

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

- 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.

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

- 34 1. For evaluation of the chairperson, see Department Chairpersons (Chapter
35 1). For the evaluation of faculty members, the department faculty as a
36 whole may choose to evaluate faculty by a designated departmental
37 committee or delegate to the chairperson the evaluation of the
38 department faculty.
- 39 a. In cases where the evaluation of a faculty member is done by a
40 department committee, the recommendation of that committee, along
41 with the evaluation and justification, shall be communicated in
42 writing to the faculty member and the department chairperson. If the
43 faculty member is not in agreement with the decision, they may

1 request a review from the college tenure and promotion committee.
2 The college committee's recommendation, along with the evaluation
3 and justification, shall be communicated in writing to the faculty
4 member and the department chairperson. Within the indicated time
5 period, the department chairperson may make an inquiry to the
6 department committee, or where appropriate, the college tenure and
7 promotion advisory committee regarding the evaluation of a specific
8 faculty member, and that committee will provide a response. If the
9 chairperson is not in agreement with that evaluation, the chairperson
10 shall forward all written evaluations and justifications, and a written
11 response from the faculty member, if the faculty member so chooses,
12 to the dean. The dean shall provide a resolution that shall be
13 forwarded to the provost and the involved parties. (For Kent Library
14 faculty, the appellate body shall be the university tenure and
15 promotion advisory committee, which shall fill the same roles as
16 those filled by the college tenure and promotion advisory committee
17 for non-library faculty.)

- 18 b. In cases where the department faculty as a whole has delegated to the
19 chairperson the evaluation of the faculty member, the chairperson's
20 recommendation, along with the evaluation and justification, shall be
21 communicated in writing to that faculty member. If that faculty
22 member is not in agreement with the recommendation, they may
23 request a review from the college tenure and promotion committee.
24 The college committee's recommendation, along with the evaluation
25 and justification, shall be communicated in writing to the faculty
26 member and the department chairperson. If the chairperson is not in
27 agreement with that evaluation, the chairperson shall forward all
28 written evaluations and justifications, and a written response from the
29 faculty member, if the faculty member so chooses, to the dean. The
30 dean shall provide a resolution that shall be forwarded to the provost
31 and the involved parties. (For Kent Library faculty, the appellate body
32 shall be the university tenure and promotion advisory committee,
33 which shall fill the same roles as those filled by the college tenure and
34 promotion advisory committee for non- library faculty.)

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

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

1 *Amended by Faculty Senate Bill 11-A-28, May 4, 2011, reviewed by President May*
2 *2011, approved by Board of Regents May 13, 2011*

3 Calendar for Annual Performance Program.

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

7
8 **February 1 - March 1:** Notices of departmental committee recommendations
9 regarding performance meeting or not meeting minimum expectations are
10 communicated in writing to faculty. In the cases where a chairperson has been
11 delegated the responsibility of evaluating faculty members, the chairperson shall
12 communicate in writing their evaluation and justification to the faculty members.

13 **March 2-March 12:** Within this time period, in cases where the dean's evaluation
14 is not in agreement with the department's evaluation, the dean will forward all
15 evaluations and justifications, and a written response from the chairperson if the
16 chairperson so chooses, to the provost. Also during this time period, in the case of a
17 faculty member evaluated by a department committee, the department chairperson
18 may make an inquiry to that committee regarding the evaluation of a specific
19 faculty member, and the committee will provide a response. Also during this time
20 period, a faculty member, who is not in agreement with their evaluation by the
21 department committee or chairperson, may appeal that evaluation to the college
22 tenure and promotion advisory committee.

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

31 Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit Program

32 **Development of Criteria for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit.** In addition, the
33 full-time faculty of each department or equivalent unit shall as a whole develop and
34 approve criteria for periodic recognition of non-tenure track faculty. These criteria
35 shall reflect higher than minimum performance, similar to the way that tenure,
36 promotion, and post-professorial merit criteria (see Faculty Tenure and Promotion
37 Policy) reflect higher than minimum performance. For a period of three years
38 following the final approval of a revision of these criteria, a faculty member

1 applying for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit may elect to be evaluated by the
2 previous criteria.

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

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

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

16
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

17
18 *Approved by Faculty Senate Bill 12-A-4 February 15, 2012, Reviewed by President February 2012,*
19 *Approved by Board of Regents June 20, 2012, Approved by Faculty Senate Bill 15-A-4 on 2/25/15,*
20 *Reviewed by President 4/14/15, Approved by Board of Regents 5/8/15*

21
22

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

23