

REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY 2005-2006

Wayne Moyer
Professor of Political Science

July 31, 2006

The 2005-2006 academic year was an important one for the faculty as we moved forward in implementing the Strategic Plan. This report will address developments in four areas: I) faculty salaries; II) faculty hiring; III) the Expanding Knowledge Initiative; IV) continuing issues.

Part I – Faculty Salaries

A. Procedures for awarding merit scores

This was the second year of our experience with 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. Faculty members up for review submit detailed statements of accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and service. 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 is 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 continuing faculty as a part of the contract renewal or promotion/tenure review process.

Both the Faculty Budget Committee and the Personnel Committee used the same guidelines for determining merit scores that they had employed for 2004-2005, which are included as an appendix to this report. These guidelines provide criteria for awarding merit scores from zero to five for teaching, scholarship and service. A score of one indicates basically competent performance, while a score of five is indicative of unusually outstanding accomplishments.

The Faculty Budget Committee, in making its assessment, awarded separate merit scores for teaching, scholarship and service, then calculated an aggregate integer score, weighing teaching at 50 percent, scholarship at 30 percent and service at 20 percent. The Personnel Committee elected not to assign separate scores, but rather to award an overall merit score, based on a similar weighting of teaching, scholarship and service. The average of the scores awarded by the Personnel Committee was very similar to the average of the scores awarded by the Faculty Budget Committee. The 2005-06 score averages were very close to those awarded in 2004-05 and to historical merit score averages. Most faculty members received merit scores of two or three in 2005-06. A much smaller number received scores of one or four, and no one received a score of five.

In making its three-year assessments for senior faculty members, the Faculty Budget Committee appreciated the efforts that faculty members under review made in preparing their personal

statements and that department chairs made in writing their recommendations. These statements and recommendations played a central role in the Faculty Budget Committee's discussions. Our experience this year confirmed our confidence in the modified guidelines for three-year salary reviews that were approved by the Executive Council in the spring of 2005. These guidelines elaborate on things faculty under review should include in their personal statements and what department chairs should include in their evaluative letters. The 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 4.5 percent for 2006-07. The Faculty Budget Committee, in its recommendations that were accepted by President Osgood, allocated funds for salary increases as follows:

- 2.5 percent plus \$150 across-the-board increase.
- Merit increases of \$500 for each point of merit, using the merit scores assigned in 2005-6 by the Budget and Personnel committees, or the average of merit scores assigned by the Budget Committee for the 2001-2002, 2002-2003 and 2003-2004.¹
- 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 \$500 for all Assistant Professors to help keep their salaries at peer institution levels
- Less than a dozen upward adjustments of \$500 or \$1,000, where salaries seemed out of line with performance, faculty rank, and teaching experience at Grinnell.

The resulting average salaries and raises by rank were:

Grinnell Faculty Salaries by Rank 2006-07*				
	Maximum	Minimum	Average	Average Raise
Professor	\$172,600	\$76,700	\$103,798	4.3%
Associate Professor	\$118,500	\$65,300	\$77,257	4.6%
Assistant Professor	\$71,400	\$54,000	\$62,417	5.0%

*Cohort includes all full-time faculty in tenured or tenure-track positions (reported at 2006-07 rank). Does NOT include Librarians with faculty rank or Physical Education faculty.

¹ 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. This year's Faculty Budget committee, following the precedent set by the 2004-05 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 junior faculty salaries at peer institutions.

We attempted to estimate how these salaries for 2006-07 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 2006-07 by other colleges. However, we made a rough approximation based on what our peers have done in recent years, summarized in the table below. Salaries for Grinnell full professors compared to the peer mean will probably drop a little as a result of the promotion of five associate professors to the rank of professor in 2006-07.

