTE. No further discounts will be made for reduced FTE.
- Faculty will be informed of their raises after they have been approved.

### **Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty**

All merit pay decisions within the department's discretion are to be made by the department head and an elected merit pay committee of three faculty members. Each of the four will have one vote.

Faculty will submit materials and documentation through the standard process; details of the process are available on the Faculty Net. Materials must include all publications or any another item for which the faculty member seeks research points. Faculty members should additionally provide supporting documentation of peer-reviewed status for venues that are not widely known in the discipline. The merit pay committee may request further documentation from faculty as necessary for their deliberations. Whenever a range of possible points is specified for a particular type of research, the merit committee will consider relevant criteria to determine exact points allocation including, but not limited to: positive reviews, prestige of journal or press, number of citations, or other such pertinent information. The merit pay committee will note an explicit justification for each rating, which will be sent to the Department Head after their review is complete and posted on the department website, such that they are accessible to faculty members and serve as reference points for subsequent merit pay committees.

The standard process will include an open-ended space for submission of any activities outside the items listed below that faculty wish to be considered for the discretionary part of the merit

raise. One notable category of such activities is extra-departmental service to other units, the university, or the discipline.

The department head and merit pay committee will use their judgment to allocate points in each category where there is a possible range. The department head and committee are all obligated to review all submitted publications. They are to prepare a written report explaining the process and criteria employed and justifying special decisions.

Faculty's research, teaching and service activities will be reviewed over a period set by the university in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement. If decisions on this period are left to the department, the review period will begin at the end of the period for the preceding merit pay evaluation and end at a date determined by the Personnel Committee, which will seek an endpoint close to the timing of their evaluation.

Faculty may include any number of books, edited books, articles, edited special issues, book chapters, or grants. In the other research categories they may select for consideration up to seven items (conference papers, book reviews, etc.) that represent their most meritorious work. When the review period is longer than two years, faculty may add one such item for each additional year of the review period. The merit committee will base its assessment upon this research portfolio.

Seventy-five percent of merit pay dollars will be allocated according to the point system, and the remainder will be considered discretionary. Discretionary points will be added to acknowledge activities faculty members have listed in the open-ended discretionary space. The committee will endeavor to reward comparable activities in consistent ways within the current merit-pay round and across rounds.

The merit pay committee will be guided by current University policy with regard to the distribution of merit among the areas of research, teaching, and service. After all points, including discretionary, are tallied, adjustments will be made to ensure that the distribution of all points across the department will conform to: 40% Research, 40% Teaching, 20% Service, except where individual faculty have workload expectations that differ from this distribution.

Appeals for reconsideration may be made within two weeks. The department head and committee will respond to these appeals in writing.

The department head will conduct the evaluation of members of the merit pay committee in consultation with the remaining members of the committee. They may appeal their evaluations in writing to the department head, just as faculty members may make written appeal to the merit pay committee.

The department head's points are calculated like those of other faculty members by the merit pay committee and included in the overall calculation of the value of points. After the discretionary adjustment, the DH's recommended raise, number of points in each category, and ranking in each category within the department (i.e. fifth highest points in research, etc.) are sent to CAS, which determines the DH's actual raise. This number may then require some recalculation of the overall value of points, since the DH raise is part of the same pool of funds.

## Records Management

*(Note: No department procedures shall conflict with UO Records Retention Policies)*

Materials provided with the merit evaluation form shall be returned to each faculty after merit decisions are confirmed (all faculty should retain these materials in an individual faculty dossier for a minimum 6-year period).

Merit evaluation forms and any memorandums or letters notifying faculty of the results of their evaluations shall be retained in each member's personnel file.

The report compiled by the merit pay committee, records of the points assigned, time "windows" during which materials count, and summary(ies) of final results shall be retained for 6 years.

## **RESEARCH POINTS**

For the categories below, "peer reviewed" means a substantive evaluation of the merits and contribution of an article or book by scholars other than a journal's editor. In light of the existence of so-called 'predatory journals' and 'vanity presses,' substantive peer review is especially important in venues where authors must pay to publish.

