

AAA Historic Preservation Program Merit Policy Outline

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

PURPOSE

This policy outlines the Program'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 program and each faculty member plays a key role in achieving programmatic goals. Merit Differentiation is used strictly as a means to differentiate between varying degrees of excellence within the program. 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 materials against criteria provided in the appropriate Merit Criteria Sheet.

3. Comparative Evaluation

Comparative Evaluation is provided by sorting all faculty evaluations 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. Activity Report – Faculty will complete and submit the program's 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 TTF Score Sheet
- 5.2. Non-Tenure Track Faculty – Criteria is provided in the NTTF Score Sheet
- 5.3. Research Faculty – Criteria is provided in the OR 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

Unless otherwise stipulated, all TTF evaluations will be weighted as 40% Teaching, 40% Research, and 20% Service. Evaluations for TTF with significant administrative appointments will generally be weighted as 30% Teaching, 40% Research, and 30% Service. Other weightings may be applied with prior approval from the AAA Dean or designee.

NTTF

Unless otherwise stipulated, all NTTF evaluations will be weighted as 100% Teaching, 0% Research, and 0% Service. Those NTTF who either self-identify as undertaking significant research and/or service or have job descriptions that specifically incorporate significant portions of research or service may have evaluations weighted 80% Teaching, 20% Research/Service, as appropriate.

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 program. The faculty rely upon the academic judgment of the Department Head 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 contribution in that merit category. The Department Head 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. 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.

7.2. Collegial and Consultative

7.2.1. Evaluators: The Historic Preservation Program Director will evaluate the contents of the submitted documents, and make an evaluation.

7.2.2. Selection of Tier Scores: The Program 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 Program Director, 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 as recommendations to the AAA Dean.

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 process

Research: May include 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 process

Service: The 12 months directly preceding the merit process

9. Merit Tiers

The final 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 standards 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.

Historic Preservation Merit Score Sheet

Evaluation Period: _____

Faculty Member: _____

Faculty Member's NTTF FTE Appointment: _____

Evaluation percentages for this faculty member:

(standard is 90% teaching, 10% service)

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:

Historic Preservation

TTF Merit Criteria

TEACHING

Does Not Meet Expectations – Faculty members receiving “Does Not Meet Expectations” ratings for teaching fail to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of teaching expertise. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Consistent and pervasive negative student evaluations.
- Consistent low enrollment in focal area courses or studios relative to peer courses or studios.
- Poor course organization.
- Lack of professionally developed standard course materials.
- Lack of adherence to UO policies and standards, or other such specific guidance as provided by the Provost, Dean, Program Head, or Designee.
- Poor peer reviews.
- Does not hold regular office hours.
- Consistently does not submit course syllabus for posting when requested.

Provisionally Meet Expectations – Faculty members receiving “Provisionally Meets Expectations” ratings for teaching show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of teaching expertise, though not significantly beyond that. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Consistent student evaluations below the program average.
- 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.
- Uses outdated resource materials.
- Excessive guest lecturers or films shown in class.
- Same exercises taught annually.
- Does not hold regular office hours.

Meets Expectations—Faculty members receiving “Meets Expectations” ratings for teaching show evidence of a normative standard for teaching expertise. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Student evaluations are at the program average.
- Provides constructive criticism on student exercises and promptly returns class or studio assignments.

- Holds office hours regularly.

Exceeds Expectations—Faculty members receiving “Exceeds Expectations” ratings for teaching show evidence of having demonstrated the standards required to qualify as “Exceeds Expectations” but has not demonstrated a level of meritorious contribution high enough to qualify for “Highest Expectations.” Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Student evaluations are consistently above the program average.
- Conducts an energized learning environment by employing engaging course materials.
- Addresses emerging technologies and current research in course content.
- Syllabus employs creative field, applied, studio, and/or research activities that are in line with focal area skillsets.
- Innovative pedagogical practices in the classroom or studio as demonstrated in submitted student work, (e.g. selection in the Associated Students for Historic Preservation (ASHP) journal, or other student forums.
- Holds office hours regularly.

Highest Expectations—Faculty members receiving “Highest Expectations” ratings for teaching show evidence of clearly demonstrating standards required to qualify as “Highest Expectations”. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Student evaluations are consistently at the highest level.
- Demonstrated high achievement in student work.
- Work from the classroom or studio is acknowledged through acceptance at regional or national conference, prizes, or awards.
- Faculty pedagogical methods are presented at conference or in published form.
- Significant research or evolving technologies are introduced and applied in the classroom or studio. These may culminate in internship, or thesis, or terminal project endeavors by the students under your mentorship.
- Holds office hours regularly and provides mentoring related to developing further professional avenues or research paths.

RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK

Note: No credit will be given for past work in lieu of current sub-par work. Likewise, credit will be given for current meritorious work that has show improvement from previously poor review. It is advised that faculty members indicate a clear trajectory of research output.

