

Prevention Science Institute Faculty Merit Increase Policy

Revised June 16, 2014

The institute Director, in consultation with the Principal Investigators, will base his/her merit increase recommendation on the performance of the faculty member. All faculty members must be evaluated for merit; it is not permitted for a faculty member to opt-out. Faculty members' formal annual performance evaluations should reflect the observations and decisions on an individual's work and ability to meet expectations. Merit increase decisions should be based primarily on 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. Performance evaluations and other criteria considered for merit for tenure track and non-tenure track faculty will be documented, tracked, and maintained 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. Faculty members should also submit an updated CV to supervisors as part of the evaluation process. 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 and follow these general guidelines:

- **Research Professor appointment series:** PSI faculty in the Research Professor series are expected to perform research-related activities that are the same as or similar to the expectations for research productivity of tenure related faculty. PSI Research Professors are expected to: produce professional products on a regular-basis (e.g., peer-reviewed publications in high quality journals, books, research or program evaluation reports, technical manuals); actively participate in appropriate professional communities (e.g., conference/workshop presentations, state or national committees and/or journal editorial assignments); and actively participate in external funding development consistent with the PSI's research agenda. The number of proposals submitted as PI/co-PI, the 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 for PSI Research Professors.
- **Research Associate appointment series:** PSI faculty in the Research Associate series are expected to participate in research, outreach and/or technical assistance activities

specific to their project. Specific expectations for each research associate position should be developed through active collaboration between the career NTTF and his or her direct supervisor and/or principal investigator, and explicitly documented as part of the annual performance evaluation process as goals and/or expectations for the coming year. Specific expectations may include: regularly contributing to the writing of grant proposals as the principal investigator or in collaboration with the principal investigator; collaborating with principal investigators on reports to funding agencies or community partners; building and maintaining positive relationships with community research partners; working towards research objectives by communicating with other research organizations or research sites; overseeing offsite branches of PSI; publishing project result findings on a regular-basis as an author or coauthor (peer review, technical reports, etc.); presenting findings individually or as an integral part of the team (dissemination to external audiences); generating intervention materials and protocols; overseeing research budgets; hiring and supervising other staff; coordinating projects or research groups; overseeing data collection, adherence to project timelines, and compliance with IRB requirements; and engaging in professional activities commensurate with this level of appointment, such as presentations, colloquia, and collaborative writing projects.

- **Research Assistant appointment series:** PSI faculty in the Research Assistant series are expected to participate in research, outreach and/or technical assistance activities specific to their project. 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 principal investigator, 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 PSI leadership positions.

Job descriptions will be reviewed and updated as needed annually.

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 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. Regardless of type of appointment or FTE, each faculty member is eligible for consideration 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 as follows:

- | | |
|------------------------------|---|
| (3) Meets Expectations: | \leq the percentage set by the faculty merit pool |
| (4) Exceeds Expectations: | = the percentage set by the faculty merit pool |
| (5) Exceptional Performance: | \geq the percentage set by the faculty merit pool |

Supervisors will communicate faculty members' ratings to the Director and ratings will be discussed with the Principal Investigators. Given that some supervisors review a single employee while others supervise many faculty members, 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 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. Supervisors will inform faculty of their raises after they have been approved.