

Understanding the Quadrennial Review Process

Cynthia Masison, PhD, OSP, CCR, NCI



Quadrennial Review

Retrospective performance review every 4 years
Standardized to fairly evaluate Staff Scientists/Staff Clinicians
despite various roles-Title 42G, Title 5/Title 38 and
Commissioned Corps

Functions of Quad review:
evaluate continuation/placement
determine salary adjustment
track allocation of personnel resources

Performance Review

- Site Visit Review—Site Visit Committee and Board of Scientific Counselors
- Quadrennial Review—all Staff Scientists and Staff Clinicians not reviewed at Site Visits
 - Staff Clinicians: Panel composed of Deputies, Lab Chiefs and PIs (9 panel members-7 SC)
 - Staff Scientists: Promotion Review Panel and Deputies (16 -18 panel members-46 SS)

Quad Review

Performance is measured in the following categories

Staff Clinicians

- Patient care responsibilities and specialized clinical skills
- % effort: clinical service, research, administration, training, teaching, mentoring, supervising
- Scientific productivity and presentations
- Collaborations/core activities
- Role in development and execution of clinical protocols
- Participation in the scientific community
- Consults with other branches and/or institutes
- Awards and board certification(s)

Staff Scientists

- Scientific productivity
- Collaborations
- Presentations
- Teaching/mentoring
- Participation in the scientific community
- Continuing education/training
- Awards
- Core facilities or Admin positions are evaluated based on their contributions to users' projects, not necessarily as pubs

Start to Finish

September-April

- By mid-September an email is sent to each SS/SC and their PI/Supervisor
- **Information Session for PIs**
- Package deadline to the CCR ARC is in December
- Packages reviewed for completeness and assembled for reviewers- Geoffrey Kidd handles SC review
- SS-Reviewers assigned in January
- Individual Reviews collected prior to Quad Review Meeting
- SS Quadrennial Review in March
- In April the review results sent to SS, PI and AO
- SS and/or PI is given 2 weeks to respond to the review (included in final package)
- Complete SS packages are sent back to the CCR ARC

Staff Clinician Quad Package

Date:

Name:

Position Title: Choose an item.

Laboratory/Branch:

Date of Last Quadrennial Review (if applicable):

Requesting Associate Research Physician titling (if applicable): Yes No

The function of this review is to look at the productivity and performance of the staff clinician. Performance is measured against the criteria listed below. Please address the following criteria, each under a separate heading, including your assessment of the staff clinician's performance.

If requesting Associate Research Physician titling, please [review the guidance](#) for professional titling and ensure the criteria are adequately addressed.

Note: Senior Research Physician titling must be requested separately from quadrennial review.

1. Patient care responsibilities and specialized clinical skills.
2. % effort in the following five categories: Clinical and Consult Service; Clinical Research; Administrative Duties; Supervisory/Training/Mentoring; Other; the percentages should = 100%.
3. Provide an updated list of clinical protocols to include information on type (treatment or natural history), accrual, and your specific role in the trial as a Principal or Associate Investigator, and the role played in each protocol.
4. A description of any intramural clinical and scientific collaborations.
5. Intramural activities (e.g. participation in faculties, working groups, advisory boards, committees).
6. Scientific productivity (e.g., publications).
7. Scientific presentations (e.g., invited talks at meetings, universities or intramural).
8. Extramural activities (e.g., editorial boards, cooperative groups, scientific societies, meeting organization).
9. Mentoring and teaching.
10. Board Certification(s).
11. Awards and other accomplishments.

The branch/laboratory chief or designee will spend about 5-10 minutes at the review meeting describing the role of the staff clinician in their branch/program.

For more information contact:

Geoffrey Kidd

<https://nciconnect.nci.nih.gov/sites/CCR/HR/FTE/Shared%20Documents/StaffClinicianChecklistQuadReview.pdf>

Staff Scientist Quad Review Package

Packages include:

Checklist (can be found at:

<https://nciconnect.nci.nih.gov/sites/CCR/HR/FTE/Pages/Staff-Scientist.aspx>)

Standardized Recommending memo from PI

**At least 2 letters of recommendation from collaborators (can
have more 2-4)**

Standardized CV and bibliography

BSC Recommendations

**Staff Scientist Quadrennial Review
Recommender Checklist**

Date:

Name:

Position Title:

Laboratory/Branch:

Name of PI/Supervisor:

Date of Last Quadrennial Review (if applicable):

Functions of this review are to look at continuation/placement of the Staff Scientist/CORE Facility Manager, possible salary adjustment, and to enable the SD to report to the BSC on allocation of these personnel resources. The quality of the Senior Investigator's laboratory is reviewed by the BSC, including the resources for support of Staff Scientists/CORE Facility Managers who are assigned to the Senior Investigator. Presentation of IC reviews of Staff Scientists / CORE Facility Managers to the BSC are at the discretion of the SD or at the request of the BSC. Performance is measured against the following elements: scientific productivity, interactions with other scientists, other achievements, and evidence of being up-to-date scientifically and technically as outlined by the employee and confirmed in letters of reference. Measures of performance include publications, collaborations, awards, presented lectures, course work, mentoring/teaching, participation in Special Interest Groups, etc.