1. Book, not including textbooks. (20-40 pts.)
2. Edited book (10-20 pts.) Introductory or concluding chapters published in a book edited by the same person will not be counted as separate publications under #5. Substantive chapters that make distinct contributions within an edited book may be counted under #5.
3. Peer reviewed article in scholarly journal (6-15 pts.)
4. Editor of special issue (4-10 pts.) Introductory or concluding articles published in a special issue edited by the same person will not be counted as separate publications under #3. Substantive articles that make distinct contributions within a special issue may be counted under #3.
5. Book chapter (4-10 pts.)
6. Obtaining a grant from a national or international funding source of at least \$20,000, counted for each year in which the grant runs (3-6 pts.). The higher amount will only be given if the grant includes overhead funds to the University.
7. Government reports (1-3 pts.) [cannot be classified or subject to restricted dissemination]
8. Convention and conference papers (2 pts.)
9. Book review (1-2 pts.)\_Two points may be awarded for reviews that cover at least two books and are at least 1000 words long.
10. Scholarly communication, research note (2 pts).
11. Encyclopedia article (1-2 pts.)
12. Book or article award (1-5 pts.)

Faculty should include a publication in the merit evaluation according to its acceptance date. No publication shall be counted in more than one review period.

## TEACHING POINTS

**(NOTE (Added by the Office of the Provost): For all reviews to be decided Fall 2020 or later, this entire section and any other references to standards or metrics for teaching quality are replaced by Section 9 of the August 2019 MOU between the university and United Academics that defines standards for teaching quality. The standards defined in the MOU are to remain in place unless and until the unit modifies those standards in accordance with the MOU and the CBA defined process for modifying unit policies. MOU can be found at <https://hr.uoregon.edu/ua-mou-course-evaluations-article-20.pdf>)**

1. Membership on thesis or dissertation committee (2 pts.)
2. Chair of thesis or dissertation committee (2 pts. in addition to #3 above). A maximum of 20 points for all thesis and dissertation committee work.
3. Chair of graduate student second-year research paper committee (2 pts.)
4. Member of graduate second-year research paper committee (2 pts.)
- 5.
6. New course preparation (2 pts)
7. Supervision of undergraduate honors thesis (4 pts.)
8. Second reader of an honor's thesis (2 pts.)
9. Teaching of Graduate Reading Course with enrollment > 1 and organized by the area subfield chair (2 pts.)
10. Co-authorship of published article with graduate student (3 pts)
11. Co-authorship of grant proposal with graduate student (2 pts.)
12. Co-authorship of a conference paper with graduate student (2 pts.)

## SERVICE POINTS

1. Participation on more than one standing departmental committee (1 pt.)
2. Chair of departmental committee (standing or subfield) (1 pt.)
3. Participation on university committee (1 pt.)\*
4. Chair of university committee (1 pt. in addition to #3 above)\*
5. Undergraduate Advisor, Director of Graduate Studies (1 pt.)
6. Chair or panel discussant at major convention (1 pt.)
7. Editorial board member of journal (1 pt.)
8. Executive officer of national or regional professional association (1 pt.)
9. Participation on National Selection or Advisory Committee (1 pt.)
10. Lecture at another university or college (1 pt.)
11. Reviewer of grant proposals and applications for foundations (1 pt. for each three proposals reviewed)
12. Reviewer of promotion files for other universities (1 pt.)
13. Editor or Associate Editor of a journal (3-5 pts.)
14. Organizer or program chair of a regular conference (1-3 pts.)
15. Participation in a search committee (2 pts)
16. Chair of search committee (1 pt in addition to #15 above)
17. Participation on departmental or university ad hoc committee (1 pt)
18. Chair of departmental or university ad hoc committee (1 pt in addition to #17 above)

\* A maximum of 16 points for the combined categories of #3 and #4.

### **Non-Tenure Track Faculty**

The Department Head will consider performance reviews of the NTTF during the relevant evaluation period using the NTTF Merit Evaluation form found on CASweb. 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.

### **Officer of Administration**

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.