Revisions since Senate Discussions (February meeting):

Section 4.2.1.2.2. Adjusted language regarding Teaching Strategies to clarify what are required expectations and what are recommendations.
Section 4.2.2.3. Converted language about Engaged Public Scholarship to Engaged Public Research.
Section 4.5.1.1. At the request of the Provost, added clarification that reduced teaching loads (average of 18/academic year) applies to those faculty who are research-active. (This is already clearly implied in earlier parts of the passage.)
Section 4.5.1.3. Added language regarding requirements for emergency response policies.
Section 4.6.2. Discussion of specific procedures for T &P reviews: Clarified the timeline for a faculty member appending a response to an evaluator’s recommendations.
Section 4.6.6.1. For performance reviews, specified a direct meeting between faculty member and head.
Sections 4.7.3.4 and 4.7.3.5. Convert 7 and 15 “day” deadlines to 5 and 10 business day deadlines.
Section 4.8.2.2. Clarification of language regarding external T&P reviewers.
Section 4.8.4. Altered language regarding representatives on College Personnel Committees, normally expecting that they be limited to Professor rank but allowing some exceptions.

Many of the revisions to this chapter involve:
- Updating language to reflect changes in titles
- Reorganization of sections to provide more logical exposition of topics
- Eliminating some superfluous language
- Replacing references to “research, scholarship, and creative activities” with “Research.”

Some major changes include
- Incorporation of the performance evaluation review (appeals) process into Chapter 4 (Faculty Evaluation) – this was previously in Chapter 5 (Salary Policies);
- Inclusion of mechanisms for a role of non-tenured faculty in certain evaluation processes;
- Consolidating the steps involved in appointment, pre-tenure, tenure, and promotion reviews into a single list;
- Adding an expectation of a review for per course faculty members;
- Renaming and changing the composition of the provost’s level personnel committee (now called Provost’s Personnel Committee, formerly Provost’s Committee on Tenure and Promotion, which was sometimes confused with the Provost’s Advisory Council on Tenure and Promotion, which is an entirely different body).
- Clarifying membership in College Personnel Committees.
- Expanding the description of possible external reviewers.

Changes made after Senate discussions (February meeting) are highlighted in yellow.
4. FACULTY EVALUATION

4.1. FACULTY PERFORMANCE CRITERIA AND EVALUATION MODEL

Faculty performance criteria at Missouri State University are based on the purpose and mission of the institution. The general mission of the University, in relation to its faculty, is the advancement of learning, scholarly inquiry, and service, but this translates, in terms of its students, to the single purpose of developing educated persons. To accomplish this, the university's mission includes cultivating advanced knowledge and practices and serving its constituents. The specific public affairs mission of the university further enhances its purpose to include fostering the ideals of democratic responsibility among scholars at every level, ethical leadership, cultural competence and community engagement. The University honors the principles of academic freedom, academic excellence, diversity in scholarly and cultural perspectives, and equal opportunity.

Table added to direct faculty to specific sections and to specify key areas of evaluation.

Faculty members with standard appointments (not clinical or research faculty; refer to Sections 4.3 and 4.4) are evaluated in three categories of performance: teaching, research, and service. Clinical faculty members are evaluated in clinical education and service. Research faculty members are evaluated in research and service. This Section outlines the evaluation models and criteria for tenure, promotion, and performance reviews. The following table outlines the evaluation categories for faculty with different types of appointments. Some variations on these criteria may be made based on contract letters. These processes result in different outcomes, and the criteria for tenure and promotion are differentiated for all types of faculty appointments. The evaluation processes are specified in Section 4.6. Performance reviews are mission-related and should be consistent with tenure and/or promotion decisions. The criteria used for evaluation in each category are based on specific elements in the university's mission as specified below. All policies and procedures described herein for departments apply to any academic unit that has primary faculty evaluation responsibilities, for example, a school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Appointment Type</th>
<th>Evaluation Based On:</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track Faculty</td>
<td>Teaching, Research, Service</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors*</td>
<td>Teaching, Service</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>Clinical Education, Professional Productivity/Research, Service</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Faculty (except State Fruit Experiment Station)</td>
<td>Research, Service</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Faculty (State Fruit Experiment Station)</td>
<td>Teaching, Research, Service, Outreach</td>
<td>4.4, 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Course Faculty</td>
<td>Teaching or Clinical Education, depending on contract</td>
<td>4.2 or 4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some Instructors may be evaluated on Research, depending on their contracts.

4.2. EVALUATION OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY AND INSTRUCTORS WITH STANDARD APPOINTMENTS

“Standard appointments” is never really defined and ambiguous. The section deals most specifically with tenure-track faculty and instructors.
Tenure-track faculty members are expected to be actively engaged in Teaching, Research, and Service throughout their careers, but the University recognizes that, at different times, faculty members may shift emphasis from one category to another. It is generally expected that during the probationary period the emphasis should be on Teaching and Research and that at any time during one's career at Missouri State University, each faculty member must negotiate his or her workload with the Department Head (within broad University parameters approved by the Provost), with the conditions of employment laid out clearly at the time of employment, and adjusted thereafter through negotiation with the Department Head and Dean as approved by the Provost (refer to Section 4.6.5). The obligations of the academic unit should not fall disproportionately on one segment of the faculty. The faculty are also expected to adhere to standards of ethical conduct in all areas of performance (refer to Section 3.1).

Expectations for Instructors. “Normally” added because there are a few cases where instructors do have research expectations.

Expectations for Instructors are similar to those for tenure-track faculty except that there is an increased emphasis on Teaching and normally no expectation for Research.

4.2.1. TEACHING

4.2.1.1. TEACHING MISSION

The teaching mission at Missouri State University is to develop educated persons. In doing so, the University is committed to standards of excellence and academic integrity. An educated person:

- is someone who is literate in the broadest sense,
- has an appreciation of the responsibility of lifelong citizenship and an awareness of global issues,
- seeks solutions to problems by means of a broad base of knowledge, as well as in-depth mastery of at least one specific academic discipline, and
- has the skills and motivation to continue to learn after leaving the university, thus being prepared for both lifelong learning and lifelong productivity.

In support of developing educated persons, the University seeks to provide high-quality education that is accessible to a broad spectrum of individuals, including those facing challenges involving distance, income, or disability. Furthermore, in recognizing the value of an open and free exchange of ideas, Missouri State University promotes diversity in all of its forms as a means to provide a wide variety of sources of knowledge and perspectives.

4.2.1.2. GOALS AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING TEACHING

The following goals and criteria are the basis of evaluating faculty members' teaching effectiveness for tenure and promotion and for required performance reviews (refer to Section 4.2.1.3 for recommended methods of documenting teaching effectiveness). Please note that item 1 below is of paramount importance on this list, and that any faculty member, in order to succeed as a teacher at Missouri State University, must succeed in the areas of item 1 relevant to his or her teaching. Although items 2 a, b, c, and d are not individually prescriptive, they are inclusive of teaching and may be considered. Success in one or more of these areas, or related areas of equal weight, is required to attain tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Sustained success in one or more of these areas is required for promotion to full Professor.

1. Developing Educated Persons

Success in this area both describes successful teaching at this university and is a prerequisite for tenure and promotion

a. Faculty members meet this goal when they demonstrate their effectiveness in cultivating students' knowledge base and skills both basic and specialized within a specific discipline.
b. Faculty should strive to make explicit the relationship between the general education curriculum and various disciplinary curricula so students can integrate their acquired knowledge and skills for lifelong application.

c. Evidence of continuing professional development also contributes to this goal.

2. Exceptional Modes or Qualities of Teaching
The specifics in this area need to be described in writing by the department from the beginning of employment, with any exceptions dependent on negotiation between the faculty member and the Department Head and the Dean, as approved by the Provost.

a. Outstanding Performance as a Classroom Teacher
Beyond basic effectiveness as a teacher, outstanding performance may be evidenced by judgments made by students, peers, administrators, and colleagues with appropriate academic expertise. Further evidence may include external recognition for outstanding preparation of students for professional fields, and students receiving external recognition for outstanding work produced in the course. Such evidence may also include noteworthy research work done with undergraduate and or graduate students, noteworthy work in student advisement, and internal or external grants to support innovative teaching.

b. Experiential Learning
While it is expected that all of our teaching efforts contribute to developing citizen scholars, special efforts in this regard may be used to meet this goal. Faculty should provide evidence of service learning components in their courses or provide evidence for other structured activities that apply the course material to social issues, problems, tasks or enhancement.

c. Accessibility  Contents on this section included in revised section
The criterion for this goal refers to efforts to increase accessibility to education beyond one's typical assignments. These may include, but are not limited to, offering distance learning, online courses, public lectures or workshops, working with the community and public schools in providing access to education, developing educational materials that address accessibility issues.

d. Diversity  Contents on this section included in revised section
Special efforts to bring diversity to students' educational experience might include inviting guest speakers who offer diverse viewpoints, taking students to locations where they will be exposed to an unfamiliar environment, and requiring students to seek out diversity as part of their course requirements.

This is the replacement language for Section 4.2.1.2 based on input from the FCTL group. Based on discussions with Chris Craig, FHRC retained the sections on Accessibility and Diversity:

4.2.1.2. EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Teaching is among the most important faculty responsibilities of any institution of higher education. The attributes considered to be indicative of effective teaching vary among individuals and across disciplines; however, high levels of student engagement and deeper learning are core values that are common to all.

Teaching effectiveness must be taken seriously with review and evaluation occurring on many levels. Evaluating and improving teaching is an ongoing and critical function of faculty and administration. Teaching effectiveness must be based on performance across a reasonable period of time and number of classes, and it cannot be measured in isolation. Teaching effectiveness is affected by overall workload, level of course, experience in teaching a particular course, number of students, use of new modalities or approaches, and nature of course (general education, requirement in major, etc.).

The areas outlined below are the basis for evaluating faculty members’ teaching effectiveness for tenure and
promotion and for required annual performance reviews. Sections 4.2.1.2.1, 4.2.1.2.2, and 4.2.1.2.5 represent essential elements of teaching evaluation, while sections 4.2.1.2.3 and 4.2.1.2.4 represent additional aspects of areas that may be evaluated as appropriate. Departmental evaluation plans must include specific required and/or encouraged criteria in these areas, as well as the materials that would be expected for adequate documentation of meeting the criteria.

4.2.1.2.1. Knowledge

Faculty members must be up to date and competent regarding the content of their courses, whether they are part of a discipline-specific major or the general education curriculum.

Faculty who engage in student advising must be thoroughly familiar with university requirements so their advisees make appropriate progress toward a degree and graduate in a timely manner.

4.2.1.2.2. Teaching strategies

*Revisions in response to Senate discussions.*

There is substantial literature on best practices in university teaching, and faculty members should incorporate best practices in their classes to the extent possible. They must specify learning objectives for each course, ensure that their students understand how to achieve those objectives, and use grading systems that reflect the degree to which students accomplish the objectives. An awareness of diversity and differences among learners must be reflected in both course content and instructional strategies. Faculty must be appropriately accessible to students through a variety of means (e.g., office hours, electronic communication). Faculty should strive to include high-impact instructional practices, such as community engagement, problem-based, experiential, and collaborative learning. In addition, course content and instructional strategies that reflect awareness of diversity and differences among learners can improve student learning and are encouraged where they are appropriate.

