

# REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY 2004-2005

Wayne Moyer  
Professor of Political Science

August 16, 2005

This report will address developments during 2004-2005 in four important areas: I) faculty salaries; II) the Expanding Knowledge Initiative; III) faculty hiring; IV) faculty election schedule.

## **Part I – Faculty Salaries**

### A. Procedures for awarding merit scores

We inaugurated the new procedures for merit assessment approved by the faculty in 2003-2004. Under these procedures, faculty members are assigned merit scores generally for three-year periods, rather than annually, the case in previous years. Faculty members up for review now submit a detailed statement of teaching, scholarship and service accomplishments. Department chairs submit a detailed letter assessing these accomplishments, based on class visits, review of end-of-course evaluations and consultation with colleagues. The task of assigning merit scores, previously the exclusive province of the Faculty Budget Committee, is now divided between the Faculty Budget Committee and the Personnel Committee. The Faculty Budget Committee now assesses merit on a three-year cycle for Professors, Associate Professors and Lecturers in five-year contracts, while the Personnel committee makes the assessment for Assistant Professors and other regular continuing faculty as a part of the contract renewal or promotion review process.

The Faculty Budget and Personnel Committees in October 2004 jointly approved guidelines for determining merit scores, which are included as the appendix to this report. These guidelines provide criteria for awarding merit scores from zero to five for teaching, scholarship and service. In essence, a score of one indicates a basic competent performance, while a score of five is indicative of unusually outstanding accomplishments.

In making its assessments, the Faculty Budget Committee awarded individual merit scores for teaching, scholarship and service, then computed an aggregate integer score, weighting teaching at 50 percent, scholarship at 30 percent and service at 20 percent. The Personnel Committee elected not to assign individual scores, but only to award an overall score. In 2004-2005, the average of the scores awarded by the Personnel Committee was very close to the average of scores awarded by the Faculty Budget Committee. Both Personnel Committee and Faculty Budget Committee 2004-2005 score averages are very close to the historical average of merit scores over the previous three years, when the historical average is converted to a five-point scale. Most faculty members evaluated in 2004-2005 received merit scores of two or three. A much smaller number received scores of one or four, and very few received a score of five.

The Faculty Budget Committee, with more data on individual faculty members, and fewer individuals to consider, was able to do a more complete assessment of the performance of senior faculty members than has been possible in the past. I also think it makes sense to have shifted

the assessment of merit for junior faculty to the Personnel Committee, which makes comprehensive evaluations of performance in the context of contract and promotion reviews.

Based on the experience this year in implementing the new merit assessment process, the Faculty Budget Committee recommended modifications to the guidelines for three-year salary reviews that were approved by the Executive Council. These modifications elaborate on what individuals under review should include in their personal statements and what department chairs should include in their evaluative letters. The modified guidelines can be found on the dean's web page. [<http://www.Grinnell.edu/offices/dean/facrevs/facsalaryreviewguides/txt/>]

### B. Faculty Salary Increases

The Grinnell College trustees approved an overall faculty salary increase of 5.5 percent for 2005-2006. The Faculty Budget Committee, in its recommendations that were accepted by President Osgood, allocated funds for salary increases as follows:

- 3.5 percent plus \$100 across-the-board increase.
- Merit increases of \$500 for each point of merit, using the merit scores assigned in 2004-5 by the Budget and Personnel committees, or the average of merit scores assigned by the Budget Committee for the 2001-2002, 2002-2003 and 2003-2004.<sup>1</sup>
- A salary increment of \$500 for first-year faculty members who have no previous experience at Grinnell upon which to base a merit score.
- A salary increment of \$400 for all Assistant Professors to help keep their salaries at peer institution levels
- Less than a dozen upward adjustments of \$1,000 or less, where salaries seemed out of line with performance, faculty rank, and teaching experience at Grinnell.

The resulting average salaries and raises by rank were:

<b>Grinnell Faculty Salaries by Rank 2005-06*</b>				
	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Average Raise</b>
<b>Professor</b>	\$166,300	\$74,300	\$101,390	5.30%
<b>Associate Professor</b>	\$100,500	\$63,100	\$75,852	5.73%
<b>Assistant Professor Instructor</b>	\$74,800	\$52,000	\$60,710	6.12%

\*Cohort includes all full-time faculty in tenured or tenure-track positions continuing from 2004-05 to 2005-06 (reported at 2004-05 rank). Does NOT include Librarians with faculty rank or Physical Education faculty.

