

## **Faculty Merit Increase Policy**

### **Institute of Theoretical Science**

*May 2014*

The institute director, in consultation with the relevant principal investigators/supervisors (if any) and the leadership committee, is responsible for merit raise recommendations for eligible faculty. These recommendations shall be based on the performance of the faculty member. The formal annual performance evaluation shall reflect the quality of an individual's work and ability to meet expectations, and the merit increase decisions shall reflect those formal evaluations. For details, see the metrics/criteria for evaluation by rank series in the appendix below. 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, disciplinary actions, opportunities not covered in the performance evaluation, or special projects undertaken post-evaluation time but before the commencement of the merit increase period. In all cases, a current CV will be considered in addition to the performance review. All faculty will be evaluated for merit, and **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 shall 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 be available to the employee for review and discussion. Those metrics must be related to the tasks articulated in the individual's job description. Job descriptions will be reviewed and updated annually as needed.

After completing the individual's annual performance review, in years where there is a merit pool and process established by the institution, the supervisor, as part of the merit increase decision process, shall give the faculty member an overall rating chosen from the following options: (1) Fails to Perform; (2) Needs Attention; (3) Meets Expectations; (4) Exceeds Expectations; or (5) Exceptional Performance. All faculty, regardless of FTE or type of appointment, shall be eligible for consideration for the highest rating. Supervisors shall communicate these ratings to the director, who shall discuss them with the leadership committee. This process is designed to ensure a fair and uniform distribution of ratings, especially in cases where supervisors are responsible for evaluating only a small number of faculty. Based on these discussions, the director may adjust ratings in consultation with the relevant supervisors (if any).

Faculty who receive, as a result of this process, 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 be recommended to receive an increase to their individual current base salaries as follows:

(3) Meets Expectations:                      a-b%

- |                              |      |
|------------------------------|------|
| (4) Exceeds Expectations:    | b-c% |
| (5) Exceptional Performance: | c+%  |

The actual amount of an individual's increase (i.e., the values assigned to a, b, and c above) will be based on funding available in the unit's merit pool established by the University.

The director will communicate these recommendations to the Vice President for Research. All merit increases are also subject to approval by the Vice President for Research and the Provost. Once the merit increases have been approved, the director shall notify the faculty members of their raises in writing.

### **Appendix: Metrics/criteria for evaluation by rank series**

- **Research Professor appointment series:** Expectations for research activities by research professors are the same as those for research productivity of tenure related faculty. These include, but are not limited to, the following types of metrics: peer-reviewed publications in high quality journals, books, technical reports, conference participation, and pursuit of external funding. Expectations for service outside the university, such as service to scholarly societies, conference organization, refereeing, etc., are the same as for tenure-related faculty of seniority.
- **Research Associate appointment series:** Expectations for research associates (postdocs) are set by the relevant principal investigators or project leaders. They typically include the production and dissemination of research results, and in some cases may include participation in grant proposal preparation. These expectations shall be clearly articulated annually, and the performance evaluations shall be consistent with them.
- **Research Assistant appointment series:** A Research Assistant is expected to participate in research, outreach and/or technical assistance activities as defined by the relevant principal investigators. Specific expectations may vary, will be developed through active collaboration between the career NTTF and his or her supervisor, and will be explicitly documented on an annual basis. These expectations shall articulate specific tasks with measurable outcomes, and the performance evaluations shall be consistent with them.