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4. PROCEDURES FOR MERIT AND EQUITY ADJUSTMENTS

Classics is a small department with four FTE, two of whom are married to each other. The size of the
department and the connection between two of its members have led to the adoption of specific procedures
that have worked well for us over the last ten years.

Allocations of discretionary funds for merit and equity are distributed the following way.
1. The department head solicits an up-to-date statement/CV from all members.
2. The department head and the faculty member review the statement/CV together.
3. The department head recommends increases to the CAS based on the guidelines noted above.
   As the University frequently specifies criteria for each round of increases, these too must be taken
   into account as the head makes his or her decision.
4. The increases are reviewed by the responsible Associate Dean of the CAS.
5. Faculty may appeal to the Dean for an additional review and/or adjustment.
Beginning in academic year 2001, the department head will consult one of the senior and non-FTE members of the department so that all merit and equity reviews will be undertaken jointly by the department head and a non-FTE member of the department.

March 2005

2. School/College: College of Arts and Sciences
   Division: Humanities
   Department/Program: Comparative Literature

PROGRAM IN COMPARATIVE LITERATURE
MERIT/EQUITY REVIEW PROCEDURES
(approved: 4/4/05)

1. The Program Director will identify one or two tenured faculty members from the Program or Participating Faculty who are not eligible for a merit/equity review in COLT. The appointed faculty member(s) will advise the Program Director in all COLT merit/equity review recommendations.

2. For faculty with joint appointments in other departments, these recommendations will then be subject to any guidelines specified in the Memo of Understanding concerning that joint appointment.

3. All faculty eligible for merit salary increases will submit a current c.v. highlighting professional accomplishments, service commitments and courses taught since the last merit/equity review. Faculty are encouraged to submit in addition a 1-2 pp. Report on Professional Activities highlighting specific accomplishments, and/or any special challenges and setbacks since the last review. COLT teaching evaluations for each faculty member are assembled.

4. On the basis of this amassed information, the appointed faculty member(s) and the Program Director will rank each eligible faculty member’s performance in the categories of teaching, research and service, according to the following scores:

   3 Unusually good performance
   2 Very good performance
   1 Fully satisfactory performance
   0 Unsatisfactory performance

Ranking should be determined on both quantitative and qualitative grounds. E.g. numerical teaching evaluations should be considered, but not weighted more heavily than more qualitative teaching issues (was the class exceptionally innovative or experimental? was it a large lecture course? etc).

5. These ranking scores will be tallied, with research and teaching being weighted twice as heavily as service -- except in exceptional cases, where the service is deemed by the Director to have been substantive enough to warrant equal weight with research and teaching. Similarly, untenured faculty who have been specifically protected from overwhelming service commitments will be held "harmless" for their comparatively lighter service load. A brief rationale for any exceptional cases will be offered in the Director's final recommendations.
6. The Director will meet with the appointed advisory faculty member(s) to compare rankings and to discuss potential equity concerns. On the basis of that meeting the Director will determine his/her recommendations for merit/equity raises.

3. School/College: College of Arts and Sciences  
Division: Humanities  
Department/Program: Creative Writing

March 16, 2005

Joe Stone, Dean  
Wendy Larson, Associate Dean  
College of Arts and Sciences  
114 Friendly Hall  
University of Oregon

Dear Joe and Wendy,

Attached are two previous policies for handling salary increase procedures in the Creative Writing Program. The April 2000 version, developed by director Garrett Hongo, stipulates that “the faculty in the Program [. . .] will first designate an associate level or tenured faculty member to carry out an initial review of materials,” who will then “pass on recommendations for increases to the Program’s director.” The more recent procedure, submitted by Ken Calhoon as acting director in October 2001, gives full responsibility to the director (because of the shortage of faculty members at that time and the “potential for conflict of interest”). Seeing that we had two options, I offered the long-term faculty the choice of voting for a tenured or associate level evaluator or electing to have me do the evaluations and recommendations. All of them requested that I do it (Bradley, Drummond, Havazelet, Laux, Long, and Triplett by email; Hongo by handwritten note). Please let me know if you’d like to see this record.

My plan, then, is to conduct the evaluations myself and make salary increase recommendations based on the principles outlined in Garrett Hongo’s April 2000 policy statement.

Sincerely,

Karen J. Ford  
Director

xc: Colleen Morgan

4. School/College: College of Arts and Sciences  
Division: Humanities  
Department/Program: East Asian

Salary Increase Policy

EALL determines merit and salary increases according to the guidelines described in this document. Our criteria are consistent with those used in the annual evaluations of untenured faculty and in post-tenure reviews. They are also consonant with the criteria used in contract renewal and promotion and tenure cases. And they comply with the current policy of the University as it is stated by the Senate Budget Committee in its White Paper of March 15, 2000.

PROCEDURE: In years when salary increases are available, the EALL faculty collectively appoint (or elect) a Merit Review Committee composed of three members. Individual faculty submit to the Committee summaries of their professional activities since the last merit increase review, including personal statements, CVs, and other relevant material. The Committee evaluates the work of the
faculty and reports its findings of merit and its salary increase recommendations to the Department Head. The Department Head reviews the summaries of the faculty and report of the Committee, consults with the Committee, and then forwards the final recommendations of the Department to the College.

CRITERIA: Merit is weighed in these percentages: scholarship 50%, teaching 40%, and service 10%. These weights are emphatic and meant to be exemplary, but truly exceptional work in one area may offset weaknesses in another. (The flexibility suggested here does not apply to contract renewal or promotion and tenure cases.) In its deliberations the Department also considers University and College guidelines regarding COLAs and issues of equity and compression. Each of these is addressed, as appropriate and when possible, only after merit is determined.

5. School/College: College of Arts and Sciences
   Division: Humanities
   Department/Program: English

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT
SALARY REVIEW PROCEDURES
(revised October 2001)

MERIT/EQUITY

When performance-based (merit) raises are authorized by the Dean, the English Department follows the following procedure:

1. An ad hoc merit raise advisory committee, consisting of one Full, one Associate, and one Assistant Professor, is elected by the professorial faculty of the department, each faculty member voting by secret ballot for one person in that member’s rank. (Faculty tenured in English but serving as program directors outside the department are excluded from the list of candidates, as are faculty on leave, although they may vote.)

2. All faculty eligible for merit salary increases are asked to submit a current c.v. indicating activities since the last merit salary review. More information in the form of a report on activities may also be solicited from eligible faculty. Teaching evaluations for each faculty member are assembled. A special file for each faculty member is assembled containing these materials.

3. The elected merit raise committee is convened by the Department Head and provided with these files and a chart showing salaries for each rank and years in rank.

4. Based on this information, each member of the merit raise committee is asked to rate each faculty member’s performance within the categories of teaching, research, and service, according to the following scores:

   3  Unusually good performance
   2  Very good performance
   1  Fully satisfactory performance
   0  Unsatisfactory performance
These guidelines are given to the committee members: Pay particular attention to both the quantity (e.g. how many articles have been published?) and the quality (e.g. where did they appear? how substantial is the work?), consider both numerical rating of teaching and what those numbers often can’t show (e.g. was the course a large lecture serving a general audience of students? a required course? innovative?) and try to note the amount, the difficulty, and centrality of the service.

5. Each committee member excludes him or herself from these ratings. The Department Head compiles a separate rating on the same basis for each committee member.

6. These scores are tallied, weighting research and teaching scores twice as heavily as service, except in the case of the Department’s officers of administration whose service scores are weighted equally with research and teaching, yielding a ranked list of merit candidates.