4.2.1.2.3. Accessibility (*old 4.2.1.2-2c*)

The criterion for this goal refers to efforts to increase accessibility to education beyond one's typical assignments. Where appropriate, faculty may extend the availability of education beyond the traditional classroom setting through activities that. These may include, but are not limited to, offering distance learning, online courses, public lectures or workshops, working with the community and public schools in providing access to education, and developing educational materials that address accessibility issues.

4.2.1.2.4 Diversity (*old 4.2.1.2-2d*)

Special efforts to bring diversity to students' educational experience might include inviting guest speakers who offer diverse viewpoints, taking students to locations where they will be exposed to an unfamiliar environment, and requiring students to seek out diversity as part of their course requirements.

4.2.1.2.5. Evaluation and response to feedback

Faculty must ensure evaluation of their teaching through multiple means (e.g., self-reflection, peer and/or supervisor review, assessment of student learning outcomes). Student evaluations are an important source of feedback; however, they should account for no more than 50% of the total evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Faculty should carefully consider evaluation data and modify future teaching strategies as appropriate.

*Section 4.2.1.3 was replaced based on input from the FCTL group:*
4.2.1.3. DOCUMENTING TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

There are two primary components to documenting teaching effectiveness: Instructor inputs and student outcomes. Everything that contributes to or derives from a teaching/learning experience should address one or more of the criteria above. The following table identifies input/output elements and possible sources for documentation. The table below is not prescriptive, but offers faculty examples of ways to document teaching effectiveness. Student teaching evaluations can only be used for a maximum of 50% of the weight of evaluation in this area. Departments can refine these suggestions as appropriate for specific disciplines and a faculty member’s specific job assignment. Only department and college administered hardcopy or online student evaluations may be used in the evaluation of annual review of appropriate progress toward tenure, tenure review, promotion, and annual performance review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUTS AND OUTCOMES</th>
<th>DOCUMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Inputs (developing educated persons)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear identification of outcome goals in terms of knowledge and skills</td>
<td>Syllabi and assignment statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear identification of relevance of courses to both major study and general education</td>
<td>Syllabi and assignment statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practiced and pedagogically informed delivery of course content</td>
<td>Teaching portfolio, evidence of professional development, peer evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up-to-date content and materials</td>
<td>Syllabi, sample materials (with explanatory narrative in dossier), curricular grants, development of new courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality organization of course and diligence in application</td>
<td>Syllabi, sample assignments, peer evaluations, student evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriately rigorous expectations</td>
<td>Syllabi statements, quantity and quality of reading, writing, and performance assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time, energy, and effectiveness</td>
<td>Teaching portfolio, peer evaluations, student evaluations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is the replacement Section 4.2.1.3 based on input from the FCTL group:

4.2.1.3. DOCUMENTATION

Faculty must provide evidence that documents sufficient knowledge, use of teaching strategies, evaluation, and response to feedback. Documentation should also be provided to establish any claims of where enhanced accessibility or special attention to diversity. Course syllabi can be rich sources to indicate currency in course content and delineation of student learning outcomes and associated grading systems. Peer and student evaluations and the faculty member’s response to those evaluations can address the extent to which strong teaching methods are used, as well as the degree of accessibility the faculty member maintains. Other useful types of documentation include pre-/post-course student performance on course knowledge and skills; professional development completion certificates; teaching portfolios; and unsolicited external letters of support.

Departmental plans must provide specific information regarding the documentation expected for annual reviews. Examples of different approaches to the evaluation of teaching effectiveness can be found in Faculty Senate Action 18-97/98, available at the Faculty Senate web site.
4.2.2. RESEARCH

4.2.2.1. RESEARCH MISSION

Moved this paragraph and heading up to make it more consistent with organization of other sections.

The process of Research is understood as the production and formal communication of original creative, scholarly work, and, while the definitions of “scholarly” and “creative” may differ across academic disciplines, the process is understood to support the University's general mission in all three fundamental areas of faculty responsibility: Teaching, Research, and Service. Research both advances knowledge in a particular specialized academic field and encourages individual faculty development; it enhances the quality of education students receive. It also helps fulfill the University's Service obligation by contributing to the public welfare. Society benefits from the results of both basic and applied Research (refer to Section 1.3.6). Not needed?

Some changes simply stylistic; some language was originally in other sections of the HB but made more sense incorporated into this paragraph.

The University recognizes the need to consider a broad spectrum of activities in the area of Research due to the diversity and uniqueness of academic fields. Herein, Research will be defined as the production and formal communication of creative, scholarly works. The nature of Research varies widely among different academic disciplines, but generally refers to the discovery, refinement, evaluation, and synthesis of information, the application of specialized knowledge to the solution of problems, and artistic activity. In the context of each The activities recognized as Research vary by, and are defined within, each academic discipline. Descriptions of what is recognized as Research can be found in approved departmental plans. To qualify as Research, activities must produce creative outcomes that are formally communicated to, and vetted by, peers. disseminated and subjected to critical peer review or evaluation by the scholarly community, and those outcomes should serve the growth of knowledge in a field or be of significant practical use.

Specific modes of Research include:

- Discovery: gaining knowledge of or ascertaining the existence of something previously unknown or unrecognized;
- Application: using established knowledge to solve significant problems;
- Synthesis: bringing knowledge together from disparate sources to produce a whole work that is greater than the sum of its parts;
- Criticism: using established values (aesthetic, logical, ethical) to evaluate quality of artifacts (e.g., art, legal decisions, news media); and
- Creation: production of unique forms of expression, generation of new interpretations, theory-building, and model-building, and performance. “performance” added to clarify that this should be considered

First sentence below now incorporated into earlier paragraph.

To qualify as research, activity in each of these areas must be disseminated and subjected to critical peer review or evaluation by the scholarly community so as to serve knowledge growth in a field or be of significant practical use. These modes of Research should be considered of equal weight and importance in the faculty evaluation process.

4.2.2.2. GOALS AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING RESEARCH

Minor editing for clarity

The following goals and criteria are the basis of evaluating faculty members’ Research for tenure and promotion and for required performance reviews. Item 1 below is of paramount importance on this list, and any faculty member, in order to succeed in the area of Research at Missouri State University and attain tenure and promotions, must succeed in item 1. Although items 2, 3, and 4 are not individually prescriptive, they are inclusive of Research and may be considered. Success in one or more of these areas (2 – 4) is required to attain tenure and promotion from Assistant
Professor to Associate Professor. Sustained success in one or more of these areas is required for promotion from Associate Professor to full Professor.

1. Expand Knowledge and/ or Demonstrate Growth in Area of Expertise
   Includes all five categories of Research at equal weight. Already stated in 4.2.2.1
   Faculty members meet this goal if they have engaged in sufficient quantity and quality of peer-reviewed Research in any of the five modes of scholarship appropriate to their field (as defined by department). The scholarship of teaching and learning is included here because any department may have faculty members who either specialize in education within their discipline, or who do Research in this area because it is important to their academic field or part of their assignment by the department. This Research content area should be fully recognized and evaluated according to the standards of one of the five modes of Research.

2. Application of Research to Benefit University Constituents
   The criterion for this goal refers to the application of Research to solving problems or addressing situations significant to the public that require professional expertise.

3. Transmission
   The criterion for this goal refers to transmission of scholarly Research product beyond that required for peer review in one's field. Faculty members meet this goal if they make a special effort to share can document accomplishments in sharing knowledge and creative work with a broader audience.

4. Involvement of Students
   Research is of added value in the University mission if the work involves students, either undergraduate or graduate, as active participants in the research process.

4.2.2.3. Engaged Public Scholarship Research

Public scholarship Research supports the University's Public Affairs mission. It is scholarly or creative activity integral to a faculty member's academic discipline. It encompasses different forms of constructing knowledge about, for, and with diverse publics and communities. Through a coherent, purposeful sequence of activities, it contributes to the public good and yields artifacts outcomes of public and intellectual value.

The University recognizes that Engaged Public scholarship Research is Research and may be included in a department's tenure and promotion policy if a department so chooses. If included in a department's policy, this scholarly activity should involve a partnership with the public and/or private sector that enriches knowledge, addresses and helps solve critical societal issues, and contributes to the public good. and The department's governance documents should clarify how such Research will be evaluated. This addition seemed appropriate because guidelines should be established at the departmental level.

Engaged Public scholarship Research includes Research focused on civic participation in public life, participation by engaged scholars, and the impact of public scholarship on all constituencies. Projects that advance Engaged Public scholarship Research must be subjected to critical academic peer review and should include input from a rigorous review conducted by involved community partners who collaborated with the public scholar. This input must assess the significance of the project, the quality of the relationship, and the impact on public good.
4.2.3. SERVICE

4.2.3.1. SERVICE MISSION

Faculty Service at Missouri State University serves three purposes: to support the academic tradition of shared governance, to support the professional and organizational needs of the disciplines, and to bring the products of University work to the public for its benefit.

4.2.3.2. GOALS AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING SERVICE

Some editing for clarity. Consensus that leadership roles in Service should be an expectation for Professor rank.

The following goals and criteria are the basis of evaluating faculty members’ Service for tenure and promotion and for required performance reviews. Item 1 below is of paramount importance on this list, and any faculty member, in order to succeed in the area of Service at Missouri State University and attain tenure and promotions, must succeed in item 1. Although items 2, 3, and 4 are not individually prescriptive, they are inclusive of Service and may be considered. Success in one or more of these areas (2 – 4) is required to attain tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. Sustained success and documented leadership in one or more of these areas are required for promotion from Associate Professor to full Professor.

1. University Citizenship

In the interest of maintaining broad participation in the decision-making process at the University, faculty should recognize their responsibilities to the organization and contribute fairly to the task of shared-governance. This includes, but is not limited to, service on program, departmental, college, and university committees and task forces. In so doing, faculty members increase the level of self-determination in their ranks. Service activities supporting University citizenship may also include collaborations and contributions for the collegiate well-being such as providing professional development, participating in campus discussions, and expanding opportunities for shaping the learning environment.

2. Professional Service

The criteria for this goal refers to contributions to professional organizations within the faculty member’s field. Professional association participation may include serving as a board member, division chair, officer, editor, reviewer, committee member, etc. of a professional organization. Additionally, this may include sponsoring, mentoring, or advising an active student organization, mentoring or advising, or providing opportunities for student experiences outside the expectations of teaching. Clarifying that mentoring/advising is different from academic mentoring/advising that is classified as teaching.

3. Public Service

The example of public service in the form of op eds seemed very limited.

Faculty members meet this goal when they provide evidence of using their professional skills and expertise to serve community, state, national or international public constituents. This may take the form of serving as a board member, division chair, officer, editor, reviewer, committee member, etc. of a public organization, or writing op eds or other articles in newspapers or other print media or on television or radio, etc. In this way, Faculty members not only further the mission of public outreach, but also serve as models for their students who are encouraged to engage in similar activities.
4. Professional Consultation

Faculty members may meet this goal by providing evidence of providing professional expertise to business, industry, schools, community organizations, and colleagues in other university programs. Consultation services to external constituents within the faculty member's professional expertise may be included in this area.

