

February 11, 2013

**Criteria for Promotion to and in the Clinical Teaching track
Department of English: University of Colorado Denver**

The general *criteria for the appointment of faculty to the Clinical Teaching track* are given in “The Laws, Policies and Administrative Policy Statement of the Regents of the University of Colorado.” *The appointment provides the privileges and responsibilities of English faculty accorded to their rank by the Regents’ Laws and Policies. In accordance with these laws and policies, CTT appointees are excluded from voting on tenure track cases but may participate fully in departmental policy, curriculum, and annual salary reviews. The CLAS document entitled “Requirements for Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion for Clinical Teaching Track (CTT) faculty in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, University of Colorado Denver” (hereafter referred to as “CLAS CTT policies and procedures” or CTT PP) stipulates that the “specific expectations and criteria for evaluation of teaching, service and scholarly activity will be determined by primary units in CLAS and must be approved by the Dean and the Chancellor”.*

The document further states that CTT faculty must “participate in a broad range of teaching, service and scholarly activities” and that for each initial appointment to the CTT track “primary units will also determine, with the approval of the Dean, the relative weight of teaching, service and scholarly activity as well as general expectations for each of the three areas. There must be a minimum of 10% distribution of effort in each of the three categories. The primary responsibility could be teaching or service, and except under special circumstances, scholarly activities would be limited to no more than 20% of evaluation. CTT faculty are expected to demonstrate continued professional growth in their fields.”

Based on these general guidelines, the department of English includes (below) criteria for the appointment to and promotion within the Clinical Teaching track.

Appointment to Assistant Professor CTT

An applicant shall have a terminal degree that is field appropriate, a demonstrable teaching record, and field appropriate scholarly goals to indicate professional growth. The candidate submits a dossier according the College of Liberal Arts guidelines. It shall include a CV, materials relevant to the appointment (e.g. currency of knowledge and skills, student evaluations, faculty interview data, evidence of scholarship) and three letters of recommendation, including at least one from outside of the department. These letters will be solicited by the chair of the Ad Hoc CTT Review Committee; this committee (see criteria below under Review Process) will review the dossier and make a recommendation to the department faculty. The entire faculty will vote, and the Chair of the department will report the vote and make a written recommendation to the Dean of CLAS.

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor CTT

“Promotion or appointment to Associate Professor CTT marks a significant point in the development of a faculty member’s professional career. The individual **must demonstrate excellence in the area of primary responsibility as well as significant contributions in the other areas**” (CTTT PP). The CTTT faculty member’s primary area of effort will be teaching and/or service (since scholarly activity is limited to 20% of evaluation).

The following guidelines identify the general parameters that guide the Department of English evaluations of candidates' work in teaching and service, as well as scholarly activity. For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor CTT the faculty member must demonstrate

- excellence in the primary area of effort (teaching or administrative service)
- significant contributions (called “meritorious” in the following descriptions) in the secondary area
- continuing professional development in the area of scholarly activity

CRITERIA FOR TEACHING - For guidelines on material to be included in the evaluation of teaching, refer to the APS: “Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation,” on line at https://www.cu.edu/policies/policies/HR_TeachingEvaluation.html

Teaching shall be considered **meritorious** when the evaluation process demonstrates that the candidate has made a positive constructive impact on the intellectual development of students in the context of formal course work. Evidence that the candidate has a genuine commitment to teaching, has respect for students, and is likely to continue such commitment and respect will be a requirement for the meritorious designation. Contributions may also be expected in curriculum development, student advising, and/or individual instruction. The extent of teaching activities expected will depend on the percentage of effort in this area of secondary importance, either scholarship/creative activities or service. Each individual contract for CTT faculty will contain a specific list of requirements for the secondary and tertiary areas of effort. The Department of English considers the following evidence when evaluating a candidate’s teaching record for meritorious distinction:

1. Evidence of breadth and depth of knowledge of the discipline.
 - Variety of course levels taught (i.e., 1000, 2000, 3000, etc.)
 - Variety of courses taught
2. Keeping up to date in the field. This will include
 - Incorporating new material into existing courses
 - Developing new courses as permitted or requested
 - Revising courses when appropriate
3. Demonstrated teaching effectiveness as evaluated by students and colleagues

February 11, 2013

- Favorable ratings in FCQs (evaluators will take into account factors that mitigate FCQ scores such as class size, required vs. elective and class format: on-campus, hybrid, online)
 - Student letters on effectiveness
 - Peer evaluation of courses
 - Effectiveness in a variety of courses and (if applicable) levels
 - Opinions of graduating seniors as well as of graduating DML majors and minors in exit interviews
4. Accessibility, communication and interaction with students
 - Availability during office hours
 - Supportive, accurate and useful advising
 5. Evidence of rigor of learning experience:
 - Course materials, including clarity and completeness of syllabus
 - Student evaluations
 - Peer evaluations
 6. Involvement in department and college's teaching mission
 - Curriculum development
 - Formulation of standards and methods of outcomes assessment
 - Willingness and ability to teach courses relevant to curricular and programmatic needs

A record that falls below these criteria will not be designated as meritorious.

