

## MERIT EVALUATION AND SALARY POLICY

The Department of History of Art has a merit-based salary policy, and salary recommendations are made annually by an elected committee (Salary Advisory Committee) of three faculty members. In making recommendations for salary increments, the fundamental principle is that individuals with similar merit rankings ought to receive a similar percentage increase in salary; however, the committee is also charged with identifying pay inequities and with ensuring that meritorious junior faculty are appropriately rewarded.

Process

Merit rankings are made early in the spring semester when members of the Salary Advisory Committee consult faculty summary reports for current and previous three academic years, updated curricula vitae, and any other materials submitted for consideration. We use a three year window in order to effectively contextualize every faculty member's productivity and have a good understanding of the current year's accomplishments in the bigger framework of their near and long term goals and activities. The first step involves a ranking of each individual on the faculty by each member of the committee. This requires separate assessments of research, teaching, and service (R, T, S) on a scale of 1 to 5. R is then multiplied by 50%, T by 30%, and S by 20%. The three numbers are averaged to produce a composite score.

Next, the committee meets as a group for detailed discussion. During that meeting, members may choose to amend their initial rankings. Ultimately, the scores of each committee member will be averaged to produce a ranking for each member of the faculty. Naturally, committee members do not rank themselves and will leave the room when their own record is under discussion. At this time the committee jointly writes a brief synopsis of how they have arrived at the rankings of each faculty member. This synopsis is passed on to the chair, along with the two sets of figures described in the next paragraph.

The department chair receives two sets of figures for each faculty member: a single figure representing an average of the three committee members' rankings and the individual rankings committee member. After this, the chair will meet with the Salary Advisory Committee in order to understand the basis for each ranking. The chair may, at that stage, question the rankings or ask for amendments; but a final decision on the numerical rankings rests with the committee. The Chair submits these to the College of Arts and Sciences, with attached commentary if s/he feels it necessary.

Salary recommendations are made later in the semester, usually in April, after budget figures for the coming academic year have been announced. The Salary Advisory Committee uses its earlier merit evaluations as a basis for proposing specific salary

figures for each member of the faculty. While the merit numbers form the basis for these decisions, adjustments may be made in the interests of equity or to reward especially meritorious junior faculty.

The Department Chair has final responsibility for making salary recommendations to the Dean's Office, but only after close consultation with the Salary Advisory Committee. Ultimately, salaries will be set by the Dean of the College.

### Criteria for Assessment

The History of Art Department is mindful of the College Policy Committee's recommendation that "annual salary merit evaluations be based on accomplishments over the preceding three years. The goal of this policy is to ensure that comparable achievements are rewarded equally despite year-to-year fluctuations in the overall salary pool. Such a policy also mitigates a bias in salary setting that favors work that manifests itself in more frequent but smaller achievements, such as journal publications, over longer term projects, such as book publication."

Since delays in scholarly publication are frequent, the committee should take care not to reward the same forthcoming item repeatedly. After three years such an item will not be counted again until it is finally published. With this principle in mind the committee should submit notes to the Department Chair indicating which items were taken into account in arriving at that year's ranking, as part of the synopsis described above.

In research, rankings that approach or equal 5 shall be reserved for truly outstanding accomplishments, e.g., publication of a major book, a national award for outstanding research; 4 signifies excellence, e.g., publication of less significant books or a minimum of two published or imminently forthcoming refereed or otherwise prestigious articles or equivalent, such as exhibition catalogue essays, or chapters in edited volumes, e.g., anthologies or Festschriften, along with significant research in progress, as indicated by public lectures or papers presented at competitive national conferences; 3 indicates a respectable level of on-going output, i.e. recent and forthcoming publications, smaller articles and essays published, talks at other universities, book and exhibition reviews; 2 indicates a program of on-going research and a solid track record of publication; 1 indicates effort or accomplishment that is significantly below average.

In teaching ratings that approach or equal 5 shall be reserved for truly outstanding accomplishments such as a major teaching award within the university or national recognition in the area of teaching. Rankings of 0 through 4.5 will take into account criteria such as range of courses taught, introduction of new courses, on-going responsibility for important service courses, teaching evaluations, enrollments generated, number of students enrolled for A495 (unless generated by graduate students enrolled in an undergraduate course) and time invested in their supervision, number of graduate advisees, supervision of honors theses, attendance at teaching workshops, etc.

In service, ratings that approach or equal 5 shall be reserved for major university service, e.g., College or University Promotion and Tenure Committees or significant service to national or international organizations, e.g., presidency of the organization or chair of annual conference; however, these should not exclude on-going service to the History of Art Department. In general, service activities are evaluated with due consideration of the degree of responsibility and time commitment they entail. Rankings of 4 or above will generally signify major contributions to the Department such as service as Director of Graduate Studies or Department Chair, Service as Director of Undergraduate Studies [or Director of Alumni Relations]. Simply holding these positions indicates significant accomplishment; however, quality will also be a factor in the assessment, and other forms of service less time consuming departmental, college, or university committees are expected as well. A ranking between 3 and 4 will indicate service on multiple departmental, college, and university committees, with special weight given to service on the Salary Advisory Committee or the Admissions and Financial Aid Committees.