

Department of Ethnic Studies Merit Evaluation Procedures

When performance-based (merit) raises are authorized by the Dean, the Ethnic Studies Department follows these procedures:

Tenure-Related Faculty

1. Reviews will be conducted by the merit review committee, consisting of the Department Head, one ES tenured faculty member (rotating appointment starting with the most senior), and one tenured participating faculty member. The merit review committee's merit salary recommendations will be based on a review of faculty members' research, teaching, and service.
2. Each faculty member will be asked to prepare a summary of their activities in teaching, research, and service for the relevant period, and to provide a current curriculum vitae. The committee will also examine recent performance reviews, course syllabi, the quantitative and qualitative teaching evaluations for each course, plus any peer teaching evaluations that may have been conducted. The committee will then write a brief merit evaluation, based on the above materials. This evaluation will be made available to each faculty member, who will have the opportunity to discuss it with the Department Head and to add a written response if they desire.
 - a. All faculty must be evaluated for merit, it is not permitted to opt out.
 - b. Regardless of type of appointment or FTE, each faculty member is eligible for consideration of the highest merit rating.
 - c. All faculty who meet or exceed expectations will receive some merit increase.
3. The following general guidelines will be followed in assessing each of the three areas:
 - a. Research – The primary evidence of research by faculty will be their ability to share with others the results of their work. This will be determined primarily by the quantity and quality of publications in recognized journals, collections, or academic presses. Research grants, fellowships, and major research awards are also evidence of excellent research performance. A secondary consideration will be presentation of papers to interested groups (e.g., papers delivered at conferences, universities, public lectures, campus groups outside of the ES Department, or ES colloquia). Number of publications is not to be taken as an end in itself. Of greater importance is the contribution of the faculty member's work to scholarship, research, or continuing discussion of issues in their field, or related fields. Scholarship or research in digital venues should also be considered within a faculty member's portfolio. Satisfactory research performance includes major articles submitted for publication, organizing conference panels, and the involvement in ongoing research projects. Faculty are encouraged to include drafts of work with their materials to demonstrate the quality and significance of their research within their field.
 - i. If the review period is 3 years or greater, satisfactory research progress will include at least one major publication or equivalent, if the review period is less than 3 years, satisfactory progress of on-going research and writing will be indicated by drafts of works in progress, presentations of work at professional meetings, invited talks, or campus symposia/colloquia. Good research includes all that is satisfactory plus more than one publication or equivalent. Very good research includes all that is good meritorious research, plus edited journals and edited volumes, or several article or

chapter publications in well placed venues (or equivalent). Excellent research includes the publication of a single author or co-author academic book .

- b. Teaching – Satisfactory teaching by faculty is assumed in the absence of recurring low teaching evaluations (3.0 or less). Satisfactory performance can be established on the basis of favorable student evaluations and peer evaluations. The committee is charged to assess the overall teaching portfolio. Syllabi should be examined to consider curricular and pedagogical innovation, the implementation of new material or course development, and the general impact and learning outcomes in line with the ES teaching mission. Satisfactory performance also includes teaching of service courses (both lower division courses and ES 301, 498, and 499), which are highly valued teaching contributions to the department. Good or higher teaching includes maintaining a satisfactory level of teaching, plus the development of new courses, collaborative teaching projects, receiving teaching funding awards for innovative course development or pedagogical projects, developing new curricular programs, or receiving major university or association teaching awards. Faculty should indicate the number of undergraduate Honor's theses, or McNairs scholars they supervised. Teaching and supervising graduate students is also considered a valuable contribution. Faculty members should include the number of dissertation committees they have served on or chaired, qualifying exam/comprehensive exam committees, and M.A. thesis committees. To assess the distinction between good, very good, or excellent teaching assessment, the committee will evaluate the scope and quantity of teaching beyond the satisfactory level. The quantity of the overall workload should also take differential teaching course loads into consideration.
 - c. Service – Willingness to share in normal departmental duties such as committee assignments, student advising, attending faculty and department meetings, participating in departmental events and programs, attending commencement, etc., will constitute satisfactory service to the Department. Serving on personnel and search committees, assisting in major departmental administrative projects constitute good service to the Department. Special positions, such as chairing personnel committees and search committees, leading major programming like conferences and symposia, or establishing new programs are considered very good departmental service. Taking on departmental or university directorships, or administrative appointments are also deserving of above average service (but will also be considered relative to course releases and compensation for such positions). Also of special merit will be participation in university, state, regional, and national committees. Credit will be given for service work performed for other University of Oregon departments and/or programs, such as serving on search committees, program evaluation committees, etc. Excellent service would be a high quantity of very good service. Service expectations are adjusted for pretenure faculty members, where much less service is expected and desired for faculty needing to focus on the research requirements for tenure.
4. Based upon this information, each member of the merit review committee will evaluate faculty members' activity reports for each area (research, teaching, and service) and use the following scoring metric:
- 0 = Unsatisfactory
 - 1 = Satisfactory
 - 2 = Good
 - 3 = Very Good

This draft contains revisions based on feedback from AA 5.21.14 and 6.5.14

4 = Excellent

5. Weighting of each category is as follows:

- Research 40%
- Teaching 30%
- Service 30%

Thus, scoring and tabulation of overall faculty merit reviews will be as follows:

Category	Evaluation (0 – 4)	Weighting	Weighted Totals
Research		x .40	
Teaching		x .30	
Service		x .30	
Total		-----	

A weighted total of 1.0 is necessary for meeting expectations for merit increase.