7. The committee then meets and discusses this ranked list, discussing each case and amending the ranking if necessary. The resulting ranking is then grouped according to the increments of merit increase available.

8. If separate equity pay increases are also available, the committee advises the Head on potential equity cases. Whether equity funds are available or not, the results of the merit and equity raise distribution are then examined to ensure as far as possible that they are consistent with the general goals set forth in the Principles document of the Senate White paper (passed by the Senate on 3,29,2000). “These include: 1) reaching the 95% sustained competitive parity goal; 2) addressing the compression issue; 3) redressing salary inequities; 4) ensuring that the vast majority of faculty receive significant raises; and 5) attaining the 80% minimum salary floor level.”

9. The Head uses the result as a basis for recommending merit (and equity) raises to the Dean.

10. If merit increases are authorized for Instructors, the same procedure is used, with a committee of two Instructors elected by Instructors in the Department. The Instructors may authorize the Department Head to conduct this review without a committee.

RETENTION

When funds are made available for retention increases, the Department Head provides the Dean with recommendations based on these criteria:

1. The Head identifies faculty members most likely to receive outside offers for employment and/or those whose departure would be most damaging to the University, based on the Head’s knowledge of their work and whether they have sought offers or have been recruited or are likely to be.
2. The Head’s recommendations are based on the current salary structure, independent of merit or across the board increases anticipated in the current raise period.

3. The Head’s recommendations should not exceed 1/3 of the most meritorious of the Department’s tenure related faculty.

4. The Head’s recommendations will be accompanied by a brief rationale in each case.

6. School/College: College of Arts and Sciences  
Division: Humanities  
Department/Program: Linguistics

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 19, 2005  
(update of memo dated April 21, 2000 written by R. Tomlin)

To: Wendy Larson, Associate Dean  
From: Spike Gildea, Department Head  
Subject: Salary Increase Procedures

The Department of Linguistics maintains internal policy and procedures aimed at an equitable and merit-oriented salary distribution, while responding well to retention issues, compression issues, and other long-term concerns in a flexible and responsible manner. The process described below is consistent with both Senate Budget Committee recommendations on salary increases and with general UO criteria for excellence in research, teaching, and service.

Criteria: Research, Teaching, and Service

Merit-based salary increases in the Department of Linguistics require demonstration of genuine achievement in each of the traditional areas of academic performance: research, teaching, and service. For strong faculty in a strong department it is expected that one will develop a record of superior scholarly research, excellence in teaching, and strength in institutional and public service.

Research (40%)

It is expected that a tenured or tenure-track faculty member will develop a mature program of independent, scholarly research. The most important evidence to demonstrate achievement in scholarly research is a series of quality publications that are judged significant through peer review and publications in appropriate, strong venues. In our field, it is ordinarily expected that one would publish at a rate of about two substantive articles per year. Book publication would be equivalent to something like 6-8 substantive articles. Secondary evidence of scholarly excellence includes successful grant efforts and invited lectures and conference participation.
Teaching (40%)

The department values good teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate level; moreover the department expects that faculty will share department responsibilities for classes taught at all levels.

In assessing teaching quality, the department relies on a variety of sources: numerical data compiled from student course evaluations; signed written comments on student evaluations; peer review of teaching effort; participation and effectiveness in individual student supervision, especially at the graduate level; preparation of published and unpublished teaching materials.

Service (20%)

The department expects its members to participate responsibly and cooperatively when called upon for service in the department, but in the end service counts significantly less in consideration for salary increases than the other areas. Still, all faculty should contribute to the service needs of the department, the university, and the field at large. Untenured faculty are not expected to take on very much service work; average or satisfactory service at the junior level is set at a lower threshold than it is for tenured faculty.

Service in the department includes formal roles of undergraduate advisor, graduate advisor, and admissions work as well as contributions to the smooth and efficient running of the department matters, including participation in department meetings, and various ad hoc activities as needed.

Service to the university includes participation in elected and appointed CAS and university committees. It is recognized that service on the DAC, FPC, FAC, University Senate and such represents a particularly important service contribution to the larger university.

Service in the field is also important. The department recognizes grant reviews, manuscript evaluation, conference organization, and service on national committees as good examples of service to the field.

Procedures

In general, the department uses a two-step process with a recommendation to the head from a department personnel committee followed by a recommendation to CAS from the department head. The process is detailed below:

(1) The faculty select by consensus a personnel committee composed of two faculty, typically one senior and one more junior faculty member. This committee reviews materials provided by each faculty member and makes a recommendation on the increase for each faculty member along with a brief evaluation of performance for the review period in each of the three areas: research, teaching, and service.

(2) Each faculty member submits to the head an updated vita and a brief report of service for the period since the last salary increase. The head conveys this material to the personnel committee.

(3) The personnel committee evaluates the efforts of each faculty member in each of the three traditional areas of activity: research, teaching, and service. As it reviews the submitted materials, the personnel committee prepares a written evaluation of performance along with a
qualitative analysis of comparative effort on a simple three point scale: **AVERAGE, SIGNIFICANTLY ABOVE AVERAGE, SIGNIFICANTLY BELOW AVERAGE.**

The results in a summary table of performance for the review period for the faculty under review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 1</td>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 2</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc</td>
<td>Etc</td>
<td>Etc</td>
<td>Etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) Dollars allocated to the department are divided into three pools: 40% for research, 40% for teaching and 20% for service. Each pool in turn is divided by the number of eligible faculty to determine an average increase for that area of activity. Thus, if there were $20,000 available for salary increases, then $8,000 would be devoted to research, $8,000 to teaching, and $4,000 to service. With 8 eligible faculty, the average increase in each area respectively would be $1,000, $1,000, $500.

(5) The department head arrives at dollar recommendations as follows. Any performance in an area rated significantly below average receives no increase for that area. Any performance rated average in an area receives an increase for that area, though this may be prorated as follows. Any performance that is rated significantly above average receives a larger than average increase for that area, where the dollars for this are drawn first from dollars available from below average ratings and secondarily by reducing somewhat the size of average increases.

(6) The department head receives the recommendations of the personnel committee for further review. The head conducts a performance review of the two members of the personnel committee and adds this to the overall summary of performance. The head will also review and may adjust for good reason the recommendations of the personnel committee. The head then makes final recommendations for salary increases based on this overall analysis and consistent with the process for dollar applications described in (5).

(7) Finally, the head may make some further adjustment to increases to address issues of compression or equity. In such cases the head will use first dollars specially allocated or earmarked for this purpose by CAS or central administration and secondarily by an even-handed reduction of other increases. Equity and compression adjustments are aimed at smoothing historical variation in salary increases, but they are not aimed at smoothing away differences in merit sustained over long periods of efforts.

(8) The head submits final recommendations to the College. After approval of the increases by CAS and the Provost Office, the head will convey the increase in writing to each faculty member and will meet with each at his or her request to discuss the increase and the department reasoning that led to it.
(1) Background

On March 29, 2000, the University Senate approved a document entitled “University Senate Budget Committee White Paper: A Plan for Sustained Competitive Parity in Instructional Faculty Compensation”. The White Paper includes implementation guidelines for the distribution of salary improvement funds, including instructions on how funds shall be partitioned into cost-of-living adjustments (COLA) and merit increases. COLA increases are to be awarded to all faculty who perform satisfactorily. Merit increases are to be distributed based on “systemic principles and procedures” in each unit, consistent with goals set forth in the White Paper. These principles and procedures are to be developed by each unit and approved by the College of Arts and Sciences and Provost’s office. This document describes principles and procedures in the Department of Biology.

