



Old Westbury

January 9, 2002

To: Naomi Rosenthal, Chair
Faculty Senate

From: R.M. Hoyte, Chair 
The Ad Hoc Committee on Discretionary Salary Increases

Subject: DSI Awards

In response to your memorandum of January 8, 2002 I hereby submit the following. The criteria used by the committee are those specified in Dr. Bonnett's memorandum to faculty and librarians dated September 21, 2001 (copy enclosed) and further listed on the checklist page (copy enclosed). The procedures used by the committee are described below and a blank copy of the score sheet used by committee members is enclosed. Please note that the committee made recommendations based solely on merit, not inequity, and did not participate in decisions regarding specific amounts of raises to individuals.

The ad hoc Committee on 2001 Discretionary Salary Increases (CDSI) made its recommendations to Dr. Bonnett in a memorandum dated October 11, 2001. The other members of the committee were Rita Colon-Urban, Sachi Dastidar, Christine Griffin, Elizabeth Ewen, Patrick O'Sullivan and Basilio Serrano. This report is excerpted from the report to Dr. Bonnett.

The ad hoc Committee on Discretionary Salary Increases (CDSI) was convened on Monday October 1, 2001 and received its charge from the Office of Academic Affairs. At that meeting the committee also discussed and agreed on a Procedure for Evaluation of DSI Applications (see enclosure). Over a period of 6 days following the October 5 nomination deadline members of the committee examined the files held in room H427 under the control of the Office of Academic Affairs. On Thursday October 11, 2001 at 2:00 p.m. the committee met to discuss the files and formulate its recommendations.

Summary of Procedures Used: During the initial examination of the files each member of the committee privately assigned an initial score to each file on a scale of 1 to 5 in whole numbers where 5 represented the highest overall quality and 1 represented the lowest. At the October 11, 2001 meeting the Chair asked for and recorded, without discussion, the initial scores of each committee member for each applicant. The recorded scores were then reviewed by the committee for discussion. In most cases where there

was general consistency among the scores assigned by committee members little or no discussion was held and the average of the scores was computed and recorded. When there was wide variation among the scores discussion was held and each member had an opportunity to adjust his/her initial score based on the comments made. After the discussion the Chair asked for and recorded the final scores of each member. These were averaged and recorded as the final average score.

Recommendations: After formulating average scores the committee examined the overall profile and decided to make recommendations in four categories based on score ranges. These are **Recommended with High Enthusiasm, Recommended, Recommended with Low Enthusiasm and Not Recommended.**

The CDSI thus made recommendations on the scored files based on the following scale:

3.9 to 4.4 Recommended with High Enthusiasm
2.6 to 3.7 Recommended
1.9 to 2.4 Recommended with Low Enthusiasm
Below 1.9 Not Recommended

Since the scores are averages of ratings by seven committee members the above scale should not be taken to suggest that there are significant differences between candidates whose scores are closely spaced above and below the range limits. The scale should therefore be viewed as a rough guideline. The overall average of the committee's rankings was 2.8 and the mean was 3.0.

Enclosures:

Dr. Bonnett's memorandum of 9/21/2001

Checklist page

Score sheet

Procedure for Evaluation