

Merit Increase Procedures for Tenure-Track Faculty and Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Revision approved by the Office of the Provost on October 25, 2019

(NOTE (Added by the Office of the Provost): For all reviews to be decided Fall 2020 or later, any 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>)

Tenure-Track Faculty (TTF)

1.1. Prior to merit raises all TTF will be asked to submit a standardized report detailing accomplishments in three general categories: research, teaching/instructional support and service (see Appendix: Merit Review Forms for Tenure-Track Faculty). Department staff will assemble additional material, such as student teaching evaluations and peer teaching reviews for each faculty, as well as all reviews (e.g., annual reviews, third-year reviews, etc.) conducted during the relevant period. Merit reviews will be based on performance during the last three years OR the period since the last time merit ratings for raises were conducted (whichever is longer). Faculty members who have arrived since that date will focus on their accomplishments since arrival at the UO.

1.2. Ratings will be 0-4 (0 = unsatisfactory contribution, 1 = fully satisfactory contribution, 2 = average contribution, 3 = above average contribution, 4 = superior contribution), made by each member of the Executive Committee and the Department Head (who do not rate themselves). Ratings will be made under three headings: Research accomplishments, teaching (undergraduate and graduate), and service (including department, university, and professional service). Raters will be instructed to anchor their ratings around a score of 2, which represents average performance within the department.

1.3. As a default, ratings in the three categories will be averaged to determine a single merit point score. In cases where faculty members have officially sanctioned teaching releases (e.g., for buyouts or committee work), their teaching evaluations should be based on the quality, not the quantity of their remaining teaching.

1.5. The total dollar amount available for TTF merit increases will be divided by the sum of all TTF average ratings to arrive at a unit increment. Each TTF's suggested merit increase will be determined by multiplying his/her average merit rating score with the unit increment. The merit score of TTF with less than 1.0 FTE will be prorated by their actual FTE.

1.6. The Department Head will use these suggested merit increases as a basis for his/her final merit increase recommendations to the CAS Dean. The actual merit awards will be based on funding availability and University criteria.

1.7. Merit ratings will be retained for at least 7 years so that they may be taken into account when considering possible salary inequities.

1.8. The Department Head and the Executive Committee will annually review the Merit Review Forms for Tenure-Track Faculty and make adjustments when necessary.

Merit Report Guidelines for Tenure-Related Faculty

Please provide a **list** of activities within your main area of professional emphasis during the last three years OR the period since the last time merit ratings for raises were conducted (whichever is longer).

I. **Research**

- a. Peer-reviewed journal articles published, in press, or accepted in the review period. (In progress work may be briefly described in Section IV).
- b. Books (authored or edited)
- c. Book chapters
- d. Other publications
- e. Grants received: title, agency, mechanism (e.g., R01, R21), your role, total support, duration
- f. Grants submitted: title, agency, mechanism (e.g., R01, R21), your role, score if available
- g. Awards and honors
- h. Other research activities (e.g., open-science related activities and products)

II. **Teaching**

- a. Courses taught
 - b. Teaching awards
 - c. Other teaching activities
- Note: Teaching evaluations, grade distributions, peer teaching reviews, completed theses, and student committees are supplied by staff.

III. **Service**

- a. Departmental service (e.g., committee memberships, special initiatives, mentoring of colleagues)
- b. University service (e.g., committee memberships, special initiatives)
- c. Service to the field (e.g., review/editing activities, grant review activities)
- d. Service to the community (e.g., outreach, membership in boards)

IV. **Other comments**

Succinctly describe any other activities or circumstances you want the merit review committee to know and that are not readily apparent from the above or from the CV (e.g., special service assignments, cross-unit assignments).

