

---

1 **FACULTY SENATE** **SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY**

2  
3 **FACULTY SENATE BILL 23-A-7**

4  
5 Approved by the Faculty Senate XXXXXX

6  
7 **BRIEF SUMMARY:** Removal of language concerning chairperson evaluation and referral to  
8 Department Chairperson section of handbook (Chapter 2, Faculty Merit Pay Policy).

9  
10  
11 **ACTION OF BILL** (REVISING “Faculty Merit Pay” language in the Faculty Handbook to  
12 remove chairperson review language)

13  
**BE IT RESOLVED:** subject to the passage and approval of this bill, Chapter 2, Faculty Merit  
Pay Policy of the *Faculty Handbook* be amended by replacing the existing content with the  
following:

14 **TITLE OF BILL (Faculty Merit Pay) Post Professorial Merit (see Faculty Tenure and**  
15 **Promotion Policy)**

16  
17 **Chapter 2, Faculty Merit Pay Policy**

18 Faculty Merit Pay Policy

19 Faculty Senate Bill 23-A-7 begins here.

20 **Underlying Principles**

- 21 1. The established mechanisms of awarding tenure, promotion, and post professorial merit (see  
22 Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy) serve, among other purposes, to provide periodic salary  
23 increases to those tenured and tenure-track faculty whose performance, measured against  
24 departmental or unit criteria, is determined to meet certain levels for certain periods of time, and  
25 who are otherwise eligible. Those mechanisms provide a type of "merit pay" system for certain  
26 faculty.
- 27 2. This Faculty Merit Pay Policy is intended to provide a type of "merit pay" system for all full-time  
28 faculty, regardless of whether they are eligible for the additional rewards of tenure, promotion, or  
29 post-professorial merit.
- 30 3. The objectives of this policy include the following:  
31 a) to provide a mechanism for determining that a faculty member's annual performance is  
32 satisfactory, in that it has met certain defined minimum expectations for performance,  
33 b) to provide a mechanism of awarding annual salary increases to satisfactorily-performing  
34 faculty members, and

- 35 c) to provide a mechanism of awarding periodic larger salary increases to non-tenure track faculty  
36 whose performance warrants such recognition.
- 37 4. The provisions of this policy shall be applicable to all full-time faculty members, as well as dual  
38 appointment faculty (to be considered in the base department only) and those faculty members  
39 with 50 percent or less released time for administrative responsibilities.
- 40 5. This policy provides for the establishment of two sets of departmental performance criteria, one  
41 for each of the two programs set out below. Department criteria will be discipline specific and  
42 performance based. They will include specific indicators of faculty performance in the areas of  
43 teaching effectiveness, professional growth, and service to the university, as appropriate to the  
44 individual faculty member's contract status. Where appropriate, criteria should be designed not  
45 only to reward individual achievement but also to reward contributions of individuals as members  
46 of the department team. Nothing in the criteria may contradict other provisions of the Faculty  
47 Handbook. Until such time as new or revised criteria are approved, existing criteria remain in  
48 force.
- 49 6. In addition to the two programs described under this policy, there exists a third merit pay program  
50 that is applicable only to those faculty members who hold the rank of Professor. This Post-  
51 Professorial Merit Pay program is described under the Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy.

## 52 **Faculty Annual Merit Program**

53 **Development of Annual Performance Criteria.** The full-time faculty of each academic department or  
54 equivalent unit shall as a whole develop, approve, and publish criteria that define minimum annual  
55 expectations for performance by the individual faculty member. Criteria must be applicable to both non-  
56 tenure track faculty as well as to tenure-track or tenured faculty, though the criteria and expectations need  
57 not be the same.

58 **Annual Performance Evaluation.** The full-time faculty of each academic department or equivalent unit  
59 shall as a whole determine and publish the process to be used to conduct the annual evaluation of faculty  
60 member performance. Annual evaluations shall be conducted according to the procedures and calendar set  
61 out below.

62 For evaluation of the chairperson, See Department Chairpersons (Chapter 1) for modifications of the  
63 procedure below. Evaluation of faculty members is conducted by department committee, designee, or  
64 chairperson as agreed upon by the department. If conducted by a committee or designee, the annual  
65 report is also made available to the department chairperson for optional review and comments prior  
66 to communication of results to the faculty member.

67 In the case of review by committee or designee, results and justification are communicated to the faculty  
68 member and chairperson in writing. In the case of review by the chairperson, results and justification are  
69 communicated in writing to the faculty member.

70 If the reviewing party and the faculty member agree with the evaluation results, the process is concluded  
71 and results are forwarded to the college dean.

72 If the reviewing party and faculty member are not in agreement: in the case of committee or designee  
73 review of annual performance, the faculty member or chairperson can request clarification from the

---

74 department committee or designee. In the case of chairperson review of annual performance, the faculty  
75 member can request clarification from the chairperson.

76 If no resolution can be obtained, the faculty member or chairperson can appeal to the college T&P  
77 committee.

78 The college committee's recommendation, along with the evaluation and justification, shall be  
79 communicated in writing to the faculty member and the department chairperson. Within the indicated  
80 time, the department chairperson may make an inquiry to the department committee, or where  
81 appropriate, the college tenure and promotion advisory committee regarding the evaluation of a specific  
82 faculty member, and that committee will provide a response.