4.3 EVALUATION OF FACULTY WITH CLINICAL APPOINTMENTS

The University recognizes the need to evaluate faculty members with specialized assignments according to the requirements of their appointment letters. Clinical faculty should be so designated in appointment letters. The following addresses the evaluation of clinical faculty (Refer to Section 3.6.11 for a definition of this category).

Clinical faculty are vital to the success of certain programs in professional fields such as communication sciences and disorders, nursing, physical therapy and physician assistant studies. The number of fields employing clinical faculty has expanded; it didn’t make sense to list specific areas. Their primary purpose is to provide an authentic applied learning environment for students in these disciplines while maintaining their own applied expertise. Clinical faculty translate new knowledge in their discipline into clinical practice and clinical practice into new knowledge. Clinical faculty members have the same Service requirements as those with standard appointments. (Refer to Section 4.2.3.2.) Areas of performance evaluation and evaluation for promotion specific to clinical faculty are Clinical Education and Service.

4.3.1. CLINICAL EDUCATION MISSION

The Clinical Education Mission for Clinical Faculty encompasses the Teaching mission to develop educated persons as defined in Section 4.2.1.1, and the specific mission to evaluate clinical competencies. Therefore, the goals and criteria for evaluating Clinical Education are specific to this faculty role.

4.3.2 GOALS AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING CLINICAL EDUCATION

Clinical faculty members have responsibilities for didactic and clinical instruction and/or supervision in clinical or field settings. These roles require communicating information and knowledge to students, promoting the acquisition of skills, fostering the development of critical thinking, modeling ethical behavior, and evaluating clinical competencies. Specific responsibilities may include the development of clinical settings, coordination of student field or clinical experiences, instruction, supervision and evaluation of students. Clinical faculty members must maintain appropriate professional credentials and currency in their practice through continuing education and training. There are two primary goals, with respective evaluative criteria. The first goal must be achieved for promotion.

1. Developing educated persons who are competent clinical professionals

Success in this area both describes successful clinical education at this University and is a prerequisite for successful performance review and for promotion.

   a. Clinical faculty members meet this goal when they demonstrate their effectiveness in cultivating students' knowledge base and skills within a specific discipline including
competencies for professional practice.

b. Faculty should strive to make explicit the relationship between the general education curriculum and various disciplinary curricula so students can integrate their acquired knowledge and skills for lifelong application.

c. Maintenance of appropriate professional credentials and evidence of continuing professional development are required to meet this goal.

2. Exceptional Modes or Qualities of Clinical Education

The specifics in this area need to be described in writing by the department from the beginning of employment, with any exceptions dependent on negotiation between the clinical faculty member and the Department Head and the Dean, as approved by the Provost.

a. Outstanding Performance as a Clinical Educator

Beyond basic effectiveness as a clinical educator, outstanding performance may be evidenced by judgments made by students, peers, administrators, and colleagues with appropriate academic and clinical expertise. Further evidence may include external recognition for outstanding preparation of students for professional clinical fields, and students receiving external recognition for outstanding clinical outcomes. Such evidence may also include noteworthy clinical outcomes or Research done with undergraduate and/or graduate students, noteworthy work in student advisement, participation in graduate committees, and grants to support innovative clinical education.

b. Experiential Learning

While it is expected that all of our Teaching and Clinical Education efforts contribute to developing citizen scholars, special efforts in this regard may be used to meet this goal. Faculty should provide evidence of service learning components in their courses, internships or other structured outreach activities that apply the course material to social issues, tasks or enhancement, especially within multidisciplinary clinical or practice contexts.

c. Accessibility

The criterion for This goal refers to efforts to increase accessibility to clinical education beyond one's typical assignments. These may include, but are not limited to, offering distance learning online and continuing professional education for practitioners, public lectures or workshops, working with community agencies and health care institutions in providing access to education, clinical service/interventions and developing clinical educational materials that address accessibility issues.

d. Diversity

Special efforts to use diversity in broadening students' perspectives and to develop cultural sensitivity may include inviting guest speakers who offer diverse viewpoints, establishing clinical experiences/externships in diverse settings, or providing exposure to clinical populations with special needs.
4.3.3. **SERVICE**

Goals and criteria for evaluation of Service for faculty with clinical appointments are identical to those for faculty with standard appointments (Refer to Section 4.2.3.2).

4.3.4. **PROFESSIONAL PRODUCTIVITY I/RESEARCH**

Clinical faculty may be evaluated on professional productivity and Research for promotion.

4.3.4.1. **PROFESSIONAL PRODUCTIVITY MISSION FOR CLINICAL FACULTY**

Professional productivity includes translation of new knowledge into measurable improvements in clinical outcomes through practice and communications with peers, as well as original Research in any of the five modes identified in Section 4.2.2. Professional Productivity/Research advances knowledge and practices in clinical professions, promotes development of clinical faculty and enhances the quality of clinical education for students. Although there is inevitable overlap with the Clinical Education and Service criteria, Professional Productivity/Research criteria focus on professional outcomes, recognition, and development.

4.3.4.2. **GOALS AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING PROFESSIONAL PRODUCTIVITY/RESEARCH**

Below are the four goals with respective criteria for evaluating Professional productivity/Research. The first goal should be achieved for promotion.

1. **Contributes knowledge to discipline.**

   Translates new knowledge in their discipline into measurable improvements in clinical practice and outcomes and/or translates clinical practice into new knowledge. The criterion for this goal requires communication of outcomes to peers through conference presentations, workshops, peer-reviewed and non-peer reviewed publications or sponsored research/contracts. Participation on masters committees, selection as a reviewer for a major funding agency, collaboration on Research in clinical settings, or the development of nationally recognized clinical service or practice standards also may be considered as evidence.

2. **Application of clinical expertise to provide expert service to the local and professional community.**

   Evidence of positive outcomes within the practice setting may be documented through field assessments, employer surveys, or client/patient surveys. Evidence of recognition by professional peers in the form of awards, requests for service, commendations, citations, etc. may be considered as evidence.

3. **Transmission.**

   “Accomplishments” seemed more appropriate than “efforts”. Other changes stylistic.

   Clinical faculty members fulfill the criterion for meet this goal by documenting special efforts accomplishments in transmission of sharing clinical expertise or Research to with a broad audience.

4. **Involvement of students.**

   Professional practice and scholarly activities are of added value to the University mission if the work involves
students, either undergraduate or graduate, as active participants in the process.

4.4. EVALUATION OF FACULTY WITH RESEARCH APPOINTMENTS

The University recognizes the need to evaluate faculty members with specialized assignments according to the requirements of their appointment letters. Research faculty should be so designated in appointment letters. (Refer to Section 3.6.10 for a definition of this category.)

Research faculty members have the similar Research and Service requirements as those with standard appointments for performance review and promotion; however, Research output expectations are naturally higher since Teaching is not required. Refer to the Research and Service criteria for standard appointments in Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3.2. Evaluations of State Fruit Experiment Station Research Faculty shall be based on Research, Teaching, Outreach (see Section 3.6.10.1) and Service, commensurate with assigned duties.

4.5. FACULTY POLICIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

4.5.1. TEACHING

4.5.1.1. TEACHING LOADS

Added heading to this section. Clarification on the equated hours. Reinforce requirement that 18 hour annual teaching load applies to research-active faculty.

Beyond Teaching, expected faculty Workloads for tenure-track faculty with standard appointments involve significant responsibilities for Research and Service in addition to Teaching responsibilities. Accordingly, average departmental Teaching loads for full-time research-active faculty should approximate 18 equated hours per academic year, and no faculty should be expected to teach more than 24 equated hours per academic year. Annual Teaching loads should typically be 24 equated hours per academic year for full-time Instructors with normal service loads, and up to 30 equated hours per academic year for full-time instructors with little or no Service expectation. Teaching assignments for Clinical and Research faculty will vary depending on details of their contracts.

4.5.1.2. MEETING CLASSES

Faculty members are expected to meet their assigned classes or to see that suitable alternate arrangements have been made for learning experiences for their students in the case of a required absence of the instructor because of unusual circumstances or because of attendance at a professional meeting. When instructors are unable to meet a class because of illness, they must call the departmental office and make arrangements to notify their classes concerning the cancellation of classes and new assignments or to make other arrangements for the classes that will be missed.

4.5.1.2.3. COURSE POLICY STATEMENTS

Within the first week of classes the faculty member shall issue a written policy statement, in print or in electronic form, to each student summarizing the following, where items marked with asterisks have suggested language posted by the Provost: Specific websites (subject to change) removed; reference to suggested language by Provost consolidated.
1. **Purpose:** A statement of the general content of the course.

2. **Course Objectives:** A list of measurable and desirable outcomes to be achieved upon successful completion of the course.

3. **Attendance Policy:** A statement of attendance policy consistent with that of the University, and the policies regarding late arrival and early departure. Refer to [http://www.missouristate.edu/recreg/attendan.html](http://www.missouristate.edu/recreg/attendan.html).

4. **Academic Integrity Policy:** A statement concerning the policies concerning plagiarism and cheating, including consequences. Refer to the Student Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures, [http://www.missouristate.edu/registrar/acintegrity.html](http://www.missouristate.edu/registrar/acintegrity.html).

5. **Textbooks:** A list of textbooks and other sources to be used for the course and whether they are recommended or required reading.

6. **Test Dates:** A statement concerning the announcement of test dates and the test dates if known. If the dates are unknown, approximations should be offered.

7. **Examinations:** A general idea of the material to be covered on each exam.

8. **Grading Scale:** A statement of the grading policy to be used in the course.

9. **Term Papers (if applicable):** A statement of the dates that term papers are due and general criteria used to determine how the papers will be graded.

10. **Final Exam:** A statement as to whether the final will be comprehensive or not, and a general idea of the subject matter to be covered.

11. **Makeups:** A statement of how or if makeups will be allowed for exams, papers, or other assignments.

12. **Nondiscrimination Policy:** A statement consistent with University policy. Refer to "Suggested Wording for Course Syllabi/Policy Statements" on the Provost web site.

13. **Policy on Disability Accommodation:** A statement consistent with University Policy. Refer to "Suggested Wording for Course Syllabi/Policy Statements" on the Provost web site.

14. **Cell Phone Policy:** A statement consistent with University Policy. Refer to "Suggested Wording for Course Syllabi/Policy Statements" on the Provost web site.

15. **Emergency Response:** A statement about pertinent information about safety issues, which may direct students to classroom-specific information posted on Blackboard.

The following statement was originally included as part of the numbered list, but should be a separate statement:

Course policy statements must be on file in the appropriate departmental/school office.
4.5.1.4. Emergency Response Information

Faculty members must provide students with information about safety-related issues (emergency fire exits, safe locations for severe weather, active shooter, etc.) consistent with information provided by the Provost’s Office and posted on Blackboard.

4.5.1.5. REVIEW OF GRADED WORK

After an examination prepared by a faculty member or any other assignment that has been graded, the work shall be made available to students so that the students can observe where they have succeeded or failed.

4.5.1.6. CLASS RECORDS

All faculty members must keep accurate accounts of grades and attendance so that they will have factual information for a fair evaluation of each student. All faculty members must leave with their Department Heads/directors all grade books or a copy of all grade sheets at the time of leaving the employ of the University. In accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), student grades are not to be publicly posted.

