Department of Linguistics Salary Policy
Approved 10 October 2001

This policy supercedes the one adopted on 12 December 1991 and emended on 11 May 2001 to allow for revision to the policy based on a simple majority vote, as specified under item G below. This policy specifically replaces item D below, "FROM EVALUATION OUTPUT TO RECOMMENDED RAISE", with a different calculation procedure. While fundamental aspects of the 1991 policy relating to the determination of merit remain the same, some minor wording has been revised or removed to reflect actual implementation practices of the original policy.

The Department of Linguistics salary policy is designed according to certain goals and principles (included as Appendix A). Some guiding factors are (i) the primacy of rewarding merit, (ii) the consideration of a faculty member's overall contributions, (iii) the need to accommodate exceptional deviations in productivity, (iv) the value of percentage based increments, and (v) respect for a variety of individual circumstances. In accordance with these considerations, the policy below is enacted.

SUMMARY OR THE PROCESS:

The Executive Committee, which consists of two elected tenured or tenure-track faculty members in addition to the chair, conducts an annual review of each tenure-line faculty member. They evaluate individual merit in the areas of research, teaching, and service. The Chair then uses this merit score, together with those of the preceding two years where available, to calculate a specific recommended salary increase for each individual. To conclude the annual process, and in accordance with the action of the Bloomington Faculty Council from 24 March 1998, the Chair reports to the faculty the nature and results of the review process.

A. INPUT FOR EVALUATION

The input for evaluation of merit includes the following elements: (1) the year-end Faculty Summary Report (as submitted to the Dean of the Faculties Office); (2) a current curriculum vitae. Additional materials may include: (1) a brief letter of self-evaluation (no more than one page), which can include suggestions for re-evaluating specific work from prior years; (2) student and/or peer teaching evaluations; (3) past annual reports and evaluations that are still relevant to the three-year evaluation window; (4) input from the Chair; and (5) any outside expert opinions the committee finds helpful.

The individual faculty member is responsible for providing the Faculty Summary Report and curriculum vitae to the Chair by January 15 of each year.

B. EVALUATION PROCESS

The merit evaluation is performed by the Executive Committee, except that no individual takes part in his/her own evaluation. Three categories are evaluated separately: research, teaching, and service.

In research, the committee consistently tries to evaluate the quality and import of work, Part of this evaluation is based on recognizing certain journals in the field as major, relativized to the various subfields in linguistics. Similar quality considerations are applied to other research factors, such as conferences, grants, and awards. The committee can also solicit expert opinions outside of the committee for help in evaluating specific research items. Along with quality, quantity of research activity is also considered.

In teaching, the committee considers both quality and load of teaching, allowing for some compensation between the two. It is generally assumed that all faculty members are doing their fair share in teaching, directing graduate student research, and advising; the evaluation is concerned mainly with significant deviations from the norm.

In service, the committee similarly considers quality, load, and level of responsibility. Again, it is generally assumed that all faculty members are doing their fair share of service activity, and the evaluation is mainly concerned with significant deviations from the norm.

Although the annual review process evaluates primarily a single year's input, items from past years still in the evaluation window can be re-evaluated as new evidence of the work's import becomes available.

C.   OUTPUT OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS

In each of the three areas, the faculty member's merit is ranked within several levels. The number of levels per area embodies a 4/3/3 relative weighting of the three areas. The five levels in research are:

4 - outstanding: evidence of exceptional distinction (exceptionally meritorious in some way)
3 - very good: evidence of distinction or major accomplishment (of a superior standard)
2 - good: evidence of accomplishment (of the good standard expected in this department)
1 - fair: evidence of effort (below the good standard expected in this department)
0 - poor (unsatisfactory)

Teaching and service each have four levels:

3 - excellent: evidence of distinction or major accomplishment (of a superior standard)
2 - good: evidence of accomplishment (of the good standard expected in this department)
1 - fair: evidence of effort (below the good standard expected in this department)
0 - poor (unsatisfactory)

A rating of "2" is considered a benchmark "standard" in all three areas.

The overall evaluation level for a single year is the simple sum of the three individual levels, which lies therefore in the range from zero to ten.

The individual year's evaluation level is put together with the evaluations from the prior two years to form a three-year evaluation window. The best two out of the three years in the window are averaged as the final evaluation output. This serves to undercut the effects of sabbatical, leaves of various kinds, long term projects, changes in research agenda, and so forth.

New faculty members have two options regarding their role in the policy, to be negotiated at the time of appointment. They may opt either for full participation in the policy from the start or for a two-year phasing-in period. Under the latter option, they are evaluated the same as others for informational purposes, but they receive the average departmental percentage raise for their first two reviews.

D.   FROM EVALUATION OUTPUT TO RECOMMENDED RAISE

All recommended raises are calculated based on the total increment money the Department receives from the College. Arithmetically, it works simply as follows:

All recommended raises are calculated as a proportion of each faculty member's current base salary and the average of his or her merit score from the highest two of the most recent three years including the current year. This calculation is performed by multiplying the average merit score, the current base salary, and the current FTE to determine merit points per each faculty member. Merit points are summed across the department, and the total monetary increment for each merit point is determined by dividing the total amount of funds allocated to the department by the total merit points across the department for salary increments.

E.   COMMUNICATION OF RESULTS

Each year, after all individual evaluations are completed and before the budget conference, the Chair reports to the faculty about:

- the process
- the results
- averages (or overall distribution) for merit
- problems encountered, resolved, and not resolved
- any other sufficiently important issues

F.   APPROVAL OF THE POLICY

This policy was approved by secret ballot. Ballots were mailed out on Friday 28 September 2001 and counted in the Department office on Wednesday 10 October. Results as follows: 12 yes, 1 no, 0 abstain.

G.   ENACTMENT OF THE POLICY

Once fully enacted, this policy remains in force unless revisions are required by a majority vote of the faculty members affected by the policy.

APPENDIX A. Goals and Principles for a Department of Linguistics Salary Policy

GENERAL:

1.   A primary goal of the policy is to foster departmental excellence. This arises, to a large degree, from quality individual work in a supportive and cooperative framework. Factors that should promote excellence and a quality working environment within the department are:

a.   Raising external competitiveness by increasing the standing of the department relative to other linguistics departments and programs nationwide.

b.   Fostering faculty morale by giving adequate recognition to efforts and accomplishments.

c.   Promoting collegiality by dealing with salary and related issues in an equitable and democratic way.

2.   Flexibility is an essential component of the policy.

a.   The policy should recognize or stand ready to recognize uncommon, unique, or unexpected circumstances (including, but not limited to, extended illness or other personal crises, new faculty status, and outside offers).

b.   The policy should allow for possible rectification of past merit reviews. The passage of time may reveal the true significance or impact of some publication or activity in the field; a re-evaluation of past records may be needed to provide appropriate recognition.

3.   As far as possible this policy should be simple, so as to be understandable and trustworthy.

4.   Feedback to the faculty is crucial. In addition to understanding the policy ahead of time, each faculty member should know how it has applied in his/her case each year and how it has applied to the department in general.

EVALUATION:

5.   The primary judgment of merit is qualitative, but quantity of activity should be adequately recognized as well.

6.   The evaluation process should include some simple form of self-assessment.

FISCAL:

7.   In normal circumstances, salary increments are made purely on the basis of merit scores and purely as a percentage of current salary, in so far as this is possible without going below cost of living minima as prescribed by the Bloomington Faculty Council.