Grinnell Salaries as a % of Peer Average		
Rank	Current year (2005-06)	Next year (predicted) (2006-07)
Professor	99.7%	98.6%
Associate	104.4%	102.5%
Assistant	99.2%	100.1%

I want to express my appreciation to all the people who helped implement the second year of the new merit assessment process and to determine faculty salary increases for 2006-2007. I especially want to thank the members of the Faculty Budget Committee, Chris Hunter, Tyler Roberts, and especially David Lopatto, who handled the spreadsheet calculations. I also want to thank the Personnel Committee, Ann Ellis, Ed Gilday, Johanna Meehan, Janet Seiz and Barb Trish. We are grateful to President Osgood and to the Board of Trustees for providing the 4.5 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 – Faculty Hiring

A. Allocation of Tenure Track Positions

The Executive Council received 13 requests for 15 tenure track positions from 10 departments, the American Studies planning committee and the EKI Interim Advisory Board. There were requests for seven replacement positions: five to replace faculty who have departed the college; and two to replace faculty who move to Senior Faculty Status. Eight new tenure track positions were requested: three from the American Studies Planning Committee; two from the EKI Interim Advisory Board (IAB); and others from the Departments of Chemistry, Mathematics and Statistics, and Theater (to regularize a term position). They are summarized in the table on the next page, which also notes the Council recommendations, key elements of discussion and President Osgood's final decision. Six of the proposals (in addition to the IAB proposal) had an identifiable EKI component. The Interim Advisory Board discussed the EKI aspects of these proposals prior to the Council discussion, forwarding on its comments.

As the table indicates, the Executive Council, without major controversy, recommended approval of requests to replace departing faculty in Biology, Chinese & Japanese, German, and Political Science. Keeping in mind that increasing faculty diversity is an important goal in all searches, special searches were endorsed for Chemistry, Music, Sociology and Theater, to follow

guidelines similar to those used under the Diversity Initiative, where successful candidates must contribute to diversity as a core value and strategic priority of Grinnell College. The Council recommended approval of the IAB proposal for new positions in geography and earth systems science to develop a new EKI curricular area with great potential to contribute to interdisciplinary work at the college.

The Council felt that the proposals from American Studies, Education and Mathematics were not sufficiently persuasive to merit approval. For American Studies, there were unanswered questions about the future structure of the American Studies curriculum, and the future deployment of staff. For Mathematics, the enrollment and curricular needs data were not convincing. The Education proposal was problematic in its emphasis on elementary science education. The Council felt it appropriate to urge the department to resubmit its request during the coming academic year to focus on secondary science education, an important area of emphasis in Strategy 6.

The Council also wrestled with the proposal to increase the shared contract to include more courses in Biology and Global Development Studies. It seemed hard to justify the Biology additions but there was a strong justification for the proposed coursework in Global Development Studies. The Council also had difficulty grappling with how to fit a contract expansion into an allocation of two new EKI positions. President Osgood, in his final decision to approve contract expansion on a term basis to increase EKI offerings allowed us to transcend the latter issue. He accepted all of the other Council recommendations

Summary of Executive Council Responses to Requests for Tenure-Track Positions, May 2006

DEPARTMENT	REQUEST	EXPLANATION OF REQUEST	EKI ASPECT	COUNCIL RECOMMEND.	KEY ELEMENTS OF DISCUSSION	FINAL DECISION
A. <u>American Studies</u>	Three new positions	Develop American Studies Curriculum	Yes	Deny positions	Uncertain future structure of Am. Studies curriculum; deployment of staff; EKI	President accepts recommendation
B. <u>Biology-Plant</u>	Replacement position	D. Robertson to SFS	No	Approve position	Renewal of unsuccessful search 2005-6	President accepts recommendation
C. <u>Biology –GDS</u>	Expansion of shared position	K. & P. Jacobson increase courses in Bio & GDS	Yes	Support GDS but does not recommend addition at this time Do not support Bio additions	GDS and BIO staffing and curricular needs; EKI positions	President approves expanded EKI offerings on a term basis

D.	<u>Chemistry-Organic</u>	Expansion position	Enrollment demands; workshop course offerings	Yes	Approve special search*	Enrollment pressures & curricular needs	President accepts recommendation
E.	<u>Chinese & Japanese</u>	Replacement position	Departure of M. Matsuga	Yes	Approve position	Japanese curricular offerings; enrollments	President accepts recommendation
F.	<u>EKI</u>	2 expansion positions: 1 in earth system science; 1 in geography	New areas that have potential to contribute to interdisciplinarity	Yes	Approve positions	Contribution to EKI and concentrations	President accepts recommendation
G.	<u>Education</u>	Replacement position	M. Voyles to SFS	No	Deny position and recommends resubmission of a revised proposal	Department curriculum	President accepts recommendation
H.	<u>German</u>	Replacement position	Departure of P. Perry	Yes	Approve position	Department curriculum; interdisciplinary contribution	President accepts recommendation
I.	<u>Mathematics</u>	Expansion position	Enrollment pressures	No	Deny position	Enrollment pressures & curricular needs	President accepts recommendation
J.	<u>Music</u>	Replacement position	Departure of R. Russell	No	Approve special search*	Music curriculum	President accepts recommendation
K.	<u>Political Science</u>	Replacement position	Departure of D. Ellison	No	Approve position	Pol. Sci. curriculum; intro needs	President accepts recommendation
L.	<u>Sociology</u>	Replacement position	Departure of L. Fernandez	Yes	Approve special search*	Curricular needs; enrollment pressures; EKI contribution	President accepts recommendation
M.	<u>Theater</u>	Regularize term position	Curricular need dance position	No	Approve special search*	Curricular needs	President accepts recommendation

