I.PERSONNEL POLICIES: D. SALARY REVIEWS

Updates to Section I.E. via governance proposals #13-42, 14-34, 17-07, 20-123.

1. General Information

a. Salary increases are based upon recommendations that result from regularly scheduled personnel reviews conducted by the President's Advisory Board or the President's Senior Faculty Advisory Board or, in the cases of tenured faculty, upon Interim Salary Reviews conducted between regularly scheduled Senior Reviews, or upon the results of Special Review. Based upon the recommendation, and in consultation with the President, the Provost makes the final decision on salary increases.

b. The criteria upon which faculty are evaluated for merit increases are I.E.2.f (Third year) and I.E.3.g (Salary/Senior Reviews).

c. Faculty are determined through this review process to be "meeting expectations," "exceeding expectations," or "not meeting expectations" in each of the three areas of teaching, research, and other contributions to the University. Each category receives equal weighting. A percentage increase to the base salary is attached each year to each of these rankings, based upon the size of the salary pool. The same merit rating may not necessarily result in the same percentage increase during the years in which the merit rating applies: if the pool is larger, the percentage increase may be larger; if the pool is smaller, the percentage increase may be smaller. The merit rating holds until the next review, unless the faculty member requests a Special Review (see below). This is accomplished through the following schedule.

2. Untenured Faculty

a. Non-tenured, tenure-track faculty are assumed to be meeting expectations during their first three year contract and, thus, receive the percentage increase appropriate for that ranking during the second and third years of their initial four-year contract.

b. The third-year review results in both a contract reappointment decision and a recommendation for merit-based salary increases, if any, which will then hold for years four, five, and six of the probationary period.

c. The tenure decision in the sixth year results in a salary recommendation that holds until the Interim Salary Review.

d. Faculty whose initial appointment acknowledges years of service at another institution will be evaluated for merit increases on their review schedule rather than upon actual years of service at Denison. Thus, a faculty member whose initial appointment acknowledges one year of prior service would be evaluated for a merit increase as part of the "third-year review" in their second year at Denison.

e. Non-tenure-track faculty will receive the percentage increase associated with meeting expectations. They will be reviewed for merit increases when they are reviewed as part of the normal review process for non-tenure-track faculty. The merit ranking that results from that review holds until the next such review.

f. The following criteria will be used to determine if faculty undergoing third-year review are meeting, exceeding, or not meeting expectations.

1. Teaching

Faculty members are expected to maintain excellence in teaching, which is meeting expectations. Not only are student evaluations of teaching examined, but the faculty member's statement on teaching plays a vital role in demonstrating exemplary pedagogical development.

Meeting Expectations:

- Professional statement conveys a thoughtful approach to teaching and advising as well as a willingness to adapt one's teaching to the liberal arts.
- Course materials are clear and appropriate to the course.
- Student evaluations of teaching consistently exhibit student engagement and learning.
- Faculty peer evaluation reflects the candidate's progress toward excellence in teaching.
- Feedback to students on their work is timely and substantive.
- Faculty member is regularly accessible to students.

Exceeding Expectations:

A faculty member's teaching is considered exceeding expectations if, in addition to meeting expectations, the faculty member accomplishes much of the following:

- Professional statement conveys a thoughtful approach to teaching and advising and an early facility for teaching successfully within the liberal arts.
- Course materials indicate a significant level of clarity, rigor, and engagement and make evident the methods to meet the aims of the class.
- Student evaluations of teaching exhibit very high levels of student learning, engagement, and enthusiasm.
- Students voice high regard for the faculty member's feedback on their work as well as the clearly articulated and demanding standards of the course.
- Faculty peer evaluation reflects the candidate's progress toward excellence in teaching.
- Feedback to students on their work is timely and substantive.
- Faculty member is regularly accessible to students.
- When possible within a departmental curriculum, effective teaching already occurs at all course levels (introductory to advanced).

Not Meeting Expectations:

A faculty member does not meet expectations if the dossier indicates any of the following:

- Professional statement does not convey a thoughtful approach to teaching and advising nor does it show a commitment to the liberal arts.

- Evidence indicates a perfunctory approach to teaching.
- Course materials lack clarity.
- Student evaluations of teaching do not exhibit sufficient student engagement and learning.

2. Scholarship

All faculty are expected to engage in scholarship or creative activity appropriate to their discipline and to remain informed about current work in their area of expertise. The candidate is expected to demonstrate a coherent scholarly research/creative agenda as well as identifiable progress on scholarship/creative work.

