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Faculty Evaluation Plan Summary

As described in the Missouri State University *Faculty Handbook*, all full-time faculty must participate in regularly scheduled performance reviews. Faculty with standard appointments (not clinical or research) are evaluated in three categories of performance: teaching, research, and service. General criteria and procedures for such evaluations can be found in sections 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, and 4.6.6. of the Handbook ([http://www.missouristate.edu/assets/policy/FacultyHandbook_2015-07-13.pdf](http://www.missouristate.edu/assets/policy/FacultyHandbook_2015-07-13.pdf))

Tenure-track faculty members, beginning their first year of probation, complete an annual review so that progress toward tenure, and promotion may be evaluated. Tenured faculty members also participate in a yearly merit-performance review. Tenured faculty members participate in a yearly merit-performance review, and, as appropriate, promotion reviews. For all annual evaluations, faculty members compile a dossier of self-evaluation, peer evaluation, student evaluation materials, as well as other documentation in support of effectiveness in teaching, research and service.

Annual reviews of tenure-track faculty and promotion reviews follow a series of formal evaluations and recommendations. The review process begins with the MPH Program Personnel Committee. The Committee forwards its evaluation and recommendation to the Department Head [Program Director] who adds comments, who then forwards the evaluation and recommendation (along with the personnel committee’s evaluation and recommendation) to the College Dean. The Dean makes her evaluation and recommendation, and if indicated, sends a list of all required actions with appropriate documentation, to the Provost. For tenure and promotion, the Dean forwards her recommendations, along with the Program Director’s and Personnel Committee’s previous recommendations, to the Provost who makes the final recommendation to the President and Board of Governors.

As per the *Faculty Handbook*, “Discussions and/or negotiations will occur in those cases where the recommendations are not acceptable to the higher-level administrator. In instances of disagreement between the personnel committee and the Department Head, there shall be a good faith effort to resolve these differences. In all tenure and promotion cases where the recommendation of the Department Head, Dean, Provost, or the President differs from that of the departmental personnel committee, the administrator initiating the change shall state in writing to the affected faculty member, the departmental committee, and other involved administrators, compelling reasons why he or she cannot agree with the original recommendation.”

The process used for annual merit/performance review also begins with the Personnel Committee. The Committee provides input to the Program Director who recommends a composite rating (based on teaching, research and service). The Program Director meets with the faculty being evaluated to discuss the rating and may make adjustments if differences can be justified. The Program Director then forwards the composite rating to the College Dean. The Dean then endorses or modifies the recommended rating. In
tenure. If there is a personnel subcommittee, it will present its recommendations to the full tenured faculty, whose vote will establish the departmental faculty recommendation for a personnel action. When an applicant is being considered for promotion, only those tenured faculty members who hold a rank equal to or above the rank for which the candidate is applying shall participate in the decision-making process. If there is a split vote among tenured faculty, the minority may file a report, signed by each member of the minority, which will be forwarded with the majority decision.

In instances of disagreement between the personnel committee and the head [Program Director], there shall be a good faith effort to resolve these differences. If resolution is not possible, the Department Head [Program Director] must offer in writing compelling reasons for disagreeing with the committee's recommendation before advancing her/his recommendation to the Dean. (Missouri State University Faculty Handbook, Section 4.8.3)

Each department [Program] shall supply new faculty with a copy of the departmental [Program] tenure and promotion guidelines on the date of hire. During the first month of full-time employment, the new faculty shall meet with the Department Head [Program Director] and review the tenure and promotion document to ensure understanding of expectations and governing procedures. Clarifications of expectations emanating from the meeting shall be noted on the guideline document. Both the faculty member and Department Head [Program Director] shall sign off on the guidelines, and this will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. The signed guidelines should be provided for the faculty member's records. In the event that a department's tenure guidelines change during the time period of a faculty member pursuing tenure and promotion, the faculty member has the right to be evaluated by the guidelines under which he or she was hired or has the option to be evaluated using the new guidelines. If it is the desire of the faculty member to be evaluated with the new guideline document, the signed guidelines shall be amended to reflect the change and a copy of the new guidelines will be provided to the faculty member.

Should the negotiated faculty workload changes from the original agreement, this amendment to the faculty member's and Department Head's [Program Director's] procedural agreement shall be reflected in all future evaluations.

II. FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

1. Annual Review of Tenure-Track Faculty

Annual reviews following the procedures outlined in Section 4.6.2 of the Faculty Handbook are conducted for probationary faculty to assess appropriate progress toward tenure and to make recommendations for continuation of appointments. The personnel committee will annually assess the probationary faculty member's cumulative record as he or she progresses toward the tenure decision year, and will specify in writing one of three outcomes:
Candidates who apply for early tenure (i.e., in a year prior to the final year for application as stated in the faculty member's initial letter of employment) may reapply up to and including the final year to apply. Although faculty hired at mid-year may "count" all work accomplished since the date of hire, the tenure clock for them begins the following August, unless otherwise negotiated.

