

Arts and Administration Program Merit Policy

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

Purpose

This policy outlines the Arts and Administration Program's procedures for determining and assigning merit raises, when available.

1. Full Inclusion

All AAD 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 Arts and Administration Program and each faculty member plays a key role in achieving program 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 of Promotion and Tenure.

Differentiation is established through an evaluation of merit material against a standard rubric in the appropriate departmental Merit Score Sheet.

3. Comparative Evaluation

Comparative Evaluation is provided by 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. **Merit Self-Evaluation** – Faculty will complete and submit the appropriate Merit Self-Evaluation Form.
- 4.2. **Activity Report** – Faculty will complete and submit the Activity Report most relevant to their position.
- 4.3. **Current CV** – Faculty will submit a Current Curriculum Vitae.
- 4.4. **Student Teaching Evaluations** – Student teaching evaluations for all courses instructed by each faculty member in the time period of the evaluation will be compiled by the Arts and Administration Program administrative staff.
- 4.5. **Peer Teaching Evaluations** – When available, peer teaching evaluations completed during the time period of the evaluation will be collected by the Arts and Administration Program administrative staff.

5. Criteria and Factors

- 5.1. **Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty** – Criteria are provided in the AAD TTF Merit Score Sheet
- 5.2. **Non-Tenure Track Faculty** – Criteria are provided in the AAD NTTF Merit Score Sheet

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. A weighted average of scores in each area of Teaching, Research, and Service relative to the prominence of each area in a faculty member's job description, determine a faculty member's final merit score.

TTF

Unless otherwise stipulated, all TTF evaluations will be weighted as 40% Teaching, 40% Research, and 20% 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. Other weightings may be applied with prior approval from the AAA Dean or designee.

7. Evaluation of Accomplishments

- 7.1. **Clarity and Transparency** – Merit Score Sheets include clear and unambiguous metrics by which faculty members can demonstrate meritorious contribution to the department, including how those metrics translate into the relative scores that ultimately determine an individual's merit increase. The faculty rely upon the academic judgment of the members of the Merit Committee to evaluate specific accomplishments and contributions and to assign an appropriate overall rating in each merit category based off of the preponderance of accomplishments or contributions in that merit category. The members of the Merit Committee recognize the necessity to honor the trust and authority placed in them by operating in good faith in a collegial manner, and adhering to the guiding principles of equity, parity, and inclusiveness in performing these evaluations.

Only the integers 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 will be used as an assigned merit score for research, teaching, or service. The weighted total score received by a faculty member will be rounded to the nearest tenth.

- 7.2. **Types of Merit Score Sheets** – One of the following Merit Score Sheets will be used as appropriate:

Tenured Associate and Full Professor Merit Score Sheet
Tenure-Track Assistant Professor Merit Score Sheet
Career NTTF Score Sheet
Adjunct Instructor Score Sheet

7.2.1 – In the spring 2014 Merit Review, a working version of two merit score sheets will be used as appropriate: Merit Score Sheet for TTF Faculty and Merit Score Sheet for NTTF Faculty. These two merit score sheets will be further modified and refined as the four score sheets listed above for future rounds of merit review.

- 7.3. **Collegial and Consultative** – The AAD Merit Review Committee will consist of three Core Faculty members including, the Program Director, one TTF, and career NTTF. The committee is only formed and active when a merit process is engaged by the Provost. The TTF and NTTF members will self-nominate during an open faculty meeting. Both members are approved by a simple majority vote of Core Faculty. If nominees fail to come forward or a simple majority vote is not reached

for either position, the Program Director may either directly appoint an appropriate representative or seek faculty approval to exclude the position from the upcoming merit process.

The AAD Program Director will collect merit self-evaluations, activity reports, updated CVs, student teaching evaluations, and peer teaching evaluations. The Merit Review Committee (MRC) will evaluate these compiled materials and complete the appropriate Merit Score Sheet for each faculty member and determine merit tier scores. In order to ensure integrity, members of the MRC will recuse themselves from input and discussion regarding their own merit scores. If the MRC does not provide input as required by the timeline for completing the merit review process, the AAD Program Director's decision regarding individual merit scores will be the final scores submitted to the AAA Dean.

