

# THE COMPARATIVE LITERATURE SALARY POLICY AS OF JANUARY 31, 1992

## PREAMBLE

The purpose of the Comparative Literature Salary Policy is to provide a rational and equitable system for the determination of salary increments, so that individual achievements can be rewarded while maintaining the integrity of the program as a cohesive unit with a common mission.

(Condensation of Preamble to the Comparative Literature Salary Policy approved in 1989)

### 1. COST-OF-LIVING INCREASE

A percentage raise for all faculty members, based on U.S. Government inflation statistics for the previous year. In any given year, the departmental cost-of-living increase shall not exceed forty percent of the total departmental salary increment.

(Modified from '89 Policy)

### 2. MERIT

A minimum of sixty percent of the total allocation will be applied toward rewarding merit in research, teaching, and service, weighted according to a ratio of 6:4:2 -- up to six points for research; up to four points for teaching; and up to two points for service -- and reflected in dollar amounts. (In exceptional cases, the merit points assigned to an individual may be raised by a maximum of two -- i.e., to a total of 14 points.)

A. Research: Research and/or creative activity will be evaluated in terms of two main criteria (maximum six points):

1. The amount of time and effort reflected in the work
2. The significance or likely significance of the work for its field(s)

Evidence of significance or potential significance could include prizes, reviews, critical responses, citations, reports of referees or editors; placement of an essay in an influential journal or collection; republication, or translation into foreign languages. Since the chair may not be in a position to gauge the significance of any given work, a faculty member who wishes his or her work to be considered under this criterion needs to supply evidence of its significance in his or her annual report, since the significance of scholarly or creative work may not become evident until well after its initial publication, it will be possible for research to be rewarded initially on the basis of the second criterion. For example, a scholarly book that is brought out in a second edition may, on its initial publication have earned salary credit on the basis of the time/effort criterion, but may, the second time around, be rewarded on the basis of its significance.

Although it is impossible to rank various publications according to genre--since different members of the same genre, whether critical editions, or collections of verse, or translations, or whatever, tremendously both in the time and effort required to produce them, and in their

importance-- it is possible to use a standard-length essay (20-30 pages in ms.) As a yardstick. Such an article is worth one point under the first criterion. Thus a standard-length essay published in a very prestigious journal, such as **PMLA**, would earn one point under the first criterion and a second point under the second criterion. All other research publications are evaluated proportionally according to this yardstick. Most original scholarly books, accordingly, would normally be worth considerably more than an article. They would therefore be rewarded in more than one installment, spread over more than one year. This allows us to retain the window principle, according to which an author who publishes a major work during a lean budgetary year is not necessarily condemned to receive only a tiny salary increment for the work. The window principle allows a book to be rewarded over as many as three years.

- B. Teaching: Performance in teaching will be assessed on the basis of course syllabi, abstracts of course evaluations, peer evaluations, letters from students, and other tangible data, and will be rewarded according to the following formula (maximum of four points):

Competent and effective performance of regular teaching duties, including development of new courses, 1-3 points;

Receipt of a Teaching Award or other formal recognition of outstanding teaching, 1 point;

Sharing new ideas in teaching through public presentations and/or publications in professional journals, 1 point.

Directing dissertations and projects, including those in other departments.

- C. Service (maximum of two points):

Standard service on departmental, school, and/or university level or in professional organizations, 1 point; conferences or exhibits, special and unusually time-consuming work on task forces or other substantive assignments (e.g., review committee, development of departmental computer programs or writing of departmental grant proposals), signal professional services to the community, 1 point.

### **PROCEDURES FOR SALARY DETERMINATION:**

1. A three-person Salary committee, representing the three faculty ranks, shall be elected each year by the faculty as a whole (excluding those who hold joint titles only). The Salary Committee will serve as an appeals committee in cases of disputes concerning the Chair's salary recommendations. The Salary committee will also serve in an advisory capacity to the Chair in gauging the significance of any given work.

2. All faculty members shall submit their Annual Report to the Chair no later than January 15 of each year. The report should include documentation on teaching (course syllabi, abstracts of evaluations, letters form students or peers).
3. The Chair shall determine the number of merit points to be assigned in each of the three categories and convey this information in writing to the individual faculty members, who may ask for a conference with a view toward clarification.
4. Faculty members dissatisfied with the Chair's explanations may file an appeal with the Salary Committee within a week of the conference. The Committee shall adjudicate each appeal within a week of its filing.
5. After all merit appeals have been settled, the Chair shall compute the individual salary increments in consultation with the Board.