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

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

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)**

15
16 **Chapter 2, Faculty Merit Pay Policy**

17 Faculty Merit Pay Policy

18 Faculty Senate Bill xxx begins here.

19 **Underlying Principles**

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

53 Faculty Annual Merit Program

54 **Development of Annual Performance Criteria.** The full-time faculty of each academic department or
55 equivalent unit shall as a whole develop, approve, and publish criteria that define minimum annual
56 expectations for performance by the individual faculty member. Criteria must be applicable to both non-
57 tenure track faculty as well as to tenure-track or tenured faculty, though the criteria and expectations need
58 not be the same. ~~Criteria must also be applicable to department chairpersons and should incorporate the~~
59 ~~administrative responsibilities of those positions. These administrative responsibilities shall be developed~~
60 ~~by the department in partnership with the dean, and forwarded to the Provost for approval~~

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

- 65 1. For evaluation of the ~~chair~~ chairperson, See Department Chairpersons (Chapter 1) for
66 ~~modifications of the procedure below. Both the department and the dean will evaluate the chair's~~
67 ~~performance based on the developed criteria. The department will forward their written~~
68 ~~evaluation and recommendation to the dean. If dean's evaluation is not in agreement with that of~~
69 ~~the department, the dean will forward all evaluations and justifications, and a written response~~
70 ~~from the chair if the chair so chooses, to the provost. The provost shall provide a resolution that~~
71 ~~will be forwarded to the president and involved parties. For the evaluation of faculty members,~~
72 ~~the department faculty as a whole may choose to evaluate faculty by a designated~~
73 ~~departmental committee or delegate to the chairperson the evaluation of the department~~
74 ~~faculty.~~

75 2. In the evaluation of faculty members, other than the chair, the department faculty as a whole may
76 choose to evaluate faculty by a designated departmental committee or delegate to the chair the
77 evaluation of the department faculty.

78 a. In cases where the evaluation of a faculty member is done by a department committee,
79 the recommendation of that committee, along with the evaluation and justification, shall
80 be communicated in writing to the faculty member and the department ~~chairperson chair~~.
81 If the faculty member is not in agreement with the decision, ~~they he/she~~ may request a
82 review from the college tenure and promotion committee. The college committee's
83 recommendation, along with the evaluation and justification, shall be communicated in
84 writing to the faculty member and the department ~~chairperson chair~~. Within the indicated
85 time ~~period~~, the department ~~chairperson chair~~ may make an inquiry to the department
86 committee, or where appropriate, the college tenure and promotion advisory committee
87 regarding the evaluation of a specific faculty member, and that committee will provide a
88 response. If the ~~chairperson chair~~ is not in agreement with that evaluation, the
89 ~~chairperson chair~~ shall forward all written evaluations and justifications, and a written
90 response from the faculty member, if the faculty member so chooses, to the dean. The
91 dean shall provide a resolution that shall be forwarded to the provost and the involved
92 parties. (For Kent Library faculty, the appellate body shall be the university tenure and
93 promotion advisory committee, which shall fill the same roles as those filled by the
94 college tenure and promotion advisory committee for non-library faculty.)

95 b. In cases where the department faculty as a whole has delegated to the chair the evaluation
96 of the faculty member, the chair's recommendation, along with the evaluation and
97 justification, shall be communicated in writing to that faculty member. If that faculty
98 member is not in agreement with the recommendation, he/she may request a review from
99 the college tenure and promotion committee. The college committee's recommendation,
100 along with the evaluation and justification, shall be communicated in writing to the
101 faculty member and the department chair. If the chair is not in agreement with that
102 evaluation, the chair shall forward all written evaluations and justifications, and a written
103 response from the faculty member, if the faculty member so chooses, to the dean. The
104 dean shall provide a resolution that shall be forwarded to the provost and the involved
105 parties. (For Kent Library faculty, the appellate body shall be the university tenure and
106 promotion advisory committee, which shall fill the same roles as those filled by the
107 college tenure and promotion advisory committee for non-library faculty.)