The distinction of **excellence** shall be given to those candidates who demonstrate superior commitment to and success in teaching. Such candidates are thought of as outstanding teachers who exceed the meritorious performance standards, as outlined above, and who are recognized by both students and faculty as having a significant impact on teaching at UC Denver.

In addition to the criteria for meritorious teaching, a combination of the following areas will be considered for establishing excellent performance in teaching:

1. Dissemination of knowledge
 - Publications and/or participation in conferences or workshops in the department, college, campus, community or profession disseminating knowledge on teaching
 - Outreach to schools
 - Mentoring other NTT faculty
 - Mentoring students
 - Collaboration with students on publications
 - Grants for teaching, curriculum development
 - Authoring or co-authoring textbooks
2. Teaching Effectiveness
 - Excellent ratings on FCQs
 - Teaching awards and honors

February 11, 2013

- External and peer evaluation of excellence
 - Indicators of quality of student outcomes
3. Incorporation of innovations and integration of technology into teaching, course development, curriculum development
 4. Evidence of extraordinary efforts in teaching beyond the standard
 - Workload: large sections, required courses
 - New preparations, course proposals
 - Number of independent studies, theses, dissertations, internships
 - Involvement in study abroad
 - Contribution to the development of learning equipment, facilities, and instructional aids
 - Extracurricular teaching contributions within or outside of the University
 5. High-quality individual instruction
 - Theses
 - Independent studies
 - Internships
 - Involvement of students in scholarly activities; evidence of high quality collaboration with students in this area

CRITERIA FOR SERVICE

CTT faculty with **meritorious service** must contribute in a meaningful way to the department. The amount of service expected will depend on the percentage of effort in this area. Each individual contract for CTT faculty will contain a specific list of service requirements for the secondary or tertiary area of effort.

Examples of service at the department level are listed below.

Departmental Service:

- Undergraduate advising
- Membership on Departmental committees (standing committees, executive, salary increment, search and ad hoc committees)
- Demonstrated leadership in areas such as program development, curriculum review and development, faculty growth, teaching improvement, and scholarly activity at the departmental level
- Student mentoring, including independent studies, directorship of internships and student theses and co-authoring scholarly articles with students, sponsorship of honor societies
- Grant writing activities
- NTT faculty mentoring
- Formal sponsorship of student organizations

February 11, 2013

A record falling below these criteria is not considered meritorious.

For excellence in service, the CTT faculty member usually provides an ongoing MAJOR administrative contribution to the department and/or the college, for example as director of an important program. In addition, the faculty member will provide the type of service required for meritorious designation. Other indicators of excellent service include committee work at the level of the university, the profession and (if appropriate) the community. Examples of service at these levels (beyond the requisite service at the departmental level) are listed below.

Administrative service

- Director of departmental program(s)
- Chair of ad hoc departmental committee (s)

College and University Service:

- Service on College or University committees or as a member of the faculty senate, CLAS Council or other appropriate committees
- Demonstrated leadership in areas such as program development, curriculum review and development, faculty growth, teaching improvement, and scholarly activity at the College or University level
- Liaison and involvement with other units, offices, and programs within UCD, at other campuses of the University of Colorado, other universities in Colorado and with secondary schools
- Participation in University-wide projects such as the CU Succeed program.