Meeting Expectations:

A faculty member's scholarly/creative engagement would be considered meeting expectations, if the faculty member accomplishes the following:

- All faculty are expected to engage in scholarship or creative activity appropriate to their discipline or interdisciplinary field and to remain informed about current work in their area of expertise. The candidate is expected to demonstrate a coherent scholarly research/creative agenda as well as significant and identifiable progress on work that would lead to a professionally peer-reviewed body of scholarship/ creative work appropriate for one's discipline or interdisciplinary field of expertise at the time of tenure.
- Evidence of progress toward a successful tenure review may include work completed mostly or entirely at Denison.
- Such evidence may include book reviews; drafts of articles, book chapters, and/or working papers; book or journal-length manuscripts currently under peer review; peer-reviewed conference paper presentations or conference poster presentations; submitted book or grant proposals; festival submissions, performances, exhibitions, and/or screenings.
- Professional statement articulates the candidate's research agenda for the years leading to the tenure review. This includes an agenda that will demonstrate continued scholarly/creative activity, growth, and productivity of work begun after employment at Denison.

Exceeding Expectations:

A faculty member's scholarly/creative engagement would be considered meeting expectations, if the the faculty member accomplishes the following:

- A candidate will be deemed to exceed expectations in scholarship at the third-year review if the candidate makes a significant, peer-reviewed, contribution to one's disciplinary or interdisciplinary engagement while at Denison.
- This may include having accepted for publication or published book chapters, journal articles, book projects or juried exhibitions, performances, or screenings in venues recognized by one's discipline, or receipt of a substantial grant or fellowship to fund a scholarly/creative project.

Not Meeting Expectations:

A faculty member would be considered not meeting expectations if:

- The candidate's professional statement lacks a coherent scholarly research/creative agenda.
- The candidate demonstratives minimal progress in successfully pursuing a research/creative agenda.
- There is insufficient evidence of a trajectory that would meet scholarship/creative work expectations at time of tenure review.

3. Service

Meeting Expectations:

The candidate is expected to participate in the life of the University. Faculty are encouraged to select activities that they find engaging and that will foster the development of the University community. Quality is valued above quantity in all instances. The professional statement should accurately and thoughtfully account for one's involvement in service. In the early years, involvement in service to the institution is an excellent and important means of learning how Denison functions.

Participation in the life of the University by the third-year review includes:

- Attending department/program meetings.
- Assuming service responsibilities at the department/ program level and possibly at the University level.
- Attending faculty meetings to learn about the university governance system and identify areas where the faculty member can contribute.

Exceeding Expectations:

A junior faculty member may exceed expectations for service if the faculty member takes an effective and meaningful role in the life of the University:

- This may involve taking an active role on University-wide committees as elected or appointed; serving as faculty sponsor for student activities; supporting admissions efforts; serving on consortium committees; or serving in professional organizations beyond Denison.
- Faculty member demonstrates leadership in disciplinary/professional organization(s).

Not Meeting Expectations:

- The candidate does not assume service responsibilities at the department/program level.

3. Tenured Faculty

a. Tenured faculty are reviewed for merit increases as part of the regularly scheduled Senior Review. This merit ranking holds until the Interim Salary Review.

b. Tenured faculty also receive an Interim Salary Review normally in the third year between Senior Reviews. These reviews are based

upon a salary report that consists of information for all of the elements of the Senior Reviews dossier since the last Senior Review. These reports are read by the President's Senior Faculty Advisory Board.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR INTERIM SALARY REVIEW REPORT

Please submit a current CV. Highlight all activity since your last review.

Please submit teaching evaluations for all courses taught during the review period.

Please provide simple bulleted lists of the following:

Teaching

- All courses you have taught during the review period. Please include course numbers, titles, enrollments, and GPAs. (Course GPAs are available from the Registrar.)
- Any additional teaching responsibilities (e.g., Advising, Advising Circles, Directed or Independent Studies, Summer Scholars, Practicums, etc.).
- Any other professional activities related to teaching that you think we should know about (e.g., Professional Development Workshops or Training, Center for Learning and Teaching programs, Teaching Conferences, etc.).

Scholarship and Professional Growth and Development

- Any peer-reviewed publications, exhibitions, performances, or other scholarship and professional activities completed during the review period.
- Any works-in-progress that were begun or continued during the review period.
- Any conferences or professional meetings attended, and/or any professional presentations given during the review period.
- Any other professional activities related to your scholarship that you think we should know about.

