

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 remove  
12 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  
21 professorial merit (see Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy) serve, among  
22 other purposes, to provide periodic salary increases to those tenured and  
23 tenure-track faculty whose performance, measured against departmental or  
24 unit criteria, is determined to meet certain levels for certain periods of time,  
25 and who are otherwise eligible. Those mechanisms provide a type of "merit  
26 pay" system for certain faculty.
- 27 2. This Faculty Merit Pay Policy is intended to provide a type of "merit pay"  
28 system for all full-time faculty, regardless of whether they are eligible for  
29 the additional rewards of tenure, promotion, or 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  
32 performance is satisfactory, in that it has met certain defined minimum  
33 expectations for performance,
- 34 b) to provide a mechanism of awarding annual salary increases to  
35 satisfactorily performing faculty members, and
- 36 c) to provide a mechanism of awarding periodic larger salary increases

- 37 to non-tenure track faculty whose performance warrants such recognition.  
38 4. The provisions of this policy shall be applicable to all full-time faculty  
39 members, as well as dual appointment faculty (to be considered in the base  
40 department only) and those faculty members with 50 percent or less released  
41 time for administrative responsibilities.  
42 5. This policy provides for the establishment of two sets of departmental  
43 performance criteria, one for each of the two programs set out below.  
44 Department criteria will be discipline specific and performance based. They  
45 will include specific indicators of faculty performance in the areas of  
46 teaching effectiveness, professional growth, and service to the university, as  
47 appropriate to the individual faculty member's contract status. Where  
48 appropriate, criteria should be designed not only to reward individual  
49 achievement but also to reward contributions of individuals as members of  
50 the department team. Nothing in the criteria may contradict other provisions  
51 of the Faculty Handbook. Until such time as new or revised criteria are  
52 approved, existing criteria remain in force.  
53 6. In addition to the two programs described under this policy, there exists a  
54 third merit pay program that is applicable only to those faculty members  
55 who hold the rank of Professor. This Post-Professorial Merit Pay program is  
56 described under the Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy.  
57

#### 58 **Faculty Annual Merit Program**

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

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

68 For evaluation of the chairperson, see Department Chairpersons (Chapter 1) for modifications of the  
69 procedure below. Evaluation of faculty members is conducted by department committee, designee, or  
70 chairperson as agreed upon by the department. If conducted by a committee or designee, the annual report  
71 is also made available to the department chairperson for optional review and comments prior to  
72 communication of results to the faculty member.

73 In the case of review by committee or designee, results and justification are communicated to the  
74 faculty member and chairperson in writing. In the case of review by the chairperson, results and  
75 justification are communicated in writing to the faculty member.

76 If the reviewing party and the faculty member agree with the evaluation results, the process is  
77 concluded.

78 If the reviewing party and faculty member are not in agreement: In the case of committee or  
79 designee review of annual performance, the faculty member or chairperson can request clarification  
80 from the department committee or designee. In the case of chairperson review of annual  
81 performance, the faculty member can request clarification from the chairperson.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

110 **February 1 - March 1:** Notices of departmental committee recommendations regarding meeting or not  
111 meeting minimum expectations are communicated in writing to faculty. The faculty body evaluating the

112 chairperson's teaching effectiveness, professional growth, and service shall convey their recommendation  
113 to the college dean. In cases where a chairperson has been delegated the responsibility of evaluating  
114 faculty members, the chairperson shall communicate in writing their evaluation and justification to  
115 the faculty members. Additionally, in such cases the chairperson shall not receive their overall  
116 evaluation from the dean until after the chairperson has completed and communicated all faculty  
117 evaluations.

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

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

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

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

136 ***Performance Evaluation for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit.*** The full-time faculty of each  
137 academic department or equivalent unit shall as a whole determine the process to be used to conduct  
138 the separate periodic evaluation of the performance of eligible non-tenure track faculty members. An  
139 individual non-tenure track faculty member is eligible to apply for periodic Non-Tenure Track  
140 Faculty Merit in the fourth year of full-time employment and each four years after having received  
141 such recognition.

142 The evaluation shall be conducted according to the calendar set out below. Each faculty member  
143 determined to have met the expectations for performance as defined by the criteria, shall receive an  
144 increase to base salary.

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

147

