

Department of Art
2014 Merit Policy

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

PURPOSE

This policy outlines the Art Department's procedures for determining and assigning merit raises, when available.

1. Full Inclusion

All 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 the department and each faculty member plays a key role in achieving departmental 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, the processes themselves are separate and distinct. 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 determined through an evaluation of merit materials in relation to the established criteria.

3. Comparative Evaluation

Comparative evaluation is accomplished by sorting all faculty evaluations into merit tiers based on the merit scores.

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 Activity Report – Faculty will complete and submit the departmental Activity Report most relevant to their position.

4.2 Current CV – Faculty will submit a current Curriculum Vitae.

5. Criteria and Factors

5.1 Tenure Track Faculty – Criteria is provided in the departmental TTF Score Sheet

5.2 Non-Tenure Track Faculty – Criteria is provided in the departmental NTTF 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. Final scores from Merit Score Sheets will be weighted based on an individual’s expected appointment in terms of Teaching; Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Activities; and Service.

TTF

Tenure track evaluations:
Scoring follows the job duty proportions.

Category	Total Weight (%)	Scale: (low) 1 to 5 (high)
Teaching	40%	1-----5
Research	40%	1-----5
Service	20%	1-----5

Tenure track faculty with *administrative* appointments involving course release:
Scoring evaluation proportions are adjusted to reflect increased service and decreased teaching load.

Category	Total Weight (%)	Scale: (low) 1 to 5 (high)
Teaching	30%	1-----5
Research	40%	1-----5
Service	30%	1-----5

NTTF

The majority of NTTF in the Art Department currently have *teaching-only appointments*. The assessment rubric reflects this emphasis on teaching. Evaluation will include activities that contribute to teaching preparation and staying current in the field, as well as classroom effectiveness.

Category	Total Weight (%)	Scale: (low) 1 to 5 (high)
----------	------------------	----------------------------

Teaching	100%	1-----5
----------	------	---------

Non-Tenure Track Faculty with partial service appointments.
 For those NTTF appointments that include some explicit service responsibilities such as advising or management, the proportion would follow the job description.

Category	Total Weight (%)	Scale: (low) 1 to 5 (high)
Teaching	60-90%	1-----5
Service, where applicable to position	10-40%	1-----5

7. Evaluation of Accomplishments

7.1 Clarity and Transparency: Merit Criteria Sheets outline the types of metrics by which faculty members can demonstrate meritorious contribution to the department. The faculty rely upon the academic judgment of the members of the Faculty Personnel Committee 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 members of the Faculty Personnel Committee recognize the necessity to honor the trust and authority placed in them by operating in good faith in a collegial manner, and adhering to the guiding principles of equity, parity, and inclusiveness in performing these evaluations. 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, determines a faculty member’s final merit score.

7.2 Collegial and Consultative

7.2.1 Evaluators:

The elected Faculty Personnel Committee, which includes three tenure-related faculty and one Career NTTF, will be responsible, in conjunction with the Department Head, for conducting the evaluations. The NTTF member will only participate in evaluations of other NTTF faculty. Until the FPC is constituted, the elected FAC will function in this role. In order to protect the integrity of this process, members of the FPC will recuse themselves from input and discussion regarding their own scores.

7.2.2 Selection of Tier Scores: The Department Head, in consultation with the FPC, 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 Department Head with guidance provided by the Associate Dean for Finance will determine appropriate raise percentages or amounts to be applied to each tier, and submit those raise percentages or amounts as recommendations to the AAA Dean. The overall distribution will be evaluated for systematic comparative merit and a portion of the pool may be used to address merit consistency in the context of an individual's total contributions and responsibilities. The AAA Dean will consider those recommendations in determining the final merit increase amounts for each tier.

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:

<u>Teaching:</u>	The 12 months directly preceding the merit process
<u>Research:</u>	Focuses on the 12 months prior, but also includes evidence of progress on the larger trajectory
<u>Service:</u>	The 12 months directly preceding the merit process

When the established review period is longer than 12 months, the merit consideration will be pro-rated for those faculty who were employed for only a portion of the period.

9. Merit Tiers

The narrative descriptions below indicate activity levels expected for five distinct tiers of merit. These are guiding principles intended to assist the evaluators in making a holistic assessment of faculty contributions and merit.

Note that activity in research (R), teaching (T) and service (S) are described for each tier, but that an individual could fall in a different category for each component. [For example: one's work could be identified as *exceeds* in research, *meets* in teaching, *does not meet* in service.]