(2) Role of Personnel or Executive Committee

The evaluation of faculty for merit raises will be carried out by the Executive Committee, by the Personnel Committee, or by an ad hoc committee constituted specifically to deal with raises. The decision as to which committee will have the responsibility will be made by the department faculty in discussion with the Head. The Executive Committee is comprised of the curriculum director and the heads of each of the four research units within the department (Ecology and Evolution, Neuroscience, Marine Biology, Molecular Biology) or an appropriate representative appointed by the department head should the research unit head not be a Biology faculty member. The Personnel Committee of the Biology Department shall be elected yearly and consist of five members: one representing each research unit within the department plus one at-large member. When salary improvement funds are made available by the administration, the evaluating committee (hereafter called simply the Committee) shall determine: (1) the period of time over which faculty shall be evaluated (e.g., the past three years); (2) the relative weighting to be assigned to research, service and teaching in evaluating faculty performance; and (3) the format of the material to be submitted for evaluation (e.g., current CV, statement of accomplishments, etc.). Explicit information regarding items 1 and 2 shall be provided in writing to faculty at the time that evaluative materials are solicited.

For most faculty, all three categories of performance (research, teaching and service) will be relevant for evaluation. However, the Committee may take into account special circumstances such as the rank of the individual, career awards or special administrative assignments. For example, junior faculty are not expected to be involved in college or university-wide committees (although they may choose to participate). Likewise, teaching load reductions for faculty on research career development awards shall be taken into account during merit evaluations. Other faculty (i.e. instructors and senior instructors) and Officers of Administration should submit curricula vitae and tailor
other materials to match their particular job description with the appropriate emphases on teaching, service and administration, and scholarly accomplishments.

The Committee shall determine the specific mechanisms for evaluating materials (e.g., numerical rating systems), but it shall be required that at least two Committee members read each individual’s file, and each individual being evaluated shall be discussed at a special meeting of the Committee. If both COLA and merit funds are available for salary improvement, the recommendations conveyed to the Department Head shall be of two types: (1) An assessment of whether an individual’s performance is satisfactory (i.e., appropriate for a COLA increase). The criteria for satisfactory performance shall be determined by the Personnel Committee and shall reflect performance above certain minimum criteria in the areas of research, teaching and service; (2) The individual’s merit rating, based on the time period evaluated and the weighting of research, service and teaching as described above. The ratings by the Committee regarding faculty performance shall be provided in writing to the Department Head.

For faculty with administrative appointments (e.g., the Department Head), the Committee shall provide its recommendations directly to the College of Arts and Sciences. The Committee may choose to evaluate its own members, in which case the identity of the evaluators shall remain unknown to the individuals being evaluated and the recommendations shall be conveyed directly to the Department Head by the evaluators. Alternatively, the Personnel Committee may request that the Department Head evaluate Committee members.

The White Paper requires that the determination of merit increases takes into account additional factors including salary compression and equity. These factors shall normally be handled by the Department Head (see below). However, the Committee is encouraged to convey to the Department Head any observations or recommendations regarding these issues that can assist the Department Head in determining appropriate salary increases.

(3) Evaluation Criteria

The general criteria used in the Biology Department to evaluate performance are similar to those used to evaluate faculty in connection with renewal of appointments, promotion, tenure and post-tenure review (see 11th Edition of the University of Oregon Faculty Handbook, 1999).

The following issues are particularly relevant to Biology faculty.

(3.1) Research and Scholarly Activities

b. Recognized evidence of research excellence, including research grants, special awards and invitations to participate in research programs elsewhere.
c. Invited participation in conferences, seminars, and professional meetings.
d. Holding offices in professional societies or serving on professional committees or editorial boards.

(3.2) Teaching

a. The overall quality of classroom instruction, including careful presentation of course materials, effectiveness of presentation, etc.
b. Stimulation of student interest in doing high-quality work and maintenance of appropriate levels of student performance.

c. Supervision and mentorship of students at the undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral levels.

d. Revision of courses to keep them updated.

e. The development of educational objectives and teaching and evaluative materials reflecting current scholarship in the discipline and in educational theory.

f. Special recognition of teaching contributions, such as university or department teaching awards, or invitations to teach in nationally or internationally recognized programs.

g. Student evaluations, including quantitative scores and signed, written comments.

(3.3) Leadership in Academic and Administrative Service

a. Departmental, Institute or Group committees and activities.

b. College of Arts and Sciences, University, or State system committees and activities.

c. Service at the national or international level.

d. Community services related to teaching or research (e.g., outreach activities).

(4) Officers of Administration and Instructors

Officers of Administration and Instructors should submit the following materials for review, as appropriate:

a. An updated CV

b. A listing of courses taught and description of notable curriculum development activities

c. Service at the Institute/Program, Department, University, and national or international level

d. One page summary of accomplishments

(5) Role of Department Head

The Department Head shall be responsible for assessing recommendations from the Committee and making recommendations to the College of Arts and Sciences and Provost’s Office regarding salary increases. The Department Head shall take into account the goals set forth in the Principles document and White Paper as approved by the University Senate. In particular, the Head shall take into account inequalities in faculty salaries that arise for any reason other than merit, rank or time in service. These reasons include unfair treatment of individuals or groups in the past, salary compression between ranks, and other inequities such as those that result from recruiting new faculty at higher salaries in order to be competitive in the current market.

(6) Approval

This document was approved by the full department faculty in March 2005.

_______________________________________   _________________
Department Head Signature      Date
8. School/College: College of Arts and Sciences  
Division: Natural Sciences  
Department/Program: Chemistry

Chemistry Department Personnel Advisory Committee  
Evaluation of Faculty Performance Report  
Personnel Advisory Committee: Mike Haley, Diane Hawley, and Mark Lonergan (Spring 2005)

Faculty performance was evaluated in three areas: research, teaching and service according to the guidelines described in the Chemistry Department document on Evaluation of Faculty Performance. Research, teaching and service were given a weighting of 5:3:2. When one takes into account that much of the research effort overlaps with the teaching effort because of the faculty/student interactions in the laboratory, teaching and research have somewhat equal weight. Given below is a detailed analysis of how the scoring of the faculty was done. The faculty were rated on a scale of 20 points.

1. Research 10 pts  
   Publications and research productivity  
   Funding from external sources  
   Training of laboratory personnel (postdocs, gs, ugs)  
   Profile/visibility/invited talks, honors and awards

2. Teaching 7 pts  
   Coursework  
   Graduate and undergraduate research education

3. Service 3 pts  
   Departmental/Institute University-wide  
   Professional Service

The personnel committee evaluated each other, but these evaluations were only disclosed to the department head. The committee met with the department head to discuss their ratings and was available to work with the department head in determining merit increases. Teaching faculty were evaluated on a somewhat different scale than the research faculty with heavier weighting on teaching. However, there was still a strong component desired from the instructional faculty to be involved in scholarly activities that assist in improvement of the educational program in the department and to be involved in professional organizations of the chemistry community.

CRITERIA FOR FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION  
Chemistry Department – October, 2001

The criteria used to evaluate the scholarly activities of the faculty in the Department of Chemistry are described below. This evaluation is the basis on which decisions are made regarding merit increases and is consistent with the evaluation of faculty for renewal of appointments, tenure and post-tenure review.

