

February 16, 2004

To: Grinnell Faculty Members

From: Executive Council

RE: Change in salary process

For the past three years the Executive Council has been discussing possible changes in the process by which faculty salaries are set. This discussion originated due to a number of factors. First, department chairs and the faculty Budget Committee have regularly worried that the current system of reviewing all faculty members each year is very time consuming and a drain on valuable faculty time. Second, concerns have been expressed that different Budget Committees have used different criteria and different systems for establishing the merit component of salary increases. In particular there have been concerns raised about the decision of some Budget Committees to exclude teaching as a component of merit for the purposes of establishing salaries. Third, it has been noticed that occasionally the recommendation of the Budget Committee for salary increase is at odds with the sense of the performance of a faculty member based upon the review by the Personnel Committee. It is important, particularly in the case of an untenured faculty member, that all messages from the college about performance be clear and consistent. The messages from the Budget Committee and the Personnel Committee should certainly not be at odds. In addition department chairs have complained at the inefficiency of preparing materials for a review of a faculty member and then having to prepare a second document (perhaps with a different form and different criteria) for the faculty Budget Committee.

As a result of the problems described above, at a faculty meeting in the fall of 2002 the Executive Council presented to the faculty a range of alternative ways of setting faculty salaries. At the end of a discussion, Mark Montgomery asked each person present to write their viewpoints on a number of issues on a piece of paper and to submit it to him. He reported to the Executive Council that the faculty overwhelmingly endorsed the principles that:

- The salary system be based upon merit
- The salary system consist of peer review (rather than being done administratively, as is the case at most liberal arts colleges)
- The reviews of salaries be done on a multi-year basis rather than annually

The Executive Council then developed a general set of guidelines for salary determination and presented them to the faculty in the spring of 2003. After a discussion, the faculty endorsed the Executive Council's suggestions and asked them to develop a specific proposal to implement the will of the faculty. That proposal is attached. We offer it to the faculty for consideration and the Executive Council will present it for approval at the faculty meeting on Monday, March 1, 2004. Please direct any questions or comments to Mark Montgomery or your division chair.

# **Proposal for Assessment of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service for Salary Review for Faculty Members in Regular Appointments--February 13, 2004**

The Grinnell College faculty has endorsed a merit-based salary system, in which merit is determined by peer review and conducted on a multi-year basis. This proposal complies with that endorsement and recommends that all salary reviews give due consideration to teaching, scholarship, and service and make salary recommendations to the Dean and the College and President.

## **Proposed Change in the Review Process**

The faculty Budget Committee is responsible for considering each year how the general salary pool should be allocated, and makes specific salary recommendations for individual faculty members. Typically the Budget Committee recommends a salary rating or ranking for each faculty member, which is then converted, in a separate determination, to an actual salary figure for that faculty. This proposal continues that process, but changes it from an annual to a multi-year review, thus allowing for more careful consideration of merit. Multi-year reviews are already conducted for untenured faculty and for tenured faculty seeking promotion to full to professor. Under the new system, those reviews would become part of the salary determination process, which is not currently the case. For other faculty in continuing positions, however, annual merit evaluations would be replaced by more extensive reviews on a three-year cycle. The rating a faculty member, junior or senior, receives in the review would be used for salary determination each year until the next review was conducted. The rating process will result in a salary merit rating on a scale of 1-5. This proposal anticipates that this system will include all faculty members in regular continuing appointments including all appointments in full-time or regular part time appointments in academic departments (including the library and PE) plus those in multi-year, but not regular appointments. It is not intended to cover faculty members in labs, or in other administrative appointments.

## **Category 1: Review of Instructors, Assistant Professors, and Lecturers**

Faculty members at the Instructor, Assistant Professor, and Lecturer ranks—those in regular positions in the first seven years at the college—are regularly reviewed by the Personnel Committee. Under the proposed system the Personnel Committee will, at the end of an interim, complete or tenure review, establish a rating for that faculty member according to the rating system used by the Budget Committee. In order to facilitate this process, the Personnel Committee will meet with the Budget Committee to review the process and rating system before the Personnel Committee commences reviews for the year. They may also meet together periodically as needed to pass on the specific ratings to the Budget Committee. The Chair of the Faculty can serve as a liaison since the Chair sits on both Committees. At the end of each review (or a series of reviews) the Personnel Committee will establish a rating for each faculty member reviewed.

