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

The following policies apply to all faculty members in this department:
  (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 in writing (email or letter) 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.

Documentation: Department merit review procedures will be posted on the RL faculty intranet and a copy will be retained on file by the department Office Manager. Decisions regarding individual merit increases will be retained on file by the Office Manager.

The departmental procedure for the distribution of merit salary improvement funds is summarized as follows:

1. The department requests updated CV from all faculty during the Fall term of each academic year. At the time of a proposed merit increase, faculty are also asked to submit activity reports covering the review period. Templates for those reports are appended to this procedural description. The department's elected Advisory Committees review all faculty members' activity reports, assessing performance in each of two three categories. For tenure-related faculty, those categories are research, teaching, and service. For NTTF without specific additional job duties such as language supervision or advising, the categories are teaching, and service/professional development. For NTTF with advising or supervisory responsibilities, the categories are teaching, advising/course supervision, and service/professional development. TTF are reviewed by the RL Advisory Committee. NTTF are reviewed by the NTTF Advisory Committee. Neither the committee members nor the department Head are assessed in this review. The Head assesses the committee members and discusses this assessment with each member privately. The Head is assessed by CAS.

2. Based on the activity reports, the assigned Advisory Committee determines a point rating for each person's performance. Specific rubrics outline point values assigned to professional activities. These rubrics are distinct for TTF and NTTF. In assessing tenure-related faculty, the ratings are consistent with the expectations articulated regularly for annual, third-year, tenure, and post-tenure reviews. For NTTF, the ratings are consistent with expectations articulated for annual contract renewal and promotion reviews.

3. 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 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.

4.   The available salary pool is divided by the total number of points generated. A dollar value is assigned to each point; that value is then used to calculate each faculty member's merit increase. Guidelines issued by the College and the University are also taken into account. There are separate pools, and thus distinct dollar values assigned to points, for TTF and NTTF. The Advisory Committees will communicate their assessments to the Head, who reviews the assessments independently. For tenure-related faculty holding joint appointments in other units, the Head may further consult with the relevant Department Head or Program Director. While the Head may seek confirmation of the final ratings from the Advisory Committee, and should try to achieve consensus, s/he reserves the right to make a final decision regarding the recommendations to be submitted to CAS.

5.   OA merit increase procedures:
     The Department Head will base the merit increase recommendation on the performance reviews of the OA during the relevant evaluation period. The Department Head is responsible for conducting annual performance reviews for department OAs. 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, the Head should also consider, when possible, feedback from relevant constituent groups both internal and external to the department.

6.   This procedure applies only to merit-based salary increases and does not account for across-the-board increases or questions of equity or salary compression.
7.   Merit reviews in spring, 2014 cover all professional activity from January 1, 2008 to the present.

RL TTF Merit Increase Rubric

There will be separate merit pools for NTTF and TTF, so that each group will be evaluated based on job-specific criteria.

Faculty will use the following rubric in completing their activity report in order to be considered for merit increases. Merit increases will be assigned based on total points assigned to professional activities during the period in question in the categories specified below.

In completing activity reports, faculty will enter each item and corresponding point value by category (see model). Items that do not correspond to established categories may be entered as "Other" and will be subject to review by the RL Advisory Committee and/or the Department Head.

Once all activity reports have been submitted to the Department Head, the dollar amount of each pool will be divided by the total number of points in each pool. Faculty teaching will be evaluated on the basis of both student evaluations and peer observations. Supervisors will also be evaluated on the basis of peer observations of course team meetings and/or practicums and on feedback from supervisees communicated via the Associate Head.

