WHEREAS the Senate recognizes that the efforts of the University ad hoc committee have clarified many points regarding the guidelines used in the annual evaluation of faculty, and

WHEREAS the Senate appreciates that department heads need flexibility and decision-making authority in the allocation of annual pay raises, and

WHEREAS some members of the Senate have concerns about fairness in the allocation of pay raises by department heads, and

WHEREAS the faculty handbook states that departments are encouraged to establish separate criteria weights and/or separate evaluation instruments for instructors, and the decision to recognize and evaluate non-tenure-track faculty using separate criteria is at the discretion of each department or department head, and

WHEREAS the required tasks of non-tenure-track faculty may limit research opportunities, funding sources, publications, presentations, etc. that, in turn, may limit their ability to score high on professional activities, and

WHEREAS some members of the Senate have concerns about the statement in the present Evaluation Guidelines that "the department head would make every effort to ensure that the evaluations are clear, honest, fair, and genuinely evaluative . . .," and

WHEREAS some members of the Senate have concerns about the statement in the new Evaluation Guidelines that "In all cases, however, the department head should evaluate the quality of the publications, presentations, or artistic productions . . .," because, in some cases, the department head does not have specific expertise in the area of some faculty members’ productions; and

WHEREAS “should” implies volition and shall implies necessity; and

WHEREAS the annual evaluation is linked to merit pay:

NOW BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate express appreciation to the ad hoc committee and recognize the need for flexibility in pay allocation decisions; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate urge the Southeastern administration and department heads to make the criteria used for calculating individuals' pay raises as open and transparent as is legally possible; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT that the Faculty Senate recommend that all academic departments develop separate, distinct, and transparent criteria outlining measures by which non-tenure-track faculty should be evaluated in accordance with the specific job responsibilities as outlined by the appointment type; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT—because annual evaluations are important to consider in granting tenure, promotions, and merit raises—the statement about dean and provost input be changed to "the department head, dean, and provost shall ensure that the evaluations are clear . . . ."; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT a committee of the whole of the faculty in a specific discipline should evaluate the works of their peers and the department head should rely on their expertise in making his or her evaluation, in the case that the department head lacks sufficient expertise to make such an evaluation of the quality of a faculty member’s productivity; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT shall replace “should” in the following sentence from the “Proposed Revisions” draft of the “Evaluation of Faculty” section of the Faculty Handbook—

Whenever deficiencies are noted, the department head should work with the faculty member to improve performance.

—so that the sentence becomes

Whenever deficiencies are noted, the department head shall work with the faculty member to improve performance.

and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED THAT merit pay be distributed consistent with the annual evaluation in each department.