

COMPENSATION AND EVALUATION PLAN
SCHOOL OF LIFE SCIENCES
(Approved by the Executive Committee - Spring 2005)

I. INTRODUCTION

The quality and effectiveness of the School of Life Sciences (SoLS) is determined in the main by the quality and effectiveness of its personnel. Satisfactory performance of SoLS, now and in the future, requires fair compensation. The basic philosophy of SoLS is that all personnel deserve equitable compensation for their contributions, and that meritorious performance should be rewarded. This document comprises the compensation and evaluation plan for tenured and tenure-track faculty with regular appointments.

The measure of success for SoLS faculty is excellent scholarship. Boyer¹ defines scholarship as encompassing discovery, integration, application and teaching. This range is fully manifest in SoLS, where a broad range of systems and processes are explored from the molecular to the ecosystem level, and from scientific, historical, philosophical and social perspectives. SoLS has the responsibility to create and extend research-based knowledge that benefits the greater Phoenix area and Arizona, the Nation and the World. Thus, the faculty is actively engaged in the full spectrum of scholarly activities of fundamental and applied research, outreach, professional and social service, and education. Members of the faculty have specialized disciplinary expertise—in such fields as evolution and systematics, ecology and behavior, physiology, molecular biology, bioethics and history and philosophy of science. Faculty scholarship reflects a balance consistent with individual appointments and the context of the school mission. Evaluation of scholarship acknowledges this diversity and the range of scholarly activities it includes. The primary expectation is demonstrated excellence and superior intellectual attainment in the context of the individual's appointment responsibilities.

II. EVALUATION PERIOD

All faculty members will be evaluated once a year. The assessment will consider accomplishments during the calendar year immediately preceding the evaluation.

III. EVALUATION MATERIALS

In order to aid the Director and Faculty Leaders in their task, each faculty member will be asked to submit an Annual Summary of Professional Activities and Achievements for the previous calendar year and a Prospective

¹ Boyer, E. L. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Princeton NJ.

Work Plan for the current year. Each Summary will include material only for the previous calendar year. Summaries will be entered on-line by each faculty member according to guidelines distributed each year. The summaries will provide the opportunity to include a description of activities considered meritorious by the faculty member, but not specifically requested. The prospective work plan will be described as outlined in the Annual Prospective Responsibility Assignment Form.

IV. DISTRIBUTION OF EFFORT

Normally, it is expected that for SoLS as a whole, there will be balanced contributions to instruction and research. However, it is recognized that individual faculty have different abilities, interests and areas of expertise, and that making use of these differences can enhance the productivity and overall achievement of SoLS. Thus, the exact mix of distribution of effort may differ among members of the faculty. When the work plan is prepared at the beginning of each calendar year, faculty members will be asked to indicate a distribution of effort in instruction, research and service for the year. Effort distributions will normally vary between 20% and 60% for instruction and research, and between 10% and 30% for service. The individual and the Director must agree on the proposed distribution of effort, with input from the Faculty Leader.

Academic Professionals on a continuing track appointment will complete the performance evaluation to reflect their distribution of effort in accordance with their appointment responsibilities and negotiated with their faculty leader and the Director.

V. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

According to the Arizona Board of Regents guidelines, faculty performance shall be assessed through both a peer-review process and an appropriate administrator. In SoLS, assessment is by the Leader of the Faculty to which the faculty member belongs, who then makes a recommendation to the Director. These individuals are expected to exercise impartiality and good judgment.

Faculty achievements in the core categories of instruction, research, and professional service will be considered as well as the degree to which the prospective work plan was implemented. Activities and factors to be considered in the evaluation include, but are not limited to those described in Section IV. C. 1 (Merit Raises: Evaluation Criteria – Guidelines) of the SoLS Policies and Procedures.

The Faculty Leader will examine the evaluation materials and work plan and assess the performance of each faculty member by awarding a score on an integer scale extending from 0 to 3 for each of the separate categories of instruction, research and service. A score of 3 is considered to be outstanding, 2 is meritorious and 1 is satisfactory. A score of 0 will be awarded for performance which is deemed unsatisfactory in a given area of activity. The overall performance evaluation score will be a weighted average of the scores in the three core categories calculated on the basis of the agreed upon effort distribution.

The Faculty Leader will present their summary to the Director. The Director may consult with the Executive Committee in making final recommendations and reporting performance evaluations to CLAS.

