

1. GENERAL FEATURES OF THE MERITORIOUS FACULTY PERFORMANCE POLICY

1.01 The Meritorious Faculty Performance Policy (MFPP) is established to provide an orderly and systematic approach to rewarding meritorious performance through salary adjustments.

1.02 The MFPP is intended to recognize and reward excellence serving to advance the mission and goals of the University. The MFPP recognizes that faculty members' interests, strengths, and skills evolve throughout their careers (see APS 790601, Faculty Instructional Workload). The University is best served by striving for a system that has enough flexibility to reward meritorious performance with enough structure to promote fairness and consistency. SHSU's MFPP rewards faculty performance in each of four categories (see Section 1.03). The MFPP provides a table of weights (Table I) for both the normative nine-credit-hours-per-semester- and twelve-credit- hours-per-semester-workloads (see APS 790601, Faculty Instructional Workload) and identifies the respective weights used in creating the final summary MFPP score. Those weights attach to scores derived from APS 820317 Faculty Performance Review policy.

1.03 Recommendations for merit will consider teaching, scholarly/creative activities, service, and collegiality based on the standards outlined in APS 820317 Faculty Performance Review Policy.

- a. The rating of teaching effectiveness is calculated by combining the chair's assessment of teaching effectiveness and the converted end-of-course student evaluations of faculty as reported in the FPR Summary Report. Each score is weighted according to Table 1. Weights for Meritorious Faculty Performance.
- b. The rating of service activities reported in the FPR Summary Report is carried over to the MFPP summary report and weighted according to Attachment 2, Weights for Meritorious Faculty Performance.
- c. The rating of scholarly and/or creative accomplishment activities reported in the FPR Summary Report is carried over to the MFPP summary report and weighted according to Table 1 Weights for Meritorious Faculty Performance.
- d. A summary rating of each faculty member based upon FPR I through FPR 4 is to be completed by using the MFPP Summary Report (Attachment 1). This MFPP Summary Report is to be completed by the department/school chair.

2. REWARDING MERITORIOUS FACULTY PERFORMANCE

2.01 Typically, faculty members who receive a score below 4 in any FPR category may be ineligible for merit pay increases.

2.02 The department/school chair shall have discretion to recommend to the college dean the amounts and distribution of merit pay to eligible faculty so long as the amounts and distributions

are not inconsistent with the ordinal ranking of faculty members on the MFPP Sum of Scores as calculated on the MFPP Summary Report. If the dean approves the chair's recommendation, the recommendation is forwarded to the provost for approval. If either the dean or the provost reject the chair's recommendation, the chair will consult with the dean or provost to determine an appropriate amount and distribution of merit pay.

APPROVED _____

Dana G. Hoyt, President

DATE: _____

CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

This academic policy statement (APS) has been approved by the reviewer(s) listed below and represents SHSU's Division of Academic Affairs' policy from the date of this document until superseded.

Original Date: March 17, 1982

Review Cycle: Five years*

Reviewer(s): Council of Academic Deans
Faculty Senate

Review Date: February 1, 2012

Approved: _____ Date: _____

Richard Eglsaer
Provost and Vice President
for Academic Affairs

* Effective January 2018, Academic Policy Statements will be reviewed on a rotating 5-year schedule. To transition to a distributed review load, some policies may be reviewed prior to the 5-year timeframe, with subsequent reviews transitioning to the 5-year schedule.

Attachment 1

MFPP SUMMARY REPORT

Teaching effectiveness ratings are weighted averages and should be recorded to the nearest tenth. Ratings by the students and chair should be weighted equally (each comprises 50% of the teaching activity score). The remaining activity areas are each to be evaluated as a whole. For example, scholarly and/or creative accomplishments (FES 3) should be evaluated and assigned an overall rating from 1 to 10. The weights for each of the categories vary depending upon each faculty member's normative teaching load as described in Table I.

Faculty Member's Workload Assignment (check one)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Normative nine credit hours per semester					
<input type="checkbox"/> Normative twelve credit hours per semester					
FES Category	Rating	x	Weight	=	Score
1. Chair's Rating of Teaching Effectiveness		x		=	
2. Students' Rating of Teaching Effectiveness		x		=	
3. Scholarly and/or Creative Accomplishments		x		=	
4. Service		x		=	

Sum of Scores

* Weights for each category area are determined by referencing Table I of this policy.

The signatures below indicate only that the department/school chair and faculty member met to discuss the faculty member's annual evaluation pertaining to APS 820317 and does not necessarily indicate the faculty member's concurrence with the same.

Chair's Signature:

Faculty Member's Signature:

Date:

TABLE I: Weights for Meritorious Faculty Performance.

NORMATIVE TWELVE-CREDIT HOURS-PER-SEMESTER WORKLOAD

FES 1 Chair's Rating	FES 2 Students' Rating	FES 3 Scholarly and/or Creative Accomplishments	FES 4 Service	Collegiality
.25	.25	.25	.25	Y/N

NORMATIVE NINE-CREDIT-HOURS-PER-SEMESTER WORKLOAD

FES 1 Chair's Rating	FES 2 Students' Rating	FES 3 Scholarly and/or Creative Accomplishments	FES 4 Service	Collegiality
.20	.20	.40	.20	Y/N