

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 **Faculty Annual Merit Program**

58 **Development of Annual Performance Criteria.** The full-time faculty of each
59 academic department or equivalent unit shall as a whole develop, approve, and
60 publish criteria that define minimum annual expectations for performance by the
61 individual faculty member. Criteria must be applicable to both non-tenure track
62 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
65 department or equivalent unit shall as a whole determine and publish the process
66 to be used to conduct the annual evaluation of faculty member performance.
67 Annual evaluations shall be conducted according to the procedures and calendar
68 set out below.

- 69 1. For evaluation of the chairperson, see Department Chairpersons (Chapter 1)
70 for modifications of the procedure below. For the evaluation of faculty
71 members, the department faculty as a whole may choose to evaluate
72 faculty by a designated departmental committee or delegate to the
73 chairperson the evaluation of the department faculty.
- 74 a. In cases where the evaluation of a faculty member is done by a
75 department committee, the recommendation of that committee, along
76 with the evaluation and justification, shall be communicated in
77 writing to the faculty member and the department chairperson. If the
78 faculty member is not in agreement with the decision, they may

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

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

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

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

123 *Amended by Faculty Senate Bill 11-A-28, May 4, 2011, reviewed by President May*
124 *2011, approved by Board of Regents May 13, 2011*

125 **Calendar for Annual Performance Program.**

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

129
130 **February 1 - March 1:** Notices of departmental committee recommendations
131 regarding performance meeting or not meeting minimum expectations are
132 communicated in writing to faculty. In the cases where a chairperson has been
133 delegated the responsibility of evaluating faculty members, the chairperson shall
134 communicate in writing their evaluation and justification to the faculty members.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

176

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

177

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

181

182

<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	

183