



Faculty Merit Pool Distribution Policy

Overview:

Recommendations for the distribution of faculty merit funds will involve input from CTL Group Directors, and the CTL Executive Leadership Team (ELT), with final recommendations made by the CTL Director. The primary data source for the merit increase will be the annual performance evaluations of individual faculty, including tenure-related faculty (if appropriate and separate from the faculty member's Department review), non-tenure related faculty (NTTF) including career, adjunct, and post-doctoral fellows. Each CTL staff member is assigned a supervisor who completes an annual performance evaluation, which is typically due on the supervisee's date of hire. As part of the CTL annual performance evaluation process, the CTL Director and the appropriate CTL Group Directors formatively review and approve each of these annual performance evaluations. CTL Group Directors will be responsible for initially reviewing the materials, including a copy of a faculty member's current curriculum vitae (CV), that faculty submit for a merit increase. The CTL Group Directors will make recommendations to the CTL Director regarding faculty who meet, do not meet, or exceed performance expectations. It is the responsibility of the CTL Director, after considering each of the Group Director's comments, to recommend the amount or percentage of merit increase for faculty who are eligible. The CTL Director may seek input from the ELT on the merit increase recommendations. The CTL Director, in turn, will submit his/her merit increase recommendations to the Vice President for Research and Innovation (VPRI) review and approval.

Merit Review Committee Composition and Responsibilities:

CTL will develop, operationalize and implement its merit review consistent with other research units under the auspices of the VPRI. This policy and the associated procedures will be documented and posted on the CTL's internal website or sent to faculty via email. Faculty at associate or senior ranks will participate in the appropriate merit review process as members of the CTL Group Directors or as members of the CTL Executive Leadership Team (ELT). The CTL Group Directors tasked with evaluating NTTF (including adjunct faculty and post-doctoral fellows) will include NTTF. The CTL Group Directors will evaluate materials that faculty submit for merit review and provide its recommendations to the CTL Director. All faculty will be evaluated for merit without exception, and no CTL faculty member will be permitted to opt out of this evaluation. Moreover, regardless of faculty appointment rank or FTE, each faculty member will be eligible for consideration for the highest merit rating.

Basis for Merit Evaluation:

Tenure-related faculty (TTF) who are members of CTL will obtain merit evaluations through their assigned academic departments, not CTL. To the extent appropriate, performance evaluation data unique to CTL work and related to the areas of research, teaching and service,

along with a current curriculum vitae (CV) will be submitted to the department as part of the CTL TTF member's merit evaluation.

NTTF evaluations will be based on the duties, responsibilities and tasks reflected in the faculty member's current job description. To the extent appropriate, performance in one or more areas of research, teaching, and service will be considered. The performance evaluations will be sufficiently flexible to reflect the unique roles and responsibilities of each NTTF.

In addition, the criteria upon which CTL NTTF (including career, adjunct and post-doctoral fellows) are evaluated as part of the annual performance evaluation process include the following:

- **Research Professor appointment series:** Individuals in the Research Professor rank series (i.e., Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Professor) are expected to perform research-related activities that are the same as or similar to the expectations for research productivity of tenure related faculty. To reflect the additional criteria, for example, we would expect to see some or all of the following types of metrics: a defined number of professional products per year (e.g., at least two peer-reviewed publications in high quality journals, books, curricula, research or program evaluation reports, technical manuals, surveys and other assessment instruments), active participation in appropriate professional communities (e.g., peer-reviewed conference presentations, 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 . At least one or two proposals submitted as PI/Co-PI, number of proposals funded, order of 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 appointment series:** The Research Associate rank series (e.g., Research Associate I, Senior Research Associate I, Senior Research Associate II) may have different expectations across schools/colleges and in some cases, the expectations are highly project or grant specific because of the contracted Scope of Work (SOW). In general, the expectation is to perform research-related activities that would result in a defined number of professional products per year (e.g., one or two peer-reviewed publications in high quality journals, books, curricula, research or program evaluation reports, technical manuals, surveys and other assessment instruments), active participation in appropriate professional communities (e.g., peer-reviewed conference presentations, 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. In addition, depending on one's job description, a Research Associate is expected to engage in activities as a team member and should have clear expectations for quality work product in that context. 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 Co-PI, number of awards on which the individual is named in grant/key personnel, number of publications authored or co-authored (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 appointment series:** A Research Assistant (e.g., Research Assistant, Senior Research Assistant I, Senior Research Assistant II) 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. In many cases, the specific performance outcomes for a Research Assistant will be based on the SOW of specific funded projects. 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.

