

Institute of Neuroscience Merit Policy

May 2014

The Institute of Neuroscience (ION) is governed by a single merit increase policy. The purpose of this document is to describe the process and criteria for awarding merit increases in ION. ION will have a unified pool for all NTTF employed in ION. This policy does not cover TTF, because TTF are covered by the policies of their home departments. Note that represented NTTF and unrepresented faculty are in separate pools.

Basis for Merit Evaluation

The ION Director will base his/her merit increase recommendation on the performance of the NTTF. In determining a NTTF's performance, his/her supervisor will consider the NTTF's primary responsibilities, as outlined in his/her job description. 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.

The merit evaluation will be based on three to four metrics that reflect the most important core professional responsibilities as described in a NTTF's job description. Because of the wide diversity of NTTFs in ION, not all of the metrics described below will be appropriate for each individual, and additional metrics may be appropriate depending on the individual's job description. The institution expects the following principles to be embedded in these metrics as relevant to the individual rank series:

- Positions in the **Research Professor** series should include metrics that are field-calibrated areas such as number of professional products or outcomes (peer reviewed publications in high quality journals, books published, white papers produced); active and notable participation in professional communities (presentations, posters, institutional/national/international professional committees, journal editorial board service), institutional service, number of submissions for external support for research projects; number of active awards managed, and/or impact of professional work on the field/profession/public policy, involvement in education/teaching/training.
- Positions in the **Research Associate and Postdoctoral Fellow** series should include metrics related to expertise and innovation in relevant research techniques and tools; engagement in discovery/analysis/outreach; involvement in dissemination of findings; engagement in proposal submissions; institutional service; engagement in training/education; managerial responsibilities; and success in meeting outcomes/deliverables of assigned projects. Where Research Associates are expected to be PIs and coPIs on sponsored projects, there should be metrics much like the ones expected of Research Professors.

- Positions in the **Research Assistant** series should include metrics that are related to defined and measurable research, outreach and/or technical assistance activities as defined in the job description. If Research Assistant positions include managerial responsibilities, metrics related to outcomes of the unit managed or project supervised should be included. In some cases, metrics found in the above two classifications around innovation, research outcomes, and research productivity should be included.

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 or disciplinary actions.

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

Regardless of type of appointment or FTE, each faculty member is eligible for consideration for the highest merit rating.

Evaluation Process

The Director or designee will notify employees via email with information about when they should submit review materials and the time period for which they will be evaluated.

1. The supervisor will provide the NTTF with a current job description.
2. The supervisor and NTTF will agree on evaluation metrics.
3. The NTTF will provide their supervisor with:
 1. Complete updated CV or biosketch
 2. A report of activity. The report must include:
 - A statement of each evaluation metric
 - A concise description or listing of activities performed that contributed to the accomplishment of that metric. A bulleted list should be sufficient.

The supervisor will provide the ION director with:

1. A current job description.
2. All of the documents provided to them by the NTTF.
3. Completed, signed merit evaluation form.

The documents provided by the NTTF and the supervisor will be placed in the NTTF's personnel file.

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 give the NTTF an overall rating of: (1) Fails to Perform; (2) Needs Attention; (3) Meets Expectations; (4) Exceeds Expectations; or (5) Exceptional Performance as part of the merit increase decision process. Faculty who receive a rating of 1 or 2 will not be eligible for a merit increase. Faculty who

receive a rating of 3, 4, or 5 will receive an increase to their individual current base salaries based on the following percentages of the available merit pool:

(3) Meets Expectations: will receive a percentage below the average available merit raise, which will be calculated based on the available pool and the overall distribution of merit scores.

(4) Exceeds Expectations: will receive the average available percentage merit raise.

(5) Exceptional Performance: will receive a percentage above the average available merit raise, which will be calculated based on the available pool and the overall distribution of merit scores.

Supervisors will communicate NTTFs' ratings to the ION Director.

Director Recommendations

The Director, in consultation with the executive committee, will review the evaluations, determine the range of increases for categories 3, 4, and 5, and then propose specific raises for each member. Given that some supervisors review a single employee while others supervise many faculty, the following process will be used to ensure that the scaling of ratings is similar across supervisors and across facilities: Supervisors whose average evaluation ratings deviate substantially from the average rating across all ION supervisors will be queried and asked to reaffirm or adjust their ratings.

The Director will make recommendations for increases for the NTTFs who are eligible to the Vice President for Research. Merit increases are subject to approval by the Vice President for Research and the Provost. The actual amount of an individual's increase will be based on funding available in the unit's merit pool established by the University.

Notification of Merit Increase Decisions

The Director will notify faculty of merit increase decisions after they have been approved by VPRI and Academic Affairs.