<sup>1</sup> The Faculty Budget Committee had to decide whether to distribute the merit portion of the salary increase as a percentage of salary or as a dollar amount per point of merit. A percentage increase gives a larger increase to senior faculty, but the increase does not become part of the salary base for as many years as for junior faculty. For a detailed discussion of the long-term impact of both methods for allocating merit see Mark Montgomery's Chair of the Faculty Report for 2003-2004. This year's Budget committee awarded merit as a dollar amount per merit point, considering that the average salary of junior faculty at Grinnell has been below the mean of the junior faculty salaries at peer institutions.

We attempted to estimate how these salaries for 2005-2006 will compare with those of our peer institutions. This is impossible to determine precisely, as we do not yet have data on the salary increases awarded for 2005-2006 by other colleges. However, we made a rough approximation based on what our peers have done in recent years, which is summarized in the table below. The salaries for Grinnell full professors and associate professors may drop a little compared to our peer institutions, at least in part stemming from the promotion this year of five associate professors to full professor.

<b>Grinnell Salaries as a % of Peer Average</b>		
<b>Rank</b>	<b>Current year (2004-05)</b>	<b>Next year (predicted) (2005-06)</b>
Professor	102%	100%
Associate	103.7%	103.6%
Assistant	99.9%	99.6%

I want to express my appreciation to all the people who helped to implement the new merit assessment process and to determine faculty salary increases for 2005-2006. I especially want to thank the members of the Faculty Budget Committee, Victoria Brown, Roger Vetter, and especially David Lopatto, who handled the heavy number crunching. I also want to thank the Personnel Committee, Vicky Bentley-Condit, Ann Ellis, Ed Gilday, Clark Lindgren and Johanna Meehan. We are grateful to President Osgood and to the Board of Trustees for providing the 5.5 percent salary increase and to Jim Swartz for his support in providing much of the data that we needed for our salary calculations.

## **Part II – The Expanding Knowledge Initiative**

In September 2004, President Osgood announced the Expanding Knowledge Initiative, which envisioned enhancement of the liberal arts at Grinnell through the expansion of interdisciplinary studies, as a final phase of the Strategic Planning process. The goal is to expose students to new and diverse approaches to knowledge that transcend traditional disciplinary boundaries, giving them new tools for critical thinking, and a better ability to address the complex issues of today's world. This initiative stemmed from faculty input in the strategic planning process and from the May 2004 recommendations of the subcommittee on Re-emphasizing the Liberal Arts, chaired by Victoria Brown. The Executive Council created a faculty committee to develop a proposal for implementing the Expanding Knowledge Initiative. The committee's work proceeded through several stages.

### Stage 1 (September to November, 2004) – Surveys and Models

The Expanding knowledge (EKI) committee proceeded on two tracks in the first stage of its work. The first track was to undertake a survey of faculty members inquiring about conceptions of interdisciplinarity, interdisciplinary training and experience, desire to participate in interdisciplinary teaching at Grinnell, and specific ideas for interdisciplinary teaching. Sixty-

Eight faculty members responded to the survey. The second track was to consider possible structures to promote interdisciplinary teaching at Grinnell. The committee felt getting the right structures in place that could achieve a high degree of faculty support was perhaps the most important aspect of its work. Several models for interdisciplinary teaching were considered, along with their implications for administration, departments, concentrations, development of new areas of interdisciplinarity, and appointments and reviews. Two of these models, a proposed Center for Support of Interdisciplinary Learning (CSIL), and a proposed Division of Interdisciplinary Learning (DIL), were discussed in Division meetings. Then these models, the results of the survey, and relevant sections of the April 2004 Strategic Planning document were submitted to the faculty for discussion in groups as a special faculty meeting on November 22, 2004. In these discussions, the participants were asked to consider how the college could most effectively pursue the following objectives: 1) to promote interdisciplinary teaching and learning; 2) to catalyze interdisciplinary course development; 3) to develop coherent hiring strategies that meet the goals of interdisciplinarity and diversity; 4) to build on and develop the College's interdisciplinary strengths.

