

Department of Philosophy

SALARY COMMITTEE POLICY

1. MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

The Committee shall consist of the Department Chair and three other members of faculty. Each year two new faculty representatives will be elected, with one continuing from the previous year, and with one of the new representatives chosen to serve for two years by lot. The first meeting of the Committee shall be convened by the Department Chair. The Committee will then elect its own chair from among the four members.

At least one of the three faculty members on the Committee must be a Full Professor, and at least one an Assistant or Associate Professor. Where practicable the Committee should include some diversity by gender and race (at least when considered over a run of a few years).

Only those members of the faculty who have not served on the Salary Committee during the previous two years shall be qualified to serve again. The Salary Committee in a given year shall not include tenured faculty who are scheduled for periodic review in that year.

2. POLICIES FOR EVALUATING FACULTY

RESEARCH

For articles, only items published during the calendar years covered by the period of review will be considered by the Committee. Books, on the other hand, can be considered by the Committee at various stages of their production (obtaining a contract, submitting a draft for review, going to press, publication). In each case the calendar year of publication is the one specified in the publication itself.

Books published during the period of review will be counted as the equivalent of a number of articles. How much weight will be given to a book in comparison to articles will be left to the judgment of the Committee, depending on the nature of the book, its length, and whether it had already been given some credit in an earlier merit review.

In evaluating publications, the Committee will assign most weight to original research. It will normally credit journal articles and book chapters equally, but will give extra weight to publications placed in journals or with academic publishers thought to be of high quality. In making these judgments the Committee will rely upon the collective knowledge of its members.

Prizes and research awards that do not bring significant resources to the Department may be considered under the 'Research' heading.

Introductory textbooks and edited books will normally be counted under the ‘Service’ heading rather than as ‘Research’.

TEACHING

Some weight will be given to numerical student evaluation scores for courses taught during the period of review, but this should only be one factor, alongside size of courses, development of new materials, student advising, etc.

In assigning merit for this category, the Committee will consider the number, range, and sizes of courses taught; whether those courses have filled or have had empty seats; newly prepared or redesigned courses; graduate and undergraduate advising; teaching scores; teaching awards; etc.

SERVICE

All departmental offices and tasks will be considered (including those that carry a teaching relief), as will wider service within the University, book and manuscript reviewing, conference organization, service on national organizations, etc.

Introductory textbooks and edited books will normally be counted under the ‘Service’ heading.

GRANTS AND AWARDS

Grants, awards, and prizes received or notified in the calendar years under review that bring significant resources to the Department will be rewarded. Those that bring resources sufficient to support at least one term of research for the faculty member in question (or something of equivalent benefit to the Department) will receive one additional ‘plus’ towards merit, which can be awarded under either Research or Service. Where the award will support the faculty member for two full terms of research, two ‘pluses’ will normally be awarded.

EQUITY

In addition, the Committee will give consideration to the question of equity, along two dimensions – equity in relation to others of similar rank, and equity in relation to total career achievements. These evaluations will be made from consideration of faculty CVs, examining records of teaching, service, and outside recognition, as well as the period of time over which the department has been served, but paying particular attention to records of publication.

(Note that this satisfies the University requirement that the evaluation of faculty should reflect performance over the last several years, even in cases where the other dimensions of evaluation cover only a single calendar year.)

The Committee will judge equity in relation to others of similar rank by making sideways comparisons, looking at salaries in relation to career achievements. For Associate Professors, equity in relation to others of similar rank will be bench-marked to the *highest* paid Associate Professor, rather than to the average.

The Committee may judge equity in relation to total career achievements in a number of complementary ways. One might be to set a notional floor for an incoming Assistant Professor with no publications and a notional ceiling (which can be exceeded, of course) for a highly distinguished Full Professor with strings of achievements, attempting to locate the person's appropriate place within that range. Another might be to take the average salaries provided by the APA for PhD granting public universities, again trying to locate the faculty member in relation to those.

3. PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED BY THE COMMITTEE

The Committee will make separate evaluations for each faculty member under five distinct headings: (1) research, (2) teaching, (3) service, (4) equity in relation to others of similar rank, and (5) equity in relation to total career achievements.

Under each heading the Committee will award up to 3 pluses, interpreted as follows:

‘+++’ means something like ‘excellent’ (or, for the equity dimensions, ‘highly underpaid in this dimension’).

‘++’ means ‘good’ (or, ‘obviously underpaid’ re equity).

‘+’ means ‘some significant additional achievement in this category’ (or, ‘significantly underpaid’ re equity).

Zero means ‘nothing significant enough to reward with merit in this category’.

There are no minus scores.

In each dimension there must be more than regular achievement to receive a plus score – e.g., in the research dimension, since publishing is part of our contractual obligations, one or two minor publications in a given year, say, won't attract any merit. And under equity, since the parameters of comparison are vague, the Committee will only take account of significant differences.

Point scores for members of the Committee will be determined in reduced committee meetings of the other two members together with the Department Chair.

In cases where a faculty member holds a joint appointment in another department or unit, the score for research will be divided by 2. Only courses taught for the department, and advising within the department, will be considered when awarding teaching scores. Service within the department will be considered, as will service for the wider university and profession; but service for the faculty member's other department will not be considered.

The point scores assigned will be totaled up, and the total sum of money that faculty receive will

(subject to the qualification below) be a linear function of the number of points (i.e. money available divided by total points awarded across the department, multiplied by the individual's point score), to make the assignment of dollar sums automatic.

In any given year, at least 80% of the merit money available should be distributed automatically by point-score (with no room for Chair discretion), provided that the Department Chair can reserve up to 20% to distribute for preemptive retention. (This has the advantage of keeping the merit component distinct from retention considerations; removing the Chair's discretion from the former, while retaining it for the latter.)

The Committee's deliberations, and the reasoning behind individual scores, will remain confidential. But the Chair will release to any faculty member a breakdown of their score if they request it, together with general information about the distribution of scores across the department. The default will be that faculty be notified just of a dollar sum (separated into COLA and Merit components), politely wrapped up.

4. APPEALS

Faculty are entitled to appeal to the Dean against the size of their merit award. The Dean's practice in such cases has been to rule that the appeal should be considered by the Departmental Salary Committee as part of its deliberations in the following year.

Ratified by secret ballot on 01/26/05

Revised by consensus on 09/13/06

Revised on 04/13/16

Ratified unanimously on 5/11/2016