THE DEAN OF FACULTY’S ANNUAL SALARY SETTING PROCESS

The annual budget process at the College includes the establishment of a salary pool for the faculty.

A. Beginning in the fall semester, the Dean regularly consults with the Committee on Budget and Finance, and the Vice President for Administration and Finance, regarding the overall College budget, including the salary pool.

B. In late February or early March, the Dean consults with the Assistant Dean of Faculty for Institutional Research and Assessment on comparative faculty salary data (rank among selected peer institution group by average salary in each rank; Physical Education data not available) and, when they become available, reports them to faculty.

C. In March, the College budget comes before the Board of Trustees for approval. When approved, estimates of relative distribution of available pool to each rank, based upon progress to general salary goals (middle 5 ranks of 25-peer institution group, i.e., 11–15th rank) are made in consultation with Assistant Dean of Faculty for Institutional Research and Assessment and Academic Budget Manager. General salary goals for Physical Education faculty are determined in consultation with the Director of Athletics with a view to maintaining competitiveness with peer institutions.

II. Salaries are adjusted annually based on merit.

A. Determination of Merit

1. Merit is established based on the annual review process [https://my.hamilton.edu/offices/dof/faculty-review-development/guidelines-for-review-process](https://my.hamilton.edu/offices/dof/faculty-review-development/guidelines-for-review-process) and the department chair’s annual merit recommendations.

2. Merit is assessed based upon the same criteria used for tenure and promotion, though service may be given more weight in setting salaries than in personnel decisions. As well, deficient or unproductive performance in any one area may affect overall salary merit determination negatively in a given year.

3. When the chair meets with the Dean to discuss annual reviews and make merit recommendations, the Dean welcomes the input of chairs on level of merit for each criterion for each faculty member in the department, including her or himself.

4. Salary letters are accompanied by a memorandum from the Dean detailing the process and any information the Dean considers helpful in understanding salary determinations that year.

B. Distribution of Merit

1. A small group of faculty members receive the highest percentage raises (“superior merit”);

2. A large group of faculty members receive higher-than-average increases (“high merit”);

3. A large group of faculty members receive increases at or slightly above the raise pool percentage (“merit”);

4. A small group of faculty members receive increases as close to the raise pool percentage as possible (“good”).

III. Salary adjustments (e.g., promotion in rank, market equity, corrections for underestimation of merit over a multi-year view), are made after merit increases have been calculated.
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The following is a summary of faculty activities associated with teaching, scholarship, and service criteria. The four-level scale—good, merit, high merit, and superior merit—is based on comparative accomplishment in these three criteria.

**Teaching**

**Good:** teaching is having mixed success, or may be facing challenges in certain respects.

**Merit:** teaching exhibits the excellence normally associated with the Hamilton professoriate, generally across all courses or modes of teaching. May also reflect work on early career teaching development, or development of new courses.

**High merit:** teaching is outstanding among department or disciplinary colleagues.

**Superior merit:** teaching is distinguished on a college-wide basis, for instance by development of program curricula, re-training in a new discipline, or is otherwise remarkable for a particular year.

**Scholarship**

**Good:** research or creative work that is building toward peer-reviewed publication or performance. This may include conference presentations; publication of conference abstracts, encyclopedia entries, or book reviews; fieldwork; or creative activity yet to be performed or exhibited.

**Merit:** research or creative work that is characterized by peer-reviewed publication of an article, on-campus performance of creative projects, or a group exhibition of artistic projects off-campus. Several or significant non-peer reviewed publications may be recognized at this level of scholarly accomplishment.

**High merit:** research or creative work that is characterized by publication of 2–3 articles, or an edited volume of contributions, or off-campus performance of a new creative project, or solo exhibition or multiple group exhibitions of artistic projects.

**Superior merit:** research or creative work that is characterized by publication of 4 or more articles or of a book-length manuscript; particular multi-year culminating accomplishments in creative fields (e.g., larger solo exhibition or published compositions) are similarly recognized.

**Service**

**Good:** largely limited to departmental duties, including advising, with perhaps some service to the profession (e.g., article peer review, judging student conference presentations, etc.).

**Merit:** includes both departmental work and "minor" college-wide service, such as on a committee that meets less than weekly and which carries lesser administrative responsibility than some "major" committees such as CAP or COA.

**High merit:** in addition to typical departmental duties, service includes two or three college-wide responsibilities, such as participation on "minor" committees as described above.

**Superior merit:** in addition to departmental duties, service on several (four or more) "minor" committees or other college-wide service duties, or service on a "major" campus-wide committee such as COA or CAP, which may be accompanied by other, "minor," college service.

Recognizing these nuances is not easy; each individual’s annual report and their chair’s (or senior member’s) input help to inform merit increases. The above characteristics are, however, easily drawn from ample examples among our faculty members, and thus may be useful in our annual review and salary determination process.

SK, rev. June