### Stage 2 (November, 2004 to February, 2005) – Development of a Draft Proposal

The November 22 group discussions confirmed that the faculty is enthusiastic about doing more interdisciplinary teaching, but is limited by department course obligations. There was consensus that expanding the faculty would provide an enormously positive impetus to innovation. The discussions also confirmed that the Grinnell faculty, with a strong desire to preserve departmental autonomy, was not very supportive of creating a new interdisciplinary division. Responding to these discussions and other feedback from faculty, the EKI committee developed a January draft proposal, which was discussed in faculty groups at the February 7 faculty meeting. This proposal accepted the model of a new Office of Interdisciplinary Studies to work with departments, centers, concentrations and individual faculty members to explore and promote interdisciplinary possibilities. The specific elements of this proposal included:

- The creation of an Office of Interdisciplinary Studies<sup>2</sup>
- The appointment of a Director of the Office of Interdisciplinary Studies, assisted by an advisory board<sup>3</sup>
- The streamlining of concentrations into an optimal set of programs of interdisciplinary minors<sup>4</sup>
- The establishment of three Distinguished Professorships of Interdisciplinary Studies
- The institution of a Sophomore Retreat that invited students to reflect on their education in the liberal arts
- Increased opportunities for students to pursue research with faculty members
- The appointment of up to 12 additional faculty members

---

<sup>2</sup> This draft asked the College Executive Council to advise the President whether the director should be a faculty member with course releases or an associate dean.

<sup>3</sup> An Interim Advisory Board including the chairs of current college concentrations, and student representatives was envisioned for the first year to lead the process of streamlining concentrations into an optimal set of programs, to be succeeded by a permanent Advisory Board

<sup>4</sup> The EKI committee envisioned interdisciplinary programs such as: 1) Global Studies; 2) Study of Culture; 3) Environmental Studies; 4) Neuroscience; 5) American Studies; 6) Gender Studies; 7) Science and Society

Stage 3 (February 2005 to April 2005) – Development of the final proposal

Responding to the comments in the February focus groups and other faculty discussions, the EKI committee developed a final proposal that was approved by the faculty at a meeting on April 18. The final proposal dropped the creation of new minors and new interdisciplinary programs. The general sense was that the faculty needed much more discussion about the implications before proceeding with such changes. In place of new programs, the final proposal called for re-envisioning concentrations. A second modification was to create three Interdisciplinary Faculty Fellowships instead of distinguished professorships. Distinguished professorships would have been open only to very senior faculty, while fellowships could be open to a much broader cross-section of the faculty, including many at intermediate stages of their careers who have the potential to lead interdisciplinary innovation. Though the final proposal still did not specify whether the Director of the Office of Interdisciplinary Study should be a faculty member with course releases or a dean, the majority view seemed to be that the duties of the office could best be carried out by an associate dean. The approved proposal recommended:

- (A) The creation of an Office of Interdisciplinary Studies
- (B) The appointment of a Director of the Office of Interdisciplinary Studies
- (C) The appointment of 12 additional faculty members
- (D) The re-envisioning of concentrations to meet current needs
- (E) The establishment of three Interdisciplinary Faculty Fellowships
- (F) The institution of a Second Year Retreat, that invited students to reflect on their education in the liberal arts
- (G) Increased opportunities for students to pursue research with faculty members.

Subsequent to the faculty approval of the Expanding Knowledge Initiative, the Trustees have approved the entire Strategic Plan. Marci Sortor has been appointed Director of the Office of Interdisciplinary Studies in her capacity as Associate Dean. The Interim Advisory Board, consisting of Todd Armstrong, Leslie Delmenico, Vince Eckhart, Wayne Moyer, Sam Rebelsky, Monty Roper and Irene Powell is now in place and has met twice over the summer to outline a plan of work for the fall. The challenges for the Board are to get planning underway for the Second Year Retreat to be held in 2006-2007 and to develop concrete ideas for increasing interdisciplinary teaching.

I want to express my thanks to all the faculty members who participated in the process leading up to the approval of the Expanding Knowledge Initiative. Your comments, criticisms and suggestions were extremely important in shaping the final proposal. I especially want to express my appreciation to the members of the Expanding Knowledge Initiative Committee, Steve Andrews, Todd Armstrong, Victoria Brown, Clark Lindgren and Marci Sortor, for their vision and commitment, as the group, meeting nearly every week, developed ideas, sought feedback and drafted and refined its proposal. I want to thank Dean Swartz for providing the data and administrative support essential for developing the EKI proposal. I also want to thank Richard Cleaver for keeping wonderfully detailed notes of the EKI committee meetings, which contributed significantly to the efficiency of the planning process.

