

Annual Performance evaluation Process, Spring 2023 (Evaluating period Calendar Year 2022)

Dean's Office, Tandon School of Engineering

3/1/2023

4/3/2023 (Revised some deadlines)

4/18/2023 (Revised some deadlines and editorial changes)

The proposed process is informed by the FAS process:

<https://as.nyu.edu/administrative-resources/office/human-resources-administration/academic-appointments/faculty-merit-rankings.html>

The process this year is similar to the last year, with only dates changed. However, the FAR is submitted through Interfolio 180, instead of using manually submitted documents.

AMI will depend on performance ratings. The mapping will depend on the university approved average AMI percentage and the AMI pool for the entire school.

Performance ratings range from 1 to 5. (1: significantly below expectations, 2: below expectations; 3: meet expectations; 4 exceed expectations; 5 significantly exceed expectations)

AMI Process:

1. FEC forms a Faculty Advisory Committee for Annual Performance Review.
2. Faculty submit FARs to chairs by 4/7 through Interfolio 180. Dean's office will make the FARs available to faculty advisory committee to be formed by FEC.
3. Chairs prepare the "Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation Procedure" memoranda that describe the process and criteria to be used for determining the rating of each performance component (research, teaching, service), and the weighting among these components. For the research component, the memo should describe how publications, funding, and Ph.D. student mentoring are jointly considered. For publication, describe how do you consider the "quality" of journals and conferences. Please describe separate criteria for the T-faculty and C-faculty, respectively. These should be submitted to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs (AD) for review by 3/20.
4. The Dean, AD will review the procedural memoranda, discuss any issues regarding the proposed review process with the chair as necessary. The chairs will submit revised memoranda if applicable for approval by the Dean. Deadline for approval of the final version: 3/31.

5. Chairs perform performance evaluation of their faculty based on the submitted FARs and other interactions with the faculty. 4/7-4/24.
6. Chairs present their criteria for performance ratings and ratings for individual faculty at a Chairs meeting with Dean and AD, and the faculty advisory committee. The Dean, AD, and the advisory committee may suggest changes during the meeting and/or within the following week and discuss with the chairs to agree on the final performance ratings. The performance ratings will be finalized by 5/7.
7. Chairs meet with each faculty, informing them their performance rating and rationale and hearing the response from the faculty. Chairs should also convey the future expectations (be specific if you think certain areas needs to be improved). The chair may inform the entire faculty the criteria used before hand through an email communication (e.g. by sharing the approved performance evaluation procedure memo, or a condensed version). Note that Chairs are required to meet with their tenure-track faculty to provide feedback about their annual performance as well as overall progress towards tenure according to NYU policy. Deadline 5/26.
8. In extraordinary cases, after the meeting with their faculty, if a Chair agrees that the performance evaluation of a faculty is not a correct reflection of the faculty's performance, the Chair may submit request to the AD to adjust the performance rating of selected faculty. The faculty may also appeal to the AD directly about their performance ratings if they were not satisfied after their meeting with their Chair. Any such changes should be submitted to the AD by 5/31. The Dean/AD/Chair/Faculty committee will discuss and finalize the performance rating by 6/4.
9. Chairs may also recommend special raise for faculty whose current salary is significantly low relative to their performance. Deadline 5/26.
10. AMI pool is expected to be announced in early June. Based on the AMI pool of the school, the Dean and AD will determine a mapping between the performance rating and the AMI. The mapping depends on whether special raises and promotion raises need to be within the AMI pool.
11. For promotion raise, the university has recently required that the promotion raise should not be less than the larger of 1) 7.5% plus Annual Merit Increase OR 2) 10% inclusive of Annual Merit Increase. At Tandon, for this year, we plan to give 10% in addition to AMI raise. Note that in the past, we have been giving fixed amounts for the promotion, in addition to the AMI. We have decided to adopt the simple percentage model, moving forward, so that it is easier to guarantee the compliance with the policy on the minimum promotion raise. Also, we choose to go beyond the minimal requirement, given that Tandon faculty salary is "known" to be lower than some other schools in NYU, especially at the higher ranks.