Leadership and Service

- Any university committees you have served on during the review period.
- Any noteworthy departmental activities during this review period.
- Any other leadership and service activities you think we should know about.

Narrative Reflection

Limiting yourself to 1500 words, please reflect on your work as a faculty member at Denison. Tell us what you have accomplished during this review period and what you hope to accomplish going forward. You do not necessarily need to address all of the following questions, but these are the sorts of questions you might consider:

- Is there anything we should know that would help clarify how and why you have allocated your time and effort during this particular review period?
- What do you most look forward to as your career progresses? What risks are you hoping to take?
- What accomplishments are you most proud of as a teacher and/or scholar and why?
- What teaching and/or scholarship challenges have you encountered and how are you addressing them?
- What is the trajectory of your scholarship and how do you to plan to move it forward in the future?
- What about your work brings you the greatest satisfaction or causes the greatest challenge?
- How have you contributed to the mission of the college in ways that don't fit neatly into the traditional categories?

c. These board members will review materials submitted by the faculty member under review and vote on whether the faculty member is meeting, exceeding, or not meeting expectations in each of three individual categories (teaching, scholarship/creative expression, service).

d. The members of the President's Senior Faculty Advisory Board will make recommendations to the Provost who makes the final decision regarding salary increases on the basis of those recommendations.

e. If a member of the President's Senior Faculty Advisory Board is also a member of the same department as a colleague under review, the board member will recuse themselves from the review process; the Provost will ask another former member of the President's Senior Faculty Advisory Board or the President's Advisory Board, who is not in the department of the person under review, to serve as a replacement for the person who has recused themselves. The person chosen will be from the same Division as the person under review.

f. The salary review evaluation will conclude with a letter from the Provost to the faculty member recording the results of the review. A conference between the faculty member and the Provost will be scheduled at the faculty member's request. This salary decision holds until the next tenured faculty review. (See Special Reviews below).

g. The following criteria will be used to determine if tenured faculty are meeting, exceeding, or not meeting expectations at the time of salary review.

1.Teaching

Once faculty have earned tenure, they are expected to maintain excellence in teaching. This constitutes meeting expectations. In order to exceed expectations of excellence in teaching, faculty will demonstrate continuing engagement as well as growth, which may take many forms. Not only are student evaluations of teaching examined, but the narrative reflection of the faculty member plays a vital role in demonstrating exemplary continuing pedagogical development.

Meeting Expectations:

- Evidence of a thoughtful approach to teaching and advising.
- Evidence that teaching is not stagnant.
- Indications that course materials are clear.

- Feedback to students on their work is timely and substantive.
- Faculty member is regularly accessible to students—not only as a teacher, but also as advisor, director of student research, and mentor.
- When possible within a departmental or program curriculum, effective teaching occurs at all levels (introductory to advanced).
- Teaching evaluations consistently exhibit student engagement and learning.
- Percent of student evaluations obtained are not routinely significantly below the campus norm.

Exceeding Expectations:
A faculty member's teaching in a review period is considered exceeding expectations if, in addition to meeting expectations, the faculty member accomplishes much of the following:

- Evidence of a thoughtful approach to teaching and advising that reflects how the faculty member's views and practice of teaching have developed over time in a liberal arts context.
- Dossier contains clear evidence that teaching develops over time (i.e., is not stagnant). Development over time does not mean changing something that works well or changing for the sake of change. Rather, it means continuing growth as a teacher.
- Such evidence might encompass a wide range: developing new courses, updating courses by incorporating new materials, assignments, technology, pedagogical approaches, incorporating own scholarship and research particularly well into courses to facilitate student learning, attending workshops and conferences at Denison and beyond, as well as fresh thinking about course material that contributes to curricular renewal and redesign.
- Indication of a significant level of clarity, rigor, and sustained engagement and make evident the methods used to meet the aims of the classes taught during the review period.
- Student evaluations of teaching consistently exhibit very high levels of student learning, engagement, and enthusiasm.
- This is often manifested in students' high regard for the faculty member's feedback on their work as well as the clearly articulated and demanding standards of the course.
- Grades are not routinely significantly different from departmental or program norms.
- The faculty member may engage in a notably high number of directed studies or senior research projects.

Not Meeting Expectations:
A faculty member does not meet expectations if the dossier indicates any of the following:

- Evidence indicates the absence of a thoughtful approach to teaching and advising.
- Evidence indicates a stagnant approach to teaching
- Indications that course materials are unclear.
- Teaching evaluations do not exhibit student engagement and learning.