Check items below that best describe the role of the Staff Scientist in your group (check as many as apply):

- Bench scientist
- Lab manager
- Bioinformatics specialist
- Facility Head/Core Manager
- Training/Mentoring
- Other (please explain)

Check items below that are covered in accompanying memo, where applicable, include as many as you can:

- Staff Scientist's role
- Scientific productivity
- Presentations
- Participation in special interest groups
- Mentoring/Teaching
- Tech Transfer, involvement in GMP production, regulatory GRP approval procedures, INDs, etc.
- Collaborations
- Continuing Education
- Awards
- Significant achievements
- Core activity and list of users/collaborators

Signature of Supervisor

Date

Attach accompanying letter to this sheet. Your letter should address the role of the Staff Scientist in the Branch/Lab/Core and should outline the Staff Scientist's: scientific productivity (e.g. publications, MTAs, patents, etc.), scientific presentations, participation in special interest groups, technology transfer, involvement in GMP production, regulatory GRP approval procedures, collaborations, mentoring/teaching, continuing education, awards and other significant achievements. For Facility Head/Core Managers please

**Staff Scientist Quadrennial Review
Recommendation Form**

Address the criteria below. Remove any that do not apply. A letter may be substituted for the form but should address as many of the categories listed below as possible. Delete this instruction prior to submission

Date:

Name:|

Staff Scientist's role

Dr. ~~Xxxxx~~...

Scientific productivity

Scientific Presentations

Participation in special interest groups

Mentoring/Teaching

Tech Transfer, involvement in GMP production, regulatory GRP approval procedures, INDs, etc.

Collaborations

Continuing Education

Awards

Significant achievements

Core activity and list of users/collaborators

Quad Review Package

Packages include:

Checklist

Standardized Recommending memo from PI

At least 2 letters of recommendation from collaborators

(can have more 2-4)

Standardized CV and bibliography

BSC Recommendations

Quad Review Package

Packages include:

Checklist

Standardized Recommending memo from PI

At least 2 letters of recommendation from collaborators (can have more 2-4)

Standardized CV and bibliography

BSC Recommendations

Ranked on a scale from 1-9, where 1-3 outstanding, 4-6 excellent, 7 good, 8 marginal (borderline) and 9 unsatisfactory.

Review Process for Staff Clinicians

- The Review Panel consists of 9 CCR PI's.
- The Lab/Branch Chief has a 5 minute discussion with the Panel describing the role of the SC in their Branch/Laboratory.
- Panel meets between February-March.
- The SC and Branch/Lab Chief will receive their score [Outstanding:1-1.9, Excellent:2.-2.9, Good:3-3.9, Satisfactory:4-4.9, Unsatisfactory:5].
- The scores are sent back to the ARC (for personnel actions). A rating of Excellent or below requires submission of a one time Expectation Plan. A rating of Good requires a one year re-review.

Review Process For Staff Scientists

The Review Panel consists of the 12 Promotion Review Panel Members (responsible for initial SS appointments) and Deputies.

- Packages are reviewed independently.
 - Scale from 1-10: 1-3 Outstanding; 3.1-3.5 Outstanding-Excellent; 3.6-3.9 Excellent-Outstanding; 4-6 Excellent; 6.1-6.5 Excellent-Good; 6.6-6.9 Good-Excellent; 7-9 Good; 9.1-10 Unsatisfactory(borderline)
 - Generally very good concordance among reviewers.
- Panel meets in March and report emailed to the SS and their PI/Supervisor by the end of April.
- The scores are sent back to the ARC (personnel actions). If a SS receives a Quad rating of “Good/Unsatisfactory” (score above 7) – Terminal one-year renewal is processed OR one-year renewal with a Quad re-review in two years. The appointment renewal may need to be more than one year depending where the employee’s appointment Not-To-Exceed (NTE) date falls with the next Quad cycle.

Appeal Process

- Once the SS receives their review the SS and/or their PI/Supervisor have two weeks to submit a response.
- The response **will not** change the final ranking but will be included in the package and taken into account in all personnel actions (e.g. renewals, pay adjustments).
- Why did I get a lower score than anticipated?
 - Most common problem is a poorly put together package
 - Role of the SS is not clear
 - Extenuating circumstances not discussed in package
 - Productive but not involved in the scientific community