

DEPARTMENT OF SLAVIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
Indiana University
1020 E. Kirkwood Ave., BH 502
Bloomington IN 47405-7103
(812) 855-2608; Fax (812) 855-2107
iuslavic@indiana.edu

SALARY-SETTING CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

(Policy adopted by general faculty vote on 16 January 2009)

This policy supersedes the one adopted on 5 February 2002.

The Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures's salary policy is designed according to certain goals and principles; see 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 OF THE PROCESS:

The following is the procedure used by the Department to set salaries. The procedure makes principal use of the annual reports filed by all faculty members. In addition it allows for updates the faculty may wish to make to them, as well as direct conversations, as needed, between the salary-setting committee and individual faculty members. The Executive Committee, which, as established by departmental vote at the meeting of 18 April 2008, 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, according to the system outlined below, which was approved by departmental vote at the meeting of 14 November 2008. Also as approved at that meeting, 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.

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. 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. Creative work is also considered; see the guidelines in Appendix B.

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

Each faculty member will be awarded a maximum of 10 points according to the following weighted scales. A score of 6 points is deemed "at the good standard expected of all faculty," where this is the sum of 2 in each category below for tenure track faculty and the sum of 4 for teaching and 2 for service for non tenure track faculty. 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. The first year this system is introduced the scores for that year will simply be used; there will be no averaging or window. In the second year the scores of the first two years will be averaged together. New faculty members will be similarly integrated into the system over a three year period.

1. Tenure Track Faculty: 4 Research/3 Teaching/3 Service

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)

For tenure track faculty, 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.

2. Non Tenure Track Faculty: 7 Teaching/3 Service

For non tenure track faculty, teaching has seven levels, with a rating of "4" considered a benchmark "standard:

- 7 - outstanding: evidence of exceptional distinction (achievement worthy of national recognition)
- 6 - excellent: evidence of major distinction (exceptionally meritorious in some way)
- 5 - very good: evidence of distinction or accomplishment (of a superior standard)
- 4 - good: evidence of accomplishment (of the good standard expected in this department)
- 3 - fair: evidence of effort (below the good standard expected in this department)
- 2 - inadequate: performance well below expected level

- 1 - weak: significant lack of effort
- 0 - poor (unsatisfactory)

For non tenure track faculty, service has four levels, with “2” the benchmark “standard”:

- 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)

D. FROM EVALUATION OUTPUT TO RECOMMENDED RAISE

All recommended raises are calculated based on the total increment money the Department receives from the College and allocated to tenure track and non tenure track categories, minus any amount mandated for faculty equity. For each category, one quarter of the total sum available is subtracted from the pool and awarded as an equal percentage amount, per FTE or portion thereof, as an across-the-board increase independent of merit. The remaining three quarters are awarded based on merit, as defined above, and purely as a percentage of current salary. Raises are thus 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, minus those funds removed for the across-the-board increase, 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 AND ENACTMENT OF THE POLICY

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

APPENDIX A. Goals and Principles for a Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures 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 Slavic 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 beyond the across-the-board percentage increase 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. In exceptional years, where the system described above (25% of the total increment plus across-the-board increase, divided on an equal percentage basis and combined with the merit increments) is deemed inadequate by the Executive Committee, the portion of the annual increment can be increased to a level such that it meets the cost of living minima.

APPENDIX B. Criteria for Evaluating Creative Writing

In addition to the criteria listed in the department's promotion and tenure document, in February 2002 the department voted to add the following criteria for evaluating creative writing that has been submitted as evidence of publication and for which a salary merit increment is being sought.

Instead of trying to recognize literary merit directly, the department recognizes the recognition of literary merit, in order to put the burden of demonstrating literary merit where it appropriately belongs, on readers and the literary community. Specifically, merit will be recognized not for publication as such, but for such literary achievements as the following (this is not meant to be exhaustive, only illustrative):

1. Prestigious awards for literary works published or to permit/allow for further creative activity. Examples would be Pulitzer or Guggenheim awards, or ones more specific to creative writing, fellowships for residence at a noted writers' colony, also any awards for an individual book, etc.
2. Invitations or appointments as a writer-in-residence (or equivalent) at other universities for a significant period of time, or comparable appointments. Individual readings or series of readings will not ordinarily be included (they are to some extent a form of publicity and are construed to be their own reward, particularly if there is an honorarium). If an invited reading is part of an ongoing prestigious series of readings, like a literary equivalent of the Patten Lectures, credit may be given.
3. Publication of a significant collection of work, either new, previously published, or mixed, in a prestigious series of poetry publications, by a university press with a record of and interest in publishing significant poetry, or by an established commercial publisher with a strong interest in publishing poetry.
4. Primary (first time) publication will not ordinarily be considered, since there are too many variables involved to allow fair assessment and equitable treatment (varying length of works, nature of the publishing venue, differing acceptance rates among journals, possible remuneration, etc.).
5. In all the above, it is the responsibility of the faculty member seeking a salary merit increment based on creative writing submitted as evidence of publication to provide to the salary committee adequate information for the evaluation of publishers, series, grants, etc.