INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

The purpose of the University-mandated Annual Increase for Faculty is to provide feedback and evaluate how well tenured/tenure-track and full time continuing contract faculty have carried out their academic responsibilities, including undergraduate and graduate teaching, research and scholarship, as well as service to the department and to the University. The review also forms the basis for determining annual salary increases. The faculty annual increase process is managed within Arts and Science and involves an official submission by the Chair to the Divisional Dean.

The ranking should consist of a formal and collegial process in which the Chair receives the guidance of an Advisory Committee duly appointed according to procedures communicated to the department’s faculty members. The Chair is welcome to serve on the Advisory Committee in an ex-officio capacity.

II. GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES

- **Annual Increase Procedures** - University policy requires that Deans' offices review and document all procedures, and later the allocation of the Annual Increase pools. Procedures will be reviewed annually, subject to Divisional Dean approval, and maintained in Arts and Science records.

- **Procedural Memoranda**
  Procedural memoranda must be kept on file with FAS Academic Appointments. Where applicable, there should be one each, for tenured/tenure-track and full time continuing contract faculty, who were appointed for the evaluation period (the previous calendar year). The deadline for submission of Faculty Annual Increase Procedural memoranda via e-mail to fas.academic.hr@nyu.edu is March 4, 2019.
- **Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty**
  - A description of how the Advisory Committee is to be formed (inclusive of names). The Chair is welcome to serve on the Advisory Committee in an ex-officio capacity.

  The standard methods used, A and B respectively (see below), afford the option to rank faculty into quintiles or by scoring a fixed number of points using a scale of 100. Regardless of the method selected, please provide an explicit weighting and rationale for the criteria that comprise each category used in the evaluation process. This should be inclusive of the relative treatment of (a) peer-reviewed monographs; (b) peer-reviewed journal articles; (c) peer-reviewed edited books; (d) non-peer-reviewed publications. To propose giving extra weight to a limited set of top peer-reviewed journals, please include a specific list with respective weights. Please explain the manner in which teaching and service will be treated with the same explicit weighting and rationale for each. In the event you propose to utilize Method B to evaluate faculty, with a subsequent conversion to Method A for the purpose of entering rankings, procedures should clearly reflect this approach.

  **Method A:** Faculty members are ranked into quintiles (i.e., equal fifths) based on specified criteria. This results in uniform percentage raises within each quintile and fixed intervals between quintiles.

  **Method B:** Faculty members are ranked by scoring performance using a fixed number of points for each criterion using a scale of 100 points, (e.g., scholarship, 50 points; teaching, 35 points; service, 15 points). Method B allows for finer distinctions and may be better suited to smaller departments in which the number of faculty is insufficient to achieve reasonable distribution using broad rankings.

- **Full Time Continuing Contract Faculty (excluding all categories of Visitors)**
  - A description of how the Advisory Committee is to be formed (inclusive of names). The Chair welcome to serve on the Advisory Committee in an ex-officio capacity.

  For Full Time Continuing Contract Faculty, **teaching must comprise a minimum of 60% of the total ranking weight.** The balance can be distributed to increase the teaching allocation (up to 100%), or to include service and/or professional development. Please provide an explicit weighting and rationale for the criteria selected regardless of the desired method (A or B respectively, below).

  **Method A:** Faculty members are ranked into quintiles (i.e., equal fifths) based on specified criteria. This results in uniform percentage raises within each quintile and fixed intervals between quintiles.

  **Method B:** Faculty members are ranked by scoring performance using a fixed number of points for each criterion using a scale of 100 points, (e.g., teaching at least 50 points, scholarship xx points, service xx points). Method B allows for finer distinctions and may be better suited to smaller departments in which the number of faculty is insufficient to achieve reasonable distribution using broad rankings.
We recognize certain continuing contract faculty, as well as faculty fellows, may have responsibilities that do not necessarily conform to the recommended method. Should you encounter such a scenario please partner with FAS Academic Appointments and your Divisional Dean to establish a suitable evaluation method.

**Important notes regarding ranking procedures**

- Please note that units may choose to allocate up to one third (1/3) of the departmental pools as a **cost of living allowance (COLA)**.

- All faculty must be evaluated using the approved ranking methodology for their respective classification. Uniform ranks applied across any given group, such as DGS/DUS will not be accepted.

- Jointly appointed faculty, inclusive of those serving at global sites, should be ranked by each department or program in which they hold an appointment. Departments and programs are asked to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of performance based on the same objective ranking scale applied to faculty fully appointed within a given unit. In the event of significant divergence between recommendations proposed by multiple departments or programs, chairs and directors will be invited to discuss the disparity with the Divisional Dean(s). The percentage of effort allocated to each unit is based on previously agreed upon splits.

- Visiting faculty of all categories are not eligible for annual increase. Should exceptional circumstances arise please include relevant details accompanying submission of procedural memoranda.

- Please propose a method of evaluation for faculty hired mid-year. Note the option to assign the median departmental ranking to faculty in this category.

- The Chair of the Advisory Committee must be a tenured faculty member.

- Chairs are free to record their own independent judgment regarding rankings. In the event such judgment diverges from of the evaluation agreed upon by the Advisory Committee, the variance should be explicitly noted.

**Deans Review/Approval of Procedural Memoranda**

The relevant Divisional Dean will review the “Faculty Annual Increase Procedure” memoranda, discuss any issues regarding the review process with the Chair as necessary, and then issue a written approval of the department’s procedures signaling the ranking process to begin.

