

MERIT EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Officers of Administration

The Associate Deans, Assistant Deans or Program Managers will base their merit increase recommendation on the performance reviews of the OA during the relevant evaluation period. If there has not been a performance review within the past year, the Unit Head will undertake such a review. The Unit Head will first ask the OA to write a summary of accomplishments for each general area of job responsibilities. The Unit Head's review should provide a narrative evaluation of 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 Unit Head, they should also include, when possible, feedback from relevant constituent groups both internal and external to the department. The Unit Head's merit increase recommendation should be based on the extent to which the OA has met or exceeded expected performance of her/his assigned duties and responsibilities.

The Unit Head's recommendations will be reviewed by the Dean's office. The actual merit award will be based on funding availability.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty

The Department Head will consider performance reviews of the NTTF using the annual/biannual evaluations for the relevant period of the merit raise. These evaluations are based on the information provided by the faculty member in their Faculty Activities Report, which includes the most current CV and which is available on the LCB's Intranet site (see attachment). Evaluations are based primarily on teaching and service, and generally carry weighting of 80% and 20%, respectively. Different weightings may be used to include research or administrative responsibilities. These weightings must have the approval of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. 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 duties and responsibilities described in their contract language and his/her current job duties. As the basis for this review, the Department Head will ask the faculty member to prepare a short (1-2 page) report on her/his teaching responsibilities and activities for the relevant period. The Department Head will also review the faculty member's quantitative and qualitative teaching evaluations which are required for every course. The Department Head then writes an evaluation based on these materials, and this will be shared with the faculty member, who has the opportunity to include a written response, if he/she desires. In cases in which a promotion (e.g. to Senior Instructor) occurs during the year, a new report is not required, other than adding the numerical evaluations as specified under the guidelines below.

The Department Head's merit increase recommendation will be based on the extent to which the individual has met or exceeded expected performance of her/his assigned duties and responsibilities, as indicated by the relevant performance reviews.

The Unit Head's recommendations will be reviewed by the Dean's office. The actual merit award will be based on funding availability.

Tenure-Track Faculty

The Department Head's merit salary recommendations will be based on the performance reviews of the faculty member using the annual/biannual evaluations for the relevant period. These evaluations are based on the information provided by the faculty member in their Faculty Activities Report, which includes the most current CV and which is available on the LCB's Intranet site (see attachment). Evaluations are based on teaching, research, and service, and generally carry weighting of 40%, 40% and 20%, respectively. Different weightings may be used to include administrative responsibilities. These weightings must have the approval of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

If there has not been a performance review within the past year, the Department Head will undertake such a review to evaluate the faculty member's performance of the duties and responsibilities described in their contract language and his/her current job duties. Each faculty member will be asked to prepare a summary of their activities in teaching, research, and service for the relevant period, and provide an updated curriculum vitae. The Department Head will also examine the quantitative and qualitative teaching evaluations for each course, plus any peer evaluations that may have been conducted. The Department Head then writes a brief merit evaluation, based on the materials submitted and the teaching evaluations.

In cases where a pre-tenure, tenure, or post-tenure review has already been done during the year, a new report is not required, other than adding the numerical evaluations as specified below. This evaluation is made available to the faculty member, who has the opportunity to discuss it and to attach a written response if she/he so desires.

Guidelines Used in the Assessments of Faculty:

The following general guidelines are followed in assessing each of the three areas:

1. **Teaching** - Satisfactory teaching by faculty is assumed in the absence of recurring low teaching evaluations (University common questions #1 and #2 on quality of course and quality of instruction) or numerous negative comments by students. Above average performance can be established on the basis of favorable student evaluation to University common questions #1 and #2, numerous positive comments by students, peer evaluation, and teaching awards. Relatively large class size will be regarded as one positive factor, provided that it is not accompanied by grading above the University or Department averages or that it requires only minimal amounts of work by students. Other indications of merit in this area would include willingness to develop new courses to meet student interests and needs, major revision of course content and materials, appropriate use of experiential learning, service on PhD committees, and experiments with new methods of teaching or new media or technologies. However, none of these activities individually should be regarded as either necessary or sufficient for exceeding expectations in teaching.
2. **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 top-tier journals. Consideration also will be given to presentation of papers to interested groups (e.g., papers delivered at conferences, other universities, public lectures), research grants, and research oriented books. 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 her or his field, or related fields.

3. Service - Willingness to share in normal departmental duties such as committee assignments, student advising, etc., will constitute satisfactory service to the Department. 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, setting up new programs, industry outreach, etc. Service to the profession such as involvement in organizing conferences and serving on editorial boards of academic journals is also highly valued.

For each of the categories the faculty member will receive a rating of:

1 = Unsatisfactory

2 = Less than satisfactory

3 = Satisfactory

4 = Superior

5 = Outstanding

An overall rating of Unsatisfactory or Less than Satisfactory would not meet expectations and would not be eligible for merit pay. An overall rating of Satisfactory would meet expectations and would be eligible for and would receive some merit pay. An overall rating of Superior or Outstanding would exceed expectations and would be eligible for and would receive some merit pay. An overall rating based on category weightings discussed above will be calculated for each review period. Department heads who have the most complete perspective of each member of their department will use past evaluations covering the relevant merit period to make a merit raise recommendation. These recommendations will be reviewed Dean's office which will make the final allocation decision. The actual merit award will be based on funding availability.

All faculty must be evaluated for merit. It is not permitted to opt out. Regardless of type of appointment or FTE, each faculty member is eligible for consideration for the highest merit rating.

Faculty will be informed of their raises after they have been approved. Summary of merit raise recommendations will be kept in the dean's office for 5 years. For more detailed information the faculty member or officer of administration should contact the unit head within 2 months of receiving the notification."