

## UO COLLEGE OF EDUCATION MERIT REVIEW POLICY

Unit	College of Education (COE)
Previous version approval date	October 24, 2016
Faculty approved	June 9, 2023
Dean's Revision Received by OTP	June 9, 2023
Date of OTP Approval	August 16, 2023

### I. GENERAL MERIT REVIEW CONSIDERATIONS

#### A. Purpose of Merit Reviews

Merit reviews are used to determine each eligible faculty member's salary increase for merit based on their performance since the last merit review or the faculty member's start date if they were hired after the last merit increase.

#### B. Eligibility for Merit Increases

Faculty classifications eligible for merit consideration are determined in each collective bargaining agreement. Generally, faculty in the tenure related and career related classifications are eligible for merit consideration.

All eligible faculty are eligible for consideration of the highest merit rating regardless of type of appointment or FTE.

As for all review types, any reviews for periods that include approved leave (e.g., FMLA) or other changes to workload (e.g., reductions in teaching load to take on administrative service) should evaluate only those duties assigned during that period accordingly. Faculty in these situations are eligible for highest levels of review.

All eligible faculty must be evaluated for merit and are not permitted to opt out.

#### C. Merit Pools and Distributions

Merit pools and dates of distribution will be established in each collective bargaining agreement with United Academics. Merit distributions will be given as a percentage of base salary, irrespective of FTE in any given review period, and not as a flat dollar amount unless the Office of the Provost has approved a different distribution method.

#### D. Review Policies

Merit reviews will be based on the criteria established for performance reviews in the unit's review and promotion policies for eligible faculty classifications.

Merit reviews will include standards for determining if the faculty member does not meet, meets, or exceeds expectations in each category relevant to their job duties, and a methodology for determining when a faculty member does not meet, meets or exceeds expectations overall based on evaluations in each of those categories.

Merit reviews will consider each faculty member's performance since the last merit review or since their date of hire if after the last university merit distribution. The length of service over the review period may be considered in merit reviews for faculty hired since the last university merit distribution.

Merit reviews will include information from any performance, mid-term, third-year, tenure, promotion, post-tenure, or continuous employment reviews that were completed during the merit review period. The unit may request supplemental materials from each faculty member to cover any time during the merit review period that did not include any of the reviews described above.

#### **E. Joint or Multiple Appointments and Reviews**

For faculty with multiple appointments that are separate positions in separate units, there will be independent reviews for each position, with separate merit increases. For faculty with joint appointments, an MOU at time of hire should describe how reviews are to be handled.

## **II. UNIT MERIT REVIEW POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

### **Overview of the Merit Review Process**

The College of Education's merit review process describes four primary areas of activity and decision making that contribute to the determination of a merit award for a faculty member and the process related to submitting merit recommendations to the College of Education (COE) and to the Office of the Provost (OtP). Areas described in this policy are (1) initiation and communication around materials that will be submitted for the evaluation of merit (described in section A), (2) a description of the makeup of the decision-making group or groups that will engage around merit within the college (described in section B), (3) a summary of the rating process that will be used for evaluating faculty for merit in the college (described in section C), and (4) the translation of ratings to the final value associated with merit recommendations for the college (described in section D). This document also includes two appendices. Appendix A will be used to gather faculty achievements that occurred during the review period when performance evaluation materials are not available due to faculty status. Appendix B provides the rubric/rating that will be used by department heads and/or unit directors for scoring faculty accomplishments during the merit review period. All rating sheets must be signed and dated by the department head/unit director. Once merit determinations have been completed, recommended increases from the department/unit level should be documented according to the procedures set forth by the Office of the Provost

#### **A. Initiation of Merit Reviews**

In those years in which the University has announced that merit will be evaluated and awarded, department heads in conjunction with notification from the dean's office, will coordinate communication to their eligible faculty regarding merit activities and expectations. Where possible and where appropriate, collegewide communication will occur to ensure consistency of messaging and expectations across faculty in the college.

All faculty (academic/clinical/research) will be notified of the full merit process via email by their department head or unit director with the timeline for completing all required materials. All such notifications must include:

1. The materials to be submitted by faculty to departments for review and required format (see required materials below and refer to any implementation guidance),
2. A deadline for when materials are due to the department head or unit director,
3. The process for submitting materials (e.g., OneDrive, email, etc.), and
4. Next steps regarding the department, college, and university roles in the review process following the submission of their materials.

### **A.i. Required Materials**

In the merit review process, Department Heads or Research/Outreach Unit Directors and reviewers will rely on a review of all existing **performance evaluation** materials that cover the period of the merit window to conduct their merit review of Tenure-Track and Career faculty. In addition to the department head and unit directors' review of performance evaluation materials on file, faculty will also be required to submit their most current CV highlighting any activities that occurred during the merit review window.