### **Part III - Faculty Hiring.**

#### Diversity Positions

Grinnell College engaged in a special initiative during 2004-2005 to increase the diversity of the faculty. Under this initiative, ten proposals were submitted from departments and concentrations requesting permission to begin searches for new faculty positions. The Executive Council approved nine of these proposals. I'm pleased to say that this initiative was highly successful, with new faculty members hired in Biology (neuroscience), Economics, Philosophy (Gender and Women's Studies), Political Science, Sociology and Physics. I want to thank the departments and concentrations that undertook these searches for their conscientiousness in identifying strong candidates for these positions and in persuading the top candidates to accept positions at Grinnell.

#### B. Allocation of Tenure Track Slots

The Executive Council received eight requests for tenure track positions from seven departments. Five were replacements for faculty moving to Senior Faculty Status, one was to replace a faculty member moving to another institution and two were for new positions. They are summarized in the table on the next page, which also notes the Council recommendation, key elements of discussion and President Osgood's final decision. As the table indicates, requests were approved without major controversy to replace departing faculty in Anthropology, Biology, English and Physics, along with the departing Librarian of the college. The Chemistry request for an expansion position was considered strong and was approved as a diversity search. The Music request for an expansion position was denied. The Council felt that although the proposed new position would add diversity to the Music curriculum, it could not be justified by current enrollments in music courses.

#### C. Changes in Faculty Hiring Procedures

##### Faculty Hiring Procedures

It seems unlikely that the College will undertake a special diversity initiative during 2005-2006. However, to ensure that faculty diversity retains its high priority, the Executive Council has produced a new statement on Faculty Allocation Procedures and modified faculty recruitment procedures to ensure that extraordinary efforts are made in all faculty searches to identify and attract applicants from under-represented groups.<sup>5</sup>

[[http://www.Grinnell.edu/offices/dean/chairinfo/fac\\_alloc/txt/](http://www.Grinnell.edu/offices/dean/chairinfo/fac_alloc/txt/)]

[[http://www.Grinnell.edu/offices/dean/chairinfo/fac\\_recruit/text/](http://www.Grinnell.edu/offices/dean/chairinfo/fac_recruit/text/)]

---

<sup>5</sup> The March 3, 2005 Executive Council Statement notes, "There are many ways to define diversity, and Grinnell values many kinds of diversity. To prioritize commitments of time and energy, our highest priority is to focus our present efforts on increasing the representation of Black/African Americans, Hispanic Americans, American Indians and Asian Americans. There may be particular circumstances where the need of the college would suggest that other elements of diversity are also a priority."

**Summary of Executive Council Responses to Departmental  
Requests for Tenure-Track Positions, May 2005**

DEPARTMENT	REQUEST	EXPLANATION OF REQUEST	COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION	KEY ELEMENTS OF DISCUSSION	FINAL DECISION
A. <u>Anthropology</u>	Replacement position	D. Caulkins moves to SFS	Approve position	Teaching linguistics subfield; intro class size	President accepts recommendation
B. <u>Biology – Micro</u>	Replacement position	B. Voyles moves to SFS	Approve position	Biology curriculum; coupling with Biology – Plant. Search	President accepts recommendation
C. <u>Biology – Plant</u>	Replacement position	D. Robertson moves to SFS	Approve position	Biology curriculum; coupling with Biology-Micro search	President accepts recommendation
D. <u>Chemistry</u>	Expansion position	Enrollment pressures & curricular needs	Approve diversity search	Dept. contribution to general education; leave-proofing	President accepts recommendation
E. <u>English</u>	Replacement position	M. Cavanagh moves to SFS	Approve position	English curriculum; class size	President accepts recommendation
F. <u>Library</u>	Replacement position	C. McKee moves to SFS	Approve position	Search process	President accepts recommendation
G. <u>Music</u>	Expansion position	Diversity in music curriculum	Deny position	Music enrollments	President accepts recommendation
H. <u>Physics</u>	Replacement position	B. Borovsky resignation	Approve position	Leave-proofing; previous hiring	President accepts recommendation

These efforts will include:

- Department representative meet with the Diversity Officer to discuss strategies for achieving greater diversity in the applicant pool well in advance of the April 1 deadline for submitting position requests to the Executive Council.
- Enhanced efforts to identify diverse applicants by doing such things as: sending position descriptions to diversity organizations in the hiring discipline; attending professional meetings of organizations focusing on diverse scholars in the discipline; making use of contacts with diverse faculty in other institutions, previous minority scholars-in-residence; and, reviewing CSMP dossiers from previous years.
- After ranking the applicant pool, the search committee should prepare a report of the search, including a statement that clearly outlines what steps the department took to build the applicant pool with respect to diversity.