Assignment to the highest performance level (weighted average scores near 3.0) will generally require substantive contributions in all three core areas (instruction, research and service) during the evaluation period (with exceptions for sabbaticals or special assignments). In evaluating performance, weight will be given both to the quality level of a contribution (creativity, outcomes, peer evaluation indicators, etc.) and to the productivity level (number of courses, students, publications, committees, etc.). High productivity coupled with high quality is, of course, most meritorious.

VI. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION GUIDELINES

This section describes the guidelines used by the Faculty Leaders to calibrate the evaluation scale in terms of performance profiles. The performance profiles given here are intended as examples of levels of performance that would correspond to the respective integer scores.

Score 3: Outstanding

Instruction/Mentoring

Outstanding performance in teaching would be evidenced by one or more of the following: strong activity in course innovation or new course development, possibly documented by publications or presentations; textbook authorship; extensive involvement of undergraduates in research; outstanding student evaluations; successful mentoring and support of students at the undergraduate, graduate and/or postdoctoral levels, as evidenced by exceptional improvements in student performance or national student awards or publications and presentations by students and postdoctoral associates, or competitive major pre-doctoral or postdoctoral fellowships and awards or faculty appointments, among others.

Research

Excellence in research and a commitment to a productive program of research are required of all faculty members. Research is evaluated using both qualitative and quantitative standards. Collaborative, multidisciplinary investigation is an important aspect of life science research and is strongly encouraged. However, each member of the SoLS faculty is expected to provide the intellectual leadership for an established program of creative, independent research.

An outstanding level of research may be evidenced in a number of ways. An outstanding researcher may publish prolifically, or selectively, but usually in respected international journals appropriate for the discipline, and/or may be a book author or the holder of multiple patents. She/he typically will have a high level of funding for their discipline, possibly from multiple sources and most or all of which is peer-reviewed, and which is capable of supporting the infrastructure and personnel (undergraduate, graduate and/or postdoctoral scientists) needed to sustain a high level of productivity appropriate for the discipline; he/she might participate in one or more major multi-investigator projects. Speaking invitations at peer institutions and major national and international meetings or organizing workshops, appointment to advisory committees or working groups that produce published reports, or national honors and awards are other evidence of outstanding research stature.

Service

A rating of outstanding for service contributions is awarded for effective performance in service activities that are both time-consuming and significant. Activities might include a combination of: quality service on, or chairing, multiple active committees; dedicated service on, or chairing, an exceptionally demanding committee or committees; active participation in, or leading of, intramural centers and research units; service on demanding external review panels for governmental and community agencies; journal editorship and associate editorships; extensive community outreach activity; organizing a major meeting or workshop; administering major multi-investigator research or educational groups within the university; and active service on committees of professional organizations.

Score 2: Meritorious

Instruction/Mentoring

A meritorious evaluation in teaching would reflect, for example, one or several of the following measures: consistently excellent student evaluations in classroom teaching a; interest and involvement in new course development and teaching innovation; involvement of undergraduates in the research

experience;. Successful mentoring of graduate students who perform publishable or patentable research and graduate in a reasonable time, and of productive postdoctoral fellows, is viewed as meritorious.

Research

Meritorious performance in research is documented primarily by publications. Rating either numbers or quality of publications is a subjective matter and guidance will be sought as necessary in citation impacts, in reviews where available, in journal quality as appropriate for the discipline, and by using funding levels as evidence of a faculty member's evaluation by her/his peers external to SoLS. A sustained level of peer-reviewed major funding appropriate for the discipline is evidence that the quality and productivity of the research is externally acceptable to a knowledgeable peer group and is also viewed as intrinsically beneficial to graduate students involved in research. For participants in multi-investigator projects, the level of individual contribution will be taken into account in assessing merit. Successful patent activity may also constitute evidence of meritorious research performance. Speaking invitations or organizing workshops, or honors and awards are other evidence of a meritorious research stature.

Service

A rating of meritorious for service contributions is awarded for effective performance in service activities that might include one or more of the following: dedicated service on, or chairing demanding committee or committees; active participation in campus centers and research units; service on external review panels for government and community agencies; journal editorship; ad-hoc review for journals; community outreach activity; organizing a meeting or workshop.

Score 1: Satisfactory

This term is meant to imply a minimum of performance level that is not formally rated unsatisfactory and should be viewed as a level to be consistently surpassed.

Instruction/Mentoring

In teaching, a satisfactory performance level corresponds to acceptable, but not meritorious, performance documented by good student evaluation at the minimum course load and by acceptable progress towards degree completion of any graduate students mentored.

