Faculty Merit Increase Policy, Oregon Center for Optics

The Center Director, in consultation with the Center's Leadership Committee, will base his/her merit increase recommendation on the performance of the faculty member. The formal annual performance evaluation should reflect the observations and decisions on an individual's work and ability to meet expectations and, the merit increase decisions should be reflected in 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 conducted post-evaluation time but before the merit increase period. Merit evaluations and other criteria will be documented and placed 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.

All faculty must be evaluated for merit. Faculty are not permitted to opt out of evaluation. Regardless of the type of appointment of FTE, each faculty member is eligible for consideration for the highest merit rating.

In determining a faculty member's performance, his/her supervisor(s) will consider the faculty member's primary responsibilities, as outlined in his/her job description. 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. Job descriptions will be reviewed and updated as needed annually. Each faculty member will submit a current CV that will be used as part of the performance review and in the merit increase consideration.

After completing the individual's annual performance review, in years where there is a merit pool and process established by the institution, the supervisor(s) 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.

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:	a-b%
(4) Exceeds Expectations:	b-c%
(5) Exceptional Performance:	c+%

The Leadership Committee will meet with the supervisors to discuss and quantify merit increase levels 3, 4, and 5 and to map ratings to merit increase. Given that some supervisors review a single employee while others supervise many faculty, this process is designed to ensure that scaling of ratings is similar across supervisors. The actual amount of an individual's increase will be based on funding available in the unit's merit pool established by the University. The percentages represented by the letters above (a-c+) will be determined by the director, with input from the Center's Leadership Committee once the merit pool information is established by the institution.

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. Merit increases are subject to approval by the Vice President for Research and the Provost.

Metrics/Criteria for Evaluation by Rank Series:

- **Research Professor appointment series:** Research Professors will be expected to perform research-related activities with the same productivity of tenure related faculty. This productivity should be quantified using the following metrics: number of professional products per year (e.g., peer-reviewed publications in high quality journals, books, curricula, research or program evaluation reports, technical manuals), active participation in appropriate professional communities (e.g., conference/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 MSI . Number of 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/Postdoc appointment series**: The expectation is to perform research-related activities that would result in a number of professional products per year (e.g., peer-reviewed publications in high quality journals, books, curricula, research or program evaluation reports, technical manuals), active participation in appropriate professional communities (e.g., conference/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. Some Research Associates might also be 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 coauthored (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:** Graduate students in the OCO are sometimes referred to as research assistants. This series refers to technical research staff, not graduate students. A Research Assistant 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 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 unit leadership positions.