

Clark Honors College Merit Process

Revised June 2014

Assumptions:

1. Merit pay will follow guidelines established by the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and Academic Affairs.
2. The “faculty,” unless otherwise specified, is defined as tenure related and non-tenure track faculty (NTTF), which includes Adjuncts, Postdocs, Professors of Practice, etc.
3. The CHC Dean will make the final decisions, guided by CHC Merit Review Committee rankings and by evaluation of research by relevant departments/schools closest to the CHC faculty member’s discipline (see below #6 in Process section).
4. All faculty will be evaluated for merit, not just bargaining unit members.
5. Regardless of type of appointment or FTE, each faculty member is eligible for consideration for the highest merit rating.
6. The evaluation for merit will include a recent performance review(s).
7. All faculty who meet or exceed expectations will receive some merit increase.

Process:

1. A CHC Merit Review Committee will be formed to offer the dean guidance on merit decisions.
2. The Merit Review Committee is composed of the associate dean and senior faculty members (tenured associate and full professors) drawn from the CHC executive committee. If both faculty ranks (associate and full professors) are not represented on the executive committee, the dean will appoint a faculty member in the unrepresented rank. The additional member will become a full member of the Merit Review Committee.
3. All CHC faculty will provide to the Executive Assistant to the Dean a CV and short personal statement (2-3 pages) highlighting their accomplishments for the period under review.
4. CHC evaluation criteria for tenure-related faculty are determined as follows: 40% research, 40% teaching, 20% service. Evaluation criteria for NTTF, Postdocs, Professors of Practice, and other faculty will vary (i.e., may not include evaluation for research) and thus be based on individual contract terms.
 - A. Research. Faculty will be evaluated using standards of excellence drawn from international and national norms developed in the scholarly fields hosted in the appropriate University of Oregon research departments.
 - B. Teaching. The committee will evaluate teaching using numeric student evaluations and qualitative measures of teaching such as narrative

student course evaluations, peer reviews, evidence of curricular innovation, willingness to tackle new course assignments, teaching awards, student letters of support, and commitment to advising and mentoring. Advising and availability will also be evaluated in this teaching category.

- C. Service. Senior faculty members (tenured associate and full professors) are expected to provide evidence of leadership in significant, non-trivial service to the bargaining unit member’s scholarly field, the university, and college. Probationary faculty members are expected to provide modest service. NTTF, Postdocs, Professors of Practice, etc., may also have different levels of service expectation depending on the individual contract.

- 5. Faculty will be evaluated in each category (e.g., teaching, research, service, depending on their contract) based on the following scoring system:

3	Outstanding
2	Excellent
1	Satisfactory
0	Unsatisfactory

- 6. Faculty research (40%) will be assessed first by non-CHC disciplinary peers using the departmental committee in the research department/school closest to the faculty member’s specialty. When a CHC faculty member shares an affinity with more than one department/school, the department/school to assess research will be chosen by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the CHC dean. The CHC dean will ask the research department/school to assess the research activity of CHC faculty affiliated with that department/school based on the CHC’s point scale (outlined above) and to provide a short written review. These assessments are considered advisory to the CHC dean. Departmental/School assessments are separate and independent from the Merit Review Committee scoring and ranking.
- 7. Research (40%), teaching (40%) and service (20%) will be assessed by the Merit Review Committee using the 0-3 point scale provided above.
- 8. The Merit Review Committee excludes itself from rating its members. The Dean compiles a separate rating on the same basis for each peer committee member.
- 9. Scores will be summed as follows: 2(research) + 2(teaching) + 1(service). Individual sums will generate a ranked list of merit raise candidates. This scoring will be adjusted for NTTF, Postdocs, Professors of Practice, etc. based on proportions outlined in their contracts.

Example:

Category	Research	Teaching	Service
Weight	40%	40%	20%

Prof X 2 2 1 = 9

10. The Merit Review Committee then meets and discusses this ranked list, analyzing each case and amending the ranking by vote, if necessary. The resulting ranking is then divided into ranking groups according to the increments of merit increase available. It is also divided into the distinct pools for each group of bargaining unit members.
11. If a tenure-related faculty member is judged as "unsatisfactory" in two of the three categories (research, teaching, service) the faculty member is not meeting expectations and is thus ineligible for merit pay. If an NTTF, Postdoc, or Professor of Practice evaluated per contract based on teaching alone is judged "unsatisfactory" in that category, then the faculty member is not meeting expectations and is thus ineligible for merit pay.
12. The Merit Review Committee forwards its recommendation to the CHC dean for consideration.
13. The CHC dean makes the final decision on the distribution of merit pay. Faculty will be informed of their merit increase after they have been approved.
14. Tracking of Merit Decisions will be conducted by the CHC dean's office. The dean's office will retain and store the materials associated with the merit review, which will include:
 - Evidence submitted by faculty and outside reviewers
 - Decisions of the peer evaluation committee
 - Decisions made by the dean
15. Upon request, individual faculty members may obtain her/his own ranking as determined by the Merit Review Committee.