* Special searches follow guidelines similar to those used under the Diversity Initiative, where successful candidates must contribute to diversity as a core value and strategic priority of Grinnell College

Part III – Expanding Knowledge Initiative

We made substantial progress during 2005-2006 in implementing the Expanding Knowledge Initiative approved in April 2005.² The Office of Interdisciplinary Studies (OIS) has been established under the direction of Associate Dean Marci Sortor; the Interdisciplinary Fellows (Jin Feng, Bob Grey, and Clark Lindgren) have developed detailed plans for the first Second-Year retreat to be held October 20-22 (the second weekend of fall break), at a scenic location in Boone, Iowa; and the Interim Advisory Board (OIB) (Todd Armstrong, Leslie Delmenico, Vince Eckart, Wayne Moyer, Monty Roper, Sam Rebelsky and Susan Strauber) is well along in discussing new areas for curricular development. The accomplishments of the OIS-IAB include the following:

- Clarified the relationship between the IAB and the faculty, and the IAB and the Executive Council (particularly in light of EKI-related position proposals)
- Developed “Guidelines for Developing New Areas of Study”
- Developed “Guidelines for New Faculty Positions”
- Surveyed departments and concentrations regarding interdisciplinary activities and interests
- Organized 29 Common Grounds Interdisciplinary lunches
- Organized 3 Teaching and Learning Lunches addressing interdisciplinary teaching issues
- Organized a summer workshop on interdisciplinary teaching to be held in August 2006
- Met with and provided feedback to Policy Studies (Bill Ferguson), American Studies (Henry Rietz and Karla Erickson), BIO/GDS (Jack Mutti & Peter Jacobson, ENV (David Campbell and Jon Andelson, and Middle Eastern Studies (Kathy Kamp)
- Submitted to the Executive Council a proposal regarding interdisciplinary faculty appointments and the means by which they would be mentored and reviewed
- Identified areas for possible expansion or development (and faculty appointments)
- Worked with a faculty group (Jon Andelson, David Campbell, Charles Cunningham, Kathy Kamp and Lee Sharpe and Monty Roper) to develop the successful proposal for two positions in Geography and Earth Science.

I was particularly pleased with the results of the interdisciplinary lunches. These lunches provided faculty members with an opportunity to identify others who shared similar teaching interests. They were well-attended and generated many exciting possibilities for future curricular development. They also led to six faculty workshops this summer to further develop curricular ideas. The Interim Advisory Board followed the lunch discussions closely and explored the ways in which the topics either overlapped or complemented each other. It was gratifying to see a high degree of connection between the topics. This has informed the IAB’s approach to its charge to identify new areas for curricular expansion.

The Interim Advisory Board has focused on two “Curricular hubs” for development and expansion: 1) Peace, Sustainability and Social Justice; and 2) the Studio for Creative Inquiry. The Peace, Sustainability and Social Justice hub addresses issues related to human and environmental well-being and their interconnection. Areas for exploration include:

² A more detailed report of progress in implementing the EKI is found in Marci Sortor’s report “The EKI in its first year: A Report of the Office of Interdisciplinary Studies” [<http://www.grinnell.edu/offices/dean/eki/officeinterdiscstudies/includes/OISreport06.pdf>]

- Peace and Conflict from personal to international scales
- The sustainability of social, political, environmental and economic systems. From local to global scales
- The allocation of natural resources and how human activities and environment affect each other
- Human rights

The Studio for Creative Inquiry would serve as a focus for the exploration of creative scholarship in the arts, and among the arts, humanities, and the sciences and social studies. Linked to this hub are a number of exciting initiatives: Arts in Practice (the implementation and practical application of art), Integrative Humanities, Inter-Arts Initiative (collaboration among the arts faculty), Visual Culture and New Media.

