

THE DEAN OF FACULTY'S ANNUAL SALARY SETTING PROCESS

- I. The annual budget process at the College includes the establishment of a salary pool for the faculty.
 - A. Beginning in the fall semester, the Dean regularly consults with the Committee on Budget and Finance, and the Vice President for Administration and Finance, regarding the overall College budget, including the salary pool.
 - B. In late February or early March, the Dean consults with the Associate Dean of Faculty for Institutional Research and Assessment on comparative faculty salary data (rank among selected peer institution group by average salary in each rank; Physical Education data not available) and, when they become available, reports them to faculty.
 - C. In March, the College budget comes before the Board of Trustees for approval. When approved, estimates of relative distribution of available pool to each rank, based upon progress to general salary goals (middle 5 ranks of 25-peer institution group, i.e., 11–15th rank) are made in consultation with Associate Dean of Faculty for Institutional Research and Assessment and Assistant Dean for Budget and Finance.

General salary goals for Physical Education faculty are determined in consultation with the Director of Athletics with a view to maintaining competitiveness with peer institutions. Physical Education faculty are eligible for merit raises.

- II. Salaries of tenure-track and tenured faculty are adjusted annually based on merit. Faculty doing satisfactory work, continuing visitors, and faculty in non-tenure-track positions can expect to receive a modest raise outside the merit evaluation.
 - A. Determination of Merit
 1. Merit is established based on the annual review process <https://my.hamilton.edu/offices/dof/faculty-reviewdevelopment/guidelines-for-review-process> and the department chair's annual merit recommendations.
 2. Merit is assessed based upon the same criteria used for tenure and promotion, though service may be given more weight in setting salaries than in personnel decisions. As well, deficient or unproductive performance in any one area may affect overall salary merit determination negatively in a given year.
 3. When the chair meets with the Dean to discuss annual reviews and make merit recommendations, the Dean welcomes the input of chairs on level of merit for each criterion for each faculty member in the department, including her or himself.
 4. Salary letters are accompanied by a memorandum from the Dean detailing the process and any information the Dean considers helpful in understanding salary determinations that year.
 - B. Distribution of Merit Raises
 1. A small group of faculty members receive the highest percentage raises (“superior merit”);
 2. A large group of faculty members receive higher-than-average increases (“high merit”);
 3. A large group of faculty members receive increases at or slightly above the raise pool percentage (“merit”);
 4. A small group of faculty members receive increases as close to the raise pool percentage as possible (“good”).

III. Salary adjustments (e.g., promotion in rank, market equity, corrections for underestimation of merit over a multi-year view), are made after merit increases have been calculated.

The following provides a summary of faculty activities associated with teaching, scholarship, and service criteria. The four-level scale—good, merit, high merit, and superior merit—is based on comparative accomplishment in these three areas of effort, though each faculty member receives a single rating that combines the evaluations into a single gestalt score. Accomplishments shared by all faculty, such as teaching a full 5-course load, or advising students effectively, do not contribute to differentiating contrasts among faculty. Teaching and scholarship are weighted more heavily than service, but a merely satisfactory or unsatisfactory effort in service can result in a lower raise. Faculty should expect an ebb and flow in merit levels, as no one person typically achieves at the highest level in all three categories year in, year out.

Teaching

General principles: A teaching release awarded for any reason other than chairing a department reduces the opportunity for a faculty member to receive the highest level of attainment in *teaching*. A paid overload is separately remunerated with additional salary per section taught. With the exception of faculty in the first year of teaching, a five-course load is the baseline, though the potential of teaching four courses in a calendar year (a 3-2 academic year followed by 2-3) is understood. Merit categories recognize the degree of investment in additional contributions to the curricular work of the College, including: senior project supervision when not counted as part of the calendar year's teaching load; new preparations or substantially revised courses; pedagogical innovation supporting strategic initiatives such as experiential learning and digital pedagogy; implementation of inclusive pedagogical methods; supervision of independent studies and student research; guest lecturing in colleagues' classes; and significant effort on curricular innovation in the department, program, or interdisciplinary area, including emerging subjects.

Good: teaching is having mixed success, or may be facing challenges in certain respects. May involve low enrollments, and few or no teaching extras (as specified above).

Merit: teaching exhibits the excellence normally associated with the Hamilton professoriate, across all courses or modes of teaching. May also reflect work on early career teaching development, or development of new courses. Should show at least medium enrollments, calibrated to intended class size, and some teaching extras (as specified above).

High merit: teaching is outstanding among department, program, or disciplinary colleagues. In addition to at least medium enrollments, calibrated to intended class size, will show several teaching extras (as specified above).