As part of its annual performance evaluation, CTL utilizes a self-evaluation form that permits a faculty member to: (a) review and revise as necessary his or her job description; (b) list and describes his or her major accomplishments; (c) describe his or her important organizational and/or personal professional goals/objectives for the current AY; (d) describe ways that CTL could support the staff member's organizational and/or personal professional goals/objectives for the current AY; and (e) describe what she or he considers to be the most significant contribution she or he made to CTL during the previous AY or since the last formal evaluation. Supervisors comment on the faculty-member's self-evaluation and the faculty member's performance as either *meets expectations*, *exceeds expectations* or *does not meet expectations*. The supervisor makes a recommendation to the CTL Director and the appropriate CTL Group

Directors prior to an in-person meeting with the faculty member to discuss the evaluation. The CTL Director considers the recommendation and makes his or her determination on whether the faculty member's performance *meets expectations*, *exceeds expectations* or *does not meet expectations*

The primary data source for merit increase in CTL will be the faculty member's CV and annual performance evaluations. Merit increases will be based on ratings of "meets expectations" and "exceeds expectations" on one or more annual performance evaluations. Thus, all faculty who meet or exceed expectations will receive some merit increase.

The CTL Director or Business Manager will notify all faculty via email with information regarding when they should submit merit review materials and the time period for which they will be evaluated. Materials to submit include:

- A completed Faculty Review form
- A record of previous annual performance evaluations
- A current CV
- Other relevant documents that a faculty member deems appropriate to submit

The CTL Director in concert with the Business Manager or a designated CTL administrative staff member will record, document, track and maintain the appropriate records that captures the decision-making process for conducting and executing the merit increase process. A record of this process will be maintained by the CTL Business Manager to allow for appropriate follow up or review if questions arise at a later date.

Committee Evaluation and Recommendation:

The Group Directors are responsible for reviewing the materials submitted by eligible faculty and assigning rankings in the performance areas under evaluation. Below are ranking designations to be used to evaluate faculty performance:

Does not meet Expectations: Faculty member is not performing to expected standards of the department or unit.

Meets Expectations: Faculty member is performing to expected standards of the department or unit.

Exceeds Expectations: Faculty member is performing at standards that exceed expected standards of the department or unit.

After reviewing faculty materials, including a summary of each individual's annual performance evaluation for the previous year(s) (as specified by the conditions of the merit increase at the time; that is, a merit increase for the previous year only or multiple years) and assigning rankings based on the submitted materials, the CTL Group Directors will submit their recommendations to the CTL Director.

CTL Director Recommendations:

The CTL Director will synthesize the rankings provided by the CTL Group Directors, adjusting for additional factors as appropriate (e.g., institutional conditions for merit increase and pool of funds available at the time), and converting these ratings into amount or percentage merit increase recommendations. These percentage recommendations shall be submitted to the VPRI or his/her designee.

VPRI's Review:

It is the VPRI's responsibility to ensure that all available funds in the NTTF merit pools are properly distributed. The VPRI/designee will submit merit increase recommendations to the Office of Academic Affairs for final approval.

Notification of Merit Increase Decisions:

It is the responsibility of the CTL Director, or his/her designee to notify all faculty of merit increase decisions, after they have been approved institutionally.

Review of Policy

CTL intends to periodically review its merit increase policy to ensure its consistency and clarity as it is executed and implemented in concert with other policies (e.g., TTF/NTTF review and promotion).