- 7.4. **Selection of Tier Scores** – The Program Director, in consultation with the AAD Merit Review Committee 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.
- 7.5. **Final Assignment of Tier Increases** – The Program Director, in consultation with the AAD Merit Review Committee and using guidance provided by the Associate Dean for Finance, will determine appropriate raise percentages or amounts to be applied in each tier, and submit those raise percentages or amounts as recommendations to the AAA Dean. The AAA Dean will consider those recommendations in determining the final merit increase amounts for each tier. Unless otherwise approved by a majority vote of the Core Faculty at the onset of a merit process, merit increase amounts for each tier will be provided as dollar amount lump sums as this is viewed to be the most equitable approach to rewarding equal merit.
- 7.6. **Participation** – If the AAD Merit Review Committee is unable to participate in the process outlined in 7.3, 7.4, or 7.5 for any reason, they will provide the AAD Program Director with a set of Guiding Principles which will be used to aid the AAD Program Director and AAA Associate Dean for Finance in providing final recommendations to the Dean by the required due date.

7.6.1 Guiding Principles will be provided in writing and in sufficient enough time to accommodate timelines mandated by the Provost and/or

Dean. In the absence of written Guiding Principles, the Program Director will informally consult with faculty before providing final recommendations.

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 review process.

Research – May consider 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 review process.

Service – The 12 months directly preceding the merit review process.

9. Merit Tiers

The final merit 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 are ineligible to 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.

Arts and Administration Program Merit Score Sheet for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Evaluation Period: _____

Faculty Member: _____

Evaluation percentages for this faculty member:
(standard is 40% research, 40% teaching, 20% service)

Research _____% Teaching _____% Service _____%

Overall Merit Evaluation Scores:

Research _____ Teaching _____ Service _____

Weighted score = _____

- Note: 1 = Does Not Meet Expectations
2 = Provisionally Meets Expectations
3 = Meets Expectations
4 = Exceeds Expectations
5 = Highest Expectations

Merit Evaluation Notes:

Merit Assessment Criteria

Does Not Meet Expectations (1)

Faculty receiving Does Not Meet Expectations ratings for research, teaching, or service fail to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of relevant effort, expertise, and/or results. Performance is below minimal acceptable standards; immediate improvement is required.

Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

Research

No publications of significance and quality per year in masked reviewed international and national journals, or chapters in books, or similar publication channels.

No juried presentation at significant international and national conferences, conventions, seminars, and professional meetings.

No evidence of community-engaged scholarship of significance and quality.

No evidence of digital scholarship of significance and quality.

No evidence of creative work / production of significance and quality.

Minimal evidence of research/scholarship in progress and substantially planned future work.

Teaching

Consistent and pervasively negative student evaluations or numeric student course evaluations significantly below the department mean.

Peer teaching evaluation concluding significant problems with teaching.

No significant participation in curricular development.

Evidence that existing courses are not regularly updated.

Evidence of student academic and/or research advising that does not meet department standards.

Service

Noticeable absence from department meetings, events, and activities.

Poor coordination, leadership, and oversight of assigned curricular area, or department initiative, or goal, requiring reassignment of that service assignment.

No meaningful participation in AAA and/or University committees.

No meaningful engagement in relevant professional associations.

Provisionally Meets Expectations (2)

Faculty receiving Provisionally Meets Expectations ratings for research, teaching, or service show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of relevant effort, expertise, and/or results, though not significantly beyond that. Performance sometimes meets requirements, but not consistently; improvement is necessary.

Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

Research

Primary Considerations:

Equivalent of one (1) publication of significance and quality per year in masked reviewed international and national journals, or chapters in books, or similar publication channels.

No significant juried presentations at significant international and national conferences, conventions, seminars, and professional meetings.

Weak evidence of research/scholarship in progress and substantially planned future work.

Secondary Considerations:

Lack of evidence of community-engaged scholarship of significance and quality.

Lack of evidence of digital scholarship of significance and quality.

Lack of evidence of creative work / production of significance and quality.

Teaching

Numeric student course evaluations slightly below the department mean.

Peer teaching evaluation concluding teaching success below departmental standards.

Lack of involvement in curricular development.

Evidence that existing courses are not regularly updated.

Evidence of student academic and/or research advising that does not meet department standards.

Service

Erratic attendance and participation in department meetings, events, and activities.

Deficient coordination, leadership, and oversight of assigned curricular area, or department initiative, or goal.

Low level of participation in AAA and/or University committees.

Low level of engagement in relevant professional associations.

Meets Expectations (3)

Faculty receiving Meets Expectations ratings for research, teaching, or service show evidence meeting departmental expectations in the relevant effort, expertise, and/or results. Performance fully meets job requirements on a consistent basis.

Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

Research

Primary Considerations:

Equivalent of two (2) publications of significance and quality per year in masked reviewed international and national journals, or chapters in books, or similar publication channels.