For example:

Total TTF points: 200
Total TTF pool: $66.66
01 point = $0.33
10 points = $3.33
16 points = $5.28
20 points = $6.66

TTF Merit Increase Rubric

<u>Research:</u>
- Authored Book Monograph in print or digital format with academic/university publisher (5)
- Edition (print or digital) of a literary text, including Introduction and critical apparatus (4)
- Edition (print or digital) of literary text without Introduction and/or critical apparatus (2)
- Literary translation including introduction and critical apparatus (4)
- Literary translation without introduction and critical apparatus (3)
- Hypertext Web or other digital project that produces new creative research and tools for teaching (4)
- Digital database or repository occasionally used for teaching and research: 2
- Edited volume or journal, including Introduction (2)
- Edited volume or journal without introduction (1)
- Journal article/book chapter/translation published in refereed publication (1)
- Other article [Interview, encyclopedia entry, book review, In memoriam piece…] (.5)
- Conference paper (.5)
- Invited Lecture (host institution invites and pays for travel expenses) (1)
- Panel moderator, respondant, roundtable participant (.5)
- Guest lectures at venues other than on UO campus (.5)
- Web pages (author bios, interviews, links etc)

- Major internal grant or fellowship (1)
  OHC, CSWS (w/ course buyout), Faculty Excellence, Williams Council, NEH summer stipend, Global World Initiative, CAS Program grant, Provost summer stipend
- Minor internal grant or fellowship (.5)
  grants for conferences and initiatives, Rippeys, etc.
- Major external grant or fellowship (2)
- Minor external grant or fellowship (1)

Not counting:
- Works forthcoming, in production, in press, in progress
- Conference session organizer or chair
- "Double dip" conference papers (same paper given at 2 different venues)
- Introduction to edited volume if the volume has already been counted under the category of "Edition with introduction"

- Reprints
- Work-in-progress talks on campus

Teaching:
- Teaching evaluations: satisfactory (1), exceptional (2)

- Major curricular revision or initiative (1)
- <u>New course with substantial new content</u> and/or course design (1)
    - **Max 3 pts this round
- Directing PhD student submitting chapters of dissertation (1)
  (*Director* of student advanced to candidacy)
- Other advising (Honors College theses, MA essays, doctoral dissertation committees) (.5)

Not counting:
- MA exams
- PhD exams
- undergrad advising
- Fall Forum
- Reading and Conference courses

Service :
- Serve on major departmental or university committee (1)
  **this round: multiply by number of years

  Major departmental committees: Grad Committee, Undergrad Committee, Advisory Committee, Spanish Heritage Committee….
  Major UO committees: Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council, CAS Curriculum Committee, UO Curriculum Committee, UO Senate, Senate Executive, Williams Council

  Super-major: DAC, FPC, FAC   (2)

- Chair major departmental or university committee (2)
  **if count as chair do not re-count as member for same years
- Search committee chair (2)
- Search committee member (1)

- Chair non-major committee (dept. or UO) (1)
- Service on non-major committee (.5)

- Editor of scholarly journal (2)
- Scholarly journal editorial board (.5)
- Review of articles for journals (.5)
- Review of book manuscript for publisher (1)
- Organizer of academic conference (2)
- Invited speakers (.5)

- Leadership in academic association [President, Vice-President, Executive Council] (1)
- External and internal reviews (tenure, post-tenure) (1)
- External or internal advisory boards (1)
- External or internal grant committee (when not part of another committee's work already counted) (.5)
- MLA delegate (term) (1)

In order to MEET standards in teaching, NTTF must have good student and peer evaluations. Once they have met those standards, these are ways in which they can EXCEED.

Teaching: 80% (50% for supervisors/advisors)   **Professional Development/Service: 20%**

Evidence of engagement in two or more of these areas EXCEEDS STANDARDS*:

Evidence of engagement in three of these areas MEETS STANDARDS; Evidence of engagement in four or more of these areas EXCEEDS

Superior student evaluations

Major curricular revision or initiative

New course design (Can be co-creator)

Textbook evaluation and selection

Ongoing, structured mentorship of students

Other

Directing/overseeing graduate or undergraduate dissertation, thesis, or project

Substantial participation in program development

Publication

Service to professional organizations: conference organization, member of a board

Work connecting RL to wider UO/Eugene/national/international community

Developing Teaching Matters

Presentation at a conference or workshop

Attendance of a conference or workshop

Continuing Education

Participation in faculty meetings

RL committee work

University committee work

Support and mentorship of Graduate Teaching Fellows and colleagues through sharing of materials and expertise (excluding

Other

Supervisory Duties (30%)

Evidence of engagement in three of these areas MEETS STANDARDS; Evidence of engagement in four or more of these areas EXCEEDS