2. Scholarship/Creative Work

All faculty are expected to engage in scholarship or creative activity appropriate to their discipline and to remain informed about current work in their area of expertise. The candidate is expected to demonstrate a coherent scholarly research/creative agenda as well as identifiable progress on scholarship/creative work since the previous salary/senior review.

Meeting Expectations:
Evidence indicates a clear vision of the general framework and the trajectory of the faculty member's scholarly/creative engagement. Evidence indicates an integrative and innovative dimension to the faculty member's scholarly/creative engagement in the relevant disciplinary or interdisciplinary fields in the review period.

- Scholarship/creative work should reflect a degree of originality in the generation, application, or reinterpretation of concepts, methods, or creative works.
- A faculty member demonstrates evidence of continued growth and progress in scholarly and creative work.
- Such evidence may include but is not limited to conference presentations and poster sessions, drafts of journal-length manuscripts, drafts of chapters in edited collections, drafts of chapters of a single-authored monograph, grant proposals, book proposals, proposals for special issues of journals, performances and exhibitions, screen plays, and festival submissions.
- Unpublished work is poised to progress toward peer-reviewed publications, performances, juried exhibits, screenings, etc. A faculty member should not submit the same work-in-progress materials for multiple review cycles.
- During the shorter salary review cycle, the faculty member meets expectations by demonstrating how one's scholarly/creative work is moving toward peer review and publication. During the longer senior review cycle, the faculty member meets expectations with peer-reviewed publication/performance appropriate to one's discipline.

Exceeding Expectations:
A faculty member's scholarly/creative engagement in a review period would be considered exceeding expectations if, in addition to meeting expectations, the faculty member accomplishes the following:

- During the review period the faculty member makes some significant, peer-reviewed, contribution to one's disciplinary or interdisciplinary engagement.
- This may include publication of book chapters, journal articles, book projects or juried exhibitions, performances, or screenings in venues recognized by one's discipline, or receipt of a substantial grant or fellowship to fund a scholarly/creative project.
- During the shorter salary review cycle, the faculty member exceeds expectations with peer-reviewed publication/performance appropriate to one's discipline. During the longer senior review cycle, the faculty member exceeds expectations with multiple peer-reviewed publications/performances appropriate to one's discipline.

Not Meeting Expectations:

- Faculty member fails to articulate a clear vision of scholarly/creative growth.
- Faculty member fails to provide evidence of scholarly/creative growth.

3. Service

All faculty members are expected to participate actively in the formal and informal governance and life of the University. This ensures an equitable distribution of service responsibilities among faculty members. Faculty members are encouraged to select activities that they find engaging and that will foster the development of the University community. Quality is valued above quantity in all instances. The professional statement should accurately and thoughtfully account for one's involvement in service.

Meeting Expectations:
Faculty support the mission of the University in the following ways:

- Faculty member attends and participates as appropriate in Department and Faculty meetings so as to remain aware of issues related to the goals of the community.
- Faculty member actively participates in the governance and the life of the University.
- Examples may include: serving on University-wide committees, working groups, or task forces as elected or appointed; serving as faculty sponsor for student activities; supporting admissions efforts; offering a course for reunions and homecomings; serving on consortium committees; serving in professional organizations.

Exceeding Expectations:
A faculty member's service will be considered to exceed expectations if, in addition to meeting expectations, the faculty member accomplishes some combination of the following:

- Faculty member demonstrates leadership and active involvement in formal and informal governance.
- Faculty member participates in decision-making.
- Faculty member contributes to initiatives that facilitate the growth and development of the institution.
- Faculty member demonstrates leadership in disciplinary/professional organization(s).

Not Meeting Expectations:

- Faculty member does not participate in departmental, program, or faculty meetings.
- Faculty member does not participate in the governance and life of the University on a regular basis or in an effective manner.

h. If a tenured faculty member does not meet expectations in teaching, scholarship, or service at the time of the review, the faculty member will discuss with the Provost issues of concern and develop a plan to improve the faculty member's work. The plan should be grounded in the feedback from the most recent review conducted by the President's Senior Faculty Advisory Board. A written copy of the plan will be included in the dossier for the faculty member's next regularly scheduled review.

4. Special Reviews

In any year, any full-time member of the teaching faculty, tenured or non-tenured, may initiate a Special Review. This review will be based upon a salary report containing all of the information an individual would normally submit for a contract renewal or tenured faculty review. It will be read by the Provost and either the President's Advisory Board or the President's Senior Faculty Advisory Board. The salary decision will hold for that individual until the next regularly scheduled review.