4.5.1.7. STUDENT ADVISEMENT

Student advisement is the process of assisting students in negotiating the curriculum in order to achieve their educational goals. The process also involves aiding students in thinking through and arriving at educational goals based on an understanding of what higher education is and how it relates to all areas of life.

Rearranged / edited following paragraph a bit to recognize that some departments have specialized advisors.

All faculty members are expected to assist in the advisement process through normal contacts with students both in the classroom and in the office. Most faculty members will be assigned individual student advisees for whom they share a particular responsibility for advisement throughout the student's experience at Missouri State University. Faculty members are expected to be knowledgeable of essential aspects of the curriculum and procedures of the University in order to provide accurate and timely advice to students.

All faculty members are expected to be knowledgeable of essential aspects of the curriculum and procedures of the University in order to provide accurate and timely advice to students, and should be able to assist in the advisement process through normal contacts with students both in the classroom and in the office. Most faculty members will be assigned individual student advisees for whom they share a particular responsibility for advisement throughout the student's experience at Missouri State University. Some departments may utilize either select faculty or staff for formal academic advising.

In the advisement process, faculty members may not make representations or commitments which are inconsistent with authorized University policies.

4.5.1.8. OFFICE HOURS

Recommended changes recognize that office hour expectation for distance-learning classes may be different, and with modern communications methods, the equivalent of face-to-face contact can be achieved without physical presence in an office. This section also addresses expectations for part-time faculty.

Office hours refer to are times when faculty are available for direct consultation with students who are in their classes and with advisees. Availability for office hours usually implies presence in an office but, following
departmental norms and consent of the Department Head, may be satisfied by other means, e.g., electronic consultation. All full-time faculty members must be available in their offices for office hours a minimum of five hours each week at times convenient for students. Access for consultation with students who are in their classes and with their advisees. Part-time faculty must also be available for office hours, but the number of office hours may be less based on their teaching assignment; expectations for office hours should be specified in contract letters. The office hours must be posted in a place where students can see the notice and make plans to confer with the teacher. Faculty members are encouraged to accommodate students who cannot appear during the regular office hours because of schedule conflicts. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the appropriate Department Head.

4.5.1–7.9. ACCESS TO AND RELEASE OF STUDENT ACADEMIC RECORDS


4.5.2. RESEARCH

4.5.2.1. INTELLECTUAL INTEGRITY AND ETHICAL CONDUCT

From 3.1.1, intellectual honesty is essential to the conduct of productive scholarship, Research, and creative activity. Intellectual honesty demands avoidance of fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism. Faculty members who do funded Research are obligated to meet standards for integrity specified by their sponsoring agencies. Join into single paragraph. Some granting agencies impose standards on the conduct of scholarship, Research, and creative activity by all faculty members as a condition on the receipt of grant funds by any faculty member. They include standards for ethical treatment of both human and animal subjects. Those faculty benefiting from such funds must, of course, follow such guidelines.

Next two points combined into a single paragraph.
Ranked faculty and Instructors are full-time employees of the University during their contract periods. Faculty consulting engagements may benefit the University, but they must not interfere materially with faculty responsibility. Therefore, faculty members are obligated to report consulting activities to the University. (Refer to also Section 10.)

Finally, the scholarship, Research, and creative activity of a faculty member may be constrained by codes of professional ethics particular to his or her discipline. Adherence to discipline-specific professional codes is an appropriate subject for peer review of Research performance.

4.5.2.2. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Some Teaching and scholarship, Research, and creative activity outcomes are consequences of faculty effort assisted by University support. They may be commercially valuable. Guidelines for equitably sharing the proceeds of intellectual property between faculty and the University are referenced in Appendix A.
4.5.3. SERVICE

4.5.3.1. SERVICE RESPONSIBILITIES

Each full-time faculty member is expected to participate actively in the shared governance structure of the University by serving on departmental, college, and university committees and by assuming an appropriate share of the requisite duties. Service activities also expand opportunities for learning and shape the learning environment.

4.6. FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCESS

Section given heading.

4.6.1. GENERAL PROCEDURES

All full-time faculty members participate in regularly scheduled performance reviews. For probationary faculty, annual reviews are completed for the purpose of evaluating appropriate progress toward tenure, tenure review, and promotion review, as well as yearly performance review. Tenured faculty participate in an annual performance review, and, as appropriate, promotion reviews. Ideally, each ranked faculty member should be evaluated no more than once annually.

The Provost will publish in the annual Master Calendar a university-wide timetable for all academic personnel decisions. All reviews occur according to this schedule. Faculty members shall submit application and/or review materials for annual review, tenure, promotion, and performance review to the department by the department-specified deadline that is based on the Master Calendar. (Faculty who begin in January will be formally evaluated for the first time in their first full academic year of employment). Each department is expected to have a personnel committee and a published set of personnel guidelines as described in Section 4.8.4. (It is to be understood that all policies and procedures described herein for departments apply to any academic unit that has primary faculty evaluation responsibilities, for example, a school.) Each department is expected to create and use a “paper trail” of annual evaluations, and when appropriate, recommendations, in the tenure/promotion, promotion, and annual review process.

Annual reviews of progress toward tenure, tenure and promotion reviews, as well as annual performance reviews, proceed through a series of formal evaluations and recommendations beginning with the departmental personnel committee (herein referred to as the personnel committee). The personnel committee forwards its evaluation and recommendation to the Department Head. The Department Head forwards his or her evaluation and recommendation along with the department committee evaluation and recommendation to the Dean of the College. The Dean makes a recommendation on reviews of progress toward tenure, required performance evaluations, and sends a list of all required actions with appropriate documentation, to the Provost. (Removed paragraph break) For tenure and promotion, the Dean forwards his or her recommendations along with all previous recommendations to the Provost. The Provost makes the final recommendation for tenure and promotion decisions and sends positive recommendations to the President and the Board of Governors.

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. Throughout the entire process, confidentiality of information must be maintained. Faculty members at every level of decision-making must assume personal responsibility to ensure confidentiality is not violated.

4.6.2. SPECIFIC PROCEDURES

This is a new section that consolidates the procedural details for a variety of evaluation processes. The steps shown here are for the most part those already in the Handbook.

Each application for tenure and/or promotion and performance evaluation follows a similar series of steps as described below.

- The faculty member prepares appropriate application / review materials and documentation based on requirements of the Provost and departmental governance documents. For tenure and promotion applications, the assembled documentation will generally be referred to as the candidate’s dossier.

- The documentation (dossier) is submitted to the chair of the personnel committee based on a schedule posted by the Provost and then a series of evaluations commences, going from the personnel committee to the Head, from the Head to the Dean, from the Dean to the Provost, and for positive tenure and/or promotion recommendations, from the Provost to the President and Board of Governors.

- For tenure and/or promotion applications that require letters from external evaluators, the letters will be inserted into the dossier by the Head after the dossier is submitted to the personnel committee. Letters are requested based on guidelines from the Provost and discipline standards. These letters will not be available to the applicant until the process is completed (up to the initial recommendation by the Provost).

- At each step of the evaluation, the evaluating party (e.g., personnel committee, Head) provides a copy of the assessment, along with any recommendations, to the faculty member. The faculty member must undersign the evaluation to acknowledge receipt, but the signature does not imply that the faculty member endorses all that is stated in the evaluation.

- The faculty member may append a response to any evaluation before it is forwarded to the next evaluator. (Alternately, the response may be delivered to the evaluator within two business days of the faculty member’s receipt of the recommendation.)

- In instances of disagreement between the recommendations at two successive levels (e.g., between the personnel committee and the Head), there should be a good faith effort to resolve differences.

- At each step of evaluation past the personnel committee, a written report of recommendations must be sent to each prior evaluator, e.g., from the Dean to both the Head and personnel committee. The report must provide rationale for any differences from recommendations made at lower levels.

- The Dean may request assistance in evaluations from the College Personnel Committee.

- For tenure and/or promotion applications, the Dean should normally forward to the Provost only the dossier containing key information (as specified by the Provost) but not supporting documentation. Supporting documentation should be forwarded only at the request of the Provost.
For tenure and/or promotion applications, the Provost will forward positive recommendations to the President and Board of Governors. Negative results are not forwarded.

A candidate for tenure and/or promotion may choose to withdraw the application from consideration at any stage of the process.

Variations in the steps outlined above may occur as outlined for specific types of evaluations. For example, for pre-tenure reviews, the review process will normally end at the departmental level.

### 4.6.13. ANNUAL REVIEWS FOR PROBATIONARY FACULTY

Changes consistent with changes above.

Annual reviews following the procedures outlined in Section 4.6.2 are conducted for probationary faculty to assess appropriate progress toward tenure and to make recommendations for continuation of appointments. Probationary faculty members initiate this process by submitting relevant materials to the chair of the departmental personnel committee by a date specified by the committee. The Department Head shall not be a participant in the voting or deliberations of the departmental committee. 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:

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

In all cases the committee will provide clear feedback, identifying areas for improvement, making specific suggestions or recommendations regarding continued appointment or non-renewal, and provide appropriate rationale in the event the committee recommends non-renewal.

The evaluation will proceed as described in Section 4.6.2 through the Dean, who will report recommendations to the Provost. The personnel committee will forward its annual evaluation with any accompanying recommendations, and the dossier of materials to the Department Head, who will then add his or her evaluation and recommendation in the case of nonrenewal and forward the evaluation, with any accompanying recommendations, and the dossier to the Dean. The Dean will make his or her evaluation and accompanying recommendation in the case of nonrenewal, and notify the Provost. The Provost may elect to review any annual evaluation and recommendation. Copies of all three evaluations and any accompanying recommendations shall be provided to the candidate. For the purpose of acknowledging that they have been received, the candidate must undersign the evaluation from the committee, the Head/Director, and the Dean before they are forwarded. Signing the evaluation does not imply that the candidate endorses all that is stated therein. The candidate may append a response before the evaluation is forwarded (this response will remain attached throughout the evaluation process).

The schedule of annual appointments is in accordance with the AAUP “Standards for Notice of Non-reappointment.”

- First-year faculty: continuation of appointment to a second year or notified of non-reappointment by March 1 of the first year.
• Second-year faculty: continuation of appointment to a third year or notified of non-reappointment by December 15 of the second year of service.

• Third-year faculty: continuation of appointment to a fourth year or notified of non-reappointment 12 months before expiration of the appointment.

• Fourth-year faculty: continuation of appointment to a fifth year or notified of non-reappointment 12 months before expiration of the appointment.

• Fifth-year faculty: continuation of appointment to a sixth year or notified of non-reappointment 12 months before expiration of the appointment.

• Sixth-year faculty: tenured or notified of non-reappointment 12 months before expiration of appointment.

4.6.24. TENURE/PROMOTION REVIEW (PROMOTION FROM ASSISTANT PROFESSOR TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR RANK)

4.6.4.1. YEAR OF APPLICATION

In most cases, a probationary faculty member must apply for tenure/promotion no later than the sixth year of employment (except when the tenure clock has been temporarily stopped – see Section 3.8.1) to remain employed beyond the seventh year. In cases where the faculty member has negotiated for a shorter probationary period, the final tenure application year is specified in the faculty member's initial letter of employment. Candidates denied tenure by the Provost in the final year for application are not permitted to reapply. 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.