108 Each faculty member determined to have met the minimum expectations for performance as defined by
109 the criteria, shall receive the standard increase to base salary. ~~(It should be understood that continuous~~
110 ~~(Continuous~~ performance that meets minimum expectations as defined by departmental criteria does not
111 assure tenure, promotion, or post-professorial merit.)

112 The annual review will identify faculty who are meeting minimum expectations, as determined by
113 departmental criteria. These faculty will receive a salary increase funded by a pool consisting of at least
114 87.5 percent of the aggregate amount of each year's faculty salary increase determined through the annual
115 budget review process. Promotions to Associate Professor and Professor shall be funded as a "cost of
116 continuing", determined by the annual budget review process.

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

119 **Calendar for Annual Performance Program.**

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

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

122 **February 1 - March 1:** Notices of departmental committee recommendations regarding performance
123 meeting or not meeting minimum expectations are communicated in writing to faculty. ~~In the case of the~~
124 ~~chair evaluation, the departmental committee shall forward their written evaluation to the dean. The dean~~
125 ~~will then communicate the recommendation regarding performance meeting or not meeting minimum~~
126 ~~expectations to the chair. During this same time period, in the cases where a chair has been delegated the~~
127 ~~responsibility of evaluating faculty members, the chair shall communicate in writing his/her evaluation~~
128 ~~and justification to the faculty members. In the cases where a chairperson has been delegated the~~
129 ~~responsibility of evaluating faculty members, the chairperson shall communicate in writing their~~
130 ~~evaluation and justification to the faculty members.~~

131 **March 2-March 12:** Within this time ~~period~~, in cases where the dean's evaluation is not in agreement
132 with the department's evaluation, the dean will forward all evaluations and justifications, and a written
133 response from the ~~chairperson chair~~ if the ~~chairperson chair~~ so chooses, to the provost. Also, during this
134 time period, in the case of a faculty member evaluated by a department committee, the department
135 ~~chairperson chair~~ may make an inquiry to that committee regarding the evaluation of a specific faculty
136 member, and the committee will provide a response. Also, during this time period, a faculty member,
137 who is not in agreement with his/her evaluation by the department committee or ~~chairperson chair~~, may
138 appeal that evaluation to the college tenure and promotion advisory committee.

139 **March 13- April 15:** Appeals made to the college tenure and promotion advisory committee shall be
140 decided and the evaluation and justification communicated in writing to the faculty member and to the
141 department ~~chairperson chair~~. During this time, if the ~~chairperson chair~~ is not in agreement with an
142 evaluation from either the department committee or college tenure and promotion committee, the
143 ~~chairperson chair~~ shall forward all written evaluations and justifications, and a written response from the
144 faculty member, if the faculty member so chooses, to the dean. The dean shall provide a resolution that
145 shall be forwarded to the provost and the involved parties.

146 **Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit Program**

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

154 Performance Evaluation for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit. The full-time faculty of each academic
155 department or equivalent unit shall as a whole determine the process to be used to conduct the separate

156 periodic evaluation of the performance of eligible non-tenure track faculty members. An individual non-
157 tenure track faculty member is eligible to apply for periodic Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit in the fourth
158 year of full-time employment and each four years after having received such recognition. The evaluation
159 shall be conducted according to the calendar set out below. Each faculty member determined to have met
160 the expectations for performance as defined by the criteria, shall receive an increase to base salary.

161 For non-tenure track merit, the amount of the base pay increase (**see table below**) shall be reviewed
162 during the fiscal year ~~2010~~ budget review process and ~~even every two~~ years thereafter.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit
Monetary Amounts for Fiscal Years 2013 to 2017

<u>Level</u>	<u>Base Pay Increase</u>
Non-Tenure Track	\$2500

163
164 *Approved by Faculty Senate Bill 12-A-4 February 15, 2012, Reviewed by President February 2012,*
165 *Approved by Board of Regents June 20, 2012, Approved by Faculty Senate Bill 15-A-4 on 2/25/15,*
166 *Reviewed by President 4/14/15, Approved by Board of Regents 5/8/15*

167

Action	Date
Introduced to Senate	09/14/2022
Second Senate Meeting	09/28/2022
Faculty Senate Vote	
President's Review	
Board of Regents Approval	
Posted to Faculty Handbook	

168 **Action**