83 If the chairperson is not in agreement with that evaluation, the chairperson shall forward all written  
84 evaluations and justifications, and a written response from the faculty member, if the faculty member so  
85 chooses, to the dean.

86 The dean shall provide a resolution that shall be forwarded to the provost and the involved parties. (For  
87 Kent Library faculty, the appellate body shall be the university tenure and promotion advisory committee,  
88 which shall fill the same roles as those filled by the college tenure and promotion advisory committee for  
89 non-library faculty.)

90 Each faculty member determined to have met the minimum expectations for performance as defined by  
91 the criteria, shall receive the standard increase to base salary. (Continuous performance that meets  
92 minimum expectations as defined by departmental criteria does not assure tenure, promotion, or post-  
93 professorial merit.)

94 The annual review will identify faculty who are meeting minimum expectations, as determined by  
95 departmental criteria. These faculty will receive a salary increase funded by a pool consisting of at least  
96 87.5 percent of the aggregate amount of each year's faculty salary increase determined through the annual  
97 budget review process. Promotions to Associate Professor and Professor shall be funded as a "cost of  
98 continuing", determined by the annual budget review process.

99 *Amended by Faculty Senate Bill 11-A-28, May, 4, 2011, reviewed by President May 2011, approved by*  
100 *Board of Regents May 13, 2011*

#### 101 **Calendar for Annual Performance Program.**

102 The performance evaluation process shall be conducted according to this calendar:

103 **January 31:** Faculty reports are due for accomplishments and contributions of the previous year.

104 **February 1 - March 1:** Notices of departmental committee recommendations regarding performance  
105 meeting or not meeting minimum expectations are communicated in writing to faculty. In cases where a  
106 chairperson has been delegated the responsibility of evaluating faculty members, the chairperson  
107 shall communicate in writing their evaluation and justification to the faculty members. In all cases,  
108 the faculty member will acknowledge receipt of evaluation recommendations in writing.

109

110 **March 2-March 12:** Within this time period, a faculty member, who is not in agreement with their  
111 evaluation by the department committee or chairperson, may appeal that evaluation to the college  
112 tenure and promotion advisory committee.

113 **March 13- April 15:** Appeals made to the college tenure and promotion advisory committee shall be  
114 decided and the evaluation and justification communicated in writing to the faculty member and to the  
115 department chairperson. During this time, if the chairperson is not in agreement with an evaluation from  
116 either the department committee or college tenure and promotion committee, the chairperson shall  
117 forward all written evaluations and justifications, and a written response from the faculty member, if the  
118 faculty member so chooses, to the dean. The dean shall provide a resolution that shall be forwarded to the  
119 provost and the involved parties.

#### 120 **Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit Program**

121 ***Development of Criteria for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit.*** In addition, the full-time faculty of each  
122 department or equivalent unit shall as a whole develop and approve criteria for periodic recognition of  
123 non-tenure track faculty. These criteria shall reflect higher than minimum performance, similar to the way  
124 that tenure, promotion, and post-professorial merit criteria (see Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy)  
125 reflect higher than minimum performance. For a period of three years following the final approval of a  
126 revision of these criteria, a faculty member applying for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit may elect to be  
127 evaluated by the previous criteria.

128 ***Performance Evaluation for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit.*** The full-time faculty of each academic  
129 department or equivalent unit shall as a whole determine the process to be used to conduct the separate  
130 periodic evaluation of the performance of eligible non-tenure track faculty members. An individual non-  
131 tenure track faculty member is eligible to apply for periodic Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit in the fourth  
132 year of full-time employment and each four years after having received such recognition. The evaluation  
133 shall be conducted according to the calendar set out below. Each faculty member determined to have met  
134 the expectations for performance as defined by the criteria, shall receive an increase to base salary.

135 For non-tenure track merit, the amount of the base pay increase (**see table below**) shall be reviewed  
136 during the fiscal year budget review process and even years thereafter.

<b>Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit</b>	
<b>Monetary Amounts as of Fiscal Year 2013</b>	
<u>Level</u>	<u>Base Pay Increase</u>
Non-Tenure Track	\$2500

137

138 *Approved by Faculty Senate Bill 12-A-4 February 15, 2012, Reviewed by President February 2012,*  
139 *Approved by Board of Regents June 20, 2012, Approved by Faculty Senate Bill 15-A-4 on 2/25/15,*  
140 *Reviewed by President 4/14/15, Approved by Board of Regents 5/8/15*

141

142

143

Date and Version: 2/21/2024 Version 5  
Handbook Section: Faculty Merit Pay  
Proposed Change: Edits to Handbook Language for Clarity and Conciseness  
Source of Bill: Professional Affairs/ Governance Committees

---

<b>Action</b>	<b>Date</b>
Introduced to Senate	2/28/2024
Second Senate Meeting	
Faculty Senate Vote	
President's Review	
Board of Regents Approval	
Posted to Faculty Handbook	
<b>Action</b>	