Professional Service:

- Offices in professional organizations
- Receipt of honors, awards, and project grants
- Membership on editorial boards of professional organizations
- Contributions to professional organizations by moderating or critiquing programs
- Consultation and/or training in areas of professional competence
- Written opinions from professional colleagues and/or recipients of service, on and off campus

Community Service Relevant to the Profession:

- Membership on appointed or elected boards, commissions, and committees
- Membership and/or offices in service or community-action organizations
- Participation in public lectures, debates, and panel discussions
- Collaboration with programs in secondary schools

CRITERIA FOR SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

CTT faculty must commit between 10% and 20% of their professional effort to the development of their academic credentials, that is, to keeping themselves current in their field. Examples of continued professional growth could include:

February 11, 2013

- Attendance at local and national scholarly conferences, including department colloquia
- Presenting a paper/creative work at a local or national-level conference
- Participation in workshops related to field of expertise
- Presenting workshops on field of expertise
- Chairing a session at a conference
- Participating in a roundtable discussion at a conference or workshop
- Collaboration with colleagues at the local and national levels as seen in co-presented papers or workshops
- Publications in conference proceedings
- Publications of research/creative work

Active participation is expected at a local or national forum (as described above) at least once every other year. Examples of active participation include presenting a paper, leading a workshop or chairing a session. For the other forums attended but in which there is no formal participation, it is expected that the faculty member will share information obtained with English faculty in an appropriate setting, such as a department colloquium. This must take place within 6 months of the conference or workshop.

More precise expectations concerning the amount and type of scholarly activity will depend on the percentage of effort devoted to scholarly activity. Each individual contract for CTT faculty shall contain a specific list of expectations for scholarly activity.

PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF FULL PROFESSOR, CTT

Faculty at this rank must have a minimum of five years at the rank of Associate Professor, CTT. The criteria for promotion to the rank of Full Professor, CTT, include continued achievement in their contracted areas as indicated in the annual ratings of “exceeding expectations” and/or “outstanding.” Successful candidates demonstrate outstanding contributions in the primary area of evaluation and significant contributions to the other two areas. Work and accomplishments already reviewed and considered for promotion to Associate Professor, CTT, although included in the dossier, will be given less weight in the review process in comparison to work done since promotion to the rank of Associate Professor CTT. The record since the last promotion must show substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in the primary area of effort and continued meritorious activity, bordering on excellence in the other two areas.

REVIEW PROCESS

Instructors interested in applying either for a CTT position or for promotion shall notify the department chair at least six months in advance, so as to allow time for the chair to form an Ad Hoc committee for the review. The candidate shall then submit a dossier in compliance with CLAS requirements. This dossier shall then be reviewed by an English committee consisting of tenure track faculty and at least one CTT appointee, if possible. The chair of English appoints an Ad Hoc committee for this purpose.

February 11, 2013

The chair of the CTT review committee summarizes the case and presents it to the department. The committee makes a recommendation based on the achievement of excellence in the candidate's primary area of Teaching or Service. The candidate need to achieve meritorious in his/her other contracted areas. The faculty vote is taken by secret ballot and follows the same mandates of quorum as govern Tenure Track faculty (see department Bylaws). The department chair reports the department's vote in his/her letter included in the dossier; the letter complies with the same requirements outlined for tenure track faculty. The chair then forwards the dossier to the CLAS dean's office.

The candidate who is appointed to the CTT position will undergo annual review based on the criteria of the candidate's contract and according to the criteria set out in the English department Salary Increment document.

Once appointed to the CTT, the candidate may apply for promotion from assistant to associate at any time, although five years or later is recommended, and from associate to full after five years or later. . A candidate wishing to change the percentages of his/her contract must petition the chair of the department with compelling reasons for the change. Any changes need to be approved by the department and then submitted to the Dean of CLAS for approval.

UCD Department of English
The Salary Increment Process
Fall 2010

General Description

The salary increment process occurs in the spring each year. It is a departmental evaluation of a faculty member's performance for the preceding calendar year, and it measures the success of activity in three areas: research, teaching, and service. Unless otherwise determined, the standard evaluation is considered by the Regent's mandate to be 40% research, 40% teaching, and 20% service. The standard teaching load in the Department of English is 2 and 2, although course releases may be built into certain positions. The salary increment process is important for two reasons. First, it becomes a significant, but not necessarily the only, factor in determining the size of a faculty member's yearly raise. Second, it is an important record of a faculty member's progress toward tenure and promotion and within post-tenure review.

Please note that the departmental evaluation--together with the completed Faculty Report of Professional Activities (FRPA) becomes the only permanent record of a candidate's yearly performance, but it is not the sole factor in determining the yearly raise. Although the department evaluation determines what percentage of the general fund a candidate will receive for his or her base raise from the available pool, the chair of the department, the dean of the college, and the vice-chancellor each have discretionary funds at their disposal and may choose to contribute to the raises of deserving candidates.