**Note:** Faculty with no performance evaluation materials within the merit review period must submit the Faculty Activity Summary for the purposes of the merit review (see Appendix A).

CVs submitted as part of the merit review should follow the CV template included in the COE's most current Tenure/d Track Faculty (TTF) and Career Track Faculty (CTF/CNTTF) Promotion and Tenure policies.

In the event that a faculty member *completed* a sabbatical during the merit review period, that faculty member must also include the sabbatical report with the merit review materials.

All materials must be submitted on or before the date provided in the communication.

## **B. Merit Review Process**

The Department Head or Research/Outreach Unit Director in each faculty member's home unit is singularly responsible for coordinating and managing all final merit reviews and recommendations that will be submitted to the College of Education Dean for university submission. Department Heads and Research/Outreach Unit Directors will serve as the single point of contact for any inconsistencies, disputes, or conflicts with the merit review and/or recommendation process. To facilitate greater accuracy in this process, all merit reviews *and* recommendations must be completed by unit-leaders (i.e., Department Head or Research/Outreach Unit Director) in consultation with at least one other knowledgeable faculty leader from the same department/unit (e.g., Program Director, Associate Director, Supervisor, etc.).

### **B.i. Academic Departments**

At the academic department level, the merit review and recommendation submitted to the Dean will be completed by the Department Head in consultation with at least one other

academic leader from the same department (e.g., Program Director, Supervisor, etc.). Faculty serving in the consultant role would be knowledgeable about the faculty member's assigned duties and productivity and will be responsible for a neutral review of the materials and submissions for general accuracy and consistency. If no such individual can be identified within a department or unit, the Department Head may consult with college administration for additional support.

For faculty with multiple appointments that are separate positions in separate units, there will be independent reviews for each position, with separate merit increases. For faculty with joint appointments, an MOU at time of hire should describe how reviews are to be handled. At a minimum, both department heads should be consulted in conducting the merit review, but the final merit rating and recommendation that is ultimately submitted to the COE Dean is the responsibility the Department Head of the faculty member's primary appointment or "home" department to initiate and facilitate review.

Note: Faculty who are not being evaluated as part of a department (such as department heads or COE academic faculty who are not part of a department) will be evaluated by the COE Dean in consultation with at least one other faculty leader.

#### **B.ii. Research & Outreach Units**

At the research/outreach unit level, reviews for merit recommendations submitted to the Dean will be conducted by the Research/Outreach Unit Director in consultation with at least one other unit leader (e.g., Associate Director, Supervisor, etc.) who is knowledgeable about the faculty member's contributions in the areas outlined in their position description. In the event that a specific faculty member has professional responsibilities that span multiple units, each unit director should contribute to determining the merit rating and recommendation that is ultimately submitted to the college Dean; however, it is the responsibility of the Director of the faculty member's primary research/outreach "home" unit to initiate and facilitate the review.

#### **C. Merit Review Ratings**

Faculty will be evaluated in direct alignment with their position and/or position description, with weight accorded to each of the domain areas associated with their faculty professional responsibilities as appropriate. All TTF evaluations would include at a minimum, the domains of Instruction/Supervision/Advising, Research/Scholarship and Service. All Instructional CTF reviews would include, at a minimum, the domains of instruction/supervision and service in alignment with their respective professional responsibilities. All Research CTF reviews would include, at a minimum, the domains of research/scholarship and service. All submissions are expected to include evidence of professional activities related to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the domains of teaching, scholarship, and/or service, as appropriate given the faculty member's position.

Based on the submitted materials, the Department Head or Research/Outreach Unit Director, in consultation with the relevant unit-level faculty leader, shall review accomplishments since the last merit review (or date of hire if the hire occurred after the last university merit distribution) and assign a value between 1 and 3 to reflect the relevant domain areas: Instruction/Supervision/Advising, Research/Scholarship, and Service. Consistent with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Appendix 2:

*All faculty are expected to contribute to the University's goals regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion. These contributions may be in the areas of research, teaching, and service activities, as appropriate given the faculty member's job duties.*

The scoring rubric (Appendix B) includes: 1 = Does Not Meet Expectations, 2 = Meets Expectations, 3 = Exceeds Expectations, or N/A = Not Applicable.