The score in each component is multiplied by the proportion of duties, to arrive at total score. [(R 4.0 x .4 = 1.6) + (T 3.0 x .4 = 1.2) + (S 1.0 x .2 = .2) = 3.0 total 'meets expectations' overall.]

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 (2.0-2.9): 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 (3.0-3.5): 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 (3.6-4.5): 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 (4.6-5.0): 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.

In addition, the addendum document “Merit Rubric Guidelines” is intended to provide the merit committee more specific information about the weighting of meritorious activities. As the departmental evaluation process is implemented in the coming years, it is expected that the list of examples in this rubric will grow and be revised to provide a more comprehensive guide. The *best*, *better* and *good* categories are intended to assist with relative importance. The final score within research, teaching or service will be based on the overall cluster (or lack thereof) of activities within that domain.

9.1 Tenure Track Faculty

All accomplishments are assessed in the context of rank, in keeping with the expectations outlined in our departmental promotion and tenure guidelines.

An Assistant Professor should show evidence of professional achievement and the initiation of promise on a national level, as well as effective and engaged teaching and active contributions to departmental service.

Associate Professors should show continued production of quality creative work and professional activity, at a national level, as well as very effective teaching, service, and leadership within the department, and service at the school and university level.

Professor in the Department of Art is expected to have demonstrated leadership and achieved national or international recognition/stature in their area of expertise/research, as well as sustained quality and high standards in teaching and a strong record of service at all levels.

A. Does Not Meet (1.0-2.0 score)

R: - does not sustain a creative practice

T: - unsatisfactory teaching outcomes: poor student work, irresponsible teaching, significant student complaints

S: - does not participate in basic service obligations: attending faculty meetings, committee meetings, department events

B. Provisionally Meets (2.0-2.9 score)

R: sustains an ongoing creative practice

T: satisfactory execution of teaching assignments

S: attends faculty meetings, committees and department events

C. Meets Expectations (3.0-3.5 score)

R: - sustains a productive creative practice; some evidence of development, as well as professional activity.

T: - solid teaching outcomes; good student work, positive peer and student evaluations, coursework contributes to larger curriculum; MFA program participation

S: -participates in faculty meetings, tangible contributions to committee work and curricular areas; participates in department events; post-tenure: participates in AAA service, serves as Curricular Coordinator

D. Exceeds Expectations (3.6-4.5)

R: - productive creative practice, including a trajectory of development and inquiry; active national record of professional activities appropriate to the

practice and academic rank; evidence of critical reception; significant reviews, invitations

T: - excellent student work; notable student accomplishments; demonstrated excellence and innovation in teaching; contributions to pedagogy beyond the department

S: - Strong contributor to departmental governance, active engagement in faculty discussions; leadership role in committee service; search committee participation; election to departmental FAC/FPC; pre-tenure: serve as curricular coordinator, AAA committee; post-tenure: UO service

E. Highest Expectations (4.6-5.0)

R: - Exceptional national or international recognition for work; inclusion in significant museum survey, solo show at top tier venue; major fellowship award

T: - Major recognition of teaching accomplishments: distinguished UO award; leading a substantial curricular development, such as a new degree program

S: - University leadership: FPC, university initiatives; leadership of a professional organization; organizing a major symposium conference

9.2 . Non-Tenure Track Faculty

(S = service, where such duties are assigned)

1. Does Not Meet (1.0-2.0)

T: - unsatisfactory teaching outcomes: poor student work, irresponsible teaching, significant student complaints

(S: unsatisfactory completion of assigned duties)

2. Provisionally Meets (2.0-2.9)

T: satisfactory execution of teaching assignments

(S: satisfactory completion of assigned tasks)

3. Meets Expectations (3.0-3.5)

T: Solid teaching outcomes; good student work, positive peer and student evaluations, coursework contributes to larger curriculum

(S: positive contributions to department functions)

4. Exceeds Expectations (3.6-4.5)

T: excellent student work; notable accomplishments; evidence of continued professional development: learning new things to expand expertise, activity in studio and professional practice that informs teaching; curricular awards or initiatives, interdisciplinary contributions

(S: - election to FAC/FPC representation; engaged participation in department

events and discussions; initiatives to enhance department or school goals)

5. Highest Expectations (4.6-5.0)

T: -university or external teaching awards; major contributions to curriculum development; outstanding student outcomes

(S: exceptional service to the department, leadership on initiatives or projects)

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.

