

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 ~~,including chairpersons,~~ is satisfactory, in that it has met
33 certain defined minimum expectations for performance,
34 b) to provide a mechanism of awarding annual salary increases to
35 satisfactorily-performing faculty members, and

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

22 Faculty Annual Merit Program

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

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

- 37 ~~1.—For evaluation of the chair chairperson, see Department Chairpersons
38 (Chapter 1). ~~both the department and the dean will evaluate the chairs
39 performance based on the developed criteria. The department will forward
40 their written evaluation and recommendation to the dean. If dean's
41 evaluation is not in agreement with that of the department, the dean will
42 forward all evaluations and justifications, and a written response from the~~~~

~~chair if the chair so chooses, to the provost. The provost shall provide a resolution that will be forwarded to the president and involved parties.~~

~~2.1. For~~ the evaluation of faculty members, ~~other than the chair,~~ the department faculty as a whole may choose to evaluate faculty by a designated departmental committee or delegate to the chair person the evaluation of the department faculty.

- a. In cases where the evaluation of a faculty member is done by a department committee, the recommendation of that committee, along with the evaluation and justification, shall be communicated in writing to the faculty member and the department chair person. If the faculty member is not in agreement with the decision, they may request a review from the college tenure and promotion committee. The college committee's recommendation, along with the evaluation and justification, shall be communicated in writing to the faculty member and the department chair person. Within the indicated time period, the department chair person may make an inquiry to the department committee, or where appropriate, the college tenure and promotion advisory committee regarding the evaluation of a specific faculty member, and that committee will provide a response. If the chair person is not in agreement with that evaluation, the chair person shall forward all written evaluations and justifications, and a written response from the faculty member, if the faculty member so chooses, to the dean. The dean shall provide a resolution that shall be forwarded to the provost and the involved parties. (For Kent Library faculty, the appellate body shall be the university tenure and promotion advisory committee, which shall fill the same roles as those filled by the college tenure and promotion advisory committee for non-library faculty.)
- b. In cases where the department faculty as a whole has delegated to the chair person the evaluation of the faculty member, the chair person's recommendation, along with the evaluation and justification, shall be communicated in writing to that faculty member. If that faculty member is not in agreement with the recommendation, they may request a review from the college tenure and promotion committee. The college committee's recommendation, along with the evaluation and justification, shall be communicated in writing to the faculty member and the department chair person. If the chair person is not in agreement with that evaluation, the chair person shall forward all written evaluations and justifications, and a written response from the faculty member, if the faculty member so chooses, to the dean. The dean shall provide a resolution that shall be forwarded to the provost and the involved parties. (For Kent Library faculty, the appellate body shall be the university tenure and promotion advisory committee, which shall fill the same roles as those filled by the college tenure and promotion advisory committee for non-library faculty.)

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

6 The annual review will identify faculty who are meeting minimum
7 expectations, as determined by departmental criteria. These faculty will receive a
8 salary increase funded by a pool consisting of at least 87.5 percent of the aggregate
9 amount of each year's faculty salary increase determined through the annual
10 budget review process. Promotions to Associate Professor and Professor shall be
11 funded as a "cost of continuing", determined by the annual budget review process.
12 *Amended by Faculty Senate Bill 11-A-28, May 4, 2011, reviewed by President May*
13 *2011, approved by Board of Regents May 13, 2011*

14 Calendar for Annual Performance Program.

15 The performance evaluation process shall be conducted according to this calendar:
16 **January 31:** Faculty reports are due for accomplishments and contributions of the
17 previous year.

18
19 **February 1 - March 1:** Notices of departmental committee recommendations
20 regarding performance meeting or not meeting minimum expectations are
21 communicated in writing to faculty. ~~In the case of the chair evaluation, the~~
22 ~~departmental committee shall forward their written evaluation to the dean. The dean~~
23 ~~will then communicate the recommendation regarding~~
24 ~~performance meeting or not meeting minimum expectations to the chair. During this~~
25 ~~same time period, i~~In the cases where a chairperson has been delegated the
26 responsibility of evaluating faculty members, the chairperson shall communicate in
27 writing their evaluation and justification to the faculty members.

28 **March 2-March 12:** Within this time period, in cases where the dean's evaluation
29 is not in agreement with the department's evaluation, the dean will forward all
30 evaluations and justifications, and a written response from the ~~chair~~chairperson if
31 the ~~chair~~chairperson so chooses, to the provost. Also during this time period, in the
32 case of a faculty member evaluated by a department committee, the department
33 ~~chair~~chairperson may make an inquiry to that committee regarding the evaluation
34 of a specific faculty member, and the committee will provide a response. Also
35 during this time period, a faculty member, who is not in agreement with their
36 evaluation by the department committee or ~~chair~~chairperson, may appeal that
37 evaluation to the college tenure and promotion advisory committee.

38 **March 13- April 15:** Appeals made to the college tenure and promotion advisory
39 committee shall be decided and the evaluation and justification communicated in
40 writing to the faculty member and to the department ~~chair~~chairperson. During this

1 time, if the ~~chair~~chairperson is not in agreement with an evaluation from either the
2 department committee or college tenure and promotion committee, the
3 ~~chair~~chairperson shall forward all written evaluations and justifications, and a
4 written response from the faculty member, if the faculty member so chooses, to the
5 dean. The dean shall provide a resolution that shall be forwarded to the provost and
6 the involved parties.

7 Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit Program

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

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

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

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

30 **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

31
32 *Approved by Faculty Senate Bill 12-A-4 February 15, 2012, Reviewed by President February 2012,*
33 *Approved by Board of Regents June 20, 2012, Approved by Faculty Senate Bill 15-A-4 on 2/25/15,*
34 *Reviewed by President 4/14/15, Approved by Board of Regents 5/8/15*

Date and Version: 9/14/22 Version 1
Handbook Section: Faculty Merit Pay
Proposed Change: Edits to Handbook Language for Clarity and Conciseness
Source of Bill: Professional Affairs/ Governance Committees

1

Action	Date
Introduced to Senate	9/14/2022
Second Senate Meeting	
Faculty Senate Vote	
President's Review	
Board of Regents Approval	
Posted to Faculty Handbook	

2