

**AEI Merit Review Guidelines**  
May 2016

Approved by the Office of Provost and Academic Affairs on August 7, 2016

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1. AEI Performance Standards .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. AEI Merit Increase .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2.1 Faculty Merit Review .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2.2 Officer of Administration Merit Increase Procedures .....</b>	<b>3</b>

**Introduction**

The purpose of this document is to outline the Merit Guidelines. This document and other review policy/procedure information, is posted in the AEI Public Folder on the AEI Server as a downloadable document. Since revisions will also be saved, it is advised that people always check this location for the most recent version. Academic Affairs will also post this document on their website upon approval.

When performance reviews are used for merit evaluations, all faculty and eligible staff will be informed of the amount of their increase (plus any COLA if any) by paper letter in the period shortly after the increase is approved. For the merit evaluations the annual review form(s) from the previous merit cycle will be used to calculate merit.

Note: During the 2015-2016 academic year, the general topic of faculty review (Annual Review and Promotions) was researched by a faculty committee and various proposals shared with faculty. Town Hall Meetings and Qualtrics surveys were used to gather information from the wider faculty. At the time of this document’s approval, no decisions were made about Faculty Review, so an update will be submitted for the 2016-2017 Academic or 2017 Calendar year. In May 2016, Merit Guidelines were reviewed and submitted for approval. Merit Guidelines are the only portion of this document that has been updated. This document only addresses merit, and not annual review. Guidelines for annual review can be found in the AEI Handbook.

**1. AEI Performance Standards**

All faculty members are expected to meet the high standards of the AEI, in accordance with their status as Pro Tem or Career faculty. There is no one prescription for what constitutes “meeting the high standards of the AEI.” The wide variety of efforts in the areas of teaching and administration represented by the faculty along with the varying significant contributions that individual faculty members make to the overall well-being of the AEI will be taken into account by a peer review committee, the Academic Director and the Executive Director. In general, all faculty are expected to demonstrate flexibility

and versatility in teaching assignments and scheduling, as dictated by program needs; in addition, career faculty are expected to engage in activities that make a significant contribution to the field, to varying degrees depending on the percent workload assigned to service and professional development.

Performance expectations will not change unless there is specific notification to faculty at the beginning of the review cycle. In addition, individual expectations and goals are determined by each faculty member in conversation with the Academic Director at an Annual Review meeting so that each member of the faculty can know at the end of each review cycle what is expected of him or her.

- Review metrics are meant to provide guidance and are not necessarily an exhaustive list of recognized service and research/ professional development.
- Performance is used in determining the level of merit pay increases (if any).
- The details of activities are still held to be important (e.g. for purposes of determining merit, presenting at a national conference may be considered more prestigious than presenting at a local conference, or a short review or teaching tip-type publication may be considered less prestigious than a journal publication).

## **2. AEI Merit Increase**

Each merit cycle, the University of Oregon will allocate a specific pool of money to the AEI for merit. The UO determines this amount by totaling all salaries in the unit and calculating the pool amount based on the allocated percentage (for 2017 and 2018, 2.25%). This pool will be divided across the FICT and TICT classifications based on the same percentage used by the UO and following the same calculation. Pro Tem instructors are not eligible for merit per the CBA.

### **2.1 Faculty Merit Review**

Merit increases are based on the results of the Annual Review for the prior year. For details on Annual Review, please see the Annual Review Guidelines on the AEI Share Drive. Annual Review will feed directly into merit considerations.

Using the Academic Director approved annual review document, the AEI Executive Director in consultation with the Academic Director will consider performance reviews of the NTTF during the evaluation period and distribute merit to NTTF that exceed expectations or meet expectations. Merit will be distributed as a percentage of salary, with one percentage assigned for “exceeds expectations” and another percentage assigned for “meets expectations”. Those individuals that exceed expectations will be assigned a higher percentage of salary than those that meet expectations. The process includes:

- determining the available funds for each pool, FI and TI, following UO procedures for determining the amount for a department. This ensures an equal percentage for both groups.
- calculating the percentages based on the current salaries, the number of instructors in FICT or TICT, and the number of people in the Meets or Exceeds

categories in order to distribute the entire pool.

- The percentages cannot be predetermined because they will be based on the current salaries, the number of instructors in FICT or TICT, and the number of people in the Meets or Exceeds categories.

Upon completion, the Executive Director will finalize the review of the NTTF during the relevant evaluation period using the NTTF Merit Summary form found on CASWeb at <https://casweb.uoregon.edu/nttf-merit-summary>.

When requested, The Executive Director will provide the department's merit increase recommendations to the CAS Dean. The actual merit award will be based on funding availability and university criteria.

If there has not been a performance review within the past year, the Academic Director will perform such a review with two or more members of the most recently active Annual Review Committee, one of which must be the committee chair, to evaluate the NTTF's performance of the duties and responsibilities described in their contract language and his/her current job duties. The Executive Director or Academic Director'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.

## **2.2 Officer of Administration Merit Review**

The Executive Director in collaboration with the Director of Operations (if appropriate) will base merit increase recommendations on the performance reviews, and the consideration of a current CV, as well as any relevant material submitted that has not been captured during the OA's relevant evaluation period.

The supervisor (or as appropriate, alternates such as Executive Director or Director of Operations) will undertake such a review. The supervisor or alternate will first ask the OA to write a summary of accomplishments for each general area of job responsibilities (e.g., program administration, project management and development, fiscal and operations management, payroll, conference and event planning, office management and service). The supervisor or alternate's review should provide a Structured Approach 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 supervisor or designated alternate, they should also include, when possible, feedback from relevant constituent groups both internal and external to the department. If a supervisor rather than the Executive Director conducts the performance review, the Executive Director will review the evaluation for approval.

The merit increase recommendation for each of the department's OAs should be based on the extent to which the OA has met or exceeded expected performance of her/his assigned duties and responsibilities, as indicated by the relevant performance reviews. The Executive Director will provide the department's merit increase recommendation to the CAS Dean.

**AEI OA Merit Evaluation Form – Structured Approach OA Evaluation Process  
2016 – 2017**

Performance Rating	3 Exceeds Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	1 Below Expectations	Weight (must = 100%)
Overall Performance Rating that best reflects combined performance and results		2+		100%

Criteria for exceeds, meets or below expectations are defined on the UO Human Resources “Structured Approach Performance Management Planning and Review Form”.

The merit rating (somewhere between 1, 2, 3) will be based on calculating an average of the individual assessment areas on the "Structured Approach" form and [if necessary] rounding to the nearest whole number.