Does Not Meet Expectations – Faculty members receiving “Does Not Meet Expectations” ratings for research and/or creative work fail to show evidence of an

acceptable minimum standard of research and/or creative work. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- No record of submittals of current research, studio, or practice to regional (for assistant professors), or national, organizations of peer reviewed work.
- No documentation of on-going (in process) articles, competitions, exhibits, field or treatment activities that relate to one's contract duties.
- Note: no credit will be given for past work in lieu of current sub-par work.

Provisionally Meet Expectations – Faculty members receiving “Provisionally Meets Expectations” ratings for research and/or creative work show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of research and/or creative work expertise, though not significantly beyond that. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Minimal efforts to maintain current standing in the field by having work selected by peer reviewed organizations in the field.
- Faculty member does not develop a clear trajectory of research progress.

Meets Expectations—Faculty members receiving “Meets Expectations” ratings for research and/or creative work have clearly demonstrated the standards required to qualify as “Meets Expectations” but have not demonstrated a level of meritorious contribution high enough to qualify for “Exceeds Expectations”. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Maintains an ongoing pattern of creative scholarly development appropriate to their recognized field of endeavor. Such work must be peer reviewed.
- For long-term projects, charting the course of development is necessary (i.e. book prospectus submitted to a press).
- Articles accepted by scholarly journals.
- Papers presented at conferences in their discipline.
- Presentations at conferences printed in proceedings.
- Efforts to seek external funding to support research.

Exceeds Expectations—Faculty members receiving “Exceeds Expectations” ratings for research and/or creative work show evidence of meeting demonstrated standards required to qualify as “Exceeds Expectations”, but has not demonstrated a level of meritorious contribution high enough to qualify for “Highest Expectations”. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Received external funding to undertake peer reviewed scholarly work.
- Completion of peer reviewed journal, article, or chapter entry.
- Publication of peer reviewed journal, article, or chapter entry.
- Selected as a paper session presenter or as session chair at a conference.

Highest Expectations—Faculty members receiving “Highest Expectations” ratings for research and/or creative work show evidence of superior achievement or recognition. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Recognition of completed scholarly work through favorable reviews in professional journals and/or awards for articles or books.
- Selected as keynote presenter at a national or international venue.
- Award recipient at the regional or national level.
- Work selected for re-publication in an anthology, encyclopedia, or compendium.
- Asked to contribute or edit a major monograph in a particular discipline related to the position held at the university.
- Achieves national landmark status for a resource put forth by the faculty member.

SERVICE

Does Not Meet Expectations – Faculty members receiving “Does Not Meet Expectations” ratings for service fail to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of service contributions to the life of the school. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Does not contribute to the scholarly or pedagogic life of the school through mentoring, or faculty collaborations leading to a tangible product.
- Does not support the program, school, university, or community outreach goals.
- Does not attend faculty meetings or undertake committee assignments.

Provisionally Meet Expectations – Faculty members receiving “Provisionally Meets Expectations” ratings for service show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of service contributions to the life of the school, though not significantly beyond that. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Accepts only low-service load activities (i.e. committees that meet only once a year).
- Participates only marginally on program or school committees.
- Does not support students seeking research or thesis/terminal project advising.

Meets Expectations—Faculty members receiving “Meets Expectations” ratings for service contributions to the life of the school have clearly demonstrated the standards required to qualify as “Meets Expectations” but have not demonstrated a level of meritorious contribution high enough to qualify for “Exceeds Expectations”. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Attends all assigned committee meetings.
- Meets all committee assignments on time and in a professional matter.
- Reviews graduate admissions applicants and takes part in assigning admissions scholarships.
- A voting member of curriculum or policy committees.
- Takes part in State or local advisory councils.

Exceeds Expectations—Faculty members receiving “Exceeds Expectations” ratings for service contributions to the life of the school show evidence of demonstrated meritorious contributions high enough to qualify for “Highest Expectations”. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Chairs major committee assignments that represent the program to the school and/or university.
- Takes an active role in shaping curricula or policy standards at the program level.
- Chairing or serving on faculty search committees.
- Recommends and brings guest lecturers to campus; does introductions and produces promotional materials.

Highest Expectations—Faculty members receiving “Highest Expectations” ratings for service contributions to the life of the school show evidence of achieving clearly demonstrated standards required to qualify as “Highest Expectations”. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Serves on national and/or regional boards; serves as an officer on such boards.
- Develops, or organizes, a local and/or regional workshop.
- Serves on school or university governance committees.
- Writes assessments for colleagues going up for promotion and tenure in other institutions.
- Received service awards at the national and/or regional level.
- Takes part in external reviews of other institutions, or takes part in creating documents for review of the Historic Preservation program related to external reviews or accreditation.