Evidence of research/scholarship in progress and substantially planned future work.

One or two (1-2) juried presentations at significant international and national conferences, conventions, seminars, and professional meetings.

Secondary Considerations:

Evidence of community-engaged scholarship of significance and quality.

Evidence of digital scholarship of significance and quality.

Evidence of creative work / production of significance and quality.

Teaching

Numeric student course evaluations at the department mean.

Peer teaching evaluation concluding teaching success meets departmental standards.

Student and peer teaching evaluations demonstrate that instruction adapts to the particular needs of diverse modes of curricular delivery and pedagogical approaches as appropriate to each course.

Designs and offers new instructional experiences within the department.

Revises existing courses to keep them updated and develops new courses.

Keeps and posts updated course learning objectives.

Holds regular office hours and is readily accessible.

Collaborates with other faculty or departments to develop innovative coursework.

Provides academic and research advising to AAD graduate students, undergraduate students, and students from other UO academic units.

Service

Regular attendance and participation in department meetings, events, and activities.

Coordination, leadership, and oversight of assigned curricular area, or department initiative, or goal.

Serves on at least one AAA committee or equivalent.

Serves on at least one university committee or equivalent.

Actively participates in relevant professional associations.

Serves as reviewer for academic journals and other publishers.

Exceeds Expectations (4)

Faculty receiving Exceeds Expectations ratings for research, teaching, or service show evidence of exceeding departmental expectations in the relevant area in terms of effort, expertise, and results to a standard that is achieved by only a minimum of peers.

Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

Research

The equivalent of three (3) publications of significance and quality per year in masked reviewed international and national journals, or chapters in books, or similar publication channels.

Publication of a co-authored or co-edited book with an academic press.

Three or more (3+) juried presentations at international and national conferences, conventions, seminars, and professional meetings.

Community-engaged scholarship of significance and quality, with significant local or regional impact.

Digital scholarship of significance and quality, recognized by an external award.

Creative work / production of significance and quality, recognized by an external award.

Recipient of a UO / AAA competitive research grant or award.

Significant active work on an externally funded grant.

Significant citations of work in reputable publications.

Well-documented evidence of the continuing impact of scholarly work.

Teaching

Numeric student course evaluations above the department mean.

Peer teaching evaluation concluding teaching success exceeds departmental standards.

Significant development work on new courses, seminars, or collaborative courses.

Significant contributions to departmental curricular development initiatives.

Coursework engages students in meaningful professional or community service.

Service

Leadership in significant departmental initiative.

Leadership role in material advancement of AAA-wide initiative or goal.

Evidence of significant service contribution to at least one university committee or equivalent.

Board member of a relevant professional association.

Serves on editorial board of a major academic journal.

Serves on scientific committee for a national/international conference.

Academic service on behalf of public bodies such as boards of directors, culture councils, advisory groups, and professional juries.

External reviewer for promotion and tenure at other peer institutions.

Chairs a regional symposium of significance and impact.

Highest Expectations (5)

Faculty receiving Highest Expectations ratings for research, teaching, or service show evidence of exceeding departmental expectations in the relevant area in terms of effort, expertise, and results to a standard achieved by only a select few peers.

Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

Research

The equivalent of four or more (4+) publications of significance and quality per year in masked reviewed international and national journals, chapters in books, or similar publication channels.

Publication of a single-authored or single-edited book with an academic press.

Four or more (4+) juried presentations at international and national conferences, conventions, seminars, and professional meetings.

Significant active work as PI on an externally funded grant.

Recipient of national or international award for research/scholarship.

Teaching

Leadership role in multidisciplinary curricular development.

Development of a new degree or certificate program.

Recipient of major college or university award for teaching excellence or innovation.

Service

Chairs a major University committee.

Leadership role in material advancement of a University initiative or goal.

Significant leadership role (e.g., President or other Officer) for a relevant professional association.

Editor of a major academic journal.

Chairs a national/international conference of significance and impact.

Arts and Administration Program Merit Score Sheet for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Evaluation Period: _____

Faculty Member: _____

Faculty Member's NTTF FTE Appointment: _____

Evaluation percentages for this faculty member:

(standard is 90% teaching, 10% service)

Research _____% (N/A) Teaching _____% Service _____%

Specific Service Assignment Considerations:

Overall Merit Evaluation Scores:

Research ____ (N/A) Teaching _____ Service _____

Weighted score = _____

- Note: 1 = Does Not Meet Expectations
2 = Provisionally Meets Expectations
3 = Meets Expectations
4 = Exceeds Expectations
5 = Highest Expectations

Merit Evaluation Notes:

Merit Assessment Criteria

Does not Meet Expectations (1)

Faculty receiving Does Not Meet Expectations ratings for research, teaching, or service fail to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of relevant effort, expertise, and/or results. Performance is below minimal acceptable standards; immediate improvement is required.

Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

Teaching

Numeric student course evaluations significantly below the department mean.

Peer teaching evaluation concluding significant problems with teaching.

No significant participation in curricular development.

Evidence that existing courses are not regularly updated.

Evidence of student advising that does not meet department standards.

Service

Noticeable absence from department meetings, events, and activities.

Poor coordination, leadership, and oversight of assigned curricular area, or department initiative, or goal, requiring reassignment of that service assignment.

No significant participation in AAA and/or University committees.

No significant engagement in relevant professional associations.

Provisionally Meets Expectations (2)

Faculty receiving Provisionally Meets Expectations ratings for research, teaching, or service show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of relevant effort, expertise, and/or results, though not significantly beyond that. Performance sometimes meets requirements, but not consistently; improvement is necessary.

Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

Teaching

Numeric student course evaluations slightly below the department mean.

Peer teaching evaluation concluding teaching success below departmental standards.

Lack of involvement in curricular development.

Evidence that existing courses are not regularly updated.

Evidence of student advising that does not meet department standards.

Service

Erratic attendance and participation in department meetings, events, and activities.

Deficient coordination, leadership, and oversight of assigned curricular area, or department initiative, or goal.

Low level of participation in AAA and/or University committees.

Low level of engagement in relevant professional associations.

Meets Expectations (3)

Faculty receiving Meets Expectations ratings for teaching, or service show evidence meeting departmental expectations in the relevant effort, expertise, and/or results. Performance fully meets job requirements on a consistent basis.

Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

Teaching

Numeric student course evaluations at the department mean.

Peer teaching evaluation concluding teaching success meets departmental standards.

Student and peer teaching evaluations demonstrate that instruction adapts to the particular needs of diverse modes of curricular delivery and pedagogical approaches as appropriate to each course.

Designs and offers new instructional experiences within the department.

Revises existing courses to keep them updated and develops new courses.

Keeps and posts updated course learning objectives.

Holds regular office hours and is readily accessible.

Collaborates with other faculty or departments to develop innovative coursework.

Provides academic and research advising to AAD graduate students, undergraduate students, and students from other UO academic units.

Service

Regular attendance and participation in department meetings, events, and activities.

Coordination, oversight and performance of assigned AAD service area(s).

Serves on at least one AAA committee or equivalent.

Serves on at least one university committee or equivalent.

Actively participates in relevant professional associations.

Exceeds Expectations (4)

Faculty receiving Exceeds Expectations ratings for research, teaching, or service show evidence of exceeding departmental expectations in the relevant area in terms of effort, expertise, and results to a standard that is achieved by only a minimum of peers.

Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

Teaching

Numeric student course evaluations significantly above the department mean.

Peer teaching evaluation concluding teaching success exceeds departmental standards.

Significant development work on new courses, seminars, or collaborative courses.

Significant contributions to departmental curricular development initiatives.

Coursework engages students in meaningful professional or community service.

Secondary Considerations, as these support teaching excellence:

Evidence of published scholarship or significant research work in progress.

Evidence of significant juried presentations at conferences and professional meetings.

Evidence of community-engaged scholarship of significance and quality.

Evidence of digital scholarship of significance and quality.

Evidence of creative work / production of significance and quality.

Service

Leadership of a significant departmental initiative.

Leadership role in material advancement of AAA-wide initiative or goal.

Evidence of significant service contribution to at least one university committee or equivalent.

Board member of a relevant professional association.

Service on behalf of public bodies such as boards of directors, culture councils, advisory groups, and professional juries.

Chairs a local or regional symposium of significance and impact.

Highest Expectations (5)

Faculty receiving Highest Expectations ratings for research, teaching, or service show evidence of exceeding departmental expectations in the relevant area in terms of effort, expertise, and results to a standard achieved by only a select few peers.

Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

Teaching

Leadership role in multidisciplinary curricular development.

Recipient of major college or university award for teaching excellence or innovation.

Secondary Considerations, as they support teaching excellence:

Evidence of a considerable body of relevant published scholarship or scholarly work in progress.

Service

Chairs a major University committee on which NTTF are encouraged to participate.

Leadership role in material advancement of a University initiative or goal.

Significant leadership role (e.g., President or other Officer) for a relevant professional association.

Chairs a national/international conference of significance and impact.