

Background:

The vote [26-0-0 on 26 April 2018] by the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University to approve revisions to the Faculty Performance Evaluation Model (aka, the Biennial Review) follows an agreement between Senate officers and the provost regarding faculty compensation. It is the understanding of the Faculty Senate that the administration remains committed both to cost-of-living *and* merit-based compensation adjustments. In years when such adjustments are possible, Academic Affairs will allocate funds for merit pay directly to departments. The Faculty Senate and the administration agree that departments, with guidance from the administration and faculty governance, will be charged with determining the process by which merit pay is distributed to their respective faculty members. This process must be established by the end of the Fall 2018 semester.

FAC Statement to Colleges and Departments

Approved by FAC (5-0-0), 9/25/2018

Approved as amended by EC (9-0-0), 10/2/2018

Approved as amended by Faculty Senate (27-3-1), 10/19/2018

By 15 February 2019, each academic department shall develop a set of procedures for identifying and rewarding regular faculty whose accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and/or service, since any prior merit review, exceed the ordinary and expected level of faculty performance. While it is not necessary that a department's policies restrict the number of people who can be identified for a merit-based compensation adjustment, policies must recognize and appropriately reward distinctions in faculty achievements. Deans, in consultation with college P&T committees, shall provide oversight in the creation of these policies; departments failing to create such policies shall be ineligible to receive merit pay adjustments.

Each time merit awards are made, the Deans shall review all merit distributions made within departments in their college. If a Dean believes that a distribution fails to provide meaningful recognition of distinctions in faculty performance, s/he may request a review of the Department's distribution and/or policy by the college's Promotion & Tenure Committee. Upon review, the college committee will either (a) confirm that the policy is appropriately-devised in accord with the above-mentioned policy statement and appropriately applied, or (b) develop a new distribution and/or require that the Department revise its policy to bring it in-line.

By April 2019, each College shall establish a process by which a faculty member may appeal their department's merit pay distribution; such appeals shall be limited to matters of due process (i.e., a committee's failure to follow approved policy or apply approved standards).

In all cases, merit decisions must comply with the ISU Non-Discrimination Policy (Handbook Section 923).

Edited Minutes from October Senate Meeting

- a) Merit Pay recommendation [from FAC at the request of the Senate]
 - i) Motion to approve (M. Jackson/J. Weust); **Vote 27-3-1**
 - ii) V. Sheets: Last spring at the end of the year the BR model was changed to separate merit pay from the process. As part of that, the administration and Senate agreed that departments would develop their own merit-pay guidelines. The BR had an artificial limit on how many could be recognized in each department. FAC tried to avoid putting limits or defining appropriate standards for everyone on campus. Each department needs to create that what would *meet* or *exceed* and how they would appropriately recognize that in the pay system. Deans would provide oversight to make sure the plan is appropriate and makes a meaningful distinction.
 - (1) D. Israel: Does there need to be clarity on how frequent merit pay discussions will be? It was every other year with the BR.
 - (a) V. Sheets: That would be valuable. “Considering from prior merit review period” was there for that.
 - (2) C. Hanson: It is not tied to the BR period?
 - (a) V. Sheets: FAC assumed it was.
 - (b) M. Licari: Yes, it flows from the BR upward.
 - (c) B. Guell: Will there be a new merit pay report? Departments will decide that under stable admin leadership, enrollment, and finances there will be merit pay. Do BR and merit pay on odd number years. Do that and then in a future recession you cannot imagine a president would scratch the BR. However, the first thing to cut is merit pay. Not right now, imagine a situation in which you do not have the standard two-year window, but some much longer window that does not correspond to the BR.
 - (d) T. Hawkins: The University is now giving departments autonomy about how they want to deal with it. Departments could consider such a scenario and create a plan for it.
 - (3) S. Arvin: If I am elected to a personnel committee then I have to look at previous years to try to be fair. I can see that adding more work.
 - (a) T. Hawkins: Departments may have those discussions.
 - (4) M. Jackson: How would we know when there is money available? When it was appropriate to evaluate faculty on the basis of merit? Will it be announced by the administration? We need language about that. We are not going to do it if there is no money.
 - (a) S. Kopaczewski: Shouldn't there be some kind of timeline where the administration will announce available money for the next year?
 - (b) T. Hawkins: I don't think there can be sufficient advanced notice of that.
 - (c) M. Licari: I would be reluctant to do that.
 - (5) E. Southar: Will the Ombuds be seated by next fall? Providing opportunity for merit pay is good, but a chair having their own self-determined structure seems like a hornets nest.
 - (a) T. Hawkins: Yes.