#### **Part IV – Faculty Elections**

The Executive Council considered a problem created by the incompatibility between the faculty election schedule and the release of the coming year's course schedule. The course schedule comes out in early April, sometimes before the election of faculty to offices where they are granted course releases.<sup>6</sup> As a result, we have been faced with a situation where the schedule has to be changed at the last minute or publicized courses have to be cancelled. The Executive Council approved a resolution asking the Faculty Organization Committee to formulate an Amendment to the Faculty Handbook to move elections earlier in the spring semester. The Faculty Organization Committee developed a proposal, jointly endorsed by FOC and the Executive Council, which the faculty approved at the May 16, 2005 faculty meeting. The new election sequence is as follows:

- Three members of Personnel Appeals Board – First regular meeting in fall semester
- Chair of the Faculty – first faculty meeting in February, even years
- Chair of the Divisions – after first, but before second faculty meeting in February – Science: even years; Humanities & Social Studies: odd years
- Division representatives to the Faculty Personnel Committee – after first, but before second faculty meeting in February – Science: odd years; Humanities & Social Studies: even years
- Division Curriculum Committee representatives – After first, but before second faculty meeting in February – all divisions
- A Member-at-Large of the Executive Council (one in even years, one in odd years) – second faculty meeting in February
- A Member-at-Large of the Faculty Personnel Committee ( one in even years, one in odd years) – Second Faculty meeting in February AFTER election of Executive Council member

---

<sup>6</sup> Up to and including 2004-2005, the Chair of the Faculty and Division Chairs have received course releases every year, and department chairs every other year. During 2004-2005, additional course releases were authorized for Members-at-Large of the Executive Council (every year), and division representatives on the Personnel Committee (every other year).

- The Chair of each department – immediately following election of Members-at-Large of Executive Council and Faculty Personnel committee each year, but BEFORE spring break annually
- The Chair and members of the Faculty Organization Committee – immediately following spring break annually
- The members of all other faculty committees – regular faculty meeting in May, annually

## **THANK YOU**

I want to take this opportunity to thank the faculty for all your support in helping to develop the EKI and other endeavors. I especially want to express appreciation to my fellow member of the Executive Council: Victoria Brown, Leslie Gregg-Jolly, David Lopatto, Roger Vetter and Eliza Willis, who kept me on my toes and were a great group with which to work. I am grateful to President Osgood and Dean Swartz for consulting me and keeping me well-informed about their thinking on important college issues. I want to thank the trustees for their support of the faculty and for treating me with respect. I am grateful to Sarah Purcell for assuming the position of Assistant Director of the Rosenfield Program, allowing me to undertake the responsibilities of Faculty Chair. I want to thank Rita Walker for maintaining order and providing administrative support in what otherwise would have been a very chaotic office. Finally, I want to thank my students for their understanding.

## Appendix

### Guidelines for Awarding Numerical Merit Assessment Scores

(Developed at Joint Meeting of Faculty Budget and Personnel Committees, October 14, 2004)

#### Scale, Range, and Median

- Range will be 0 to 5
- Scores will be set using “disciplined subjectivity,” guided by rules of thumb below
- Teaching scores will be assigned based on evidence of teaching performance, teaching scholarship, and teaching service

#### PRELIMINARY RULES OF THUMB FOR EVALUATING TEACHING

- 0 possible in theory, unlikely in practice
- 1 = competent, static teaching with moderate evaluations
- 2 = static teaching with excellent evaluations
- 3 = new course, expanding teaching horizon, innovation
- 4 = multiple new courses or innovations
- 5 = innovations including assessment demonstrating impact
- PRELIMINARY RULES OF THUMB FOR EVALUATING SCHOLARSHIP
  - 0 = no evidence of scholarly activity
  - 1 = small number of book reviews, presentations or performances/exhibitions at regional venues
  - 2 = invited chapters, minor journal articles, presentations or performances/exhibitions at national or international venues
  - 3 = peer-reviewed articles in significant journals
  - 4 = multi-year project of major proportions
  - 5 = multi-year project of major proportions with substantial impact
- PRELIMINARY RULES OF THUMB FOR EVALUATING SERVICE
  - 0 = no evidence of service
  - 1 = departmental service
  - 2 = minor committee service (+ department service)
  - 3 = major committee service, busy committed department or concentration chair
  - 4 = multiple significant service roles (e.g., dept chair and Personnel Committee)
  - 5 = Chair of faculty, director of accreditation effort, etc.
  - NEED TO FACTOR IN SERVICE OUTSIDE THE COLLEGE