February 11, 2013

The Committee

The committee has four subcommittees, one for research, one for teaching, one for service and one for instructors. Members of the committees are appointed by the chair. The chair of the department in consultation with the chairs of the four subcommittees evaluates the director of composition. The chairs of the four subcommittees of Salary Increment evaluate the administration of faculty with contracted appointments. Clinical Teaching Track appointments are evaluated according to their contracted percentages by the three committees for teaching, service and research. The chair is a de facto member of each committee: s/he will facilitate the discussion and guide the process but not actively participate in individual evaluations. The committees will consider submitted materials and evaluate a candidate's performance in each of the three areas and assign a grade for that performance based on a 4 point scale where the increment is .5. In the case of the director of composition, a committee considers this fourth area and assigns a numerical score based on a 4 point scale where the increment is .5. The three scores (or four scores) are then averaged against their respective percentages, and a single score is determined. That score is used by the dean's office to determine the base raise if funds are available. The chair and dean discuss the scores and distribute their available monies after the base raises have been determined.

Submission of Materials

The first step in the process is the completion of the Faculty Report of Professional Activities (FRPA). The FRPA form is available in electronic format and sent by email early in the spring term. The faculty member records the facts of his or her labor on the FRPA form. Under research, for example, the candidate will indicate any books or articles published in the previous year, conferences attended, grants attained. Under teaching, the candidate will list courses taught, new preparations, independent studies, honor theses, etc. Under service, the candidate will rank contributions according to level: departmental, college, university, system, community. Please note: record only those publications/activities that were accomplished WHILE EMPLOYED by the university.

In addition to completing the FRPA, faculty members must submit to the Salary Increment Committees two additional records in each category of evaluation. First, faculty should submit EVIDENCE of accomplishments. For research and creative work, these may include published articles and creative work, articles and creative work completed in draft, presentations given at conferences, readings and their venues, plays written and performed, citations of your work, etc. For teaching, evidence may include syllabi and policy statements, class exercises, corrected papers, sample exams, FCQ summaries, a list of independent study students and new preparations, etc. For service, please include some evidence of the labor involved in serving on committees to supplement the list of activities included on the FRPA.

Second, faculty should also submit a detailed SELF-EVALUATION broken down by category: research, teaching, and service (and administration where applicable). The self-evaluation needs to include the contracted assignments if they differ from the standard 40-40-20. A research summary might list significant research accomplishments and explain the nature of the work and the quality of the outlet and the status of work in progress, etc.; the second might explain teaching philosophy, successes and failures of courses taught, an analysis of student evaluations (both the Boulder FCQs and the departmental narrative evaluations), innovations

February 11, 2013

attempted, curriculum developed, independent studies taken on, theses directed, etc.; the third might describe which service responsibilities were the most significant and why.

Faculty members should also provide a numerical self-evaluation based upon the departmental criteria for each category being evaluated. The Salary Increment Committees cannot evaluate any activities or accomplishments not cited either in the FRPA or in the materials provided by the faculty member in question.

The Ratings

Average Annual Productivity in Research and Creative Work

The level of research and creative productivity of members of the English department may be satisfied by various combinations of books, articles, reviews, abstracts, conference presentations, grants, poems, short stories, creative non-fiction, plays, performances, editorials, video productions of scholarly value, published reports based on conference findings, and curatorial exhibits requiring research. The value of research production should be determined on the basis of its impact on a field of study and on its potential to advance the goals of the University of Colorado Denver.

Faculty members will be rated on a four point scale with .5 increments in each of the three areas and administration, if applicable, and then a final, overall score will be averaged out. Promotion and tenure, however, are not granted on the base of a numerical score. For tenure and promotion, all three areas of activity—research/creative work, teaching, and service—must be deemed "meritorious," and excellent in either research/creative work or teaching. .

Sample Annual Ratings:

Research:

- 4.0– May be one single-authored book through a major press (credited over three years); or one edited book through a major press (spread out over two years); or one long essay in top-tier outlet and one major conference presentation; or two shorter essays in second-tier journals and 2 international conferences or readings.
- 3.5– May be one major essay with no conferences or reviews; or one long review essay with several national conferences or readings.
- 3.0 – May be multiple conferences (several major) with book reviews or abstracts and work in progress.
- 2.0– May look like one international conference or reading with significant work in progress.
- 1.0 - Work in progress.