**4.6.4.2. APPLICATION PROCESS AND REVIEW**

*Much of the information is now provided in 4.6.2.*

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 annual probationary review until it gets to the Dean. When the Dean completes his or her recommendation, all recommendations and rationales and a current vita are forwarded to the Provost for review. Supporting materials are forwarded as far as the Dean's office; they are forwarded beyond the Dean's office at the request of the Provost. The Provost makes a final recommendation that is forwarded to the President and the Board of Governors for approval. At each stage of evaluation, the candidate will be given a copy of the recommendation and the written rationale for the recommendation. At each subsequent stage, a copy of the recommendation including probative rationale and any appended rebuttals from the candidate will also be furnished to the personnel committee for its information and records.

A candidate for tenure/promotion may choose to withdraw the application from consideration at any stage of the process.

*No such rank as “Full Professor” – it’s just “Professor.”*

**4.6.35. PROMOTION REVIEW (PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR RANK TO FULL PROFESSOR RANK)**

**4.6.35.1. PRE-PROMOTION REVIEW**

*Some additions for clarity / flexibility.*

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.
4.6.35.2. APPLICATION PROCESS FOR PROMOTION AND REVIEW

Clarity / removing information provided earlier.
The faculty member prepares a complete promotion dossier according to guidelines provided by the Provost and forwards it to the chairman 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 by the department head. The process for promotion review follows the steps outlined in Section 4.6.2. This review may complement the annual performance review and proceed as indicated in the appointment flowchart above (4.6.1). Copies are maintained by the department, forwarded to the Dean and provided to the candidate, who must undersign to indicate receipt of the evaluation.

4.6.35.3. APPLICATION PROCESS FOR PROMOTION FOR NON TENURE-TRACK FACULTY (INSTRUCTOR, CLINICAL FACULTY, RESEARCH FACULTY)

Clarity / removing information provided earlier.
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 process for promotion review follows the steps outlined in Section 4.6.2. The promotion dossier will be compiled according to department and college guidelines. The process for promotion review follows the steps of the annual probationary review until it gets to the Dean. When the Dean completes his or her recommendation, all recommendations and rationales and a current vita are forwarded to the Provost’s Office for review. Supporting materials are forwarded as far as the Dean’s office; they are forwarded beyond the Dean’s office at the request of the Provost. The Provost makes a final recommendation that is forwarded to the President and the Board of Governors for approval. At each stage of the evaluation, the candidate will be given a copy of the recommendation and the written rationale for the recommendation. At each subsequent stage, a copy of the recommendation including probative rationale and any appended rebuttals from the candidate will also be furnished to the personnel committee for its information and records. A candidate for promotion may choose to withdraw the application from consideration at any stage of the process.

4.6.46. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Performance evaluations shall be conducted annually for all full-time faculty (Section 4.6.6.1) and, for per course faculty, after completion of each teaching assignment (see Section 4.6.6.2).

The following originally part of the appeals section:
The decision-making process for assigning annual salaries annual evaluation process should foster an open and encouraging environment for faculty performance. Accordingly, faculty evaluations shall observe the highest standards of collegiality, be based on coherent, published policy and administered fairly. To ensure transparency, faculty shall be allowed to review the departmental evaluation process and his or her resulting performance ratings as well as provide a written response to a performance evaluation.

4.6.6.1 PERFORMANCE REVIEWS FOR FULL-TIME FACULTY

The Department Head shall seek the written input of the departmental personnel committee on each faculty member and recommend a composite rating to the Dean of the college in which the department is located. However, in years when there will be no performance-based component to salary adjustments, the full-time faculty of a department may, by majority vote, opt to forgo a review by the departmental personnel committee; in those years, the review process shall start with the Department Head. The Dean shall either endorse or modify the recommended rating. In
instances where the Dean modifies the rating, the Dean must provide a compelling rationale for the change in writing to the Department Head, to the departmental personnel committee, and to the affected faculty member.

At least five numerical or categorical ratings are to be used. The ratings are to be designed to recognize both outstanding and unsatisfactory performances as well as those appraised as degrees of good or satisfactory. Each department shall develop a clear set of expectations for satisfactory performance in the categories of Teaching, Research, and Service. (Outreach and Professional Productivity will be evaluated for those faculty for whom these are considered responsibilities.) Former passage did not include some criteria important for Research and Clinical faculty.

Added to reinforce requirements for notification.
At each step of the evaluation process, the faculty member must be informed on the results of the evaluation, including an explanation for each numerical or categorical rating. A faculty member who is dissatisfied with his or her evaluation may append a written response to the evaluation before it is forwarded to the next evaluator.

Suggested addition here and in other sections to clarify reporting responsibilities. Each recommendation must also be reported back to prior evaluators, e.g., the Dean must report her/his recommendation back to the Department Head and the Departmental Committee, along with a written explanation for any changes in recommendations.

Each faculty member should have an opportunity to meet directly with the Department Head to discuss his or her annual review as well as to establish goals and support for the next year. These discussions may be incorporated into the workload assignment negotiation (Section 4.6.7).

A faculty member may appeal the performance rating to the College Compensation Committee. (Refer to Section 5.)

4.6.6.2 PERFORMANCE REVIEWS FOR PER COURSE FACULTY
This is new, based on recognition of accountability for the performance of per course faculty. The section specifies that such reviews are the responsibility of the Head, but the language does not preclude input/advise from departmental faculty.

A performance evaluation for each per course faculty member must be completed after each teaching session (i.e., semester or summer session). The evaluation shall be the responsibility of the Department Head, and should be based on the per course faculty member’s reliability and effectiveness in completing teaching assignments. Evaluations should be based on meeting contract requirements and on the department’s criteria for Teaching evaluation. Departments must have a plan in place for providing feedback to per course faculty within established timelines.

The following was originally in Chapter 5(Salary Policies), but made more sense in this chapter.

5.4. 4.6.6.3) PERFORMANCE EVALUATION APPEALS PROCESS
Intro sentences did not seem that useful.
The decision-making process for assigning annual salaries should foster an open and encouraging environment for faculty performance. Accordingly, faculty evaluations shall observe the highest standards of collegiality, be based on coherent, published policy and administered fairly. To ensure transparency, faculty shall be allowed to review the departmental evaluation process and his/her resulting performance ratings as well as provide a written response to a performance evaluation. A faculty member who is dissatisfied with his/her performance rating(s) may appeal the rating(s). The faculty member’s request for review, along with any supporting materials, shall be forwarded to the College Personnel Committee.
The faculty member’s request for review and the accompanying recommendation of the College Personnel Committee shall continue to the Dean and if still unresolved, to the Provost. If either the Dean, or the Provost, if necessary, does not concur with the appeal of the faculty member, he/she shall send to the faculty member who is appealing, a written explanation of the reasons for not concurring.

Any employee faculty member who believes that he or she has been discriminated against for any reason not related to job performance may consult the Office for Institutional Equity and Compliance Diversity. In the event a pattern of misapplication of departmental policies in evaluating faculty performance is detected, a faculty member may appeal his/her salary adjustments as first a grievance through the Academic Personnel Grievance Process (APGP) process. The last change is appropriate because the section was originally part of the chapter on salary policies.

4.6.57. WORK ASSIGNMENT NEGOTIATION
This particular topic is located here mainly because the negotiation is usually completed as part of annual review. Work assignments are negotiated between the faculty member and the Department Head at the time of the annual review. If a change in a work assignment is needed before a review is done, the Department Head will negotiate that change with the faculty member. In making an appropriate assignment, the Department Head will take into consideration the needs of the department, and the professional objectives and recent productivity of the faculty member. The Department Head must make assignments within the parameters set by the University for expected workloads.

4.7. PROMOTION, TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW

This following section is redundant with information in the Grounds for a PPC Appeal

4.7.1. EVALUATION CRITERIA
Faculty members must be evaluated under the proper set of criteria from the appropriate academic year described earlier in Chapter 3 and earlier in this chapter. Failure to use these criteria creates a grievable procedural issue.

The following passage showed up later in this document. It seemed appropriate to define the committee earlier.

4.7.3.7. 4.7.1 COMPOSITION AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PROVOST’S PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (PPC), PCTP AND ANNUAL REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

The name of the committee is changed to (1) avoid confusion with the similarly-named Provost’s Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion, which has totally different responsibilities and (2) to make the name consistent with analogous committees at the departmental and college levels. The composition of the committee was changed to reflect that (1) the committee in general would meet infrequently, so it wouldn’t make sense to have a standing committee and (2) when challenges are brought forward, it makes sense to have individuals who have had significant prior exposure to T&P processes.

The Provost’s Personnel Committee (PPC) shall consist of the chairs of each of the six College’s Personnel Committees. If an appeal involves a faculty member from the Darr School of Agriculture or the Department of Library Science, the chair of the affected unit’s personnel committee will also serve. In all cases, a PPC member with any conflict of interest must be replaced by an alternate selected by his or her college.

Six tenured faculty members shall be elected by the Faculty Senate to serve on the PCTP. One member shall come from each academic college (except the Graduate College).
The Provost shall be responsible for convening this committee, which will review promotion, tenure, and reappointment decisions. The PCTP PPC shall select a chairperson who shall be responsible for making an annual report to the Faculty Senate during the first fall meeting of its work.

### 4.7.2. GROUNDS FOR A PCTP PPC APPEAL

Appeals based on denial or granting of promotion, tenure or reappointment shall be filed with the Associate Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, and shall proceed to the Provost’s Personnel Committee on Tenure and Promotion (PCTP). No finding of a prima facie case by the Associate Provost of Faculty and Academic Affairs is required. A PCTP PPC appeal may be filed to challenge the denial of reappointment, tenure or promotion substantially affected by:

1. failure to use for evaluation of tenure and promotion the appropriate criteria in effect for that faculty member (see Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2), or

2. failure to consider the substantive merits of the applicant’s performance, and fulfillment of appropriate University expectations, or

3. substantial failure to follow Faculty Handbook procedures, or

4. failure to provide timely notice for non-reappointment of probationary faculty as defined in Section 4.6.3 3.11, or

5. arbitrary and capricious failure to evaluate the faculty member in a fair manner and by comparable standards used to evaluate other faculty members being considered for reappointment, tenure or the same rank promotion, or

   *The next item is more properly addressed by the Office for Institutional Equity and Compliance.*

6. denial of reappointment, tenure or promotion based on gender or other protected status, or

   7–6. retaliation for exercising academic freedom of speech or political speech/affiliation

### 4.7.3. PROVOST’S PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (PPC) ON TENURE AND PROMOTION (PCTP) REVIEW PROCESS

#### 4.7.3.1. APPEAL RELATED TO REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, OR PROMOTION

Language added to permit Instructors and Clinical/Research faculty to challenge denial of promotion. Because these are term contracts, there is no legal expectation of reappointment.

An appeal or claim related to reappointment, granting of tenure or promotion decisions shall be initiated with the Associate Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs and filed in the Faculty Senate Office. Such an appeal may be initiated by a tenured or tenure-track faculty member to challenge denial of reappointment, tenure or promotion. Non-tenure track faculty may challenge denial of promotion, but not reappointment.

