

(The Senate and Senate Committees should use the following form for officially c recommendations to the Provost. Such committees would include: UCC, UPC and Senate along with any other committees which provide recommendations directly

Copies mailed
on 9/18/13

Senate Recommendation to the Provost

Originating Body: Faculty Senate

Originator: Faculty Senate

Date Submitted: 9/13/2013

Requested Effective Date: ASAP

OFFICE OF
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

SEP 18 2013

Recommendation: Faculty Pay Policy Recommendation

Date Approved by Senate: April 9, 2013

J. Craig Clarke

President, Faculty Senate

9/13/13
Date

1. Attach any supporting documentation.

From the April 9, 2013 Faculty Senate Minutes.

Minutes. Motion to retain the 2004 recommendation (attached) to the administration regarding Merit / No Merit. The motion to retain the 2004 Senate recommendation regarding Merit / No Merit passed.

Action Taken by Provost:

Date 09-13-13

☒ Recommendation Accepted ☐ Recommendation Not Accepted
☐ Recommendation returned to Originating Body for further review (see attached)

Disposition for Approved Recommendation:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> President	<input type="checkbox"/> VP Student Affairs
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Faculty Senate President	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VP Finance
<input type="checkbox"/> Forum Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> School Deans
<input type="checkbox"/> Webmaster	<input type="checkbox"/> Graduate Council
<input type="checkbox"/> Catalogue Editor	<input type="checkbox"/> Provost Council

Diane D. Allen
Provost

09-13-13

Date

Senate Recommendation to the Provost

Originating Body Faculty Senate Originator Dr. Michael O'Loughlin

Date submitted December 3, 2004 Requested Effective date ASAP

Recommendation To accept the attached policy on State Funded Merit Pay Approved by the Faculty Senate on November 30, 2004. Approved policy attached.

Attach any supporting documentation. *Letter, December 2, 2004; Memorandum, David Rieck, July 26, 2004; Charge to Committee, July, 2004; Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Pay Policy, November 30, 2004; Deans' Proposal on Faculty Salary Adjustments, November 23, 2004*

Action Taken by Provost:

Date 1/3/2005


☒ Recommendation Accepted ☐ Recommendation Not Accepted

☐ Recommendation returned to Originating Body for further review (see attached)

Disposition for Approved Recommendation:

☒ President
☒ Faculty Senate Chair
☐ Forum Chair
☐ Webmaster
☐ Catalogue Editor
☐ Student Handbook Editor
☐ Faculty Handbook Editor

☐ VP Student Affairs
☒ VP Finance
☒ School Deans
☐ Graduate Council
☐ Provost Council
☐ Other: _____

Signature: 

provost/sow/121802

*Ed 1 - recom to provost
What to do about 1st year faculty*

Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Pay Policy
November 30, 2004

Committee members: Elizabeth Curtin, Michael Garner, Joel Jenne, Rich McKenzie, Dave Parker, David Rieck, Don Whaley

Consistently, the faculty of Salisbury University has endorsed a simple "merit or no merit plan" for distribution of state-allocated merit funds. We, on the Ad-Hoc committee to examine merit pay distribution, once again conclude that we should continue to endorse such a two-tiered system. We believe that this system has worked well at SU. We further believe that the "high merit" schemes that were implemented in some years seriously eroded the cooperative, collegial environment that helps to make SU so special and have had the effect of demoralizing and alienating many hardworking and productive faculty members from the institution. We continue to believe that these schemes are counterproductive.

Last summer our Ad-Hoc committee asked those who find a two-tiered merit policy unacceptable to provide us with a written explanation of their objections this system. To date we have received no such explanation. We did receive a pay policy proposal from the deans last Wednesday, November 23, 2004. Although we have not had time to consider their proposal carefully, we believe that we may have found some common ground concerning the two-tiered approach for the distribution of state-provided merit money. We welcome the opportunity to meet with the deans to discuss their entire proposal. At this time, however, we are not aware of any evidence or reasoning, either from our administration, the chancellor, or the research available on the issue that suggests we should implement anything other than the two-tiered distribution system that has worked well at SU over the years.

We believe that the two-tiered system is the least divisive and most appropriate method for distributing merit money and best serves to preserve the interdependent character of the teaching and scholarship enterprise of Salisbury University faculty.

Consequently, on behalf of the committee I move that the Salisbury University Faculty Senate reiterate its recommendation for a two-tiered merit system as opposed to a multi-tiered merit scheme.