I. Salary Market Advance: Policies and Procedures

1. In addition to merit raises, Lamar University recognizes four different types of salary market advances: Internal Misalignment, Market Misalignment, Specific Expansion of Responsibilities, and Salary Counteroffer.

2. Faculty members should review and familiarize themselves with the official policy in the LU Faculty Handbook (See Performance Evaluation of Faculty, Chapter II, Policies and Procedures, Section 44.8 for comprehensive information).

3. To make the process more accessible and easier for CoFAC faculty members, the official process as set out in the LU Faculty Handbook has been reinterpreted to provide clearer guidelines and steps as it relates to a potential Market Misalignment request.

II. Responsibilities of the Faculty Member

1. The faculty member must make a formal request for a salary market advance in writing with thorough justification and ample supporting documentation.

2. The review process will be initiated when the faculty member submits their request and documentation to their department chair.

3. The internal CoFAC deadline for submitting the formal request and supporting documentation is December 1 for salary adjustments to be considered for the following academic year.

4. Collect the following personal information (to be included with Step 7):
   a. Year started at Lamar University as full-time faculty
   b. Years of full-time service at Lamar University (minimum of three years), including current faculty rank and tenure status
   c. F2.08 scores for the past three years
   d. Academic and professional credentials related to the discipline
   e. Starting salary
   f. Current salary
   g. Full CV (Tenure and Promotion format preferred)
   h. Executive summary of significant accomplishments in Teaching, Creative/Research Activities, and Service over the past five years

5. Collect the following information about the CoFAC department (to be included in Step 7):
   a. Size and scope of department
      1) Most recent fall semester enrollment of department
      2) Current number of full-time and adjunct faculty in department
3) Highest degree awarded by department
b. Other relevant information as appropriate
c. List of current accreditations relevant to the department
d. Additional information as appropriate or requested

6. Collect the following information for at least three peer institutions (to be included in Step 7). The LU Faculty Handbook defines peer institutions in this context as “similarly situated universities and departments with similar accomplishments in the same discipline, with comparable rank and time of service.”
   a. Size and scope of departments:
      1) Most recent fall semester enrollment of department
      2) Current number of full-time and adjunct faculty in department
      3) Highest degree awarded by department
   b. List of current accreditations relevant to the departments
   c. Additional information as appropriate or requested

7. Compilation of salary comparison data from Steps 4–6 (see “Salary Comparison Data” template). This document is to include the following information about the faculty member making the request compared to selected faculty from peer institutions. This should include, but is not limited to:
   a. Salary Comparison Table
      1) Faculty name, institution, department, rank, tenure status, and current salary.
   b. Peer Faculty Member Information
      1) Significant professional accomplishments, major publications (including impact score if applicable), significant awards, and any other evidence indicating scholarly reputation and teaching excellence.
   c. The information listed above should be collected by the faculty member from official sources (with documentation), which could include accreditation reports (such as HEADS reports) or other official sources.
   d. Additional documentation as appropriate or requested

8. External supporting documentation:
   a. Three letters of recommendation from external reviewers (of similar or higher rank) from peer institutions. (Note: The CoFAC Dean and/or Provost may wish to independently request additional reviewers from other peer institutions)

9. Once all materials are compiled and prepared, the faculty member will initiate the formal process by presenting all required material to their department chair. The documentation submitted should include:
   a. A written narrative outlining and justifying the request
   b. Full CV (Tenure and Promotion format preferred)
   c. Salary Comparison Data (see template)
   d. Three letters of recommendation from external reviewers of similar or higher rank from peer institutions
III. The Review Process: as adapted (see Section 44.8.3–4 of the LU Faculty Handbook for the original language):

1. The faculty member will forward a request along with her or his documentation and supporting evidence to their department chair.

2. The department chair will forward the material to the department personnel committee who review the information and make a recommendation on the merits of a market advancement.

3. The department personnel committee will then forward its evaluation and recommendation on the merits of a market adjustment to the department chair.

4. The chair will consider the recommendation of the personnel committee and advance their recommendation to the dean and to the faculty member.

5. The dean will forward their recommendation, to the provost and to the faculty member, her or his recommendations on the merits of a market advancement.

6. The dean’s recommendation, along with the decisions of the other deliberative bodies, are then forwarded to the provost.

7. Upon the provost’s approval, the recommendation will be forwarded to the University President, who has final discretion and authority to approve or disapprove such an adjustment.

8. Nothing in this policy shall be construed as an entitlement or property right in a market advancement.

9. Following the final approval of the equity request submitted, any market adjustments will take effect in the next year’s contract before the merit raise are included.

10. The timetable and steps for reviewing market adjustments will be the same as the timetable and steps for reviewing recommended merit adjustment with the F2.08. The provost and president reserve the right to accelerate, refine, and/or modify the timetable and the process.