#### 4.7.3.2. BURDEN OF PROOF

The burden of proof shall be on the party initiating the appeal to demonstrate its case by the preponderance of the evidence.
4.7.3.3. **PCTP PPC REVIEW**

The references to the AAUP documents clarified:


4.7.3.4. **REPORT**

Upon completion of its review, the PCTP PPC shall prepare a written report divided into findings of fact and recommendations with supporting reasons which shall be presented to the Provost and the faculty member within 7 business days of the conclusion of the hearing. A minority report also may be prepared.

4.7.3.5. **IMPLEMENTATION OR APPEAL OF RECOMMENDATION**

If the Provost agrees with the PCTP PPC recommendations, the Provost shall promptly implement the recommendation of the PCTP PPC unless the faculty member appeals the results of that recommendation in writing, stating the reasons therefore within fourteen (14) business days of the receipt of the PCTP PPC Findings and Recommendations. Such appeal shall be filed at the Provost's office. The Provost will include whatever additional information and investigation the Provost determines necessary and promptly forward that information and PCTP PPC Findings and Recommendations to the President for Final Determination. If the Provost decides not to adopt the PCTP PPC recommendations, the faculty member may appeal that decision in the same manner set forth herein.

4.7.3.6. **UNAVAILABILITY OF APGP APPEAL PROCESS**

If a faculty member reviewed under the PCTP PPC process is denied promotion, tenure or reappointment any given year, that faculty member cannot file a separate Academic Personnel Grievance.

4.8. **EVALUATION-RELATED POLICIES**

4.8.1. **APPLICANT'S RIGHTS**

All faculty evaluations are based on university-level criteria and the guidelines and expectations specified in departmental and college documents and any specific contractual agreements that may exist.

Faculty applying for tenure will be evaluated according to their performance in accumulated assignments since employment at MSU unless otherwise negotiated at the time of initial employment. Faculty applying for promotion will be evaluated according to performance in present rank. If credit towards promotion is given for years in prior assignment, corresponding professional activities during those years of credit shall be considered in the promotion review process as long as they are contiguous to present assignment.
4.8.2. RESPONSIBILITIES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION APPLICATIONS

4.8.2.1. APPLICANT’S RESPONSIBILITIES

Clarification of confidentiality of letters.
Each faculty member making application is responsible for assembling evidentiary documentation, for making the case in support of the application, and for submitting materials according to established format and deadlines. The faculty member shall have access to all materials submitted to the head, with the exception to external review letters, which will remain confidential until the initial recommendation by the Provost. Recommendations at each level will be based upon data supplied by the candidate as well as that collected by the department, such as student evaluation results.

4.8.2.2. RESPONSIBILITIES FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWS

For tenure track actions, external reviews, based on criteria provided in departmental guidelines, will be solicited from comparable institutions by the Department Head to aid each tenure/promotion or promotion decision. External reviewers will normally be selected from comparable institutions; however, individuals whose expertise make them specifically suitable to serve as reviewers may also be selected with approval of the Dean (see the Provost’s website for specific qualifications). External reviewers will be identified collaboratively by the faculty member, the Department Head and the departmental personnel committee. Departments must, in their policy documents, define the role of the personnel committee in this process: the committee’s role may range from formal input on the selection process and approval of the reviewer list to availability for advice and consulting at the request of either the Head or the candidate. Four external reviewers will be identified collaboratively by the faculty member, the Department Head and, to the extent specified in the department’s governance documents, the departmental personnel committee. If the faculty member and Head cannot agree on the list of four reviewers, each shall select two. The list of reviewers will be submitted to the Dean who will certify that the selection process has followed guidelines. Reviewers may then be contacted.

The Department Head is responsible for obtaining a sufficient number of reviews. The Department Head should contact selected reviewers early in the process (ideally during the Spring) to determine if they would be willing to provide reviews; when a timely review appears unlikely, an alternate reviewer should then be identified. The absence of review will not be allowed to prejudice the tenure or promotion candidacy of the faculty member.

4.8.3. DEPARTMENTAL PERSONNEL COMMITTEES

This section has been edited, but much of the editing involves rearrangement to more logically group related topics. A provision has been added that allows non-tenure track faculty to participate in some types of evaluations (this has in fact been allowed by the Provost for certain departments.) In addition, the guidelines for committees when there are insufficient qualified faculty are clarified.

Departmental personnel committees serve as the initial evaluating bodies for all faculty evaluations (except as indicated in Section 4.6.6.1). Personnel committees are normally made up of all tenured faculty members in the department with restrictions as noted below, and serve as the initial evaluating body for all departmental faculty evaluations. Departmental personnel committees may include non-tenure track faculty for certain evaluations as described in Section 4.8.3.1 below. The term personnel committee is understood to mean the departmental committee responsible for these evaluations. The personnel committee may designate subcommittees for specific assignments as described in its departmental guidelines.

Normally, the personnel committee should have at least five qualified members. This general guideline has been in the HB for some time. In the event that the department has fewer than five tenured eligible faculty members, see
Section 4.8.3.2 below for options, additional tenured faculty members from the college who, based on rank, would be eligible to participate, may be appointed by the Dean to a total number of five. In such cases, the Department Head and the faculty applicant will submit a list of possible committee members for the Dean’s consideration and appointment. The personnel committee operates as an autonomous faculty body, and therefore the Department Head shall not participate in personnel committee proceedings or make decisions regarding its composition or actions. Tenured faculty members who have administrative assignments that require them to participate in personnel review at a higher level shall not participate in personnel decisions within his or her home department. A faculty member with a potential conflict of interest (usually evaluating a spouse) should not participate in the evaluation process for annual appointment, tenure, or promotion. 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. An exception to this occurs when the applicant is applying for promotion to Distinguished Professor, where faculty at the rank of Professor or above may participate. Guidelines for eligibility for evaluating Distinguished Professor candidates was not previously clarified. The expectation is that Distinguished Profs will be relatively uncommon, so candidates must be vetted by those in the Professor rank.

Some rearrangement and clarification.
The committee selects a chair who is responsible for working with the head to establish and communicate internal application deadlines. The chair, for convening the committee's meetings, for assuring that committee processes are carried out with integrity, and generally is responsible for writing (or delegating the writing of) personnel recommendations based on the deliberations of the committee. Inappropriate actions by individuals on the committee should be addressed by the committee chair and for members of the personnel committee.

Clarifications.
The candidate's credentials and/or application will be presented to the chair of the personnel committee (or of the subcommittee), who will undertake the security of the application dossier to assure appropriate confidentiality. At the time of evaluation for annual review of appropriate progress toward tenure, required performance reviews, promotion or tenure, the personnel committee will have access to the candidate's current vita, other documentation of Research, Teaching, and Service as required by the Provost and/or department, as well as all prior personnel reviews generated by the Dean, Department Head and personnel committee. Additional materials, supporting Teaching, Research, and Service, may be requested by the personnel committee.

A personnel committee of tenured faculty members shall make the original recommendations in all cases involving annual review of appropriate progress toward tenure, promotion or tenure. If there is a personnel subcommittee, it will present its recommendations to the full tenured faculty personnel committee, whose vote will establish the departmental faculty recommendation for a personnel action. 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, there shall be a good faith effort to resolve these differences. If resolution is not possible, the Department Head must offer in writing compelling reasons for disagreeing with the committee's recommendation before advancing his or her recommendation to the Dean.

4.8.3.1 NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY ON DEPARTMENTAL PERSONNEL COMMITTEES
This is a new section that recognizes that, particularly for departments that employ a large number of non-tenure track faculty (Research faculty, Clinical faculty, and Instructors) it may be appropriate to allow those faculty to participate in promotion decisions. However, non-tenure track faculty must not be allowed to participate in evaluation of tenure-track faculty because the differences in the nature of their contracts makes non-tenure track
faculty vulnerable to inappropriate pressures. Note that this is optional – in departments where there are few non-tenure track faculty, it may be uncomfortable to have those faculty participate in each other’s evaluations.

Non-tenure track faculty may not participate in evaluations of tenure-track faculty. However, departments may choose to allow non-tenure track faculty to participate in promotion evaluations of other non-tenure track faculty, provided that the evaluator is at or above the rank sought by the applicant.

4.8.3.2 OPTIONS WHEN A DEPARTMENTAL PERSONNEL COMMITTEE HAS FEWER THAN FIVE MEMBERS

The old language was pretty vague, saying that the committee had to have a least five tenured faculty, but because some of those would not be eligible to participate in evaluations of candidates for Professor, there could easily be cases where a department had five or more tenured faculty but only 1 – 2 at the rank of Professor to consider the promotion of an Associate Professor to Professor. The following language is, hopefully, in the spirit of the original language’s intent, but allowing flexibility in procedure.

Ideally, any committee evaluating a colleague for annual review of appropriate progress toward tenure, required performance reviews, promotion or tenure should have a minimum of five qualified members, but some departments may have insufficient qualified faculty to meet this expectation. Options include:

• Allowing the department to proceed with the evaluation with as few as three qualified faculty from the department.
• Supplementing the departmental committee with faculty from other departments (normally from the same college) who, based on rank, would qualify. The additional faculty should never increase the size of the committee to more than five total. These additional faculty are to be selected by the Dean, based on recommendations by the Head and the faculty member.

The option (or combination of options) selected should be negotiated with and approved by the Dean.

4.8.4. COLLEGE PERSONNEL COMMITTEES

The College Personnel Committees (CPCs) should now have a non-tenure track faculty representative when the committee is considering evaluations of other non-tenure track faculty. This addition was presented to Senate in 2012 – 2013 as part of the FHRC’s “principles document” and Senate appeared to be in favor of the addition. Based on discussions in Senate, departmental representatives should ideally be at Professor rank, but may under certain circumstances be Associate Professors.

All colleges shall have a personnel committee. The College Personnel Committee (CPC) will be comprised of one elected tenured representative from each department of the College. Representatives should normally be selected from a department’s tenured Professors. In some cases (e.g., when there are few faculty at Professor rank in a department), the Dean may permit a department to elect a tenured Associate Professor as its representative. Each College Personnel Committee must also have a representative of non-tenure-track faculty (elected by the College’s non-tenure-track faculty) who will serve on the committee on matters involving non-tenure-track faculty members. The non-tenure track faculty member must recuse himself or herself on any matters dealing with tenure-track faculty. If a department has no tenured faculty, the department may be represented on the College Personnel Committee for purposes of discussing compensation issues. The department will elect one faculty member to represent the department for the discussion of compensation.

If a college committee serves in an advisory capacity only on matters of tenure, promotion, and continuation of appointment, it generally should not be required to supply a written recommendation.

For the role of the College Personnel Committee in compensation, see Section 5.3.
4.8.5. DEPARTMENTAL PERSONNEL AND GOVERNANCE DOCUMENTS

All departments, schools and other academic divisions with faculty evaluation responsibilities must maintain current personnel and governance documents that are fully compliant with the University Faculty Handbook. All recommendations within the review process must adhere to the standards and requirements identified in the departmental documents. Departmental documents minimally must contain the following:

The following list will be renumbered as needed.

