

**Merit Review and Salary Adjustment Procedures
UO Department of Earth Sciences**

April 28, 2016

Approved by the Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs: October 6, 2016

Overview

Evaluation of faculty members for merit-based salary increases in the Department of Earth Sciences is carried out by the Department Head, under advisement of an appointed ad-hoc personnel committee. The evaluation for merit raises is based on recent performance reviews, current CV's, and teaching evaluations. The committee reviews all materials and gives their recommendation to the Department Head in the form of a report with performance ratings and explanatory text for each faculty member under review (excluding the committee members themselves and anyone with whom they may have a conflict of interest). The Department Head may make adjustments based on additional information and knowledge of faculty performance. The Department Head uses these data to create a spreadsheet with numerical performance ratings for all faculty and staff under review, and the numerical ratings are used to calculate merit salary increases. The actual amounts are scaled as needed to match the total amount allocated for merit raises in the online spreadsheet tool. The report and spreadsheet used for this purpose are archived to allow for appropriate follow-up or review if questions arise later.

All Career NTTF and TTF (faculty) are potentially eligible for merit raises. Faculty are evaluated for merit; no one is 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. Faculty will be informed of their raises after they are approved. The criteria and expectations for satisfactory performance are explained below.

Procedures

The procedures for evaluating performance are explained below. The Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure in our department, approved by our faculty, provide additional detailed evaluation criteria that are used to supplement the broad procedures outlined below.

Tenure-Track Faculty

In evaluating individuals for merit increases, performance in the three traditional areas of research, teaching, and service is considered. Under normal circumstances, equal weight is given to research and teaching (approximately 40% each) and ~20% is assigned to service contributions. In accordance with our promotion and tenure guidelines, in some cases faculty members may ask to adjust the relative weighting to reflect changing focus of their career through time. This adjustment may lead to greater emphasis on teaching or service activities than research, at the discretion of the Department Head.

Research:

Publications and funded research grants are the two primary metrics by which research productivity is evaluated. Greater weight is given to publications on which the faculty member is first or second author, compared to those for which the faculty member is lower down the list of authors. Papers authored by a faculty member's students or postdocs, which include the faculty member as second author, are also weighted highly. The quality of the journal, proceedings volume, map, or book is also evaluated. Papers appearing in journals not deemed to be in the first tier are given less weight, and abstracts are not considered except insofar as they indicate active participation in scientific meetings. Invited talks and lectures are also considered. In some cases, scholarship other than research papers, such as maps, field trip guidebooks, and major appendices, may be considered on par with journal articles or book chapters.

Grant funding provides another measure of research success, because grants are awarded through the peer-review process. An attempt is made to arrive at an overall picture of the level of grant activity, grant-funded student, postdoc and faculty support, research productivity, and a faculty member's standing in their sub-discipline as indicated by their record of competitive grant funding. Because different fields have different monetary needs, grant dollar amounts are considered secondarily.

Teaching and Graduate/Postdoc Advising:

Teaching is evaluated primarily through peer reviews of teaching and numerical student evaluations. Other factors including numerical student evaluations, signed narrative comments, quantity of teaching, and new versus previously taught classes are also considered. The numerical student evaluations are averaged for all classes taught during the review period, to arrive at a single numerical score.

Education, training, and mentoring of undergraduate students, graduate students, and postdoctoral scholars is an important part of our teaching mission. Accordingly, the number of students and postdocs advised, and the quality of that advising, is assessed as part of our teaching effort. Assessment includes students currently in the degree program as well as any that have graduated during the review period.

Service:

This category evaluates service to one's department, the university, professional societies, schools other than the UO, and the general public. Professional service may include serving on journal editorial boards, grant review panels, steering committees, elected office in professional societies, etc. Faculty submit vitae listing their service activities during the review period, and the ad-hoc committee assesses the magnitude of the service assignment and the quality of service rendered. The rating of service will reflect the different expectations for junior versus senior faculty or other similar considerations, as outlined in our departmental Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure document.

After considering all factors described above, based on a comparison of performance by tenure-track faculty members in the department, faculty are assigned a general rating one of: "outstanding" (3), "good" (2), or "fair" (1) in each category (research, teaching, and service). These ratings are combined to create a total score that is used to assign relative merit raises, as explained below.

Instructors (including tenured and career)

The individual position descriptions for instructors' state that their efforts are to be focused on teaching and teaching-related scholarship, with most of the remaining effort directed toward service activities, advising, writing, etc. Performance expectations are outlined in contracts and position descriptions. Teaching and service activities of instructors are evaluated in the same way as that of tenure-track faculty, and their performance is rated in the same pool. Assessment of teaching-related scholarship places greater emphasis on publication in teaching- and outreach-related books and journals and participation in workshops etc., than in external grant funding, although this latter activity is valued.

Career Research Assistants and Associates

Performance reviews of research-related NTTFs (research assistants and associates) will be carried out by the Department Head with input from the supervising faculty member(s). Reviews will evaluate the performance of duties, tasks, and responsibilities described in the contract language and job descriptions for each position. Merit increase recommendations will be based on the extent to which the individual has met, failed to meet, or exceeded the expectations for performance of their assigned duties and responsibilities as documented in the performance reviews.

Officer of Administration (OA)

The Department Head will base their merit increase recommendation on the performance reviews of any OAs during the relevant review period. If there has not been a performance review in the past year, the Department Head will undertake such a review. The review will evaluate the OA's performance of the duties and responsibilities described in the OA's position description. While OA reviews are conducted by the Department Head, they may 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 will be based on the extent to which the OA has met or exceeded expected performance of their assigned duties and responsibilities, as indicated by the relevant performance reviews.

Overall Rating

Overall ratings for tenure-track faculty are determined by combining the ratings for research, teaching, and service, giving approximately 40% weight to research and teaching and ~20% to service (40-40-20). These weightings serve as the default values unless a faculty member has requested and received a different weighting scheme. Different weightings are applied to instructors consistent with their professional responsibilities and associated workloads. Ratings for research assistants and associates and officers of administration are determined using the criteria above. The department head may adjust the final rating somewhat on the basis of additional factors that the ad-hoc committee may not have access to.

Salary Increase Recommendations

The ratings described above serve as the primary guide in determining merit salary increase recommendations to be made to the Dean. Raises are assigned as a percent of faculty salary. Final small adjustments may be necessary to compensate for the effects of distributing percentage raises across a group of faculty with different salaries. Any final adjustments are scaled and pro-rated to retain the relative ratings determined using the criteria and methods described above.