Research

In research, a satisfactory ranking would be appropriate if some research is pursued, as evidenced by publication in a peer-reviewed journal, minor funding from internal or external sources appropriate for the discipline, participation in multi-investigator proposals, or significant efforts to obtain funding by preparing and submitting research proposals.

Service

Satisfactory service consists of effectively serving on, for example, at least one committee at the SoLS, college or university level that is active and productive through the academic year.

Score 0: Unsatisfactory

Instruction/Mentoring

In teaching, an unsatisfactory rating would be given to a faculty member who consistently teaches less than his/her minimum load, as decided by the Director in consultation with the Faculty Leaders and communicated in writing to the faculty member.

An unsatisfactory rating would also be appropriate in cases where persistently poor performance in teaching was documented even though an acceptable minimum load was carried. Unsatisfactory performance ratings could result from one or more of the following:

- a) Consistently adverse student evaluations: Student input is an essential component of faculty assessment.
- b) Abandonment of assigned classes: Professional travel is an essential component of faculty activities; however, when such travel is necessary, disruption of the teaching process should be minimized. When travel to fulfill professional responsibilities is unavoidable during the semester, a faculty member's class should be covered, by prior arrangement, by another faculty member. Because it is SoLS policy to have classes taught only by approved faculty, classes should not be taught by a postdoctoral fellow or teaching assistant, unless prior approval of the Director is obtained, in writing. Repeated failure to obtain this approval would constitute unsatisfactory performance. Continuing failure to meet assigned classes without acceptable cause is unsatisfactory.
- c) Continuing refusal to involve students in research would be viewed as unsatisfactory in this aspect of faculty teaching activity.

Research

In research, a rating of unsatisfactory is appropriate where a faculty member makes little or no attempt to pursue research. Evidence of an attempt to pursue research is publication, or submission of a patent application, or seeking funding at any level from federal to internal university funds by writing proposals. Supporting research solely out of non-competitive SoLS funds other than for a brief interim period during a funding lapse may be considered unsatisfactory. Attempting to pursue research with no funding is considered detrimental to any graduate student involved in that research, and is unsatisfactory in the long term. Chronic lack of involvement of students in the research effort is viewed as counter to the central educational mission of the university and can adversely affect an otherwise favorable evaluation.

Service

Documented failure or refusal to perform assigned duties on a committee is unsatisfactory.

VII. SALARY ADJUSTMENTS: OTHER FACTORS

In recommending salary adjustments, the Director and Faculty Leaders may consider factors other than the performance evaluation, including:

- A. Salary compression and inversion within SoLS.
- B. Salaries below market.
- C. Contributions to university goals such as affirmative action and minority student recruitment.
- D. Discriminatory salary inequities that may exist or arise for individual faculty or groups of faculty.

VIII. DETERMINATION OF SALARY ADJUSTMENTS

In arriving at salary adjustments, the average of the weighted annual performance ratings for the last three years will be used. To the extent that it has discretion, SoLS will require a weighted three-year average performance score better than 1.0 for all types of salary increases, and scores must be at least satisfactory in each of the three areas of performance evaluation. The method of allocating available funds among the different performance levels will be determined by the Director, after consultation with the Faculty Leaders and the faculty. The nature of the allocation may change from time to time in response to specific SoLS goals and needs, and the amount of funding available. The Director may ask the Faculty Leaders/Executive Committee to develop or approve a specific allocation plan each year.

IX. NOTIFICATION OF PERFORMANCE LEVEL

The weighted annual performance score, together with individual scores in each of the three separate activities, will be provided to each faculty member. The Director, in consultation with the Faculty Leader, will also provide a separate annual performance evaluation in the form of a letter. This letter, together with the committee evaluation and the Annual Summary of Professional Activities and Achievements, will constitute a written record of the annual performance evaluation.

Either the Director or the faculty member may request a meeting to discuss the results of the evaluation. The sense of this discussion, including any comments that the faculty member may wish to add, will become part of the official written record if either party so desires. This discussion may address both past performance and expectations for future performance.

X. APPEALS

Appeals of the annual performance evaluations will be addressed in accordance with the CLAS Bylaws (Article VIII, Section B, part 3).

XI. IMPLEMENTATION

This Compensation and Evaluation Plan shall be effective upon approval by eligible voting members of SoLS in accord with the Bylaws, and the Director. A copy of the approved plan will be available on the SoLS intranet.