There are a number of criteria listed in the 9th Edition of the University of Oregon Faculty Handbook that are particularly relevant to Chemistry faculty. These criteria can be roughly divided in three categories: (I) TEACHING, (II) RESEARCH, AND (III) SERVICE. In most cases, all three of these categories will be important to the evaluation. However, the relative importance of these categories is different for tenure track instructors relative to tenure track research faculty.

Merit increases require meritorious performance in at least one of the above categories, and at least satisfactory performance in all categories. Annual reviews of faculty will occur every year,
even in years in which merit increases are NOT available. In the case where merit increases are not available annually, merit increase will then be based on a faculty member's performance over the period of time since the last merit increase.

The Chemistry Department Personnel Advisory Committee will be responsible for evaluating the performance of faculty, based on the annual progress reports, which are to be submitted in January of each year. The committee will attempt to classify faculty into several categories such as those showing exceptional performance in the areas considered, those who are doing well but are not considered to be exceptional, and those whose performance needs significant improvement. The Department Head will be responsible for discussing these evaluations with the Personnel Advisory Committee and assigning merit raises.

Summary of Criteria for Faculty Performance Evaluation

I. Teaching:
(1) The overall quality of teaching of classroom instruction including careful presentation of course material and effectiveness of presentation.
(2) Stimulation of student interest in doing high-quality work and maintenance of appropriate standards of student performance.
(3) Supervision and evaluation of student research at both the undergraduate and graduate level including student review committees.
(4) Revision of courses to keep them updated.
(5) Development and implementation of effective teaching techniques.
(6) Development of educational objectives and developing teaching and evaluation materials reflecting current scholarship in the discipline and in educational theory.

II. Research and Scholarly Activities
(1) Publications of significance and quality.
(2) Research in progress and substantially planned work.
(3) External funding of research program.
(4) Participation and attendance at conferences, seminars and professional meetings.
(5) Holding offices in professional societies or serving on professional committees, editorial boards and science advisory boards.
(6) Awareness of current developments in the faculty member's profession.
(7) Recognized evidence of scholarliness such as special awards, lectureships and scholarly citations.
(8) Education of research personnel and execution of responsibilities associated with supervising research theses and projects of undergraduate students, graduate students and postdoctoral associates.

III. Leadership in Academic and Administrative Service
(1) Departmental/Institute administration and curriculum, personnel and policy committees or activities.
(2) College of Arts and Sciences, University, or State system committees or activities.
(3) Service and activities on behalf of the larger community (local, state, national and international governmental bodies etc) as they are related to teaching or research.
The CIS Department's general policy is to maintain an equitable and merit-oriented salary distribution, while responding to issues of equity, parity, compression, inversion, and retention.

The departmental procedure for the distribution of salary increases is as follows:

1) The department's elected Personnel Committee performs a yearly review of all faculty members based on annual activity reports and vitae. The criteria used for merit are taken from the 11th edition of the UO Faculty Handbook, pp. 74-75 with elaboration for the CIS department. (See the following section.) Except for him/herself, the committee rates the faculty according to the documented achievements in the areas of research, teaching and service.

For post-tenure faculty, the following weighting is applied to the evaluation: 40% for research, 40% for teaching, 20% for service. For pre-tenure faculty, the weighting is: 50% for research, 40% for teaching, 10% for service. For senior instructors, the weighting is: 60% for teaching, 25% for service and 15% for professional development.

The Personnel Committee will rate faculty in each category (research, teaching, service) as meritorious, satisfactory but not meritorious, unsatisfactory. In instances of especially meritorious or unsatisfactory achievement, the Committee will provide a short narrative.

2) The Dept. Head uses the committee's rating since the last salary increase to construct a distribution of any available funds for salary increases, within the constraints of guidelines obtained from the College and the University with respect to the separation of Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) and merit raises. The distribution of merit raises usually follows the committee's ranking very closely, although occasionally the dept. head may factor in additional information. The resulting distribution is usually discussed between the Dept. Head and the chair of the Personnel Committee before it is submitted to the College.

Merit Salary Criteria

The criteria used for merit are taken from the 11th edition of the UO Faculty Handbook, pp. 74-75:

TEACHING: The quality of teaching:
   1) classroom instruction, including careful presentation of course material and effectiveness of presentation;
   2) academic advising, consultation, and informal teaching;
   3) stimulation of student interest in doing high-quality work;
   4) supervision of student research;
   5) revision of courses to keep them updated and new course development;

Revision: 3/17/2005
6) maintenance of appropriate standards of student performance;
7) evaluation of student performance;
8) interest in effective teaching techniques;
9) defining educational objectives and developing teaching and evaluative materials reflecting current scholarship in the discipline and in educational theory.

RESEARCH: Professional growth, and scholarly activities:
1) publications of significance and quality in books, journals and conferences;
2) research in progress and substantially planned work including grant activity;
3) participation in conferences, conventions, seminars, and professional meetings–reading papers, holding office, serving on committees or on editorial boards;
4) attendance at conferences, conventions, seminars, and professional meetings;
5) awareness of current developments in the faculty member’s profession;
6) association with organizations and groups that will result in professional improvement of the participant and bring recognition to the university;
7) professional consultation;
8) regular and constructive use of sabbaticals and leaves of absence;
9) recognized evidence of scholarliness, such as special awards, scholarly citations, and the republication of work;
10) scope and depth of scholarship as revealed in public lectures, book reviews, and, in special circumstances, discussions;

SERVICE:
Leadership in academic and administrative service and activities on behalf of the larger community (local, state, national, and inter-national governmental bodies, etc.);
1) departmental administration and curriculum, personnel, and policy committees or activities;
2) college or school administration and committees or activities;
3) university or state system administration and committees or activities.
4) academic contributions to community activities, either as an individual or as a representative of the university;
5) academic service on behalf of public bodies.

Revision: 3/17/2005
The general policy of the Mathematics Department is to maintain an equitable and merit oriented salary distribution. General procedures are as follows.

1. Faculty members submit yearly activity reports documenting achievements in the areas of research, teaching and service. Additional information is provided by numerical and signed teaching evaluations and reports of the departmental Teaching Effectiveness committee.

2. Faculty members will be rated according to their contributions in each of the main categories. Of particular note are the following.
   - **Research**: mathematical articles and books published and submitted, invited lectures, editorial duties, grant activity, work with doctoral students, and activity in graduate level seminars, etc.
   - **Teaching**: undergraduate and graduate instruction, work with undergraduate honors theses, summer projects for undergraduates, etc.
   - **Service**: departmental and University committee work and professional service (organizing conferences, NSF panels, etc.).

3. The Department Head rates all faculty members in each category and then prepares an overall rating based approximately on the weights: Research - 55%, Teaching - 35%, Service - 10%. A committee consisting of two senior faculty members reviews the ratings and recommends adjustments. Salary figures are computed based on the ratings, with adjustments made to account for matters of equity and retention. The salary data is then submitted to the Dean of CAS for further review, along with whatever ranking data the Dean requests.

General Faculty
I. Salary Policy Criteria for Merit and Equity
(Adopted 04/28/00; Amended 01/14/02; Amended 01/29/07)

1. Criteria

1.1 All faculty will be considered in three general categories: research, teaching and service. These will be weighted equally. The ratings will be based on performance during the last three years OR the period since the last time merit ratings for raises were
conducted (whichever is longer). Faculty members who have arrived since that date will focus on their accomplishments since arrival at the UO. (Amended 3/14/05)

1.2 Ratings will be 0-4 (0 = unsatisfactory contribution, 1 = below average contribution, 2 = average contribution, 3 = above average contribution, 4 = superior contribution), made by each member of the executive committee and dept. head and assoc. head (if any). Ratings will be made under five headings: Research accomplishments, graduate teaching, undergraduate teaching, university service (including department) and professional service. The two forms of teaching and the two forms of service will be averaged into a single rating.