## **Category 2: Associate Professors and Professors**

All faculty at the rank of Associate and Full Professor, whether tenured or not, will be reviewed for salary increases by the Faculty Budget Committee. The Committee or the Dean may choose to include other long-term faculty in Category 2 in unusual circumstances. The review may be conducted by the department Chair, another designated Associate Professor or Professor, or a team from the department. For instance a review of a very experienced faculty member might be assigned to another very experienced faculty member as opposed to a newly tenured and new Chair.

**Teaching.** The faculty member under review will prepare a 1-3 page document that summarizes teaching accomplishments, reflects on goals from the past three years and sets new goals for the next three. The department Chair or designee will sit in on one to three class sessions. Department Chair or designee will meet to review the goals and accomplishments and to review the end of course evaluations for the past three years. Additional information could be sought if needed or desirable.

**Scholarship.** The faculty member will prepare a list of scholarly accomplishments for the three-year period, annotate it with respect to their significance, and reflect upon past and future for scholarship. Scholarly accomplishments and goals will be reviewed in the discussion with the chair or designee.

**Service.** The faculty member will prepare an annotated list of service activities (both on and off campus) for the three-year period. This list will also be reviewed with the Chair or designee.

**Materials to Budget Committee.** The self-assessment document described above, along with the faculty member's extended FAR, will be sent to the Budget Committee together with a departmental report assessing teaching, service and scholarship. The Budget Committee will make a recommendation of a merit level (from 0-5) for the next three years. The Budget Committee will provide this information to the Dean and Chair along with a brief rationale for the merit level.

**Meeting with the Dean.** The Dean will meet with the faculty member and discuss the process, accomplishments, and goals. They will also discuss resources needed for the next several years to achieve those goals.

## **Implementation**

This multi-year system will formally commence in the 2004-05 academic year. The success of this system will depend on the Faculty Budget Committee having the time to consider carefully the reduced set of faculty under consideration. It is likely that this will be particularly true during the first couple of years of the system, so it seems unwise to attempt to maintain two systems in parallel. Since only one third of faculty will come up

for review in a given year, for the two transition years, it is still necessary to establish merit scores for approximately 90 faculty for salary recommendations done in 2004-2005, and for 45 faculty in 2005-2006. Merit scores from the previous two years (i.e. those established in 2002-2003 and 2003-2004) will be averaged to produce an interim merit score for those faculty. For extraordinary cases in which a given faculty member's merit score for those years is seen to not adequately reflect the true merit of that individual's performance, the Faculty Budget Committee will entertain an appeal from the department chair to reconsider that merit score; the appeal must first establish grounds for the inadequacy of the original merit score before the Budget Committee will re-evaluate the merit score. The resulting score of such a re-evaluation will then replace the original merit score, regardless of the direction of any change.

**Category 1.** All beginning faculty members will receive a standard raise until the time of their first review. The schedule of salary evaluations for Category 1 faculty members will be determined by their personnel review schedule. Once faculty members move to Category 2, their first review under the new system will occur three years after their last Category 1 review. The most recent Category 1 rating will be used until their review in Category 2.

**Category 2.** By the end of the 2003-04 academic year, each department will recommend a schedule for Category 2 faculty members in that department. The Budget Committee will consider those recommendations and suggest any needed alterations so that the approximately one third of the faculty members in Category 2 will be reviewed each year. In 2004-05, Category 2 faculty members scheduled for that year will be reviewed according to this procedure, and others will retain their previous merit score as described above. In 2005-06 those in Category 2 scheduled for that year will use the new process, and by 2006-07 the final third of the Category 2 faculty will be passed through the new system.