12. The AMI will be finalized based on the performance ratings by mid June, including any special raises and promotion raises.
13. The proposed AMI will be submitted to the Provost for approval (sometimes in June). Provost approval is expected in Early August.
14. All faculty will be informed of their new salary effective of 9/1/23 by mid August.
15. For faculty with a joint appointment among multiple units in Tandon, the chairs/director of the jointly appointed units should both review the FAR of the faculty and meet to discuss the performance rating for the faculty. The proposed performance rating and if applicable special raise for the faculty and rationale should be submitted by the Chair of the primary unit. In the event of significant divergence between the chairs of the units, chairs will be invited to discuss the disparity with the Dean or AD. Once the performance rating is finalized, the Chairs/Director should meet together with the faculty for feedback if possible.
16. For faculty with primary joint appointment in units outside Tandon, they submit their FARs to the primary unit. The Chair should request a copy from the faculty for their own assessment. The Chair could discuss with the primary unit's chair to determine their recommended performance rating for the faculty and submit their proposed performance ratings to Tandon AD. Once the mapping from the performance rating to AMI is determined, the AD would contact their counter part in the primary unit about Tandon's recommended AMI. The final AMI for these faculty would generally be based on the weighted average of AMI recommended by each unit, with weights equal to the appointment split. For faculty with secondary joint appointment in units outside Tandon (i.e. their primary unit is Tandon), the process reverse. These faculty submit their FARs through Tandon. For the performance feedback, the Tandon Chair should preferably meet with the faculty together with the Chair of the other unit(s) if possible; if not, the Tandon Chair should meet with the faculty individually.

Guidelines for Performance Rating:

Performance ratings: 1: significantly below expectations, 2: below expectations; 3: meet expectations; 4 exceed expectations; 5 significantly exceed expectations.

Performance rating = Weighted average of ratings for (1) research, (2) teaching, and (3) service, each with range 1 to 5.

- Required criteria for research include: (1) publications, (2) funding, and (3) mentoring of PhD students; (4) recognition/awards from the past year. Additional optional criteria may be included with rationale and approved by the AD.

- Required criteria for teaching include (1) teaching evaluations, (2) curriculum innovation, and (3) mentoring of MS, BS, K-12 students; Additional optional criteria may be included with rationale and approved by the AD.
- Required criteria for service include: (1) internal (department, school) service, (2) outside (professional community) service and (3) IDBE activities. Additional optional criteria may be included with rationale and approved by the AD.

Each chair can determine their own weightings for these three major components for T-faculty and C-faculty respectively, following the school-wide guideline below. The chair could choose to use different weightings for faculty depending on their activity distribution between research, teaching and service. Furthermore, the chair should determine how to evaluate each component. These should be documented in the submitted Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation Procedure memoranda.

Guidelines for Determining the Weighting for Different Performance Components:

Recommended weightings for different components

T-faculty:

- Research: 0.3-0.6
- Teaching: 0.3-0.6
- Service: 0.1-0.3

Example:

- TT faculty and Tenured faculty with high research activity and teaching load of 2 not due to service: 0.6 for research, 0.3 for teaching, 0.1 for service
- Tenured faculty with average research activity, average teaching load, and no significant service assignment: 0.5 for research, 0.4 for teaching, 0.1 for service
- Tenured faculty with low research activity, higher teaching load, and no significant service assignment: 0.3 for research, 0.6 for teaching, 0.1 for service
- Tenured faculty with significant service (e.g. program director):
 - 0.4 for research, 0.3 for teaching, 0.3 for service (for average research activity)
 - 0.3 for research, 0.4 for teaching, 0.3 for service (for low research activity)

C-faculty:

- Teaching: 0.7-0.9
- Service: 0.1-0.3
- For C-faculty with reduced teaching load and expected research activities as specified in the appointment letter: the weighting for teaching can be reduced to account for research performance.

Example:

- C-faculty with teaching load of 6 courses, without special service assignment: 0.9 for teaching, 0.1 for service

- C-faculty with special service assignment (e.g. program directors): 0.7 for teaching, 0.3 for service
- C-faculty with teaching load of 4 courses plus research, without special service assignment: 0.3 for research, 0.6 for teaching, 0.1 for service