

College of Education Faculty Performance Evaluation and Merit Review Guidelines *Updated 2/6/24*

The Faculty Performance Evaluation and Merit Review have two different but related purposes. The purpose of the Performance Review is to provide developmental feedback, acknowledge performance, and provide clear information to a faculty member about their preparedness for promotion and advancement. The Merit Review is to acknowledge work performed and provide salary enhancements in a manner commensurate with faculty performance across the unit and college.

Department level guidance (process and timelines) for both Performance Evaluations and Merit Reviews for the College of Education (COE) are included in this document. The COE will follow these procedures and timelines:

Performance Evaluations

Frequency of Evaluations:

- **Career faculty:** The College of Education follows the timeline of career faculty reviews outlined in Article 19 of the United Academics Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)
 - Career Instructional Faculty:
Section 4 a. Career faculty must be reviewed each year for the first three years of employment and at least once every three years (academic years for 9 month and fiscal years for 12 month) of employment thereafter. The review will consider the Career NTTF bargaining unit faculty member's performance since the last review.
 - Career Research Faculty: *Career research faculty will have a performance review annually*
 - Performance reviews may take place out of cycle when a department or unit head has identified or become aware of performance concerns.
- **Pro tem faculty** are to be reviewed annually. Instructional pro tem will be reviewed at the end of their contract period. (<https://provost.uoregon.edu/career-faculty-evaluation#protem>) Ongoing pro tem faculty are reviewed once every 3 years after the position has been designated as ongoing.
- **Retired faculty** in active instructional positions, including faculty in their tenure reduction period: The faculty's department head or supervisor will have a discussion around performance as part of the annual workload planning meeting.
- **Tenure-Track Faculty:** Assistant Professors and Untenured Associate Professors evaluations will be conducted annually (with the exception the year a midterm review is conducted).

Tenured Faculty will have a major review every three years (<https://provost.uoregon.edu/post-tenure-review>)

Performance Evaluators:

- **Instructional Faculty Evaluators:** The Department Head conducts all annual evaluations for Core Program faculty in the department. This includes Career Instructional Faculty and Tenure Track Faculty (TTF) who are considered core faculty in their program in the department.
- **Instructional Pro-Tem and non-core Career Evaluators:** Program Directors or supervising career faculty may conduct annual evaluations for all pro-tempore and non-core career faculty in their academic program (e.g., career faculty with very low FTE who have not been identified as core but because of teaching a specialized course for a period of time are considered career).
- **Research Unit Faculty Evaluators:** In research units, the supervisor of record (direct supervisor) is responsible for conducting performance evaluations for each of their direct reports.

Period under Review:

All instructional, research and scholarly activity produced since the last performance evaluation should be included in the current performance evaluation. For recently hired faculty, the period of review would be from hire date through the end of the previous calendar year.

For 9-month faculty, summer contracting is separate and can be included in the performance evaluation. Publications, grant submissions, presentations, and student research supervision that occur in the summer months (or term), whether on contract or not, are included in the performance evaluations.

Note: COE Performance Evaluations are timed to cover each of the preceding calendar years under evaluation and should encompass all professional activity within those calendar years. All activity includes instruction; scholarship, research, and creative activity; service; and contributions to equity and inclusion that occurred between January 1 to December 31 of the year/s under review.

Timing, Evaluation Meetings and Required Signatures:

- **Timing:** Faculty prepare their evaluation materials in the winter term of each year, following the COE templates for performance evaluations. Performance evaluation meetings between the faculty member and immediate supervisor (Department Head, Program Director, or supervisor

in academic units; Unit Director or direct supervisor in research units) are conducted in the winter and spring terms.

- **Evaluation Meetings:**
 - Career and tenure track faculty will meet with their supervisor to discuss their efforts, performance, and goals as well as the evaluation form.
 - Supervisors are not required to meet with Pro Tem faculty, unless it is a function of giving feedback related to re-hiring. However, these meetings are optional and may be conducted at the discretion of the supervisor or the request of the Pro-Tem faculty member and a signature from the faculty member is requested regardless of whether a meeting is conducted.
- **Performance Improvement Plan:** If any instructional or research faculty member other than Pro Tem receives an evaluation that is less than "meets expectations" in one or more of their assigned duties, the evaluator and the Department Heads or Unit Directors are required to have a face-to-face meeting to discuss a performance improvement plan (process outlined in CBA Article 19, section 6)
- **Work Load Assignments:** The Department Head and faculty will complete an Annual Work Assignment (planning) document to plan instructional activities and course releases for the upcoming academic year.
- **Signatures:**
 - Performance evaluations for research faculty must be signed by the faculty member being evaluated, and the evaluator.
 - Performance evaluation forms for all instructional faculty must be signed by the faculty member being evaluated, the evaluator (if the evaluator is not the Department Head) and the Department Head. Every evaluation must be endorsed by the Department Head with a signature affirming that evaluation procedures and any required face to face feedback was followed, and the evaluation was signed by all parties.

Merit Reviews:

1. General Process: COE Departments and Research Units will follow their internal governance procedures for merit review. Unit or Department Merit Review Committees or Unit Directors or Department Heads, commensurate with the Internal Governance Policies of the unit, will review the materials identified above in making Merit recommendations to the Dean of the College of Education. If a faculty member has multiple position descriptions (e.g., a career faculty in a research unit and teaching a course), each position will have a separate merit review and rating. If a faculty member has one position description but roles in multiple units (e.g., a TTF in a department and a research unit), the administrators of the units involved

will collaborate on the merit recommendation and provide a single merit review and rating.

2. Primary Materials: Merit recommendations are based on: (a) prior performance evaluation materials submitted by a faculty member covering the period of review, (b) prior faculty evaluations submitted by the supervisor covering the period of review, (c) an updated CV highlighted to indicate new achievements and notable productivity or activities in all job categories that are part of their assigned duties during the merit review window. Faculty without performance evaluation materials within the merit review window, use materials provided in the COE merit policy to submit performance and productivity highlights for the period of review.

3. Supplemental Materials: Supplemental materials should include an updated CV and/or a list of notable productivity or activities in all areas of work during the time period following their last performance review.

4. Timing. Note 1: The “merit review window” or “period under review” refers to the timeframe within which professional activities will be reviewed for merit. In many cases, this window covers a period that extends from the last merit review period to the near present. Because there is significant overlap in timing between the Faculty Performance Evaluation period and the Merit Review period, Department Heads, Unit Directors, and Department/Unit Merit Review committees ***will consider only activity and productivity since the last Merit Review*** in making Merit recommendations to the Dean.

5. Timing. Note 2: Materials described above to be included in Merit Review are due to your Department Head or Unit Director by **October 31** each fall term.

6. Submission of Reviews: Department Heads and Unit Directors will make merit recommendations for all faculty members that are based on the above materials to the COE Dean. Where applicable per your unit Internal Governance Policy, Merit Review Committees will make merit recommendations to the Unit or Department head, who will then make Merit recommendations to the COE Dean. All Merit recommendations are due to the Dean of the College of Education by **November 14** each fall term.