6. Raises will be distributed by score, irrespective of the faculty member's base salary. With regard to merit, one's base salary is not a relevant variable, but it would become one if a merit increase, based on one's total score, were to be awarded as a percentage of a faculty member's current salary. Therefore, merit raises will typically be determined in dollar amounts and added to the base salary of individual faculty members, except when the committee agrees that percentage allocation, or a combination of percentage and dollar amounts, will aid efforts to avoid inversion or compression. All faculty members who overall meet or exceed expectations based upon the calculations of the weighted total (explained in section 5) will be eligible for merit increases.
 - a. To calculate the salary increase dollar amount, the sum of all the faculty weighted totals are divided into the total merit increase pool. The quotient is the dollar amount for each point earned by the faculty member. The faculty members weighted total is multiplied by the quotient, to produce the dollar amount of salary increase for merit.
7. The ES faculty member on the merit review committee will exclude themselves from their own review process. The Department Head and ES participating faculty member will conduct the review of the ES faculty committee member on the merit review committee.
8. If separate funds related to equity are made available to the Department, the Department Head will consult the merit review committee to consider equity within ranks, across ranks, and between ES and our comparator institutions.
9. The Department Head will use the results of these tabulations as the basis for their recommendation to the Dean for all pay raises based on merit and equity.
10. Each faculty member will be informed of the dollar amount increase to their base salary that is a result of merit, equity, and/or across-the-board increases. The evaluation will be made available to the faculty member, who will then have the opportunity to discuss it and to attach a written response if desired. Documentation of all merit decisions will be tracked and maintained.

II. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF)

1. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF) include adjunct instructors, visiting instructors, and visiting professors. Currently the department does not rely on career NTTF for instruction or research. NTTF are primarily hired to teach courses for the department when TTF are away on leave or on reduced teaching for administrative purposes. Thus, merit review of NTTF will be based on the expectations outlined in their contract.
2. The Merit Review Committee will conduct performance reviews of the NTTF during the relevant evaluation period. 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 current job duties. As the basis for this review, each eligible NTTF will be asked to prepare a short (1-2 page) report on their teaching responsibilities and activities for the relevant period. The merit review committee will review the NTTF member's annual performance reviews conducted by the Department Head, quantitative and qualitative teaching evaluations, course syllabi, and peer teaching observations. If NTTF are also assigned advising responsibilities, the merit review committee will also assess the number of advisees, and scope of work conducted with their pool of advisees over the duration of the review period.
3. Based upon this information, each member of the merit review committee will evaluate the NTTF members' activity reports for each area for teaching and use the following scoring metric:

0 = Unsatisfactory
1 = Satisfactory
2 = Good
3 = Excellent
4. Satisfactory teaching by NTTF is assumed in the absence of recurring low teaching evaluations (3.0 or less). Satisfactory performance can be established on the basis of favorable student evaluations and peer evaluations. We recognize that ES faculty teach challenging material in our courses that many students are resistant to, and that this can lead to less favorable scores and comments in course evaluations. Thus, the committee is charged to assess the overall teaching portfolio. Syllabi should be examined to consider curricular and pedagogical innovation, the implementation of new material or course development, and the general impact and learning outcomes in line with the ES teaching mission. Good or higher performance will be based on excellent teaching evaluations and peer evaluations, the presence of innovative teaching, and curricular class-based programming.
5. Raises will be distributed by score, irrespective of the NTTF member's base salary. With regard to merit, one's base salary is not a relevant variable, but it would become one if a merit increase, based on one's total score, were to be awarded as a percentage of a faculty member's current salary. Therefore, merit raises will typically be determined in dollar amounts and added to the base salary of individual NTTF members, except when the committee agrees that percentage allocation, or a combination of percentage and dollar amounts, will aid efforts to avoid inversion or compression. All NTTF members who overall

This draft contains revisions based on feedback from AA 5.21.14 and 6.5.14

meet or exceed expectations based upon the calculation score explained in section II.3. are eligible for merit increase.

6. If separate funds related to equity are made available to the Department, the Department Head will consult the merit review committee to consider equity within ranks, across ranks, and between ES and our comparator institutions.
7. The Department Head will use the results of these tabulations as the basis for their recommendation to the Dean for all pay raises based on merit and equity.
8. Each NTTF member will be informed of the dollar amount increase to their base salary that is a result of merit, equity, and/or across-the-board increases. The evaluation will be made available to the NTTF member, who will then have the opportunity to discuss it and to attach a written response if desired. Documentation of all merit decisions will be tracked and maintained.