February 11, 2013

Creative Activities: The acceptance rate of fewer than 2.5% of submissions constitutes a top-tier journal for creative activities

- 4.0- May be a book (credited for three years) OR 1 story or creative non-fiction essay (approx 15 mss pages) in a top-tier venue and 1 significant reading/presentation; OR
- 1-2 stories (approx 30 mss pages) in 2nd-tier venues; 1 significant reading/presentation
 - 1 story in a 2nd-tier venue and two readings; 1 significant reading/presentation
 - 4-5 poems/ flash fiction pieces or 5-10 mss. pages in top-tier journals; 1 significant reading/presentation
 - 8-10 poems/ flash fiction in 2nd-tier or 4-5 mss. pages, 1 significant reading/presentation
 - 5-10 pages in 2nd-tier + 2 readings
- 3.5- May be one story in second-tier venue (15 mss pp), multiple significant readings OR
- non-fiction essay (15 mss pp)
 - 4-5 poems or 8-12 mss pages in 2nd-tier venue with presentations or readings.
- 3.0- May be 1 story or creative nonfiction essay (15pp) in 2nd-tier journal without a reading of consequence OR
- 4-5 poems in 2nd-tier journal
 - 4 or more readings or presentations as a quest of a university or other major national organization and work in progress.
- 2.0- 1 story or creative nonfiction essay or 2-3 poems in a third-tier journal (acceptance rate of more than 5%) OR
- 1 or more readings or presentations for local or regional organizations
 - 40 pp. of prose work in progress; 15-20 pp of poetry in progress
- 1.0- Work in progress with evidence of research.

A lesser record is considered below expectations.

Teaching: Evidence of teaching includes multiple means of evaluation as outlined in the APS “Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation” and as enumerated in the English department “General Criteria for Tenure and Promotion.”

The same 4 point scale is applied to candidates in the Clinical Teaching Track and instructors. The committee, however, considers the course load and the percentage contracted to reach the score. The materials necessary for evaluation are the same as those required for Tenure Track faculty and for Instructors.

February 11, 2013

- 4.0– FCQ scores for teaching and for course may be a 5 to 6 average , with excellent teaching materials, but with no significant independent studies (1 to 3 per year) or no curriculum development (other than routine course revitalization); or it may be 5 to 5.5 FCQs, with excellent teaching materials, with significant independent studies (8 to 10 or more) or significant curriculum development (new program or graduate track, for example) or unusually high number (3 or 4) of new preps.
- 3.5– FCQ scores may be 4.5 to 5 average FCQs, with good course materials, but with no significant independent studies or curriculum development; or it may be 4 to 5 average FCQs, with good course materials, with significant independent studies or curriculum development or unusually high number of new preps.
- 3.0– FCQ score may be 4 to 4.5 average in teaching and for course, with good course materials, but with no significant independent studies or curriculum development or new preps; or it may be 3 to 4 average FCQs, with good course materials, with significant independent studies or curriculum development or new preps.
- 2.5-1- FCQs range from 1-3 with various indicators of effort in teaching materials, independent studies, new preps, etc. that combine to indicate the score.
A lesser record is considered below expectations.

Service: Please specify remuneration, whether in course release or in financial compensation. Clinical Teaching Track appointments need to include the percentages of the contract assigned to service. The standard for Pre-Tenured evaluation applies to Clinical Teaching Track appointments but the numerical award needs to reflect the contract.

Tenured:

- 4.0– May look like two or three major committee assignments (DAC, RTP, or chair of hiring committee, for example) with one or two smaller committees; or one major committee assignment with active participation on three or four smaller committees; or substantial professional service with two or three active departmental or college committees; or significant ongoing commitment to department or college (scheduling or advising or program development, for example) with two or three additional committee assignments. In all cases, evidence of leadership and active participation in departmental, college, or university environment is important; evidence of active professional service
- 3.5– May look like one major assignment (chair of personnel committee) and one or two smaller committees; or one major assignment and several smaller committees without compelling evidence of leadership; evidence of professional service
- 3.0– May look like four or five smaller, active committees.
- 2.0– May be three or four small, but active committees.

A lesser record is considered below expectations.

February 11, 2013

Pre-tenured faculty:

- 4.0– One major committee and one smaller committee; or significant program development; or ongoing departmental commitment to advising, scheduling, etc; or significant departmental initiative (conference, service learning, etc); evidence of professional service.
- 3.5– Several (3 or 4) smaller committees; evidence of professional service.
- 3.0– two departmental committees.
- 2.0– One departmental committee.
A lesser record is considered below expectations.

Administration for the Composition Director

The Composition Director's contract and/or offer letter specifies what percentage of the annual merit evaluation composite score will be based on administration of the composition program and attendant duties.

