

Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit Increase Policy
Institute of Molecular Biology
DRAFT May 29, 2014

The Institute Director, in consultation with the executive leadership committee, will base his/her merit increase recommendation on the performance of the faculty member. The formal annual performance evaluation will occur for all faculty, and 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 post-evaluation time but before the merit increase period. Merit evaluations 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.

In determining a faculty member's performance, his/her supervisor will consider the faculty member'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 annually. Metrics for the types of positions in the Institute of Molecular Biology include:

Research Professor: 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. This includes 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 such as NIH R01 grants. Number of proposals submitted as PI/coPI, number of proposals funded, authorship (e.g., level of leadership assumed within the research effort), quality of publication outlet, and impact or recognition of professional products within the field are appropriate criteria for assessing research, technical assistance and dissemination contributions.

Research Associate: The expectation is to perform research-related activities as a team member that supports the efforts of individual labs in the Institute. At minimum, performance evaluations for position in the Research Associate series should include some of the following measures: number of proposals written (individually or as part of a collective), number of awards received as PI or coPI, number of awards on which the individual is named in grant/key personnel, number of publications authored or coauthored (peer review,

technical reports, etc.), number of presentations made individually or as an integral part of the team (dissemination to external audiences), other defined dissemination activities, and/or impact to the field/reputation growth measures.

Research Assistant and Postdoc: A Research Assistant is expected to participate in research, outreach and/or technical assistance activities with defined and measurable outcomes. Because many of these activities will be defined in most cases by principal investigators or supervisors, the specific expectations for each research assistant position should be developed through active collaboration between the career NTTF and his or her direct supervisor and/or Unit Director, if appropriate, and explicitly documented as part of the annual performance evaluation process as goals and/or expectations for the coming year. All performance evaluations for Research Assistants should have some specific tasks articulated to which quality of work expectations can be ascribed. The higher-order, traditional measures of research outcome noted in the above two other rank series may be included in these performance evaluations as relevant to the position and job description; particularly for those individuals in unit leadership positions.

Performance reviews, along with the final merit decisions, will be tracked and maintained by Institute staff.

After completing the individual's annual performance review, in year's where there is a merit pool and process established by the institution, the supervisor will give the faculty member 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. The evaluation for merit includes review of both recent performance review(s) and the current CV. Each faculty member, regardless of type or appointment or FTE, is eligible for the highest merit rating.

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 consistent with their rating and funding available in the unit's merit pool established by the University.

Supervisors will communicate faculty members' ratings with the Director and discussed in a leadership committee meeting. 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 Director will use input from the discussion to make recommendations for increases for the faculty members who are eligible to the Vice President for Research.

The final merit increase is subject to approval by the Vice President for Research and the Provost. Faculty will be informed of their raises after they have been approved.