**Submission of Rankings**

The **Faculty Annual Increase Ranking Roster/ Worksheet** listing all full-time faculty will be available to the Chair via the OASIS system (or paper-based upon request) and will be used to submit departmental rankings. Faculty annual increase rankings must be entered in OASIS by **April 5, 2019**. Though submission of a Chair’s memorandum is optional, Chairs may elect to do so in order to highlight special cases and/or department priorities for the
Deans. Memoranda should be sent to FAS Academic Appointments (fas.academic@nyu.edu) by April 5, 2019.

- **Verification of Rosters**
The information on the OASIS roster should be immediately reviewed. If corrections are warranted, please alert FAS Academic Appointments by e-mailing fas.academic.hr@nyu.edu. Corrections will be made promptly and subsequent roster certification will be requested periodically throughout the process.

- **Recording and submitting faculty annual increase data and rankings**
The department Chair will be prompted to send a letter instructing faculty to submit Personnel Record Supplement Forms and updated CV’s in early spring.

A copy of the Calendar Year 2018 Faculty Personnel Record Supplements and/or updated CV’s must be uploaded to OASIS along with the Faculty Annual Increase ranking recommendations.

The Chair should submit a memorandum when highlighting any significant cases or department priorities to the Divisional Dean.

- **Deans review/approval**
The Divisional Dean will review the Faculty Annual Increase Rankings to determine that both the unit’s procedures were followed, and that all categories of faculty performance (teaching, research, and service) were considered in the review. If the rankings are accepted, the Divisional Dean will issue a memorandum of approval.

- **Notifying faculty of annual increase rankings**
Upon approval, each faculty member should be notified by the Chair in writing of their ranking with a copy to the Divisional Dean.

The Chairs should meet with individual faculty members, particularly those at the assistant professor rank, to review the results of the department’s evaluations.

III. **ANNUAL INCREASES**

- **Pools**
Salary increases are funded by the Annual Increase (AI) pool which is a percentage of funds calculated based on the Arts and Science faculty salary budget and which are provided by the University. It is the practice of Arts and Science to divide the AI pools into Departmental Pools and a Dean’s Reserve. The majority of the AI pool is apportioned to the Departmental Pools and is allocated based on submitted rankings; the remainder is used to respond to extraordinary salary needs such as cases of promotion and retention that cannot be adequately addressed within the Departmental Pools. Please note that rankings are the mechanism by which salaries should be derived and the need for other adjustments is therefore expected to be minimal.
There is a good deal of flexibility in managing departmental pools. As noted above, a department must demonstrate that the overriding factor in allocating the departmental pools is ranking, however within this framework departments have leeway in managing funds. Each full-time faculty member should be evaluated on the basis of his or her activities during the previous calendar year according to the criteria listed in the department’s procedures.

Annual increases require the approval of the Office of the Provost, and involve a formal recommendation made by the Chair to the Divisional Dean and, in turn, a recommendation made by the Dean of the Faculty to the Provost.

- **Conversions**

  Following the University announcement regarding the AI pools, the rankings will be calculated and converted to percentages in OASIS for each faculty member according to the rankings and the department’s stated method of allocating the department pools. *Faculty should not yet be notified of their recommended Departmental Pool allocation.*

  *As a general reminder, Chairs are the only party privileged to converted ranking data (salary details). This information is not to be shared with any other party – including the Advisory Committee - as salary information is strictly confidential and should remain so.*

  Allocations from the Dean’s Reserve will be added to allocations from the Departmental Pool to determine the Annual Increase recommendation made to the Provost’s Office. The Annual Increase will be recorded in the Faculty Salary Worksheet in OASIS and the Chair will have one final opportunity to review the information. At this time, the ranking details for the Chair will be omitted from the Worksheet and addressed separately by the relevant Deans. *Notification of the proposed Annual Increase must remain confidential and should not be disseminated to faculty until the Dean of the Faculty notifies each faculty member in writing of their recommended Annual Increase and their recommended new salary for the following year in late summer.*

- **Appeals**

  According to Arts and Science guidelines, faculty members are free to appeal their ranking to their Divisional Dean. They may only appeal their ranking on the claim that the department’s Advisory Committee did not fully weigh their achievements and contributions for the period under review. The appeal should include whatever information the faculty member deems necessary to support his or her case and should be accompanied by relevant supporting documentation.

  Faculty members may not use the appeals process to seek response to competitive salary offers, to seek reconsideration of a prior salary commitment, to appeal salary levels, or for any other reason that is not based on the most recent ranking. All appeals submitted for any reason other than reconsideration of the ranking will be returned.
Faculty will be given the opportunity to appeal their ranking to the Divisional Dean within five days subsequent to their receipt of the Chair’s letter notifying them of their recommended ranking.

For all appeals received, a notification letter will be sent by the Divisional Dean to the faculty member with a copy to the Chair to confirm receipt of the appeal.

The Divisional Dean shall review the relevant materials, consult with the Chair and make independent inquiries as needed.

If the Divisional Dean determines that the faculty member has been incorrectly evaluated, the Divisional Dean will consult with the Chair to address any adjustments to the ranking that may be warranted.

Based on the adjustment of the ranking, FAS Fiscal Affairs will calculate what the departmental pool allocation would have been based on the revised ranking. An adjustment will be made to the faculty member’s recommended Annual Increase and a revised notification letter will be issued by the Dean of Arts and Science.

- **Annual Increase Letters**
  At the conclusion of the process, each faculty member will receive a salary notification letter from the Dean of FAS.

**SAMPLE LETTERS**

[Sample Letter to Faculty Requesting Submission of Faculty Personnel Record Supplement](#)
[Sample Letter Informing Faculty of Rankings](#)