1. Specific guidelines or expectations for tenure, promotion and annual review of appropriate progress toward tenure; the policy must contain a progression of expectations, e.g., minimal expectations for annual appointment are not sufficient for tenure or promotion.
2. Clarification of what the department will recognize as Research and how it may be evaluated. This is intended to help define what is recognized as Research in the discipline, and also to describe how activities such as Applied Public Scholarship may be evaluated.
3. Criteria for “exceptional records of accomplishments: that could lead to early tenure and/or promotion. These criteria must require performance that significantly exceeds the normal expectations for tenure or promotion. Specific examples of exceptional accomplishments should be provided. At a minimum, accomplishments in both Teaching and Research must be exemplary.
4. Departmental personnel committee structure, rules and procedures
5. Required and recommended materials for application dossiers, following formats specified by the Provost; required format for the application dossier This is now specified by the Provost; incorporated into 5.
6. A statement regarding policies for adding materials to the application dossier after the departmental deadline must be addressed in the departmental guidelines not needed
7. Generic calendar specifying approximate dates of submission and review for all actions
8. Faculty mentoring policies
9. Policies and procedures for required performance evaluations for tenure track faculty
10. Policies and procedures for evaluating non-tenure track faculty
11. Descriptions of all other self-governance policies and procedures within the department, school or program, including procedures for amending the governance document itself.

The tenure and promotion document of each department shall be reviewed by a departmental committee at least every three years. This review is to ensure that the guidelines appropriately reflect the goals and mission of the department and remain in compliance with the criteria, goals and mission of the University community. The departmental review committee will first forward the reviewed document with or without changes to the departmental faculty for approval. Upon receipt of faculty approval, the document will 1) be forwarded to the Department Head for review; 2) after review of the Department Head forwarded to the Dean for review; 3) and after review of Dean forwarded to the Provost’s Office for review and final approval. A department’s tenure and promotion guidelines are under the purview of the departmental faculty. If compelling reason or explanation is provided (by the Department Head, Dean, or upper administration) to the faculty for modifications, it is the responsibility of the departmental faculty to consider suggested modifications, and for all parties to make a good faith effort to work collaboratively in achieving resolution. Administrators’ recommendations should be based on issues of compliance and clarity.

Specifically, all departmental policies must meet the following requirements:

1. The department’s personnel and governance document shall be presented in writing to the candidate at the time of employment. If it is expected that some of these criteria will be met at different points in a faculty member’s career, the timetable must also be placed in writing with notification given to the Office of the Provost and Office of Human Resources.
2. The guidelines shall be appropriate to the discipline, achievable, and consistent with university criteria.
3. Promotion to a higher faculty rank requires documentation of sustained performance within rank at the level required by the University. Distinctions between performance expectations for the various ranks must be clearly and specifically stated in writing.
4. Only verifiable job performance indicators are valid considerations for personnel decisions.
5. Departmental guidelines will emphasize performance outcomes, meeting clearly stated goals and objectives and professional achievements. Guidelines shall be specific so that they can be applied consistently within a department.
6. Differential Research guidelines may be applied to faculty members within a department whose professional specialties differ substantially in construction and delivery, as long as they do not disadvantage one group over another. For example, studio artists would generally be held to a different set of performance measures than art historians in the same department.

4.8.6. DOCUMENTATION

Both the faculty member and the Department Head shall maintain complete documentation for all aspects of the review of that faculty member’s promotion, tenure, and annual review of appropriate progress toward tenure. This requirement shall begin at the date of employment.

Documentation shall include, but not be limited to, letters of understanding at the time of hire; applicable departmental guidelines signed by faculty member and Department Head; participation in teaching improvement activities; any recommendations made by departmental personnel committees prior to the final review; previous annual reviews, required performance reviews, and annual letters from the Department Head; summaries of all teaching evaluations; committee assignments and results; proposals written or grants received; and other documentation of Research scholarly/creative activities.

At the time of evaluation for required performance reviews, promotion, tenure, or annual review of appropriate progress toward tenure, the candidate shall submit to the personnel committee a current vita as well as all the documentation that has been maintained up to that time. Additional materials supporting Teaching, Research, and Service activities may also be submitted as required by the department/school/college. The personnel committee shall have access to all information to be used in the decision regarding Teaching, Research, or Service.

4.8.7. FACULTY AND DEPARTMENT HEAD PROCEDURAL AGREEMENT

Each department shall supply new faculty with a copy of the departmental tenure and promotion guidelines in effect on the date of hire. During the first month of full-time employment, the new faculty shall meet with the Department Head 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 and Department Head 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 probationary period of a faculty member pursuing tenure and for promotion, the faculty member has the right to remain within the domain of the guidelines under which he or she was hired or elect to be evaluated with 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 provided to the faculty member. A tenured faculty member pursuing promotion may remain within the domain of an earlier set of promotion guidelines provided they are no more than five years old at the time the faculty member applies for promotion. Not currently accurate – changes in other sections completed last year, this section missed. For applications for promotion to Associate Professor separate from the tenure application, see Section 3.4.1 regarding
the departmental policy in effect. For promotion to Professor, see Section 3.4.2 for the departmental policy in effect. Should the negotiated faculty workload change subsequent to the original agreement, this amendment to the faculty member's and Department Head's procedural agreement shall be reflected in all future evaluations.
**Revised Language**

4. FACULTY EVALUATION

4.1. Faculty Performance Criteria and Evaluation Model

Faculty performance criteria at Missouri State University are based on the purpose and mission of the institution. The general mission of the University, in relation to its faculty, is the advancement of learning, scholarly inquiry, and service, but this translates, in terms of its students, to the single purpose of developing educated persons. To accomplish this, the university's mission includes cultivating advanced knowledge and practices and serving its constituents. The specific public affairs mission of the university further enhances its purpose to include fostering ethical leadership, cultural competence and community engagement. The University honors the principles of academic freedom, academic excellence, diversity in scholarly and cultural perspectives, and equal opportunity.

The following table outlines the evaluation categories for faculty with different types of appointments. Some variations on these criteria may be made based on contract letters. These processes result in different outcomes, and the criteria for tenure and promotion are differentiated for all types of faculty appointments. The evaluation processes are specified in Section 4.6. Performance reviews are mission-related and should be consistent with tenure and/or promotion decisions. The criteria used for evaluation in each category are based on specific elements in the university's mission as specified below. All policies and procedures described herein for departments apply to any academic unit that has primary faculty evaluation responsibilities, for example, a school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Appointment Type</th>
<th>Evaluation Based On:</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track Faculty</td>
<td>Teaching, Research, Service</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors*</td>
<td>Teaching, Service</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>Clinical Education, Professional Productivity/Research, Service</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Faculty (except State Fruit Experimentation Station)</td>
<td>Research, Service</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Faculty (State Fruit Experiment Station)</td>
<td>Teaching, Research, Service, Outreach</td>
<td>4.4, 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Course Faculty</td>
<td>Teaching or Clinical Education, depending on contract</td>
<td>4.2 or 4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some Instructors may be evaluated on Research, depending on their contracts.

4.2. Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty and Instructors

Tenure-track faculty members are expected to be actively engaged in Teaching, Research, and Service throughout their careers, but the University recognizes that, at different times, faculty members may shift emphasis from one category to another. It is generally expected that during the probationary period the emphasis should be on Teaching and Research and that at any time during one's career at Missouri State University, each faculty member must negotiate his or her workload with the Department Head (within broad University parameters approved by the Provost), with the conditions of employment laid out clearly at the time of employment, and adjusted thereafter through negotiation with the Department Head and Dean as approved by the Provost (refer to Section 4.6.5). The obligations of the academic unit should not fall disproportionately on one segment of the faculty. The faculty are also expected to adhere to standards of ethical conduct in all areas of performance (refer to Section 3.1).
Expectations for Instructors are similar to those for tenure-track faculty except that there is an increased emphasis on Teaching and normally no expectation for Research.

4.2.1. Teaching

4.2.1.1. Teaching Mission

The teaching mission at Missouri State University is to develop educated persons. In doing so, the University is committed to standards of excellence and academic integrity. An educated person:

- is someone who is literate in the broadest sense,
- has an appreciation of the responsibility of lifelong citizenship and an awareness of global issues,
- seeks solutions to problems by means of a broad base of knowledge, as well as in-depth mastery of at least one specific academic discipline, and
- has the skills and motivation to continue to learn after leaving the university, thus being prepared for both lifelong learning and lifelong productivity.

In support of developing educated persons, the University provides high-quality education that is accessible to a broad spectrum of individuals, including those facing challenges involving distance, income, or disability. Furthermore, in recognizing the value of an open and free exchange of ideas, Missouri State University promotes diversity in all of its forms as a means to provide a wide variety of sources of knowledge and perspectives.

4.2.1.2. Evaluation of Teaching

Teaching is among the most important faculty responsibilities of any institution of higher education. The attributes considered to be indicative of effective teaching vary among individuals and across disciplines; however, high levels of student engagement and deeper learning are core values that are common to all.

Teaching effectiveness must be taken seriously with review and evaluation occurring on many levels. Evaluating and improving teaching is an ongoing and critical function of faculty and administration. Teaching effectiveness must be based on performance across a reasonable period of time and number of classes, and it cannot be measured in isolation. Teaching effectiveness is affected by overall workload, level of course, experience in teaching a particular course, number of students, use of new modalities or approaches, and nature of course (general education, requirement in major, etc.).

The areas outlined below are the basis for evaluating faculty members’ teaching effectiveness for tenure and promotion and for required annual performance reviews. Sections 4.2.1.2.1, 4.2.1.2.2, and 4.2.1.2.5 represent essential elements of teaching evaluation, while sections 4.2.1.2.3 and 4.2.1.2.4 represent additional aspects of areas that may be evaluated as appropriate. Departmental evaluation plans must include specific required and/or encouraged criteria in these areas, as well as the materials that would be expected for adequate documentation of meeting the criteria.

4.2.1.2.1. Knowledge

Faculty members must be up to date and competent regarding the content of their courses, whether they are part of a discipline-specific major or the general education curriculum.

Faculty who engage in student advising must be thoroughly familiar with university requirements so their advisees make appropriate progress toward a degree and graduate in a timely manner.
4.2.1.2.2. Teaching strategies

There is substantial literature on best practices in university teaching, and faculty members should incorporate best practices in their classes to the extent possible. They must specify learning objectives for each course, ensure that their students understand how to achieve those objectives, and use grading systems that reflect the degree to which students accomplish the objectives. Faculty must be appropriately accessible to students through a variety of means (e.g., office hours, electronic communication). Faculty should strive to include high-impact instructional practices, such as community engagement, problem-based, experiential, and collaborative learning. In addition, course content and instructional strategies that reflect awareness of diversity and differences among learners can improve student learning and are encouraged where they are appropriate.

4.2.1.2.3. Accessibility

Where appropriate, faculty may extend the availability of education beyond the traditional classroom setting through activities that include, but are not limited to, offering distance learning, online courses, public lectures or workshops, working with the community and public schools in providing access to education, and developing educational materials that address accessibility issues.

4.2.1.2.4 Diversity

Special efforts to bring diversity to students' educational experience might include inviting guest speakers who offer diverse viewpoints, taking students to locations where they will be exposed to an unfamiliar environment, and requiring students to seek out diversity as part of their course requirements.

4.2.1.2.5. Evaluation and response to feedback

Faculty must ensure evaluation of their teaching through multiple means (e.g., self-reflection, peer and/or supervisor review, assessment of student learning outcomes). Student evaluations are an important source of feedback; however, they should account for no more than 50% of the total evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Faculty should carefully consider evaluation data and modify future teaching strategies as appropriate.