The Interim Advisory Board contemplated a number of different approaches for implementing the EKI. Three scenarios were discussed: 1) Scenario A – maximize the opportunities for existing faculty members to teach interdisciplinary courses; 2) Scenario B emphasizes strategic development or expansion of curricular areas; and 3) Scenario C relies on existing interdisciplinary entities (namely the Centers) as foci for developing the College’s interdisciplinary offerings. The IAB’s recommendation is to pursue a combined version of Scenarios A and B. But, it is also clear that the centers have much to offer in promoting cooperation and collaboration.

This approach to the Expanding Knowledge Initiative must be combined with the other faculty-related goals of EKI – enhancing the diversity of the faculty, increased opportunities for faculty-student research and other inquiry-based learning, and decreasing the College’s reliance on term faculty – as departments and other groups propose new faculty positions

During the 2006-2007 academic year the IAB-OIS agenda includes

- Working with faculty members to develop areas including Integrative Humanities, Inter-arts, and Environment
- Continuing the Common Interdisciplinary Grounds Lunches
- Bringing to campus specialists in some of the areas listed above to work with interested groups of faculty members and students
- Continuing the preliminary work done this past year on re-envisioning the concentrations and issues related to the nature of interdisciplinary teaching
- Developing by the end of the year a clear idea of how to expand and enrich the curriculum.

While the outlook for the successful implementation of the EKI appears promising, continuing the momentum requires adequate financial resources to complete the faculty and curricular expansion contemplated by the approved proposal. Even though the administration has found sufficient funding for the efforts thus far, I must admit to some apprehension about the future. The college has a very tight academic budget, and there is a question whether the increased costs for completing the EKI can be included unless the college produces more revenue or it relaxes

the spending limits from the endowment. It would be a shame, given the energy and commitment that has gone into the development of the EKI, if it runs aground or is slowed for financial reasons.

I also have a concern about the future relationship between the currently developing Strategy 6, Strengthening the Public Profile of Grinnell College, and the Expanding Knowledge Initiative. Strategy VI contemplates increased spending to invest in and promote science education, socially aware leadership, and creativity. This is an exciting initiative and we have been assured by the administration that this will complement the EKI. However, Strategy 6 could develop in such a way as to compete with EKI or could divert attention away from the EKI. I hope that indeed the two initiatives will complement and reinforce each other.

Part IV - Continuing Issues

A. Unresolved Executive Council Issues

There are several issues that the Executive Council spent time discussing in 2005-2006, but which are still unresolved and will have to be addressed again in 2006-07.

Faculty Voting Rights

The first of these is faculty voting rights, which also has occupied the Faculty Organization Committee. This issue is complicated in part because there are so many different types of faculty appointment (tenured, tenure track, term, continuing full-time, part-time, SFS, emeritus) with individuals in different categories having different stakes in the college. There is also a question whether voting rights should be similar or different in departments, divisions and the faculty as a whole. The current Faculty Handbook adds to the difficulty in that it is both inconsistent and ambiguous in its guidance. The Executive Council reached consensus with the Faculty Organization about recommended changes, and is waiting for comments from President Osgood before submitting its recommendations to the faculty.

Procedures for Promotion to the Rank of Professor

We have had good discussions in the Executive Council and on the floor of the faculty about revising the Procedures for Promotion to the Rank of Professor. The Council, however, did not have time at the end of the year to refine its proposal taking into account the comments from the faculty meeting discussion. There are still questions about such things as when to use the word “normally,” what to say about the importance of service for promotion, and whether to revise the procedures for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure to make them consistent with the changes for promotion to professor.

Appointment and Review of Faculty in Interdisciplinary Areas

We have begun to consider how to treat the appointment and review of faculty in interdisciplinary areas. The college has established interdisciplinary search committees, but once a faculty member is here, mentoring and review becomes the primary responsibility of a

department. There is a question whether this is adequate for appointments in areas that cross departmental boundaries. The Interim Advisory Board developed a proposal regularizing interdisciplinary search committees, and, subsequent to the search, giving these committees responsibilities for mentoring and review, while the faculty member still maintains a departmental affiliation. The Executive Council began to consider this proposal in 2005-2006, and will continue the discussion in 2006-2007.

