

Research: Institute of Ecology and Evolution (IE²) Faculty Merit Increase Policy

Revised June 2, 2014

The IE² Director will base her or his merit increase recommendation on the performance of the faculty member. The formal annual performance evaluation should reflect the observations and decisions on an individual's work and ability to meet expectations, and the merit increase decisions should be reflected in those formal evaluations. The evaluation is a primary, but not the sole element, in the merit increase decision. Other factors that might be involved include, but are not limited to, situational challenges or opportunities not covered in the performance evaluation, disciplinary actions, or special projects that occur post-evaluation but also before the merit increase period. Merit determinations and other criteria will be documented and placed in personnel files. Faculty who meet or exceed expectations will be eligible for merit increases, provided that a faculty merit pool has been established by the University for that fiscal year. As part of the merit increase process all faculty are required to submit a Curriculum Vitae (CV).

In determining a faculty member's performance, her or his supervisor will consider the faculty member's primary responsibilities as outlined in her or his job description and as applicable to rank and classification of employee. In general, metrics and criteria include, but are not limited to, the following for each rank series that exists within IE²:

- **Research Professor:** Individuals in the Research Professor series should be expected to perform research-related activities that are the same as, or similar to, the expectations for research productivity of tenure related faculty. These expectations will be agreed upon through conversations with the IE² Director. Metrics include significant number professional products per year (e.g., peer-reviewed publications in high quality journals, books, curricula, research or program evaluation reports, technical manuals), active participation in appropriate professional communities (e.g., conference/workshop presentations, state or national committees and/or journal editorial assignments), and active participation in external funding development appropriate to IE². Decisions will be based upon the number of proposals submitted as PI/co-PI, number of proposals funded, order of authorship, quality of publication outlet, and impact or recognition of professional products within the field.
- **Research Associate appointment series:** Individuals in the Research Associate series, including those in the classification of Postdoctoral Scholar, may have different expectations across laboratories based upon the research focus of the position which will be determined through conversations with the supervising Principal Investigator (PI). Research Associates are generally expected to perform research-related activities that would result in a defined number of professional products per year (e.g., peer-reviewed publications in high quality journals, books, curricula, research or program evaluation reports, technical manuals), active participation in appropriate professional communities (e.g., conference/workshop presentations, state or national committees and/or journal editorial assignments), and active participation in external funding development appropriate to the research agenda of the research or outreach unit. Other laboratories might place more emphasis on Research Associates engaging in activities as a team member and to produce a quality work product in that context. Determination of merit for Research Associates will include the number of proposals written (individually or as part of a

collective), number of awards received as PI or co-PI, number of awards on which the individual is named in grant/key personnel, number of publications authored or co-authored, number of presentations made individually or as an integral part of the team, and impact on the field of study.

- **Research Assistant appointment series:** A Research Assistant is expected to participate in research, outreach and/or technical assistance activities with defined and measurable outcomes as determined by the supervising PI. The specific expectations for each research assistant position should be developed through active collaboration between the career NTTF and her or his direct supervisor.

Specific metrics to judge the individual's performance must be clearly identified year-to-year and available in the performance evaluation or other document for review and discussion with the employee. Those metrics must be related to the tasks articulated in the individual's job description. Job descriptions will be reviewed and updated as needed annually. The performance evaluation also serves other areas of career development as will be articulated in the forthcoming policy on review policies and procedures.

After completing the individual's annual performance review, in years where there is a merit pool and process established by the institution, the supervisor will assign the faculty member an overall rating of: (1) Fails to Perform; (2) Needs Attention; (3) Meets Expectations; (4) Exceeds Expectations; or (5) Exceptional Performance. These ratings will occur as part of the merit increase decision process.

Regardless of appointment type or FTE, each faculty member is eligible for consideration for the highest merit rating. All faculty must be evaluated for merit, and it is not permitted for a faculty member to opt out of consideration for a merit increase. Faculty who receive a rating of 1 or 2 will not be eligible for a merit increase. Supervisors will be clear in their expectations and the cut-off for lack of merit increase will be communicated to impacted faculty. Faculty who receive a rating of 3, 4, or 5 will receive an increase of their individual current base salaries as follows:

(3) Meets Expectations:	a-b%
(4) Exceeds Expectations:	b-c%
(5) Exceptional Performance:	c+%

Supervisors will communicate each faculty member's ratings to the IE² Director via a written performance evaluation, and a discussion of the available pool will be held in a PI Committee meeting to determine the appropriate percentage ranges. Given that some supervisors review a single employee, while others supervise many faculty, this process is designed to ensure that scaling of ratings is similar across supervisors. The IE² Director will use input from the discussion to make recommendations to the Vice President for Research for increases for eligible faculty members. Documentation of the decisions will be maintained in the IE² administrative office.

The actual amount of an individual's increase will be based on funding available in the unit's merit pool established by the University. Merit increases are also subject to approval by the Vice President for Research and the Provost. Faculty will be informed of their raises after they have been approved.