

University of Florida
College of Engineering
Merit Raise Criteria for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

The merit pay criteria and procedures described in this document are intended to apply to non-tenure track faculty in the College of Engineering.

Purpose of Merit Based Pay Raises

Pay raises based on merit may be used to promote and further various goals of the College of Engineering, including:

1. Advance college mission
2. Improve the quality of college programs
3. Recognize and reward meritorious performance and sustained excellence of faculty
4. Promote retention of the most valuable and productive faculty
5. Improve faculty morale
6. Provide incentives for future faculty efforts
7. Improve college reputation in national surveys

Criteria for Award of Merit Pay Raises

Merit-based pay raises should be based on the quality and quantity of faculty activities in the areas of research, teaching, and/or service. Merit-based raises should generally reflect a continuous trend of productivity and excellence over a period of several years, as opposed to being based on achievements during a single academic year. Merit evaluations should be based on standardized activity reports submitted by the faculty member over the evaluation period, which will serve as the faculty member's 'case for merit'. In addition, merit deliberations may also consider other formal documents prepared during the evaluation period such as: promotion folders including external letters, and recent memoranda of understanding written by the chair following an extended discussion with the faculty member.

Metrics

The following metrics should be considered by the departments as evidence of meritorious performance. The relative importance of the metrics will vary among the ranks. Faculty in the Research scientist track, for example will be evaluated using the Research criteria, while those in the Lecturer track will be judged using the Teaching criteria. Those faculty whose assignments encompass more than one area will be evaluated using the relevant metrics.

Research:

1. Publications
 - a. Peer reviewed
 - i. Journal papers
 1. Journal quality
 2. Journal impact factor

- ii. Papers in conference proceedings and other refereed volumes
 - 1. Acceptance rate
 - 2. Quality
 - 3. Number of reviewers per paper
 - b. Not peer reviewed
 - i. Advanced level books, texts, and monographs
 - ii. Patents and copyrights
 - iii. Conference papers
 - iv. Other scholarly works
- 2. Originality and relevance of research
 - a. Citation indices
 - b. External letters
- 3. Recognition and stature in profession
 - a. Awards, Fellowships, etc.
 - b. Invited talks, Keynote talks
 - c. Other honors
- 4. Research funding
 - a. Source and type
 - i. Grant vs. contract
 - ii. Research vs. infrastructure
 - iii. Type of peer review
 - iv. Interdisciplinary vs. disciplinary
 - b. Amount
- 5. Graduate student supervision
 - a. Number and quality of Ph.D supervised/graduated
 - b. Number and quality of Engineer supervised/graduated
 - c. Number and quality of M.S. supervised/graduated
 - d. Student placement

Teaching:

- 1. Evaluations
 - a. Student
 - b. Peer
 - c. Awards
- 2. Level of Effort
 - a. Class size
 - b. Updating of course content
 - c. Laboratory/facilities development
 - d. Introduction of new approaches and new initiatives
- 3. Innovation
 - a. New course development
 - b. Undergraduate and beginning graduate textbook publication
 - c. Other teaching related publications
- 4. Funding
 - a. Teaching related grants
 - i. Source and type

ii. Type of review

Service:

1. Teaching
 - i. Professional education
 - ii. Educational research
 - iii. Non-traditional teaching
2. Publications
 - i. Journals
 - ii. Conference Proceedings
 - iii. Manuals
 - iv. Codes
 - iii. Non-traditional media
3. External service recognition, commendations, awards
4. Exceptional internal service activities with the potential for significant institutional impact.
5. Professional Service
 - i. Advisor to student society
 - ii. Member or Chair of professional committees
6. Coordination of teaching or research programs

Implementation

Final Evaluation

A merit based pay raise system requires comparative evaluation of departmental faculty. The final evaluation is the responsibility of the Department Chair, who should give due consideration to the guidelines established by the department faculty and may choose to solicit help (i.e. peer evaluation) from the faculty.

Distribution of Merit Pay

1. It is recommended that monies available for merit raises not be distributed “acrossthe-board” to departmental faculty, as this defeats the purpose of such raises.
2. In making merit pay decisions, the Chair should follow the guidelines established by the department faculty, but may also consider the productivity/merit of faculty members relative to their current level of pay, as well as relative to national norms.
3. Eligibility for, and decisions on merit pay raises should not be influenced by other pay increases due to bonus programs, promotions, or other special programs.
4. In the interests of transparency, it is recommended that the chair inform the faculty regarding the distribution of merit pay. This could be accomplished in the form of a histogram showing the numbers of faculty receiving raises in various ranges of dollar amounts, while still protecting the privacy of individuals.