1.3 Ratings in the three categories will be added to determine a single merit point score.

1.4 Policy for faculty who have been on leave without pay or have been relieved of teaching and service because they have a career development, senior scientist or other such award (Adopted 01/14/02). Such individuals have the option of being rated entirely on their contributions as full time researchers. Factored into these ratings should be the degree to which the individual's contributions to the department as a full time researcher compensates for the loss to the department in terms of teaching and service.

1.5 Merit ratings will be retained for at least 7 years so that they may be taken into account when considering possible salary inequities (see below). Procedure

2. Equity

At the time of a salary raise the executive committee will determine the amount to be allocated for equity purposes. In identifying equity concerns, factors to be considered may include rank, time-in-rank, time-since-Ph.D., past merit, and possible inequities created by recent hires and salary adjustments for retention purposes (including inequities across ranks).

2.1 To determine whether the salary of an individual is in need of an equity adjustment, salaries will be compared to an appropriate metric that takes into account rank and time-in-rank. These metrics may include, for example, a within-department regression line for each rank relating time-in-rank or timesince-Ph.D. to salary (if this relationship has an appropriate positive slope), the mean salaries for psychology departments throughout the U.S. as compiled by the APA (http://research.apa.org/), or the mean salaries for faculty at comparator institutions as compiled by the UO. If appropriate, cost of living adjustments may be made to these metrics if they are more than a year old, as well as interpolation of values to allow for estimates with a greater precision than the published valued.

2.2 Individuals with salaries below the appropriate value within the chosen metric(s) will be considered for an equity adjustment relative to the difference between these two values. Because a low salary might be the appropriate result of low ratings during past merit reviews, the amount of the adjustment will be scaled by an average of the merit
scores for that individual from the past 7 years, with merit ratings well below average possibly resulting in no equity adjustment. However, the decision on whether it is appropriate to provide an equity adjustment will be made on a case-by-case basis.

2.3 Adjustments can be made on an individual basis for those with salaries above the appropriate value within the chosen metric(s) if a case can be made that their salary is out of line with past performance and current merit.

3. Merit

3.1 The remaining funds will be distributed based upon the merit rankings.

3.2 Each faculty with fully satisfactory performance will get a proportion of the merit funds related to rating. The total number of faculty will be multiplied by the average rating and this will be divided into the dollars available to produce a unit increment. Each faculty will get merit money corresponding to their merit number times the unit increment.

3.3 In years where there are no across-the-board funds (e.g., cost of living increases), all faculty will receive some merit increase if their overall rating is greater than zero. When across the board funds are available, the funds for merit will be allocated to those with fully satisfactory performance.

4. Policy on Salary Inequities Created by the Appointment of New Professors
(Adopted 05/25/90; Amended 01/29/07)

4.1 Whenever a faculty member is hired at a salary greater than that of a professor having equal or greater rank, the Department Head will consider whether there are discretionary funds that could be converted from other budgetary needs to resolve any possible inequities.
The current procedures and criteria for evaluating regular distributions of salary funds in Economics have been in place since 1978. They rely upon the discretion of the Department Head, who is formally advised by a three-member Salary Review Committee elected by the faculty at large in the fall of each year (usually October). After receiving instructions from the University administration, the Department Head presents tentative recommendations to the Salary Review Committee for advice and comment. In the event of unresolved disagreements, the Salary Review Committee may submit a separate set of recommendations to the Dean, although that has not occurred in the twenty-seven year experience under the current procedures. To provide the information necessary for evaluations, faculty submit detailed “Faculty Activity Reports” once a year, along with activity updates to the most recent annual report and a current vitae. The formal evaluation period for salary distributions is the previous three-year period, with greater weight on the most recent year.

Under University guidelines (UO Policy Statement 3.120, 31 January 1986), if a faculty member believes that the announced evaluation procedures or the assigned salary increase do not adequately reflect that faculty member's performance, the faculty member should first consult with the department head, and if not satisfied, with the Dean and, ultimately, the Provost. Final determination of any change in evaluation procedures or criteria or in the assigned salary increase is the responsibility of the Dean, with the approval of the Provost.

Regular salary distributions typically consist of three components: across the board, equity, and merit. Under university policy, across the board increases are given to all faculty providing fully satisfactory service.

Equity increases are intended to offset, at least partially, differentials due solely to irrelevant, random or fortuitous factors. They are not intended to negate the effects of repeated judgments of merit, time in rank, or other relevant factors. Equity increases are typically given under one or more of the four following circumstances. 1) "entry compression" -- continuing junior faculty performing satisfactorily are paid less than new, entry-level junior faculty. 2) "rank compression" -- faculty at one rank are paid less than one would expect based upon considerations of merit as compared to faculty at a lower rank. 3) "horizontal compression' an individual salary is lower than one would expect based upon merit considerations as compared to other faculty at the same rank. 4) "protected employment group bias" -- the salary of an individual who is a member of a
protected employment group (e.g., women or minorities) is lower than one would expect based upon merit considerations as compared to other faculty.

Merit increases are provided for performance in three areas: teaching, research, and service. Our department grants both Masters and Ph.D. degrees in economics, so that a substantial portion of an individual's evaluation is based upon scholarly research and supervision of graduate student research. Thus, we evaluate teaching, research, and service with respective weights of 40%, 40%, and 20%. For us, the teaching category consists of classroom instruction, supervision of student research and other activities, and general accessibility to students. Classroom instruction is regularly evaluated by formal student evaluations and by inspection of course syllabi and other course materials. Additional weight is given to instruction in very large lower-division classes. Supervision of student research refers primarily to supervision of Ph.D. field papers and dissertations, Masters research papers and theses, and undergraduate honors papers, with emphasis on not only the number of students supervised, but also the quality of the supervision. Accessibility to students is a difficult criterion to define and measure, but is crucial to the overall teaching mission of the department. The same can be said of the research and service missions, where the availability of colleagues with whom to interact is an important element in research and service productivity. Extreme examples (both positive and negative) are usually obvious, and should be evaluated accordingly. This issue is especially crucial if academic departments are to maintain the integrity of their mission against the potential abuses of outside consulting activities, which in economics are typically more lucrative than academic endeavors.

Research in economics, particularly for members of Ph.D.-granting departments, is evaluated primarily on the basis of the publication of significant work in high-quality scholarly economics journals, which are formally refereed and open to all researchers. The peer review process, the necessity for meticulous reporting of results, the requirement to share data permit replications, and the formal opportunity to challenge or support work published in a journal are crucial elements of the scientific process. Books and book reviews, research monographs, conference papers, articles in "in-house" journals or journals with a more popular perspective, work in progress, invited presentations, grants and grant applications, and the like are also important and evaluated accordingly, but in a Ph.D.-granting department of economics these outlets are not a substitute for research published in scholarly economics journals. Consulting reports, in particular, receive little or no weight, except to the extent that they emerge as publications in scholarly economics journals. Availability to colleagues for research interactions is also an important "public good" in academic departments and is a factor in research evaluations.

Service is a broad area covering specific contributions primarily to department committees and activities, but also to university committees and other professional activities, such as service on the editorial board of a journal, as a journal referee, as an officer of a professional organization, or sharing professional expertise in a public service capacity (e.g., speeches, media interviews, and appointed boards). Effective service is also more than merely accepting a service assignment -- it also means conscientiously
pursuing the responsibilities of the position. Here, as in teaching and research, general accessibility to students for advising and to department and university colleagues is also a factor in evaluating service contributions.

