

Research Core Facility NTTF Merit Policy

May 27, 2014

Including: Animal Care Services; Aquatic Animal Care Services; Bowerman Sports Science Clinic; Center for Advanced Materials Characterization in Oregon; Center for Assessment, Statistics, and Evaluation; Genomics and Cell Sorter Facility; Lewis Center for Neuroimaging; and Transgenic Mouse Facility.

RIGE Research Core Facilities (RRCF) are governed by a single merit increase policy. The purpose of this document is to describe the process and criteria for awarding merit increases in the Core Facilities. The RRCFs will have two processes: a unified merit process for all Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF), and an independent merit process for all Officers of Administration (OA). Each merit process will be governed separately by RIGE merit policies. OA merit policies are described elsewhere.

Basis for Merit Evaluation of NTTF

The Core Facility directors/managers will base their merit increase recommendation on the performance of the faculty member. 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. 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 annually as needed at the conclusion of each performance evaluation meeting. All eligible faculty employees will be evaluated for merit; they may not opt out.

The merit evaluation will be based on three to four metrics that reflect the most important core professional responsibilities as described in a faculty member's job description. The following principles will be embedded in these metrics as relevant to the individual series and rank:

- Positions in the **Research Professor** series should include metrics that are field-calibrated areas such as number of professional products or outcomes (peer reviewed publications in high quality journals, books published, white papers produced); active and notable participation in professional communities (presentations, posters, state/national professional committees, journal editorial board service), number of submissions for external support for research projects; number of active awards managed, and/or impact of professional work on the field/profession/public policy.
- Positions in both the **Research Associate** and **Postdoctoral Fellow** series should include metrics related to expertise in relevant research techniques and tools; engagement in discovery/analysis/outreach; involvement in dissemination of findings; engagement in proposal submissions; and success in meeting outcomes/deliverables of assigned projects. Where Research Associates are expected to be PIs and co-PIs on sponsored projects, there should be metrics much like the ones expected of Research Professors.
- Positions in the **Research Assistant** series should include metrics that are related to defined and measurable research, outreach and/or technical assistance activities as

defined in the job description. If Research Assistant positions include managerial responsibilities, metrics related to outcomes of the unit managed or project supervised should be included. In some cases, metrics found in the above two classifications around research outcomes and research productivity should be included.

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 or disciplinary actions.

Evaluation Process

The Research and Innovation Associate Vice Presidents or their designees will notify directors/managers via email with information about the timelines for conducting merit evaluations, and the period to be covered in any given review. The directors/managers will provide this information to the NTTF's in their unit.

The NTTF will provide their supervisor with:

1. **Complete updated CV**
2. **A report of activity.** The report must include:
 - A statement of each evaluation metric.
 - A description or listing of activities performed that contributed to the accomplishment of that metric.

The supervisor will provide the core facility director/manager with:

1. A current job description.
2. All the documents provided by the faculty member.
3. Completed, signed evaluation form.

The documents provided by the NTTF and the supervisor will be placed in the employee's personnel file.

After completing the individual's annual performance review, in years where the University has made merit raises available, the supervisor will give NTTF 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. Supervisors will communicate NTTF ratings to their facility director/manager. Facility directors/managers may consult with their Faculty Advisory Committee and use that information to make final rankings. Regardless of type of appointment or FTE, each faculty member who is eligible for merit increase 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:	X%
(4) Exceeds Expectations:	2X%
(5) Exceptional Performance:	3X%

where X is a number that is determined the facility directors/manager based on the pool in any given year. Within each performance category, directors/managers may award a range of increases around the mean (X, 2X, 3X) to reflect smaller differences in merit in any given rating category.

Core Facility Director/Manager Recommendations

Each core facility director/managers will discuss the evaluations, determine the range of increases for categories 3, 4, and 5, and then propose specific raises for each member. Then directors/managers will come together to ensure that merit is awarded equitably across the units. Given that some supervisors review a single employee while others supervise many NTTF, this process is designed to ensure that scaling of ratings is similar across supervisors and across facilities.

The director/manager will make recommendations for increases for the NTTF who are eligible to the Vice President for Research. Merit increases are subject to approval by the Vice President for Research and the Provost. The actual amount of an individual's increase will be based on funding available in the unit's merit pool established by the University.

Notification of Merit Increase Decisions

The core facility directors/manager will notify NTTF of merit increase decisions after they have been approved by VPRI and Academic Affairs.