Department of Art
Merit Rubric Guidelines
 4/2014

This evaluation rubric is intended to be used as a guide by the Faculty Personnel Committee and Department Head in making merit assessments, providing more specific information about the weighting of meritorious activities. As the departmental evaluation process is implemented in the coming years, it is expected that the list of examples will grow and be revised to be more comprehensive and inclusive.

Faculty are not necessarily expected to do things in all of the categories listed under each heading; different outcomes are appropriate for different practices. The *best*, *better* and *good* distinctions are intended to assist with relative importance. The final score within research, teaching or service will be based on the overall cluster of activities within that domain. For example, multiple *good* things in research might constitute an overall *exceeds* score. One *best* activity might not constitute a *highest* ranking overall.

RESEARCH

The Department of Art recognizes the importance and complications of a sustained and engaged creative practice and professional record. We value a trajectory of inquiry and challenging and evolving work, as well as career advancement.

	Good	Better	Best
<i>creative work</i>	Sustained production of work Notable works-in-progress	Evidence of development and change Evolution of inquiry Resolved body of work	Notably ambitious projects Landmark developments in practice
<i>exhibitions</i>	Minor group exhibitions Regional group Juried exhibitions	Regional solo National group Int'l group Multiple venues	Solo show in a top tier gallery, national or int'l Prestigious museum survey group exhibition

<i>publications</i>	Reviews in local/regional press	Catalogue publication Review in a national publication, print or online Writing or work published in a peer – reviewed journal	Work featured in national publication
<i>screenings</i>	Inclusion of a short in a large program	Feature of work within a limited program Solo feature at a regional venue	Solo featured work in a significant venue
<i>curatorial work</i>	Member of artists-run non-profits	Curated project at a regional venue	Curated project at a national/int'l venue
<i>residencies</i>	Small regional residency	Competitive national level (eg. Ucross, Bemis, Djerassi) Smaller int'l	Most competitive residencies (eg. Yaddo, MacDowell) Major int'l
<i>awards</i>	AAA fellowship Small regional	UO fellowship Large Regional award Modest national	Major national award (eg. Guggenheim, Pollock-Krasner)
<i>collections/commission</i>		Public project Work acquired by a museum	Major public commission Work in a major collection
<i>conferences</i>	Regional panel	Paper/panel national (eg. CAA, SIGGRAPH, SNAG, NCECA.)	Keynote at National Panel chair

<i>invited lectures</i>	Regional institution	National institution	Featured distinguished lecture
-------------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------

TEACHING

The Department of Art recognizes that strong teaching involves both challenging and supporting our students. We value the cultivation of individual sensibilities, risk-taking, growth and diverse outcomes for our students, as well as the development of technical, aesthetic and critical abilities.

	Good	Better	Best
<i>student accomplishments</i>	Capable work, technical, aesthetic and conceptual progress	UO or external awards for students Notable MFA admissions for BFAs Evidence of particular rigor, diversity and risk taking in student work	Exceptional recognition of student work
<i>student evaluations</i>	Solid scores and qualitative remarks Evidence of growth	Strong student testimonials of accomplishment and development	
<i>peer observations</i>		Notable peer review	University teaching award
<i>curriculum</i>		New course development Area curricular revisions	New degree program
<i>pedagogical contributions</i>	Guest lectures inside or outside the department Overseeing student exhibitions Honors college advisor	Honors college courses Interdisciplinary teaching projects Overseeing external student exhibitions Developing new opportunities for students	Pedagogical leadership: major initiatives within or beyond the department

<i>graduate program</i>	MFA thesis committees	MFA chair Contributing to MFA course offerings Serving on thesis committees for students from other programs	
-------------------------	-----------------------	--	--

SERVICE

The Department of Art recognizes that shared governance, engaged service and collegial discourse is critical to the health of the program.

	Good	Better	Best
<i>AAA</i>	AAA committee (post-tenure)	AAA committee (pre-tenure)	AAA FPC Leading school initiatives
<i>UO</i>		UO committee (post-tenure)	UO FPC or major search committee Leadership in a university initiative
<i>department</i>	Curricular coordinator (post) Jury UO art exhibit One dept committee Engaged mentorship (post)	Curricular Coord. (pre-tenure) Search Committee appointment Elected to FAC/FPC Leads an initiative Director of Graduate Program or Digital Arts	Leads a major initiative
<i>external</i>		Percent for Art committee Jurying a regional external exhibit Significant participation in a professional organization External reviewer for P&T at other institutions	Leadership of a professional organization Serving as an external reviewer for accreditation