A&AA Academic Affairs Merit Policy

Merit Policy

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

Purpose

This policy outlines the A&AA Academic Affairs procedures for determining and assigning merit raises, when available.

1. Full Inclusion

All A&AA Academic Affairs 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 A&AA Academic Affairs 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 members 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 AAA ACADEMIC AFFAIRS TTF Merit Score Sheet
5.2. **Non-Tenure Track Faculty** – Criteria are provided in the AAA ACADEMIC AFFAIRS 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.

7. **Evaluation of Accomplishments**

7.1. **Clarity and Transparency:** Merit Criteria Sheets include clear and unambiguous metrics by which faculty members can demonstrate meritorious contribution to the department. A weighted average of scores in each area of Teaching, Research/Creative Work, and Service relative to the prominence of each area in a faculty member’s job description, determine a faculty member’s final merit score. The faculty rely upon the academic judgment of the Director 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 Director recognizes the necessity to honor the trust and authority placed in him or her by operating in good faith in a collegial manner, and adhering to the guiding principles of equity, parity, and inclusiveness in performing these evaluations.

7.2. **Collegial and Consultative**

7.2.1. **Evaluators:** The Director is responsible for performing merit evaluations based on the Activity Report and CV submitted, and in comparison with colleagues at similar rank.

7.2.2. **Selection of Tier Scores:** The Director 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.

7.2.3. **Final Assignment of Tier Increases:** The Director, using guidance provided by the Associate Dean for Finance, will determine appropriate raise percentages or amounts to be applied each tier, and submit those raise percentages 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 Faculty at the onset of a merit process, merit increase amounts for each tier will be provided as percentage increases above base salary.

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.
AAA Academic Affairs
Merit Score Sheet for
Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Evaluation Period: ____________________________________________

Faculty Member: ____________________________________________

Faculty Member’s NTTF FTE Appointment: ______________________

Evaluation percentages for this faculty member:
(% based upon initial employment agreement)

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.
Consistent feedback indicates minimal or slow response to student needs.
Peer teaching evaluation concluding significant problems with teaching and poor course organization.
No significant participation in curricular development.
Evidence that existing courses are not regularly updated.
Evidence of student advising that does not meet department standards.
Does not respond in timely manner with course information requests such as syllabus or proposed course schedules.
Is not accessible to students
Does not engage in professional development opportunities

Service

Consinual 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.
- Noted poor organizational skills, lack of clarity of course expectations.
- Inconsistent standards for grading, and/or does not return graded items within a reasonable time frame for student improvement.
- Inconsistent office hours, student have erratic access.
- Minimal participation in professional development opportunities.

**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 AAA graduate students, undergraduate students, and students from other UO academic units.
  • Student evaluations are at the program average.
  • Provides constructive criticism on student exercises and promptly returns class or studio assignments.
  • Holds office hours regularly.

Regularly engages in professional development opportunities

**Service**

Regular attendance and participation in department meetings, events, and activities.
Coordination, oversight and performance of assigned AAA 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.
Holds regular office hours, readily accessible to students

Regularly engages in professional development opportunities and provides resources and synopsis to share with colleagues

**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.

- Student evaluations are consistently at the highest level.
- Demonstrated high achievement in student work.
- Faculty pedagogical methods are presented at conference or in published form.
- Holds office hours regularly and provides mentoring related to developing further professional avenues or research paths.

Actively seeks on-going professional development to expand teaching and student engagement activities. Regularly shares information and mentors colleagues on new information.

**Secondary Considerations, as they support teaching excellence:**

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

Evidence of significant contribution to the professional field through conference or other venue content presentations

**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.