13. School/College: College of Arts and Sciences
   Division: Social Sciences
   Department/Program: Ethnic Studies

   Ethnic Studies Program
   Salary Review Procedures

When performance-based (merit) raises are authorized by the Dean, the Ethnic Studies Program follows these procedures:

1. All faculty eligible for merit salary increases are asked to submit a current c.v. indicating activities since the last merit salary review and, when applicable, supporting materials such as recent book contracts. More information in the form of a report on activities (describing, for example, publications in progress and other information not reflected on the c.v.) may also be solicited from eligible faculty. A special file for each faculty member is assembled and includes these materials as well as teaching evaluations.

2. Based on this information, the Director evaluates each faculty member’s performance within the categories of research, teaching, and service, according to the following scores:

   3  Unusually good performance
   2  Very good performance
   1  Fully satisfactory performance
   0  Unsatisfactory performance

   Evaluation follows these guidelines: Pay particular attention to both the quantity (e.g. how many articles have been published? are they distinct from one another?) and the quality (e.g. where did they appear? how substantial and original is the work?) of research, consider both the numerical ratings of teaching and what those numbers cannot show (e.g. was the course a large lecture course serving a general audience of students? a required course? innovative?), and bear in mind the amount, difficulty, and centrality of the service.

3. These scores are tallied and weighted as follows:

   Research  45%
   Teaching  30%
   Service  25%

4. Based on these results, the Director creates a list of merit candidates ranked according to a point system and uses the point system to determine the pay increase in each case. In the process, the Director will solicit recommendations from at least two senior members of the Ethnic Studies executive committee and/or other officers of administration affiliated with the Program. In addition, the Director will consult with heads of departments with which the Program’s faculty are affiliated (i.e. departments that evaluate and grant tenure).

5. If separate pay equity increases are also available, the following goals, set forth by the Principles document of the Senate White paper (passed by the Senate on 3/29/2000), will determine the distribution: 1) reaching the 95% sustained competitive parity goal; 2) addressing the compression
issue; 3) redressing salary inequities; 4) ensuring that the vast majority of faculty receive significant raises; 5) attaining the 80% minimum salary floor level.

6. Based on these guidelines, the Director recommends merit and, if applicable, equity raises to the Dean.

Retention

When funds are made available for retention increases, the Director provides the Dean with recommendations based on these criteria:

1. The Director identifies faculty members most likely to receive outside offers for employment and/or whose departure would be most damaging to the University, based on the Director’s knowledge of their work and whether they have sought offers or have been recruited or are likely to be.

2. The Director’s recommendations should not, except in exceptional cases, exceed 1/3 of the most meritorious of the Program’s tenure-related faculty.

3. The Director’s recommendations will be accompanied by a brief rationale in each case.

This document was discussed and approved at a meeting on March 30, 2005.

Martin Summers
Director

14. School/College: College of Arts and Sciences
    Division: Social Sciences
    Department/Program: Geography

Procedure for Evaluations of Salary Increases in Geography

Administrative Process

1. The individuals affected by the raise take a secret ballot vote on whether they want assessments and recommendations to be handled (a) by a committee of two-three elected tenured faculty members who will review and make recommendations on salaries, or (b) by the Department Head alone. The latter option is followed only if there is unanimous support for it (i.e., even one secret ballot vote for the first option leads to the appointment of an advisory committee).

2. Each faculty member is asked to submit a statement detailing accomplishments in research, teaching, and service since the last raise that was not an across-the-board COLA raise – along with any other material the faculty member deems to be relevant.

3. The materials of each faculty member are reviewed along with a recent curriculum vitae and student/peer teaching evaluations.
4. If the Department Head is empowered to make recommendations alone, he/she develops them in accordance with the raise criteria noted below, and then submits the recommendations to Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. If a committee is appointed to make recommendations on salary increases, those recommendations are developed in accordance with the raise criteria noted below and then forwarded in written form to the Department Head. The Department Head then takes those recommendations into consideration in drawing up a plan for submission to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Any significant departure from the committee’s recommendations must be accompanied by a statement detailing the committee recommendations and explaining the reasons behind the deviation from those recommendations.

Raise Criteria

1. In determining raises, consideration is given to (1) research productivity, (2) the quality and effectiveness of the individual’s teaching, and (3) service to the department, university, state, nation, and discipline. The relative importance of these matters will depend on the rank of the individual and other special circumstances, such as agreements between a faculty member and the Department Head to stress one or another of these matters during a particular period. Eligibility for a significant raise (within the context of available funds) will be determined by meritorious performance in at least two of these categories (see item 2 below), and at least satisfactory performance in the remaining category (see item 3 below). In cases of meritorious performance, the raise amount may be increased if there is evidence of exceptional performance in multiple categories and/or if equity considerations are clearly at play. Examples of equity issues are differential salaries for faculty members of similar rank and productivity, or a differential relationship across rank between University of Oregon salaries and salaries at comparable institutions.

2. Meritorious performance in research productivity is demonstrated by a level of productivity that is resulting in the production of at least two substantial published research articles or book chapters each year, the completion of a significant portion of a scholarly book each year, or the production of other materials of comparable scope that represent the outcome of creative practice or scholarly research. Significant grant activity or the publication of a variety of shorter pieces could lower the publication threshold in a given year. Meritorious performance in teaching is demonstrated by strong student evaluations and very active participation in graduate advising. Meritorious performance in service is demonstrated by active, responsible participation in departmental/university committee work (appropriate to the rank of the individual) and significant service initiatives beyond the university.

3. Satisfactory performance in research productivity is demonstrated by a level of productivity that results in the production of at least one substantial published research article or book chapter each year – or equivalent progress on a book or other material of comparable scope that represent the outcome of creative practice or scholarly research. Satisfactory performance in teaching is demonstrated
by at least average student evaluations and active participation in graduate student advising. Satisfactory performance in service is demonstrated by at least modest, regular participation in departmental/university committee work and some service activity beyond the university.

4. Irrespective of salary increase recommendations based on merit and equity considerations, all members of the department will be eligible for the recommended COLA raise in a given raise period if they have performed at a satisfactory level during that period. For purposes of this provision, satisfactory performance will be determined either by satisfactory performance in all three categories specified in item 3 or, if performance is less than satisfactory in one or more of these categories, offsetting meritorious performance in the remaining category or categories.

Dated 1999

15. School/College: College of Arts and Sciences
   Division: Social Sciences
   Department/Program: International Studies

International Studies Program
Merit Pay Evaluation Procedures

Revised: 18 March 2005

The ISP Merit Pay Committee will be comprised of three members to evaluate International Studies faculty on the three-fold basis of scholarly work, teaching, and service (to ISP and to the University). If a member of the committee is under evaluation, that individual will recuse him- or herself from the discussion.

This committee will make recommendations to the Program Director, who, based on her/his consideration of the merit committee report, will then make her/his recommendations to the Dean. Faculty members’ work will be evaluated over the period specified by the College of Arts and Sciences. We will ask for information from the faculty in the following categories:

**Research**
1. List of all written work that has been published or accepted for publications, e.g., books, edited books, articles, research notes, comments, book chapters, books reviews.
2. List of other forms of work that have been published or accepted for publication, e.g. videotapes, curriculum profiles.
3. Brief written summary of current research projects: (the status of each, and future research directions).
4. List of grants, fellowships and awards.
5. List of all convention papers presented or accepted for presentation as well as chairing or being a discussant at a major convention.