Career Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF)

1.1. Prior to merit raises all Career NTTF will be asked to submit a standardized report detailing accomplishments in the area of their main professional emphasis. Thus, instructional non-tenure track faculty report on teaching and instructional support; research-oriented non-tenure track faculty report on research-related activities (see Appendix: Merit Review Guidelines for Instructional/Research-Oriented Non-Tenure Track Faculty). In addition, the faculty member has an opportunity to detail possible additional contributions outside their main professional emphasis (e.g., service). The department staff will assemble additional material, such as student teaching evaluations and peer teaching reviews for instructional NTTF, as well as all performance reviews conducted during the relevant period. Merit reviews will be based on performance during the last three years OR the period since the last time merit ratings for raises were conducted (whichever is longer). Faculty members who have arrived since that date will focus on their accomplishments since arrival at the UO.

1.2. Ratings will be 0-4 (0 = unsatisfactory contribution, 1 = fully satisfactory contribution, 2 = average contribution, 3 = above average contribution, 4 = superior contribution), made by each member of the Executive Committee and the Department Head. Ratings should reflect mainly an individual's core professional area (research or teaching) and to a lesser degree contributions outside the main area. Raters will be instructed to anchor their ratings around a score of 2, which represents average performance within the department.

1.3. Given the differences in the way instructional and research-oriented NTTF are reviewed, the total dollar amount available for NTTF merit increases will be divided into an instructional and a research-oriented share, proportional to the total base salaries in each category. Within each category, the total dollar amount available for merit increases will be divided by the sum of all NTTF ratings to arrive at a unit increment. Each faculty's suggested merit increase will be determined by multiplying his/her merit rating score by the unit increment.

1.4. The Department Head will use these suggested merit increases as a basis for his/her final merit increase recommendations to the CAS Dean. The actual merit awards will be based on funding availability and University criteria.

1.5. Merit ratings will be retained for at least 7 years so that they may be taken into account when considering possible salary inequities.

1.6. The Department Head and the Executive Committee will annually review the Merit Review Forms for Instructional/Research-Oriented Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and make adjustments when necessary.

Merit Report Guidelines for Instructional Non-Tenure Track Faculty:

Please provide a **list** of activities within your main area of professional emphasis during the last three years OR the period since the last time merit ratings for raises were conducted (whichever is longer).

I. Teaching-oriented activities

- a. Courses taught (Note, that teaching evaluations, grade distributions, peer teaching reviews, completed theses, and student committees are supplied by staff.)
- b. Teaching innovations
- c. Teaching awards
- d. If relevant, describe any other teaching activities (e.g., advising, mentoring):

II. Other comments or contributions

Succinctly describe any other activities (e.g., in the areas of service or research) or circumstances you want the merit review committee to know and that are not readily apparent from the above (e.g., special service assignments, cross-unit assignments).

Merit Report Guidelines for Research-Oriented Non-Tenure Track Faculty:

Please provide a **list** of activities within your main area of professional emphasis during the last three years OR the period since the last time merit ratings for raises were conducted (whichever is longer) and submit this report to your supervisor. It is understood that job descriptions among NTTF research faculty differ widely and not all of the categories listed below will apply to each faculty member. It may be useful to also consult your annual evaluation to ensure inclusion of key components of your job that are not listed here.

Please submit your report to your direct supervisor, who will then provide the executive committee with their rating. The executive committee will make the final reevaluation.

Name of faculty member:

I. Research-oriented activities

- a. Major research-related activities (e.g., recruitment, IRB, data management, data analysis, coding, supervision and training others)
- b. New skills acquired
- c. Publications and grants (submitted or received)
- f. Awards and honors
- g. Other research activities (e.g., open-science related activities and products)

II. Other comments or contributions

Succinctly describe any other activities (e.g., in the areas of service or research) or circumstances you want the merit review committee to know and that are not readily apparent from the above (e.g., special service assignments, cross-unit assignments).

Evaluation through supervisor:

Consider in evaluating this NTTF faculty:

- *the information provided above*
- *the job description of this faculty member*
- *your own observation of this faculty member*

*Please provide a score on the following scale, keeping in mind that the median and average score across **all** evaluated NTTF faculty should be 2.*

- 0 = unsatisfactory contribution*
- 1 = fully satisfactory contribution*
- 2 = average contribution*
- 3 = above average contribution*
- 4 = superior contribution*