

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

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

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

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

97

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

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

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

109 **Calendar for Annual Performance Program.**

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

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

112 **February 1 - March 1:** Notices of departmental committee recommendations regarding meeting or not
113 meeting minimum expectations are communicated in writing to faculty. **The faculty body evaluating the**
114 **chairperson's teaching effectiveness, professional growth, and service shall convey their recommendation**
115 **to the college dean** In the cases where a chairperson has been delegated the responsibility of
116 evaluating faculty members, the chairperson shall communicate in writing their evaluation and
117 justification to the faculty members. **Additionally, in such cases the chairperson shall not receive their**
118 **overall evaluation from the dean until after the chairperson has completed and communicated all faculty**
119 **evaluations.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Date and Version: 11/16/22 Version 3
Handbook Section: Faculty Merit Pay
Proposed Change: Edits to Handbook Language for Clarity and Conciseness
Source of Bill: Professional Affairs/ Governance Committees

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

149

Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit
Monetary Amounts 1 Since Fiscal Year 2013

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

150

151

152

153

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

154

155

<u>Action</u>	<u>Date</u>
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	

156