B. Other Issues

Merit Assessment and Promotion to the Rank of Professor

Under the new salary review process promotion to the rank of professor is totally separated from the merit assessment process. The merit score awarded in the last three-year review carries over for the full three year period, even when an individual is promoted to professor between these reviews. Thus, promotion to professor does not have a direct link with salary. Another problem is that the Personnel Committee, with the full evaluation requisite for promotion, has far better data for the assessment of merit than is available to the Budget committee at the subsequent salary review. These issues were discussed in the Faculty Budget Committee, the Personnel Committee and briefly in the Executive Council, but no decision was reached. Two suggested possibilities are: 1) restart the salary cycle with promotion and let the Personnel Committee determine the merit score; 2) retain the existing salary cycle, but have the Personnel Committee calculate a shadow merit score to be passed on to a subsequent Faculty Budget Committee for consideration along with other data.

Use of End-of-Course Evaluation Data in Salary and Personnel Reviews

Under current procedures approved by the faculty, end-of-course evaluation teaching data are not made available to the Faculty Budget Committee and the Personnel Committee only gets the confidence intervals in the replies to the various questions. The Personnel Committee can make a good assessment of teaching because it has multiple other sources of teaching information (Chair's letter, SEPC report, Dean's survey of students). The Faculty Budget Committee only has the Chair's letter, and there is a question whether this single source of teaching data is adequate if we are going to continue to give a high weight to teaching quality (currently 50 percent) in the determination of merit scores by the Faculty Budget committee.

Diversity in Faculty Hiring

The Executive Council spent quite a bit of time discussing the implementation of the new faculty hiring procedures approved by the Executive Council last year to promote diversity (for the procedures see http://grinnell.edu/offices/dean/chairinfo/fac_alloc/ and http://www.grinnell.edu/offices/dean/chairinfo/fac_recruit/). Our goal has been to improve our effectiveness in recruiting more diverse pools of applicants. One strategy that we are employing for the searches beginning this coming year is to require departments or other entities contemplating searches to accompany their proposals to the Executive Council with detailed plans for increasing diversity in the applicant pool.

Implications of the Opening of the Rosenfield Campus Center

The college is gaining a magnificent new facility in the Rosenfield Campus Center. The opening of this facility will lead to a major transformation in campus dining and in where events and meetings are held. The adjustment will be eased in that South Lounge will continue to serve as a central location for talks, symposia and other events. The conversion of the Forum Grill and Coffeehouse areas into a new interdisciplinary media production facility, known as the Creative Computer Center, will help maintain the Forum as a focal point for student activity. One not yet completely answered question related to the transformation is the extent to which the Rosenfield Center will displace the functions of Grinnell House. Though obviously some changes will make sense, let me say that Grinnell House is a valued meeting place for faculty, for entertaining visitors, and for hosting meals and receptions. It is a wonderful place for discussion, away from the clamor of the central campus. Even though we have been assured by the administration that no changes are contemplated for Grinnell House in the immediate future, what happens beyond that is less certain. I would hope that the administration, in its long-term planning, will be persuaded by the faculty interest in preserving the current functions of Grinnell House.

Thank You

I want to thank my colleagues in the faculty for all your support over the last two years. It has been an honor to serve and an uplifting experience as well. I want especially to express my gratitude to everyone who has been involved in one way or another with the development of the Expanding Knowledge Initiative. It has been inspiring to see the energy, commitment and creative ideas that so many of you have contributed to this enterprise. This gives me great confidence for the future of Grinnell College. I also want to express my appreciation to my colleagues on the Executive Council and Personnel Committee who have been wonderful colleagues with whom to work. I think the discussions and interactions in both groups have been of very high quality. I am grateful to President Osgood and Dean Swartz for keeping me well-informed of their thinking and for consulting me on important college issues. I also want to thank the Trustees for their interest in the faculty and for their openness to faculty input. I owe a debt of gratitude to Sarah Purcell for serving as Assistant Director of the Rosenfield Program for the past two years, which has allowed me to fulfill responsibilities as Faculty Chair. Rita Walker, the Rosenfield Program Assistant, also deserves thanks for keeping the Rosenfield program office running smoothly during this interval. Finally, I want to thank my students for their understanding.

Looking to the future

I want to offer my best wishes to Eliza Willis as she succeeds me as faculty chair. I know that she will represent the faculty well.

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
- 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
- **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
- **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**