- (6) B. Kilp: Is it all faculty? Or regular, FT, PT? If it is, tenure-track people tend to have a lighter load so they can spend more time on publishing. Is it the department's determination who qualifies?
- (a) L. Brown: It is regular faculty only, instructors and professors.
 - (b) B. Kilp: It does not say that.
 - (c) J. Kinne: I suggest regular faculty.
 - (d) L. Brown: If you are required to do BR, you have to be *meeting expectations* in all categories.
 - (e) B. Kilp: What if what they get on P&T does not apply? If it is a legal document, you have to pay attention.
 - (f) B. Guell: This was drafted vaguely to let departments draft policies which made meaningful distinctions. If not, they will cede decisions to college P&T.
 - (g) L. Brown: Departments might have to consider how important service is, which is why it is sent to departments.
 - (h) T. Hawkins: That was the philosophy behind allowing departments to make these decisions.
 - (i) B. Jose: What if those expectations vary from year to year?
 - (j) T. Hawkins: Nothing ties departments to the first iteration of their process. They can redo it.
 - (k) V. Sheets: FAC was hoping they would not lay down too many expectations, but there are some standards to evaluate. It is up to the department.
- (7) X. Li: There are two documents to submit at the same time, the BR and the merit pay?
- (a) T. Hawkins: You will submit BR material and will be categorized as *meeting* or *not meeting*. Departments will then determine candidates for merit pay. Senate's hope was that departments would have made the adjustments to their BR documents by October of this fall to be in line with the Senate document passed last spring. Now we are asking departments to move ahead and establish a merit-pay process by early 2019.
 - (b) J. Kinne: Departments could take what you had already created for exceeds or could do something else. *Meets* is real and genuine, but not too easy.
 - (c) D. Israel: The timing issue is going to be challenging. If we happen to be in departments with pre-tenured faculty, they have different deadlines. A timeline is helpful when you have to have decisions. Are we going to have stuff in there other than materials used for the normal BR process? That would be difficult to do. It should be stated somewhere. We have had problems before with that. Departments did not want to include instructors. If departments do not have the leeway in the category to be eligible, it should state that in here.
 - (d) L. Brown: Deans in consultation with P&T committees will provide oversight; the department would not get away with it (not rewarding instructors). There are checks and balances.
 - (e) T. Hawkins: We can include "regular" in this document with unanimous consent. Keep in mind, this is essentially a letter from FAC asking departments to write procedures and be ready for February 2019. As far as a list of requirements, we should be talking about this in our own departments.

The point of the change was to empower departments to make decisions. I am concerned that we seem to be questioning this here. Take it to the departments. We can pass this with the necessary revisions right now, and I can send a statement to the deans & to the chairs that there are specific concerns you need to be sure are raised in each department. Each department could have a different answer. We do not, I think, want to turn this into a FAC-proscribed list of rules. That is not what Senate wanted last spring.

- (8) B. Jose: I was asked to inquire if there are models for several different disciplines we can see.
- (a) T. Hawkins: As far as I know those do not exist.
- (b) L. Brown: You could ask colleagues from other institutions what they do.
- (9) C. Hanson: Is this a one-time bonus, or on top of the base salary?
- (a) L. Brown: Base.
- (10) T. Hawkins: I am asking for unanimous consent to include “regular” ahead of the first appearance of “faculty” in line 2. [unanimous consent granted] I can then have this discussion included in the email we are going to send tomorrow to the deans. We will ask deans and chairs to begin deliberations. These issues can be a part of those discussions.
- (11) E. Wittenmyer: What is the definition of “regular faculty?”
- (a) B. Guell: It is in 305.
- (b) M. Licari: Tenure-track professors and instructors.
- (c) E. Wittenmyer: OK, but in the past I have had people say you are just an instructor and not faculty.
- (d) B. Guell: That is not true now, but it was ten years ago.
- (12) S. Arvin: Will this potentially be given every year? Pre-tenured faculty turn in reports every year. Tenured faculty have the BR.
- (a) V. Sheets: Every other year.
- (b) M. Jackson: It does not say that. Are we to assume we set out timelines based on the old timeline?
- (c) M. Licari: I do not see a problem with that. It does not change anything for the university.
- (d) S. Kopaczewski: For our department it would be much easier to do merit pay in the spring. Are there problems if we make those decisions in the spring than in the fall?
- (e) T. Hawkins: Last year Senate rejected a spring BR.
- (f) D. Israel: Not merit pay. Some people do not have to do BR, are we making them do another report?
- (g) L. Brown: It depends on what process your department creates. That is the reason it goes to departments
- (h) S. Kopaczewski: Do we have the authority to do it in the spring?
- (i) M. Licari: That would be a big problem for payroll, budgeting and accounting. It has to be one timeline. Otherwise, payroll will not be happy.
- (j) M. Chambers: If we are not going to increase workload on 4/5 years their stuff is due in Dec/early Jan. If we are going to be doing merit pay decisions, are we going to use reports in December for the previous year?

- (k) L. Brown: It depends on what departments ask for in the merit pay plan. It may not be full evaluation materials. It depends on what they decide they want.
- (13) K. Games: Could we use FAD? If a department comes up with merit pay documents will departments be able to work with Susan Powers to create a separate report for departments? The BR is meeting expectations, but merit pay is exceptional. That could result in different things ask for. On the back end, does that create a challenge?
- (a) T. Hawkins: I do not know if we can answer some of these questions now. Departments will have to wrestle with many of them. Senate wants departments to create the merit pay documents by February. That will give deans and P&T committees time to review them and suggest revisions. If there are problems then they can be addressed. We must emphasize that departments should not be trying to overburden their faculty by creating a complicated process to identify their best persons. You could go through FAD...but why? Build a process right off the BR. For example, if you *meet expectations* you can ask to be considered for merit pay. You would then submit specific materials for evaluation by your department committee. That is all it has to be.
- (b) L. Brown: Or a little check list. People could submit their CV. Departments can make it super simple or really complicated, or hopefully somewhere in between.
- (14) A. Anderson: Many of you many not remember, but with the old merit system we were often told do it, but then the money was not there in the end. Be conscience of that. A committee has met, worked on it, but there is no money. Exercise caution, please.