Evidence: The Department of English considers the following types of evidence when evaluating a candidate's administrative record annually:

- 1) program maintenance and development
- 2) curricular design and revision
- 3) faculty development and advising
- 4) program assessment
- 5) program-related representation on committees

Quality:

The English department believes that scholarship, teaching and service work in conjunction with administration and that administration requires field-specific expertise. Assessment of performance is then based on an evaluation of the evidence. Outstanding administrators substantially contribute to their programs in most of the categories listed under evidence. An administrator who meets some of the criteria under evidence in addition to maintaining the program exceeds expectations. The department values the administrator who consistently and actively explores ways to improve performance and to encourage success among the constituencies the program serves. An awareness of the latest scholarly findings within the field of the administrator's expertise further contributes to programmatic excellence. The administrator is expected to be available and professional in dealing with problems, in providing feedback, and in ensuring accountability. Quality depends on an understanding of theory, research and best administrative practices. The administrator's ability to convey this

February 11, 2013

understanding and institute effective outcomes will be carefully weighed in determining the candidate's contributions.

- 4.0- May be substantial evidence of a) program maintenance and development; b) curricular design; c) faculty development & advising; d) assessment including follow up with correctives; e) program related textual production, f) program related committee work in any combination.
- 3.5- May be substantial work in a majority of the categories.
- 3.0- May be significant development of the program and assessment including follow up with correctives and faculty development and advising.
- 2.0- May be program maintenance with significant work in one of the categories.
- 1.0- May be program oversight with less than adequate attention to improvements.

A lesser record is considered below expectations.

What counts:

Research and creative works: Works in progress must be documented, and they then receive minimal credit. Conference presentations are counted the year that they are given. International conferences are considered as more significant than national conferences, which are considered as more significant than regional conferences, which are considered as more significant than local conferences. Articles may be counted either the year that they are accepted OR the year that the article appears in print. They may not be counted twice, and it is the faculty member's responsibility to keep the record straight. Books may be counted for three years in a row, beginning with the year of acceptance contingent upon approval from the Salary Increment Committee. The Committee assesses the scope of the project and the quality of the outlet and the reception history in order to ascertain how many years credit will be given.

Teaching: Student evaluations are valuable indications of teaching performance, but they cannot be considered exclusively. The Salary Increment Committee derives no more than 50% of its score from FCQ data. Other evidence to be considered may include: evidence of pedagogy (syllabi, exams, teaching innovations); curriculum development; variety of courses taught; class observations; numbers of independent studies and theses; teaching of uncompensated overloads; and opinions of graduating seniors. For an outline of materials that may be presented, please refer to the APS: "Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation."

February 11, 2013

Service: Pre-tenured faculty are required to do less service than tenured faculty. Two committees at the department level, for example, might earn a "2" For tenured faculty two or three committees at the department level might earn a "3." Participation in a major service commitment—a search committee, for example—with a smaller department committee might earn a "4." For further clarification, consult the department criteria. Tenured faculty are required to assume more responsibility for departmental, college, and university governance.

It is tempting to believe that departmental service counts less than college service, which counts less than university service, which counts less than system service, which counts less than community or professional service, but this is not the case. In fact, the Salary Increment Committee evaluates the service performed, and it is possible that extraordinary service at the department level will earn a "4," while light service at the system level will earn a "2." Significant factors are: willingness to shoulder the collective burden, level of competency in performing tasks, capacity for innovation and flexibility, and ability to work well with others. Since faculty are on a nine-month contract, service performed in the summer must also be considered as an added benefit to the department and so rewarded.

Nota bene: Faculty member are responsible for identifying those service responsibilities for which remuneration has already been received. It is, in other words, disingenuous and unethical to ask the Salary Increment Committee to give service credit for responsibilities that bring with them either a course release or stipend. Faculty should err on the side of complete disclosure.

Productivity Adjustments

Salary compression is an unpleasant fact of academic life. It is, however, not in itself an effective rationale for salary adjustment. Candidates who believe that their salaries may be significantly depressed and that they deserve special "productivity adjustment" must first demonstrate: 1) continued productivity in research, teaching, and service; and 2) external confirmation of salary compression.

Evaluation Protests

If at any time a faculty member feels that his or her evaluation has been unjust, that faculty member may appeal to the chair of the department for reconsideration. The faculty member in question should explain the complaint and then provide the evidence to the contrary. The Salary Increment Committee will then re-evaluate the decision and provide its rationale. Both the faculty member's appeal and the committee's response have to be in writing.