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The Faculty Salary Committee is charged with making recommendations about individual faculty salaries using a merit point system that evaluates accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service, using the information from Sedona, additional data from the Registrar on number of advisees, and commentary from both the faculty member being reviewed and their reviewer. The committee assigns scores for teaching, scholarship, and service, which are then combined into an overall merit score. Similarly, the Personnel Committee assigns merit scores to faculty whom they review. The rubric described below summarizes the criteria that will be used by both committees next year (2013-14) and until the merit rubric is next revised.

The equation below will be used to compute a merit score, which will be rounded to the nearest ½ point. Since it is envisioned that faculty might be able to devote differing amounts of attention to teaching, scholarship, and service at various times in their careers, the equation includes a 10% slush factor that is allotted to the category with the highest score.

Merit = (.45) teaching score + (.25) scholarship score + (.20) service score + (.10) highest score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Rounded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 ≤0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25 ≤ 0.75</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;0.75 ≤ 1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1.25 ≤ 1.75</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1.75 ≤ 2.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25 ≤ 2.75</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75 ≤ 3.25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25≤3.75</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.75 ≤ 4.25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25 ≤ 4.75</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.75 ≤ 5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation of Teaching and Other Core Responsibilities—Scored on a 0 to 5 scale
End-of-Course Evaluations and peer teaching evaluations will carry the most weight in assessing teaching merit; however, other accomplishments and activities valued by Grinnell will also have an impact on the final score. For faculty who regularly teach fewer than five courses because of substantive administrative or other professional duties, a proportional portion of the teaching score may be allocated to those activities. Teaching and Other Core Responsibilities are only assessed for semesters in which faculty are not on leave.

**Evidence relevant for evaluating Teaching and other Core Activities:**

A. End of course evaluations  
B. Peer reviews  
C. Advising an especially large average number of students per semester, during the semesters in which the faculty taught).  
D. Teaching classes outside of core competencies, especially service courses like tutorial and statistics.  
E. Teaching independent studies, guided readings, and for-credit internships  
F. Honors or awards for teaching  
G. Talks, posters, presentations, articles, leading workshops or other activities that report successful teaching experiences and enhance Grinnell’s reputation for teaching effectiveness. *Actual research on pedagogy as opposed to the sharing of successful teaching ventures will receive credit as research. The person under review should indicate where the work should be credited.*  
H. For other core tasks the evidence will vary, but the goal is to demonstrate excellence and impact.

**In the salary statement faculty should comment on:**

A. Particular challenges that might explain lower teaching evaluations in a course.  
B. Exceptionally creative teaching or thoughtful pedagogies in a course or courses.  
C. Any evidence of teaching excellence not mentioned above.

**Category Descriptions for Teaching**

5—*Exceptional Teaching*  
- High EOC evaluations relative to Grinnell averages with excellent peer evaluations and 2 or more factors that the college values.

4—*Excellent Teaching*  
- High EOC evaluations relative to Grinnell averages with good peer evaluations and fewer than 2 additional factors that the college values. OR  
- Average EOC evaluations relative to Grinnell averages with good peer evaluations and than 2 additional factors that the college values.
3—Very Good Teaching
   • Average EOC evaluations relative to Grinnell averages with good peer evaluations and fewer than 2 additional factors that the college values. OR
   • Mixed EOC evaluations relative to Grinnell averages with good peer evaluations and more than 2 additional factors that the college values.

2—Good Teaching
   • Mixed EOC evaluations relative to Grinnell averages with good peer evaluations and fewer than 2 additional factors that the college values OR
   • Low EOC evaluations relative to Grinnell averages with good peer evaluations and more than 2 additional factors that the college values.

1—Improving Teaching
   • Low EOC evaluations relative Grinnell averages with some problems seen in peer evaluations, but evidence that the faculty member is working to improve their teaching.

0—Unacceptable Teaching
   • Consistently low EOC evaluations and negative peer evaluations.

Evaluation of Scholarship—Scored on a 0 to 5 Scale

**Evidence Relevant for Evaluating Scholarship**

A. Completed (published or performed) scholarship. Works in progress do not count.
   a. Scholarship is judged using information about both the type of work and the venue.
   b. Normally, substantial works receive more credit, but there are exceptions, such as when a short article is considered extremely influential, or if it is published in an extremely prestigious journal.

B. All external grants whether funded or not. Internal grants do not count.

C. Awards related to scholarship.

D. Other evidence of scholarly impact that may occur well after the original publication or performance.

**Category Descriptions for Scholarship**

5—Exceptional achievement with high visibility in a discipline.
   • A book published by a reputable press OR
   • A musical, dance, or theatrical performance of substantial scope involving a national-caliber performing ensemble or venue, or an exhibition at a prestigious gallery or museum of national or international significance. OR
   • In some cases, multiple works that fit into category 4. OR
   • In rare cases, a major article considered seminal or on the cutting edge within
the discipline and published in a major journal in the field.

4—Very strong achievement with likely visibility in a discipline
   • An article or articles published in highly competitive peer-reviewed journals. OR
   • An invited article or articles or book chapters. OR
   • A textbook. OR
   • In the performing or visual arts: performances or exhibitions of substantial. OR
   • Scope resulting from professional review in venues of regional significance or
     smaller scope resulting from professional review in venues of national or
     international significance. OR
   • In some cases, multiple works that fit into category 3.

3—Average achievement with some visibility in a discipline
   • Peer-reviewed article or articles in second or third tier journals. OR
   • In the performing or visual arts: several performances or exhibitions of lesser
     scope resulting from professional review in venues of regional significance. OR
   • In some cases, multiple works that fit into category 2.

2—Scholarship with low visibility in a discipline.
   • An article or articles not subject to peer review. OR
   • Public presentations or exhibitions without peer review presented at regional or
     national venues. OR
   • In the performing or visual arts: a small number of performances or exhibitions
     resulting from professional review in local or regional venues outside of
     Grinnell.

1—Less demonstrable or of limited visibility within the discipline
   • Book reviews. OR
   • Talks presented on campus or at other local colleges or universities. OR
   • Works in progress. OR
   • In the performing or visual arts: performances or exhibitions not subject to
     some form of professional review

0—Little or no evidence of scholarship

Evaluation of Service—Scored on a 0 to 5 Scale

Evidence Relevant for Evaluating Service

Service expectations are only assessed for years in which faculty are not on leave. In other
words, leaves will not be counted against faculty in assessing merit. Suggested scores are per
year and the final score represents an aggregate of the activities for the non-leave years
represented.
To the college

A. College committees and taskforces
B. Chairs of divisions, departments, concentrations
C. Specific departmental duties (such as running searches) when the individual is not chair.

To the Professional Discipline

A. Reviewing articles and books for publication
B. Serving on M.A. and Ph.D. committees
C. Serving in leadership positions in professional organizations
D. Serving on journal editorial boards
E. Serving as a journal editor
F. Organizing conferences, meets, etc.

CATEGORY DESCRIPTIONS FOR SERVICE

5—Exceptional Service
• The evidence shows that the candidate discharged the duties of a demanding elected or appointed office within the institution in an outstanding and highly effective manner or in some cases multiple level 4 activities.

4—Above Average Service
• The evidence indicates effective service and leadership in an elected or appointed office within the institution OR service in a professional capacity beyond campus that had a positive impact on the college’s reputation.

3—Average Service
• The evidence indicates a generous contribution of time and effort to maintain the routine governance of the college AND/OR some external service at a low level of prominence.

2—Less than Average Service
• The evidence indicates a reasonable allocation of time and effort to service.

1—Little Service
• The evidence indicates occasional service,

0—No Service.