

### Proposed modification of the PEC evaluation process

The following recommendations for modifications to the PEC evaluation process are the result of the faculty discussions and reactions to the original set of proposed changes, dated July 5, 2013, from the PEC committee (Klaus Apel, Greg Martin & Eric Richards).

- There was significant support for the recommendation to shorten the window of evaluation to a single year, to match the frequency of review and the implicit understanding that annual evaluations measure and reward performance during the past twelve months, and form the basis for annual wage adjustments.
- Despite focusing the review to a single year, the PEC documents will still reflect activities and achievements from the past three years to provide a broader context for both the PEC and the President to take under consideration.
- The current five point scale (outstanding, exceeds expectation, meets expectation, needs improvement, unsatisfactory) will be retained.
- The current system of maintaining two independent assessments – one written by the PEC and one by the President will also be retained. The PEC may opt to provide a bullet point list rather than a written narrative. In either case, this information from the PEC will be provided to the PL as is the current practice.
- The current post-tenure review trigger will remain unchanged: two consecutive years with an overall rating of “unsatisfactory”.
- Evaluations on the five-point scale will be assigned for each of the four evaluation subcategories with the following weighting:
 

<u>Tenure &amp; Tenure-track faculty</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 30% Productivity</li> <li>○ 30% Funding</li> <li>○ 10% Impact/Visibility</li> <li>○ 30% Service</li> </ul>	<u>Non-tenure-track faculty</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 40% Productivity</li> <li>○ 40% Funding</li> <li>○ 5% Impact/Visibility</li> <li>○ 15% Service</li> </ul>
--	--
- The President’s narrative and scoring for all evaluations will be shared with the PEC to allow the committee to provide the President with feedback before the evaluations are finalized.
- Faculty who participate on the PEC committee will be evaluated by the President using the criteria and evaluation system outlined above.

Description of evaluation criteria

Productivity:

Productivity encompasses publications (including research reports in peer-reviewed journals, invited reviews, methods papers, book chapters), creation and curation of databases, research interfaces or software, and the development of intellectual property. In evaluating these products of research, the PEC will consider both quality and quantity.

Funding:

The Funding category focuses on the acquisition of extramural funding and the PEC will assess the nature and level of external support.

Impact / Visibility:

Impact corresponds to assessment of rank among peer scientists and the overall importance of research contributions. Visibility reflects the prominence and frequency of the PL's contributions at scientific conferences, as well as interactions with colleagues at other institutions.

Service:

Accomplishments within and contributions to the scientific community, the Institute, and Cornell are important secondary criteria, as are science outreach activities.