Constructive relationships with GTF/instructors X2

} To be determined by a survey

Coordination of curriculum

Design and deliver orientation week

Attendance of supervisory meetings

Development of Summer curriculum

Hold Course Meetings

} To be addressed in an evaluation report submitted by the Director of Language Instruction and/or supervisor's merit report

Extra-curricular activities

Other

} To be addressed by supervisor in merit report

NTTFF Activity Report for _____ (Name)
Review Period is January 1st 2008 – present

Exceeds Teaching / Exceeds Service   10 points
Exceeds Teaching / Meets Service   8 points

Meets Teaching / Exceeds Service   6 points
Meets Teaching / Meets Service   5 points

Meets Teaching / Not Exceed Service   2 points

Teaching: Evidence of engagement in two or more of these areas EXCEEDS
STANDARDS:
Note: In order to MEET standards, NTTF must have good student and peer evaluations.
Once they have met those standards, these are ways in which they can EXCEED.

Superior student evaluations	This will be analyzed and determined upon reviewing all student evaluations. You can leave blank for now; because this category is new, you may need to submit documentation at a later time.
Major curricular review or initiative	
New course design (can be co-creater)	
Ongoing, structured mentorship of students (e.g. reading and conference…)	
Other	

Professional Development/Service: Evidence of engagement in three
of these areas MEETS STANDARDS; Evidence of engagement in four or more of these areas
EXCEEDS STANDARDS:

Directing/overseeing graduate or undergraduate dissertation, thesis, or project	
Substantial participation in program development	

Publication	
Service to professional organizations: conference organization, member of a board	
Work connecting RL to wider UO/Eugene/national/international community	
Developing Teaching Matters	
Presentation at a conference or workshop	
Attendance of a conference or workshop	
Continuing Education	
Participation in faculty meetings	
RL committee work	
University committee work	
Support and mentorship of Graduate Teaching Fellows and colleagues through sharing of materials and expertise (excluding	
Other	

Supervisors*: A letter of support written by the Director of Language Instruction should address your coordination of the curriculum, course meetings, and attendance of supervisory meetings AND the Associate Head should gather information about the constructive relationships with GTFs/instructors.

* *Please note that the NTTF Advisory Committee will not be evaluating the supervision and advising components of these activity reports. The Head will use the activity reports, as well as the letters submitted by the DLI, and data collected by the Associate Head, to make these evaluations.*

Extra-curricular activities	
Other	

Advisors*: A letter of support written by the Director of Undergraduate Studies should address your duties and if you meet them. To exceed, you must do one of the following, please check.

* *Please note that the NTTF Advisory Committee will not be evaluating the supervision and advising components of these activity reports. The Head will use the activity reports, as well as the letters submitted by the Director of Undergraduate Studies to make these evaluations.*

_____ Provide undergraduate advising for the department via e-mail over Winter Break and Spring Break.

_____ Initiate, plan, coordinate and publicize student workshops with staff from the UO Career Center, CAS Development, Office of International Affairs (Study Abroad), etc.

_____ Provide articles and statistics for the RL newsletter; recruit and coordinate student writers of articles for the RL newsletter

_____ Assess readiness/ability of students to be language tutors on campus (at TLC) in Spanish and French.

_____ Meet with students and evaluate participation in order to sponsor IE3 Global Internship credits in Spanish and French.

_____ Assess language proficiency for non-RL UO students applying for Fulbright and Rotary programs.

_____ Actively reach out to the study abroad coordinators and program providers to encourage strong ties with RL and to maintain a flow of information pertinent to our students and our faculty advisors.

_____ Attend workshops and training sessions on UO campus to expand knowledge and abilities in areas related to advising undergraduates (i.e. Student Veteran Symposium, workshops presented by Academic Advising and other departments).

Advisors/Supervisors point scale:
Exceeds in all three areas: 10 points
Exceeds in teaching and supervision/advising; meets in service/professional development: 8 points
Exceeds in teaching or supervision/advising; at least meets in the other two areas: 7 points
Meets in all three areas: 5 points
Below expectations in either teaching or supervisory responsibilities, exceeds in the other two areas: 4 points