

BOYCE THOMPSON INSTITUTE

POLICY: Annual Review – Faculty/Scientist

DATE: October 10, 2001

OVERVIEW

Comprehensive performance evaluations are completed annually for all faculty/scientists by September. The objectives of the annual review are 1) to identify performance successes and problems and 2) to formulate meaningful research and career development plans. The annual review provides the scientist with regular and timely feedback on his or her performance with respect to the expected standard of accomplishment for their appointment level, and also evaluates the faculty member's standing for future promotion. The President may waive the annual evaluation under special circumstances such as sabbatic leave and family or medical leave.

BTI is a research institution and its criteria for performance evaluation emphasize accomplishment in research. Publications in prestigious peer-reviewed journals, acquisition of funding and rank among peer scientists are the primary criteria for promotion and evaluation. Accomplishments within and contributions to the scientific community, the Institute, and Cornell are important criteria, but secondary to those directly to research.

An overall rating will be given based on the annual review. The possible ratings are exceptional, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, needs improvement, and unsatisfactory. An evaluation of unsatisfactory in two consecutive years will trigger a formal post-tenure review of a tenured faculty member.

PROCEDURE

Research and tenure track faculty are evaluated by the **Performance Evaluation Committee (PEC)**. The PEC is comprised of three tenured Institute scientists, including the Vice President for Research, one elected by the faculty and one appointed by the President. The latter two serve staggered two-year terms. Only scientists with performance ratings of "meets expectations" or higher are eligible to serve.

The President evaluates each faculty member in parallel. Upon receipt of the PEC's evaluation, the President is responsible for writing a summary evaluation, taking both into account. The President meets with each faculty member to discuss the performance evaluation. This evaluation is signed by both the

President and the faculty member and is placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

Documents Provided by Faculty Members

In June of each year, faculty members submit an updated resume and a "Statement of Accomplishments and Development" to the PEC.

The resume is prepared in a standard format using the sections listed below and covers the past 3 years. Evaluation of this broader record of performance will allow the PEC to place the current year's accomplishments in context. All information must be separated by year.

1. Current Position
2. Laboratory Personnel
3. Publications: Peer-Reviewed Articles
4. Publications: Invited Reviews, Symposium articles, patents, etc.
5. Invited seminars or symposium talks (More than 20 minutes)
6. Poster presenter and/or short (Less than 20 minutes) talks
7. Current and pending support (total costs may be used). Particulars of proposals written but not funded may be included to show effort.
8. Honors and Awards
9. Internal (BTI/Cornell) Activities: (Examples: Committee Chair or Member, Teaching, Graduate Student Minor Committee Member)
10. External (off-campus) Activities: (Examples: Editorships, Committees, Panels, Service as *Ad Hoc* Reviewer, Conference Organizer, public service, media interactions, outreach)

The "Statement of Accomplishments and Development" has two components. The accomplishment statement highlights progress in the past year and provides the PEC with an overview of activities in the scientist's laboratory. In addition to the major projects and accomplishments, this statement should emphasize new, high-risk, or unfunded initiatives. The development statement expresses the scientist's view of the future of his or her research over the next three years. It may reflect research and professional transitions the scientist anticipates in response to changes in their field of discipline, or proactively to influence their discipline. The development statement should provide clear insight to the scientist's plans and is an important component of the evaluation. Both components should not exceed two pages.

PEC Evaluation

The PEC evaluates each scientist's performance using the following weighted primary and secondary criteria, as well as other performance issues raised during the PEC meeting. Primary criteria include publications in prestigious peer-reviewed journals, acquisition of funding, and information in the Statement

of Accomplishment and Development. In evaluating publications, the PEC will consider both quality and quantity, while for funding it will assess the nature and level of external support. Secondary criteria include internal and external non-research activities. There may be circumstances under which extraordinary accomplishments under secondary criteria would be more positively weighed against lesser accomplishments under primary criteria. Thus, the weighing is only a guideline for the PEC.

Weighting of Performance Criteria: For tenure-track or long-term contract track scientists, primary criteria will be weighted at 70% and secondary criteria at 30%. For the research scientist track, primary criteria will be weighted at 85% and secondary criteria at 15%. The PEC may choose to assign a score for each candidate, or use other appropriate methods to arrive at a rating and recommendation for an increase in salary.

Documentation of Evaluation: The PEC prepares a written summary of its deliberations, and meets with the President to discuss each person's evaluation no later than August 1 of each year. These comments include recommendations on the scope, vision, and prospects of the scientist's plan for research and professional development. The PEC will also rank the scientists being evaluated to aid the President in allocating funds that are available for salary actions. The PEC documentation will be maintained separately in the Human Resources office. The PEC documentation will not be part of the faculty member's personnel file.

President's Evaluation: The President conducts his/her independent evaluation of each faculty member based on the criteria identified above. After receiving the PEC evaluation, the President, taking into account his/her independent evaluation and the recommendations of the PEC, prepares a written statement for each faculty member, summarizing the strengths and the areas needing further development. The President then meets with each faculty member to discuss his or her performance. The evaluation will be signed by both the President and the faculty member and placed in the faculty member's personnel file. Faculty members may retain a copy for their own files.

In general, oral or written reviews for scientists receiving evaluations of meets expectations or better will be relatively brief. Reviews for scientists receiving ratings of "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory" will be more comprehensive with emphasis on areas that need improvement and on establishing an effective development plan. Where relevant, the President must insure that the scientist understands the possibility of triggering a post-tenure review and the significance of such a review.