Historic Preservation Merit Score Sheet

Evaluation Period: _____

Faculty Member: _____

Faculty Member's NTTF FTE Appointment: _____

Evaluation percentages for this faculty member:

(standard is 90% teaching, 10% service)

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:

Historic Preservation

NTTF Merit Criteria

TEACHING

Does Not Meet Expectations – Faculty members receiving “Does Not Meet Expectations” ratings for teaching fail to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of teaching expertise. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Consistent and pervasive negative student evaluations.
- Consistent low enrollment in focal area courses or studios relative to peer courses or studios.
- Poor course organization.
- Lack of professionally developed standard course materials.
- Lack of adherence to UO policies and standards, or other such specific guidance as provided by the Provost, Dean, Program Head, or Designee.
- Poor peer reviews.
- Does not hold regular office hours.
- Consistently does not submit course syllabus for posting when requested.

Provisionally Meet Expectations – Faculty members receiving “Provisionally Meets Expectations” ratings for teaching show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of teaching expertise, though not significantly beyond that. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Consistent student evaluations below the program average.
- 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.
- Uses outdated resource materials.
- Excessive guest lecturers or films shown in class.
- Same exercises taught annually.
- Does not hold regular office hours.

Meets Expectations—Faculty members receiving “Meets Expectations” ratings for teaching show evidence of a normative standard for teaching expertise. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Student evaluations are at the program average.
- Provides constructive criticism on student exercises and promptly returns class or studio assignments.

- Holds office hours regularly.

Exceeds Expectations—Faculty members receiving “Exceeds Expectations” ratings for teaching show evidence of having demonstrated the standards required to qualify as “Exceeds Expectations” but has not demonstrated a level of meritorious contribution high enough to qualify for “Highest Expectations.” Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Student evaluations are consistently above the program average.
- Conducts an energized learning environment by employing engaging course materials.
- Addresses emerging technologies and current research in course content.
- Syllabus employs creative field, applied, studio, and/or research activities that are in line with focal area skillsets.
- Innovative pedagogical practices in the classroom or studio as demonstrated in submitted student work, (e.g. selection in the Associated Students for Historic Preservation (ASHP) journal, or other student forums.
- Holds office hours regularly.

Highest Expectations—Faculty members receiving “Highest Expectations” ratings for teaching show evidence of clearly demonstrating standards required to qualify as “Highest Expectations”. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Student evaluations are consistently at the highest level.
- Demonstrated high achievement in student work.
- Work from the classroom or studio is acknowledged through acceptance at regional or national conference, prizes, or awards.
- Faculty pedagogical methods are presented at conference or in published form.
- Significant research or evolving technologies are introduced and applied in the classroom or studio. These may culminate in internship, or thesis, or terminal project endeavors by the students under your mentorship.
- Holds office hours regularly and provides mentoring related to developing further professional avenues or research paths.

SERVICE

Does Not Meet Expectations – Faculty members receiving “Does Not Meet Expectations” ratings for service fail to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of service contributions to the life of the school. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Does not contribute to the scholarly or pedagogic life of the school through mentoring, or faculty collaborations leading to a tangible product.

- Does not support the program, school, university, or community outreach goals.
- Does not attend faculty meetings or undertake committee assignments.

Provisionally Meet Expectations – Faculty members receiving “Provisionally Meets Expectations” ratings for service show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of service contributions to the life of the school, though not significantly beyond that. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Accepts only low-service load activities (i.e. committees that meet only once a year).
- Participates only marginally on program or school committees.
- Does not support students seeking research or thesis/terminal project advising.

Meets Expectations—Faculty members receiving “Meets Expectations” ratings for service contributions to the life of the school have clearly demonstrated the standards required to qualify as “Meets Expectations” but have not demonstrated a level of meritorious contribution high enough to qualify for “Exceeds Expectations”. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Attends all assigned committee meetings.
- Meets all committee assignments on time and in a professional matter.
- Reviews graduate admissions applicants and takes part in assigning admissions scholarships.
- A voting member of curriculum or policy committees.
- Takes part in State or local advisory councils.

Exceeds Expectations—Faculty members receiving “Exceeds Expectations” ratings for service contributions to the life of the school show evidence of demonstrated meritorious contributions high enough to qualify for “Highest Expectations”. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Chairs major committee assignments that represent the program to the school and/or university.
- Takes an active role in shaping curricula or policy standards at the program level.
- Chairing or serving on faculty search committees.
- Recommends and brings guest lecturers to campus; does introductions and produces promotional materials.

Highest Expectations—Faculty members receiving “Highest Expectations” ratings for service contributions to the life of the school show evidence of achieving clearly demonstrated standards required to qualify as “Highest Expectations”. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to the following types of indicators:

- Serves on national and/or regional boards; serves as an officer on such boards.
- Develops, or organizes, a local and/or regional workshop.
- Serves on school or university governance committees.
- Writes assessments for colleagues going up for promotion and tenure in other institutions.
- Received service awards at the national and/or regional level.
- Takes part in external reviews of other institutions, or takes part in creating documents for review of the Historic Preservation program related to external reviews or accreditation.