

## ACADEMIC MERIT REVIEW

### CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING MERIT IN RESEARCH

**Criteria** (Modified 1/23/2002, 4/17/2005, 5/12/2006 and 8/2/2012, Corrected 5/6/2013, Revised 12/30/14, 11/4/15, 6/23/16, 4/19/17, 12/19/18, 12/18/2023)

**Definition:** Includes extramurally funded research and institutionally funded research, with the associated publication and other related activity, and grant writing.

The Executive Committee of the Academic Merit Plan expects explicit and detailed documentation to determine “**Acceptable**” and “**Superior**” ratings. There may be achievements that have not been included in this list, and the Chair may also consider these other factors, including the long-term contributions of the faculty member and particular accomplishments in the research arena that fall outside the usual criteria of papers and grants.

**Effort:** For funded research, uses the research FTE. For unfunded research and grant-writing, the percentage of effort reported will be a decision reached between the chair/center director and the faculty member, based on a reasonable estimate of the commitment of time and, whenever possible, aligned with data (e.g., how many proposals submitted, scores, etc.). The CREATE profile will report the time actually allocated by payroll coding.

*The criteria listed below for the various ratings should be interpreted as reasonably firm guidelines. There is room for flexibility and discretion in balancing percent effort against those criteria.*

### **CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION**

Performance **Acceptable**

Meeting at least 2 of the following 3 goals is required for a rating of “**Acceptable**”:

R1. Faculty should have at least one sizeable funded extramural grant (NIH RO1, NSF, major segment of a P01, ACS, AHA, Alzheimers, Sloan, Donaghue, etc.). For anyone whose primary commitment is to research, a research award that permits one to staff and run a laboratory is extremely important.

R2. There must be evidence of continuing productivity as a senior/corresponding author in peer reviewed journals that would be judged to be of high caliber by a reasonable person with expertise in the relevant field. Alternatively, there must be evidence of collaborative support of other investigators as evidenced by identifiable contributions, such as co-authorship, on high quality peer reviewed publication(s) or listed as key personnel on an extramural research grant. Reasonable variability may occur in terms of the number of publications across years as a result of time required to complete research and as a result of publication schedules.

R3. In addition, scholarly activity can be evidenced by writing a book chapter(s), presentation of invited seminars or presentation of work at national/international meetings, reviewing grants and manuscripts, and service on an editorial board/study section can also factor into ratings on the adequacy of the research activities.

### Performance Superior

For a rating of “**Superior**” a faculty member should satisfy two or more of the following:

R4. Has two or more sizeable extramural grants as Principal Investigator.

R5. Significant contribution to three or more extramural research grants as a co-investigator or as key personnel.

R6. Has one or more papers as corresponding author, or multiple papers as a contributing author, in high impact journals (e.g., Nature, Science or Cell, NEJM, JAMA, or Lancet).

R7. Publishes significant papers in high quality, peer reviewed journals as senior/corresponding author

R8. Is awarded patent(s). This applies to patents awarded, not applied for.

R9. Organizes a symposium at a national/international meeting or organizes the meeting itself; elected officer in a national/international organization.

R10. Writes an invited review in a high-ranking journal.

R11. Is awarded a major prize for research.

R12. Serves as an editor for a highly ranked journal.

R13. Writes a book or monograph.

R14. Services on national study sections (NIH, NSF, American Cancer Society, etc.), national advisory groups and boards (includes advisory groups and boards of major research facilities and centers), or leadership positions in or election to prestigious national professional societies. Service on NIH, American Cancer Society, etc. study section.

R15. Mentoring UConn undergraduate(s) and/or UConn medical students, in a research experience in the faculty member's laboratory with evidence of success. \*\*

Reaching 1 goal would constitute “**Marginal**”, while failure to reach any of these goals would constitute “**Not Acceptable**”.

\*

\*\*\*This applies to patents awarded, not applied for.