Ratings should be based on relevant evaluative criteria provided in the COE's TTF/CNTTF promotion and tenure policies. The stated expectations in these policies equate to "Meets Expectations." Performance above or below these stated expectations should be considered for ratings above or below "Meets Expectations" based on the available evidence and the professional judgment of the Department Head/Unit Director and consulting leader (see Appendix B Rubric). Faculty must at least meet expectations in all job categories that are part of their assigned duties to be eligible for a merit increase.

In the event that the faculty member is not expected to participate in one area (e.g., Instructional assignment with no expectation for scholarship) that category will receive a N/A = Not Applicable rating.

Expectations will vary as a function of FTE such that an individual with .75 FTE in the COE will not be expected to have the same activity/productivity as a faculty member with 1.0 FTE.

In the event that a faculty member completed a sabbatical during the review period, materials included in the sabbatical report will be considered along with other materials submitted for the review period.

#### **D. Merit Review Distribution**

Once materials are submitted for an individual, the Department Head or Research/Outreach Unit Director along with the consulting Program Director/Associate Director/Supervisor will review the assigned ratings of 1, 2, or 3, adjust for additional factors as appropriate, and convert individual faculty ratings into an amount or percentage merit increase recommendation based on (a) performance norms and expectations included in the appropriate P&T policy (i.e., TTF or CTF), and (b) professional judgment and understanding of the proportion and importance of each of the duties for which a faculty member is evaluated. Merit raises will be calculated as a percentage of base salary such that:

- Faculty with the same merit rating receive the same percent raise.
- Percent raises are proportional to the merit rating for faculty who at least meet expectations.

These percentage recommendations shall be submitted to the COE Dean using the format or template provided by the Office of the Provost to the COE Dean or their designee by the Office of the Provost.

It is the Dean/designee's responsibility to combine all merit recommendations submitted by departments and research units within the college as individual faculty-level percentages to

ensure that all available funds in the TTF and CTF merit pools are consistently awarded and appropriately balanced according to the criteria provided by the OtP. Once all departments' submissions are reviewed, combined, and approved by the COE Dean, the Dean/designee will submit merit increase recommendations to the OtP for final approval.

*A link to the current adopted version of this policy is posted at <https://provost.uoregon.edu/department-unit-policies>.*

## **APPENDICES**

### **APPENDIX A: Faculty Performance Evaluation Activity Summary**

### **APPENDIX B: Merit Review Form**



**APPENDIX B: Merit Review Form  
College of Education**

**Faculty Member Name:**

**Date:**

**Rater Name(s):**

**To be completed by Department Head/Research/Outreach Unit Director in consultation with Program Director/Associate Director/Supervisor.**

**Materials reviewed for merit review:**

- Performance Evaluation materials
- CV with highlighting
- Faculty Activity Summary
- Other

**(1) TEACHING/CLINICAL:**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<i>Below</i>	<i>Meets</i>	<i>Exceeds</i>	
<i>Expectations</i>	<i>Expectations</i>	<i>Expectations</i>	

*Contribution to institutional diversity, equity, and inclusion evident within domain:*

- Yes
- No

**(2) SCHOLARSHIP/RESEARCH:**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<i>Below</i>	<i>Meets</i>	<i>Exceeds</i>	
<i>Expectations</i>	<i>Expectations</i>	<i>Expectations</i>	

*Contribution to institutional diversity, equity, and inclusion evident within domain:*

- Yes
- No

**(3) SERVICE:**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<i>Below</i>	<i>Meets</i>	<i>Exceeds</i>	
<i>Expectations</i>	<i>Expectations</i>	<i>Expectations</i>	

*Contribution to institutional diversity, equity, and inclusion evident within domain:*

- Yes
- No

**COMMENTS:** Please provide justification for any “1= Below\* Expectations” rating. (\***Note:** A score of “Below Expectations” for one domain area does not automatically disqualify a faculty member from a merit increase)

**Required Signatures**

**Department Head/Unit Director:**

**Date:**

**Consulting Leader:**

**Date:**

**Definitions:**

**Below Expectations:** Activities, quality of activities, or outcomes of activities within the merit review period were mostly inconsistent with the expectations associated with the faculty member’s faculty rank, time in service, or job duties as outlined. No notable areas of excellence based on a review of submitted materials.

**Meets Expectations:** Activities, quality of activities, or outcome of activities within the merit review period were consistently in alignment with expectations associated with the faculty member’s faculty rank, time in service, or job duties as outlined. Occasional areas of excellence accompanied a few areas in need of improvement based on a review of submitted materials.

**Exceeds Expectations:** Activities, quality of activities, or outcome of activities within the merit review period consistently exceeded expectations associated with the faculty member’s faculty rank, time in service, or job duties as outlined. Frequent areas of excellence based on a review of submitted materials.