Individuals whose initial appointment is to the Associate Professor rank must apply for tenure by the fourth year of their probationary status except in those circumstances where the Provost has granted a temporary stopping of the tenure clock.

Application Process and Review
The faculty member prepares a complete tenure/promotion dossier according to guidelines provided by the Provost, and forwards it to the chair of the departmental personnel committee. The tenure/promotion dossier will include external reviews gathered according to departmental guidelines, and inserted by the department head. The process for tenure/promotion review follows the steps outlined in Section 4.6.2. of the Faculty Handbook.

3. Promotion Review (Promotion from Associate Professor Rank to Full Professor Rank)

Pre-Promotion Review

Tenured faculty members may request a pre-promotion review facilitated at the departmental level one to two years prior to application for promotion. This review is optional, and the decision not to request a pre-promotion review does not preclude a favorable review at the time of application for promotion. Details of such reviews should be included in departmental governance documents. Pre-promotion reviews normally end at the Head, but by mutual agreement of the faculty member and Dean may include the Dean.

The personnel committee and the Department Head will specify in writing to the requesting faculty member one of the following three outcomes:

1. That progress toward promotion is satisfactory.
2. That progress toward promotion is questionable, identifying areas for improvement and providing specific suggestions.
3. That progress toward promotion is unsatisfactory, providing specific rationale.

Application Process And Review

The faculty member prepares a complete promotion dossier according to guidelines provided by the Provost and forwards it to the chair of the departmental personnel committee. The tenure/promotion dossier will include external reviews gathered according to departmental guidelines based on guidelines from the Provost, and inserted
needed before a review is done, the Program Director will negotiate that change with the faculty member). In making an appropriate assignment, the Program Director will take into consideration the needs of the program, and the professional objectives and recent productivity of the faculty member. The Program Director must make assignments within the parameters set by the University for expected workloads.

III. MPH PROGRAM GUIDELINES FOR TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE

All MPH faculty are expected to participate in teaching, research, and service activities. The typical teaching load is 12 credit hours per semester (or 24 credit hours per academic year); however, the College and the Program supports faculty research by allowing faculty who are pursuing or maintaining research activities a 3-credit hour reduction in teaching load per semester. Research-active faculty teaching loads, therefore, are 9 credit hours per semester (or 18 credit hours per academic year).

Research and service are vital components of the Program mission which is, "...to prevent disease, promote health, and protect the well-being of the public through education, research, and service." However, in fulfilling the MPH Program mission, the CHHS mission, and the University's public affairs mission, some faculty are more involved in research activities while others are more involved in service.

A. Evaluation of Teaching

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness is based on multiple indicators whenever possible. Teaching effectiveness also varies depending on terms of employment. Because there is a period of initial adjustment to a new position, teaching effectiveness in the first year of employment, may not be weighed as heavily as in subsequent years. Other conditions of employment, such as faculty workload, development of new courses, online courses or teaching courses new to the faculty member, shall be considered when evaluating teaching effectiveness.

MPH faculty members are expected to demonstrate continued learning and updating of course materials and course content. The faculty member's record of teaching is expected to demonstrate a gradual increase in responsibility commensurate with rank and tenure.

Examples of types of supporting data include:

1. Courses taught: number of students enrolled, student credit hours, new course preparation involved;
2. Other teaching activities: guest lectures, number of independent readings, other teaching activities;
3. Activities to improve teaching: revision of existing courses, development of new courses for the program, new teaching methods, professional upgrading (participation in workshops, institutes, pedagogical reading and research, etc.).
publications at each rank clearly satisfies program requirements for tenure and promotion; however, the faculty member can obtain peer-reviewed publication “equivalents” with a variety of achievements. For the purposes of this requirement, the following definitions and equivalents are used in the program:

1. “peer reviewed” – a publication in an academic journal that has been sent out for review to a panel of experts in the field. The journal must identify itself as a peer-reviewed journal.
2. “editor-reviewed” or “edited” - publication is one that is reviewed by the editor or staff of the publication but is not sent out to a panel of experts for peer-review. This should be considered under the category of “other publication”.
3. A trade or technical journal is not a peer-reviewed publication (also considered under the category of “other publication”).
4. A book chapter (as author) or book (as editor) will be considered on a par with a peer-reviewed publication.
5. A book as author will be the equivalent of 2 peer-reviewed publications.
6. Reports on research to funding or collaborating organizations should be considered “other publications”.
7. Submission of a major external grant proposal (> $100,000) will be considered the equivalent of a peer-reviewed publication. If the grant is actually funded, it will count as 2 peer-reviewed publications instead of one.
8. Submission of 2 minor external grant proposals (< $100,000) should be considered the equivalent of 1 peer-reviewed publication; obtaining either or both of the grants will count as an additional publication.
9. Grants and contracts are considered equivalent for the purposes of this document.
10. Being a co-investigator counts the same as PI (ex. third author ranks the same as first author).
11. Three publications under the category of “other publication” will count as one peer-reviewed publication with the approval of tenured faculty in the MPH program. Newsletter or newspaper articles do not count.
12. Two state or national level presentations are the equivalent of one “other publication.

C. Evaluation of Service

As a Public Affairs university, service is an integral part of the faculty role and helps assure the contribution, recognition, growth, and well-being of the Program, College, or University as it relates to the profession and community. Evidence of service involves activities that contribute to the governance and function of the MPH Program, the College of Health and Human Services, and MSU, such as committee work, and completion of special projects. At the community level, service may involve work in professional and community organizations, consulting and involvement in health-related initiatives.
B. **Professionalism as a criterion**

Meeting all objective criteria does not ensure that tenure will be granted (*not sure we want this wording, just seemed like a lead in sentence was needed*). Per the Faculty Handbook (3.7.2) “basic competence in itself is not sufficient to justify granting tenure, for such competence is prerequisite for the initial appointment. The decision to grant tenure is inherently and inescapably judgmental and is a deliberate action indicating the person has been selected as a member of the permanent faculty because of demonstrated high-quality performance and relative merit.” The criteria listed here are specific but not *exhaustive*. The successful applicant for promotion or tenure will also exhibit professionalism by contributing to a shared vision of the MPH program in a manner that demonstrates a capacity and a desire to collaborate with other members of the faculty. A lack of professionalism is indicated by lapses in ethical behavior, by the creation of a negative or *adversarial* environment, or by repeated failures to meet obligations within the program. Any such lapses should be discussed during annual reviews and documented during that process and may be influential in the decision to grant promotion or tenure.
### Criteria for Research: MPH Program

The faculty member demonstrates scholarship by the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Ass't (reappt)</th>
<th>Assoc (promo)</th>
<th>Full (promo)</th>
<th>Eval Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1. Pursues research agenda. (Integration, Application, Teaching, Discovery)</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2.a. Applies for intramural grants or contracts as P-I or Co-I;</td>
<td>R\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>E\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>R\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2.b. Applies for extramural grants or contracts as P-I or Co-I;</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>E\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>R\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3.a. Obtains/maintains funding for internal grant or contract as P-I or Co-I;</td>
<td>R\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>E\textsuperscript{††}</td>
<td>R\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3.b. Obtains/maintains funding for external grant or contract as P-I or Co-I;</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>E\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4. Participates in collaborative research activities with public health practitioners;</td>
<td>R\textsuperscript{††}</td>
<td>E\textsuperscript{††}</td>
<td>R\textsuperscript{††}</td>
<td>R\textsuperscript{††}</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-5. Participates in collaborative research activities across the college, university or other university;</td>
<td>R\textsuperscript{††}</td>
<td>E\textsuperscript{††}</td>
<td>R\textsuperscript{††}</td>
<td>R\textsuperscript{††}</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-6. Submits (as author or co-author) a chapter, book, manual or research article to a peer-reviewed professional journal/publisher;</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>E\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>R\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-7. Publishes research-based scholarly materials in non-refereed publications;</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>E\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>E\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-8. Publishes (as author or co-author) a chapter, book, manual or research article to a peer-reviewed professional journal/publisher;</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>E\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>R\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-9. Submits for presentation at a professional meeting or conference;</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>E\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>R\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-10. Presents at a professional meeting or conference;</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>E\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>R\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-11. Presents at an international professional meeting or conference;</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>E\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-12. Involves students in research activities;</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>E\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>E\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-13. Receives recognition or award for outstanding scholarship;</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>N\textsuperscript{†}</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: R=Required - E=Encouraged - N=Not Expected

R\textsuperscript{†} = required after first year.
E\textsuperscript{†} = although not required each year for reappointment, a consistent track record of activity is expected during the probation period.
\(\dagger\) = if R-2.b./R-3.b. is not accomplished
\(\dagger\dagger\) = R-4 and/or R-5 is required

Possible methods to evaluate research criteria:

D. Other Portfolio documents (i.e., grant applications, award transmittals, submission letters, copies of publications, presentation brochures, letters, etc.)