Superior merit: teaching is distinguished on a college-wide basis, for instance by successfully instituting a field of study, re-training to teach in a new discipline, carrying especially high course enrollments in one or both terms, or receiving national recognition for pedagogical innovation. Will show at least medium enrollments, calibrated to intended class size, and many teaching extras (as specified above).

Scholarship

General principles: When the passages below refer to “peer-reviewed publications,” these should be understood to encompass juried exhibitions and off-campus public performances. All merit categories for scholarship require an active research or creative program, with marked progress from the prior reported year of work. Departmental tenure and promotion guidelines indicate disciplinary preferences for some forms of dissemination over others, and may extend to public scholarship and digital scholarship or creative work, but peer-reviewed publication remains the primary marker of distinction, in accordance with the Faculty Handbook. The highest merit categories should be understood as unusual levels of attainment, rarely achieved year after year. In 2018, 52% of Hamilton College academic faculty published at least one peer-reviewed article or its performance or exhibition equivalent.

Good: research or creative work that is building toward peer-reviewed publication or performance. This may include conference presentations; publication of conference abstracts, encyclopedia entries, or book reviews;

fieldwork; laboratory research results-gathering; or creative activity in progress, yet to be performed or exhibited. A new research program or collaboration may be launched or in development.

Merit: research or creative work that is characterized by peer-reviewed publication of an article, on-campus performance of creative projects, or a group exhibition of artistic projects off-campus. Several non-peer-reviewed publications may be recognized at this level of scholarly accomplishment. Submissions of new work or grant proposals, revision and resubmission, acceptance(s), reviews of previously published work and/or citations, and invited lectures may result in the “Merit” level even in a year with no new peer-reviewed publication (or performance or exhibition equivalent).

High merit: research or creative work that is characterized by an edited volume of contributions, by more than one peer-reviewed publication, or off-campus performance of a new creative project, or solo exhibition or multiple group exhibitions of artistic projects. Submitting a winning grant or fellowship proposal; submitting, revising and/or resubmitting work resulting in acceptance; receiving reviews of previously published work and/or citations; and giving invited lectures: activities such as these may combine with a single new publication (or its performance or exhibition equivalent) for the “High Merit” level even in a year with just one peer-reviewed publication. Must also show signs of the activities associated with the “Good” or “Merit” level.

Superior merit: research or creative work that is characterized by publication of multiple articles, a monograph, or a book-length co-authored project; particular multi-year culminating accomplishments in creative fields (e.g., larger solo exhibition or published compositions) are similarly recognized. Winning a major grant or fellowship, receiving acceptances for future peer-reviewed publications, receiving significant scholarly recognition, giving invited lectures, and other attainments indicating high impact work may severally combine with a few publications (or their performance or exhibition equivalents) for the “Superior Merit” level. Will also show signs of the activities associated with the “Good” or “Merit” level.

Service

General Principles: Except in a leave year or in the first year of service, advising students attentively is expected of all faculty members. An *ad hoc* committee or group convened for temporary purposes may, in a given year, be considered a major committee, depending on the work carried out. Service to students, drawn to a faculty member by shared identity or affinity, that requires a significant amount of time and effort, receives recognition. Faculty at all ranks are encouraged to serve not only their departments, but also the College and their professions, in order to receive recognition as contributors.

Good: largely limited to departmental duties, including advising, with perhaps some service to the profession (e.g., article peer review, judging student conference presentations, etc.).

Merit: includes both departmental work and light college-wide service, such as on a committee that meets less than weekly and which carries lesser administrative responsibility than committees with the heaviest workloads. Informal mentoring of colleagues and community service may contribute to a “Merit” level service profile.

High merit: in addition to typical departmental duties, service includes unusual effort in the department or program, and two or three college-wide responsibilities, such as participation on several lighter committees, or one of the heavier committees (such as CAP, COA, or Academic Council). Informal mentoring of colleagues and community service may contribute to a “High Merit” level service profile, in combination with committee work.

Superior merit: in addition to departmental duties, service on many (four or more) lighter committees or other college-wide duties; or service on one or more major campus-wide committees accompanied by other lighter college service. Here, too, informal mentoring and additional community service count.

The dean employs the standards above to evaluate all three areas of effort in the annual review and salary determination process. Recognizing the nuances distinguishing among levels of merit is not easy; faculty annual reports and their chair’s (or senior member’s) input help to inform the dean’s decisions about merit increases. The above characteristics are, however, easily illustrated by ample examples among our faculty members at every rank.

Rev. SK November 2019