**Teaching**
1. List of courses taught, including quantitative and qualitative evaluations.
2. Brief written summary of innovative teaching techniques.
3. List of B.A. Honors Theses, Honors College Theses, M.A. Theses and Ph.D. dissertations served on and/or chaired in this or other programs and departments.
4. List of any additional information about teaching that would be relevant to the merit review committee, e.g. high student evaluations, teaching awards, and teaching innovations.
5. List of any unscheduled teaching activities, e.g. Reading and Conference (405), Field Studies (406), Internship Supervision (409).
Service

1. List of service to International Studies Program, (e.g. committee membership, Undergraduate Program Coordinator, Graduate Program Coordinator, newsletter editor, etc).
2. List of service on University or College committees.
3. List of offices held and service to international, national or regional professional associations.
4. List of editorial board memberships and manuscript reviewing for journals and book companies, (distinguish between being on the editorial board and reviewing manuscripts and note the number of manuscripts reviewed).
5. List of services given to local and community groups with international interests.
7. List of any other professional activities for consideration, e.g. international consultancies, promotion of others’ international research and teaching, TV and radio interviews, special service projects, assistance in developing internships for ISP students, and other special service for the ISP and University.

We have not established a quantitative rating scheme. Instead we weigh these areas in much the way that a tenure and promotion committee might weigh this sort of information. Our faculty is satisfied with this system of evaluation.

This document was discussed and approved at meetings on October 1 and October 8, 2001.

It was revisited and endorsed by faculty at a meeting on February 11, 2005, and revised to reflect the shift from a UCIS committee to an expanded ISP Core Faculty in March 2005.

16. School/College: College of Arts and Sciences
   Division: Social Sciences
   Department/Program: Political Science

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
MERIT EVALUATION PLAN
(Revised for Spring 2005)

All pay decisions within the department's discretion are to be made by the department head and an elected pay committee of three faculty members. Each of the four will have one vote.

Faculty are to report their activities on a standard form. Documentation must be provided. Activities not listed on the standard form may also be reported (e.g., citations in a major index or other evidence of national recognition). All materials submitted for counting shall be retained in permanent files, together with the records of the points assigned and time "windows" during which materials count. These files shall be open to all department faculty.

The department head and pay committee will use their judgment to rank faculty and allocate merit pay. Decisions will be based on material submitted by faculty, departmental course evaluations and, where appropriate, equity considerations. The department head and committee are all obligated to review all submitted publications. They are to prepare a written report explaining the process and criteria employed, and justifying special decisions.

While teaching and service activities are normally evaluated over a one-year period, research accomplishments are judged over a two-year span. Faculty will select what they believe to be their most meritorious research pieces completed during this period, to include no more than five pieces. The merit committee will base its assessment upon this research portfolio.

Fifty percent of merit pay dollars will be allocated according to the point system, and remainder will be considered discretionary.

The merit committee will be guided by current University policy with regard to the distribution of merit among the areas of research, teaching, and service.

Appeals for reconsideration may be made in writing in a suitable time frame. The department head and committee will respond to these appeals in writing.

The department head will conduct the evaluation of members of the pay committee. They may appeal their evaluations in writing to the department head, just as faculty members may make written appeal to the pay committee.
The regular time period for evaluation shall be temporarily extended one year for each previous year in which available salary increases contain no merit component, and the number of permissible research submissions will increase by one item (from the usual five) for each such year.

RESEARCH
(2-Year Period)

1. Book (12-30 pts.)
2. Edited book (9-18 pts.)
3. Article in scholarly journal (6-15 pts.)
4. Book chapter (6-15 pts.) [Chapters in edited books (#2) will not be counted twice.]
5. Scholarly communication, research note (2 pts.)
6. Government reports (1-3 pts.) [cannot be classified or subject to restricted dissemination]
7. Convention and conference papers (2 pts.)
8. Book review (1 pt.)
9. Obtaining a grant from a national funding source, counted for each year in which the grant runs. (3-6 pts.) The higher amount will only be given if the grant includes overhead funds to the University.
10. Encyclopedia article (1-2 pts.)

(Forthcoming publications shall be counted as long as acceptance of publication is received by the merit committee’s closing date, rather than the previous June 30th. No publication can be counted for more than two years, in either forthcoming or in print status.)

Copies of all publications and papers should be provided to personnel committee. Whenever a range is specified for a particular type of research, the assumption will be that each item deserves only the lowest score; justification for a higher score must be made by the faculty member in the form of positive reviews, prestige of journal, number of citations, or other such pertinent information.

TEACHING
(1-Year Period)

1. Each course evaluation over 8.0. Points for each course are equal to (instructor's mean-8.0), doubled.
2. One point for each 50 students over department mean enrollment. Quantity = number of students taught above department mean. (Departmental mean enrollment to include all courses (excluding summer) taught in the department during the two-year period.)
3. Membership on thesis or dissertation committee (1 pt.)
4. Chair of thesis or dissertation committee (1 pt. in addition to #3 above). A maximum of 20 points for all thesis and dissertation committee work.
5. Teaching overload (2 pts. per course) This applies only to noncompensated overloads.)
6. New course preparation (1 pt.)
7. Supervision of undergraduate honors thesis (1 pt.)
8. Teaching of Graduate Reading Course with enrollment > 1 (1 point) Note: Area Field Chairs will organize these courses.
9. Coauthorship of published article with graduate student (1 pt.)
10. Coauthorship of grant proposal with graduate student (1 pt.)

Basic TEACHING AND SERVICE Responsibilities (Across-the board, not merit) All faculty are expected to:

1) Hold weekly office hours (3 hrs. minimum)
2) Participation on one standing departmental committee (Personnel, Curriculum, Admissions and Awards, Undergraduate Advising)
3) Participate on one subfield committee
4) Teach five courses over 3 quarters
5) Report grades in a timely manner
6) Be available to graduate students
7) Office hours during fall term New Student Week, and IntroDUCKtion advising if teaching in summer school
8) Regular attendance at department meetings
9) Attendance at departmental graduation ceremony

SERVICE
(1-Year Period)

1. Participation on more than one standing departmental committee (1 pt.)
2. Chair of departmental committee (standing or subfield) (1 pt.)
3.* Participation on university committee (1 pt.)
4.* Chair of university committee (1 pt. in addition to #3 above)
   * A maximum of 16 points for the combined categories of #3 and #4.
5. Undergraduate advisor, Graduate advisor (1 pt.)
6. Chair or panel discussant at major convention (1 pt.)
7. Editorial board member of journal (1 pt.)
8. Executive officer of national or regional professional association (1 pt.)
9. Participation on National Selection or Advisory Committee (1 pt.)
10. Lecture at another university or college (1 pt.)
11. Reviewer of grant proposals and applications for foundations (1 pt. for each three proposals reviewed)
12. Reviewer of promotion files for other universities (1 pt.)

OTHER

The personnel committee, along with the department head, has the discretion to award merit for recognition of people not working full-time or being on leave, thus having limited opportunity to score points for teaching and service, as well as the following teaching activities:
1) Faculty Availability (e.g., second reader on honors & other theses)
2) Special Projects/Research & Readings and other open-ended credit hours.
3) Teaching awards

In addition, merit will be awarded to the Office Manager (OA) based on the required annual review, and requests from the OA for merit considerations.

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
MERIT EVALUATION FORM 2005
DUE: March 28, 2005

Print Name ________________________________ Signature ________________________________

RESEARCH

List examples of your research from October 1, 2000 to March 15, 2005, not to exceed seven (7) items. Copies of publications and conference papers should be provided to merit committee. Forthcoming publications shall be counted as long as firm acceptance of this publication is received by the due date.

POSSIBLE RESEARCH POINTS:
1. Book (12-30 pts.)
2. Edited book (9-18 pts.)
3. Article in scholarly journal (6-15 pts.)
4. Book chapter (6-15 pts.)
5. Scholarly communication, research note (2 pts.)
6. Government reports (1-3 pts)
7. Convention and conference papers (2 pts.)
8. Book review (1 pt.)
9. Obtaining a grant from a national funding source, counted for each year in which the grant runs. (3-6 pts.)
10. Encyclopedia article (1-2 pt.)
TEACHING
(December 16, 2001-March 15, 2005)

List all thesis or dissertation committees on which you have served during the above period and indicate if you were the chair.

List all new course preparations or uncompensated course overloads that you have done during the above time period. (Note: does not include any summer school courses or Spring Term 2005 courses, and please indicate the credit hours and grade status if not a regular 4-credit course.)

List any honors theses that you have supervised during the above time period.

List any graduate reading courses that you have taught with an enrollment of more than one student, which were organized by the area subfield chair.

List any successful grant proposals or articles that you have co-authored with a graduate student.

POSSIBLE TEACHING POINTS:
1. Each course evaluation over 8.0. Points for each course are equal to (instructor's mean-8.0), doubled.
2. One point for each 50 students over department mean enrollment. Quantity = number of students taught above department mean. (Departmental mean enrollment to include all courses (excluding summer) taught in the department during the two-year period.)
3. Membership on thesis or dissertation committee (1 pt.)
4. Chair of thesis or dissertation committee (1 pt. in addition to #3 above). A maximum of 20 points for all thesis and dissertation committee work.
5. Teaching overload (2 pts. per course) This applies only to noncompensated overloads.)
6. New course preparation (1 pt.)
7. Supervision of undergraduate honors thesis (1 pt.)
8. Teaching of Graduate Reading Course with enrollment > 1 (1 point)
9. Coauthorship of published article with graduate student (1 pt.)
10. Coauthorship of grant proposal with graduate student (1 pt.)
SERVICE
December 16, 2001-March 15, 2005

List all departmental and university committees on which you served and indicate if you were the chair.

List any convention panels in which you served as discussant or chair, including dates.

List any journal editorial boards, national advisory committees, or national selection committees on which you served.

Indicate if you served as an executive officer of a national or regional association.

List any lectures that you gave at another university or college, including dates.

Indicate if you reviewed any promotion/tenure files for another university or reviewed any grant proposals or applications for a foundation.

POSSIBLE SERVICE POINTS:
1. Participation on more than one standing departmental committee (1 pt.)
2. Chair of departmental committee (standing or subfield) (1 pt.)
3.* Participation on university committee (1 pt.)
4.* Chair of university committee (1 pt. in addition to #3 above)
   * A maximum of 16 points for the combined categories of #3 and #4.
5. Undergraduate advisor, Graduate advisor (1 pt.)
6. Chair or panel discussant at major convention (1 pt.)
7. Editorial board member of journal (1 pt.)
8. Executive officer of national or regional professional association (1 pt.)
9. Participation on National Selection or Advisory Committee (1 pt.)
10. Lecture at another university or college (1 pt.)
11. Reviewer of grant proposals and applications for foundations (1 pt. for each three proposals reviewed)
12. Reviewer of promotion files for other universities (1 pt.)

DISCRETIONARY

Describe any meritorious activities that you believe the committee should consider, including: second readership on an honors thesis, open-ended credit hours, or teaching awards.
The School of Journalism and Communication (SOJC) Procedures for Merit and Equity Salary Allocation establishes a fair and equitable process for the allocation of funds available for faculty merit and salary increases. The School is committed to the principles and goals articulated in the University Senate Budget Committee White Paper (2000) and related documents.

This policy replaces the School of Journalism Procedures for Merit Salary Allocation first adopted in 1985.

Merit Allocations:
When merit allocations for faculty salaries are made to the SOJC, the following process is followed to determine individual raises. The procedures apply to merit allocations, and not to other salary increments for retention, equity, compression, marketplace factors or similar purposes.

1. Each member of the faculty is asked to submit a report of activity at the beginning of the salary review process. The report summarizes activity since the last review process that relates to teaching, research, service (school, university and professional) and other relevant performance. Should the salary review process coincide with the annual portfolio review process, the portfolio report may be used for both purposes.

2. The dean, on the basis of these reports and other information of record, assigns an indicator score of 0—5 to each area of activity (teaching, research, service). In each area the faculty member’s performance is evaluated in the context of his or her faculty portfolio over the period under review and standards of performance defined by the School’s Policy for Promotion and Tenure. These scores are averaged to produce a net indicator score for each individual, ranging from 0—5.

3. Although the scores are the result of subjective evaluation of the record, they are based on these criteria:\(^1\)

   RESEARCH: Publications, including books/monographs and textbooks; articles in refereed publications; articles in professional and general publications, and other creative work that bears on the individual’s professional and academic accomplishment. Consulting activity is also considered.

   TEACHING: Student course evaluations, required in all classes, are examined and compared to all others. The dean also confers individually with teachers about techniques and experience, examines syllabi and may request materials from a faculty member’s teaching portfolio.

   SERVICE: The number of committee and other service assignments are examined. Among factors considered are the role served in the assignment, the relationship of the service to

---

\(^1\) The statement of criteria will be amended, as needed, following faculty adoption of the Personnel Committee’s revision of the School’s Tenure and Promotion Policy.
the School’s mission and whether it is voluntary or assigned service. Community and professional organization service is also evaluated, including participation in workshops, academic organizations, etc.

4. The total of indicator scores assigned to all faculty is calculated. The amount of dollars allocated for merit raises is divided by that total score. This produces a figure that represents the amount (in dollars) assigned to a net indicator score of one. The net indicator score of each individual is multiplied by that sum, producing the merit allocation for the individual. (Example: If 20 faculty members have net indicator scores that total 40, and if $20,000 is available for merit, then each individual merit point is worth $500.)

5. Using the net indicator scores as a starting point, the dean will then determine the final merit allocation for each faculty member. Any significant difference in allocation from the total based on the indicator score shall be documented.

Equity Adjustments:
In order to address equity issues in the School’s salary structure, when possible the dean may allocate a percentage of any salary increase allocation to equity raises. Equity allocations will be used to address issues such as salary compression between academic ranks and salary distribution within academic ranks.

Consultation with the Dean’s Advisory Council (DAC):
Prior to the merit increase review the dean shall consult with the DAC concerning the percentage of any salary increase allocation to be designated for Equity Adjustments.

After the dean has completed the initial analysis and made preliminary salary allocations, the dean and the DAC will meet to review the results. At the meeting, the dean will provide the DAC with a report of the preliminary results and invite comment.

The DAC’s role in the process will be advisory and will not involve extensive review of individual faculty files; however the individual files used in the salary review process will be available to DAC members during the review meeting.

Report to Faculty:
At the first faculty meeting following the completion of a salary increase review process and the submission of salary increases to the Provost’s office, the dean shall report the results of the process to the faculty. The report shall consist of the total and the percentage of funds allocated to COLA, merit and equity increases. In addition, the dean will identify challenges facing the School in meeting the goals of the Senate White Paper and report on progress made toward meetings those goals.