4.2.1.3. Documentation

Faculty must provide evidence that documents sufficient knowledge, use of teaching strategies, evaluation, and response to feedback. Documentation should also be provided to establish any claims of enhanced accessibility or special attention to diversity. Course syllabi can be rich sources to indicate currency in course content and delineation of student learning outcomes and associated grading systems. Peer and student evaluations and the faculty member’s response to those evaluations can address the extent to which strong teaching methods are used, as well as the degree of accessibility the faculty member maintains. Other useful types of documentation include pre-/post-course student performance on course knowledge and skills; professional development completion certificates; teaching portfolios; and unsolicited external letters of support.

Departmental plans must provide specific information regarding the documentation expected for annual reviews. Examples of different approaches to the evaluation of teaching effectiveness can be found in Faculty Senate Action 18-97/98, available at the Faculty Senate web site.
4.2.2. Research

4.2.2.1. Research Mission

The process of Research is understood as the production and formal communication of original creative, scholarly work, and, while the definitions of “scholarly” and “creative” may differ across academic disciplines, the process is understood to support the University's general mission in all three fundamental areas of faculty responsibility: Teaching, Research, and Service. Research both advances knowledge in a particular specialized academic field and encourages individual faculty development; it enhances the quality of education students receive. It also helps fulfill the University's Service obligation by contributing to the public welfare.

The University recognizes a broad spectrum of activities in the area of Research due to the diversity and uniqueness of academic fields. Herein, Research will be defined as the production and formal communication of creative, scholarly works. The nature of Research varies widely among different academic disciplines, but generally refers to the discovery, refinement, evaluation, and synthesis of information, the application of specialized knowledge to the solution of problems, and artistic activity. The activities recognized as Research vary by, and are defined within, each academic discipline. Descriptions of what is recognized as Research can be found in approved departmental plans. To qualify as Research activities must produce outcomes that are disseminated and subjected to critical peer review or evaluation by the scholarly community, and those outcomes should serve the growth of knowledge in a field or be of significant practical use.

Specific modes of Research include:
- Discovery: gaining knowledge of or ascertaining the existence of something previously unknown or unrecognized;
- Application: using established knowledge to solve significant problems;
- Synthesis: bringing knowledge together from disparate sources to produce a whole work that is greater than the sum of its parts;
- Criticism: using established values (aesthetic, logical, ethical) to evaluate quality of artifacts (e.g., art, legal decisions, news media); and

These modes of Research should be considered of equal weight and importance in the faculty evaluation process.

4.2.2.2. Goals and Criteria for Evaluating Research

The following goals and criteria are the basis of evaluating faculty members’ Research for tenure and promotion and for required performance reviews. Item 1 below is of paramount importance on this list, and any faculty member, in order to succeed in the area of Research at Missouri State University and attain tenure and promotions, must succeed in item 1. Although items 2, 3, and 4 are not individually prescriptive, they are inclusive of Research and may be considered. Success in one or more of these areas (2 – 4) is required to attain tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. Sustained success in one or more of these areas is required for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor.

1. Expand Knowledge and/ or Demonstrate Growth in Area of Expertise

Faculty members meet this goal if they have engaged in sufficient quantity and quality of peer-reviewed Research
in any of the five modes of scholarship appropriate to their field (as defined by department). The scholarship of teaching and learning is included here because any department may have faculty members who either specialize in education within their discipline, or who do Research in this area because it is important to their academic field or part of their assignment by the department. This Research content area should be fully recognized and evaluated according to the standards of one of the five modes of Research.

2. Application of Research to Benefit University Constituents
The criterion for this goal refers to the application of Research to solving problems or addressing situations significant to the public that require professional expertise.

3. Transmission
The criterion for this goal refers to transmission of Research product beyond that required for peer review in one's field. Faculty members meet this goal if they can document accomplishments in sharing knowledge and creative work with a broader audience.

4. Involvement of Students
Research is of added value in the University mission if the work involves students, either undergraduate or graduate, as active participants in the research process.

4.2.2.3. Engaged Public Research
Public Research supports the University's Public Affairs mission. It is Research integral to a faculty member's academic discipline. It encompasses different forms of constructing knowledge about, for, and with diverse publics and communities. Through a coherent, purposeful sequence of activities, it contributes to the public good and yields outcomes of public and intellectual value.

The University recognizes that Engaged Public Research may be included in a department's tenure and promotion policy if a department so chooses. If included in a department's policy, this scholarly activity should involve a partnership with the public and/or private sector that enriches knowledge, addresses and helps solve critical societal issues, and contributes to the public good. The department's governance documents should clarify how such Research will be evaluated.

Engaged Public Research includes Research focused on civic participation in public life, participation by engaged scholars, and the impact of public scholarship on all constituencies. Projects that advance Engaged Public Research must be subjected to critical academic peer review and should include input from a rigorous review conducted by involved community partners who collaborated with the public scholar. This input must assess the significance of the project, the quality of the relationship, and the impact on public good.

4.2.3. Service

4.2.3.1. Service Mission
Faculty Service at Missouri State University serves three purposes: to support the academic tradition of shared governance, to support the professional and organizational needs of the disciplines, and to bring the products of University work to the public for its benefit.

4.2.3.2. Goals and Criteria for Evaluating Service
The following goals and criteria are the basis of evaluating faculty members' Service for tenure and promotion and
for required performance reviews. Item 1 below is of paramount importance on this list, and any faculty member, in order to succeed in the area of Service at Missouri State University and attain tenure and promotions, must succeed in item 1. Although items 2, 3, and 4 are not individually prescriptive, they are inclusive of Service and may be considered. Success in one or more of these areas (2 – 4) is required to attain tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. Sustained success and documented leadership in one or more of these areas are required for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor.

1. University Citizenship

In the interest of maintaining broad participation in the decision-making process at the University, faculty must recognize their responsibilities to the organization and contribute fairly to the task of shared-governance. This includes, but is not limited to, service on program, departmental, college and university committees and task forces. In so doing, faculty members increase the level of self-determination in their ranks.

Service activities supporting University citizenship may also include collaborations and contributions for the collegiate well-being such as providing professional development, participating in campus discussions, and expanding opportunities for shaping the learning environment.

2. Professional Service

The criteria for this goal refer to contributions to professional organizations within the faculty member’s field. Professional association participation may include serving as a board member, division chair, officer, editor, reviewer, committee member, etc. of a professional organization. Additionally, this may include sponsoring, mentoring, or advising an active student organization, or providing opportunities for student experiences outside the expectations of teaching.

3. Public Service

Faculty members meet this goal when they provide evidence of using their professional skills and expertise to serve community, state, national or international public constituents. This may take the form of serving as a board member, division chair, officer, editor, reviewer, committee member, etc. of a public organization, or writing opeds or other articles in newspapers or other print media or on television or radio, etc. In this way, Faculty members not only further the mission of public outreach, but also serve as models for their students who are encouraged to engage in similar activities.

4. Professional Consultation

Faculty members may meet this goal by submitting evidence of providing professional expertise to business, industry, schools, community organizations, and colleagues in other university programs. Consultation services to external constituents within the faculty member’s professional expertise may be included in this area.

4.3 Evaluation of Faculty with Clinical Appointments

The University recognizes the need to evaluate faculty members with specialized assignments according to the requirements of their appointment letters. Clinical faculty should be so designated in appointment letters. The following addresses the evaluation of clinical faculty (Refer to Section 3.6.11 for a definition of this category).
Clinical faculty are vital to the success of certain programs in professional fields. Their primary purpose is to provide an authentic applied learning environment for students in these disciplines while maintaining their own applied expertise. Clinical faculty translate new knowledge in their discipline into clinical practice and clinical practice into new knowledge. Clinical faculty members have the same Service requirements as those with standard appointments. (Refer to Section 4.2.3.2.) Areas of performance evaluation and evaluation for promotion specific to clinical faculty are Clinical Education and Service.

4.3.1. Clinical Education Mission

The Clinical Education Mission for Clinical Faculty encompasses the Teaching mission to develop educated persons as defined in Section 4.2.1.1, and the specific mission to evaluate clinical competencies. Therefore, the goals and criteria for evaluating Clinical Education are specific to this faculty role.

4.3.2 Goals and Criteria for Evaluating Clinical Education

Clinical faculty members have responsibilities for didactic and clinical instruction and/or supervision in clinical or field settings. These roles require communicating information and knowledge to students, promoting the acquisition of skills, fostering the development of critical thinking, modeling ethical behavior, and evaluating clinical competencies. Specific responsibilities may include the development of clinical settings, coordination of student field or clinical experiences, instruction, supervision and evaluation of students. Clinical faculty members must maintain appropriate professional credentials and currency in their practice through continuing education and training. There are two primary goals, with respective evaluative criteria. The first goal must be achieved for promotion.

1. Developing educated persons who are competent clinical professionals

Success in this area both describes successful clinical education at this University and is a prerequisite for successful performance review and for promotion.

   a. Clinical faculty members meet this goal when they demonstrate their effectiveness in cultivating students' knowledge base and skills within a specific discipline including competencies for professional practice.

   b. Faculty should strive to make explicit the relationship between the general education curriculum and various disciplinary curricula so students can integrate their acquired knowledge and skills for lifelong application.

   c. Maintenance of appropriate professional credentials and evidence of continuing professional development are required to meet this goal.

2. Exceptional Modes or Qualities of Clinical Education

The specifics in this area need to be described in writing by the department from the beginning of employment, with any exceptions dependent on negotiation between the clinical faculty member and the Department Head and the Dean, as approved by the Provost.

   a. Outstanding Performance as a Clinical Educator
Beyond basic effectiveness as a clinical educator, outstanding performance may be evidenced by judgments made by students, peers, administrators, and colleagues with appropriate academic and clinical expertise. Further evidence may include external recognition for outstanding preparation of students for professional clinical fields, and students receiving external recognition for outstanding clinical outcomes. Such evidence may also include noteworthy clinical outcomes or Research done with undergraduate and/or graduate students, noteworthy work in student advisement, participation in graduate committees, and grants to support innovative clinical education.

b. Experiential Learning

While it is expected that all Teaching and Clinical Education efforts contribute to developing citizen scholars, special efforts in this regard may be used to meet this goal. Faculty should provide evidence of service learning components in their courses, internships or other structured outreach activities that apply the course material to clinical or practice contexts.

c. Accessibility

This goal refers to efforts to increase accessibility to clinical education beyond one's typical assignments. These may include, but are not limited to, offering distance learning online and continuing professional education for practitioners, public lectures or workshops, working with community agencies and health care institutions in providing access to education, clinical service/interventions and developing clinical educational materials that address accessibility issues.

d. Diversity

Special efforts to use diversity in broadening students' perspectives and to develop cultural sensitivity may include inviting guest speakers who offer diverse viewpoints, establishing clinical experiences/externships in diverse settings, or providing exposure to clinical populations with special needs.

4.3.3. Service

Goals and criteria for evaluation of Service for faculty with clinical appointments are identical to those for faculty with standard appointments (Refer to Section 4.2.3.2).

4.3.4. Professional Productivity / Research

Clinical faculty may be evaluated on professional productivity and Research for promotion.

4.3.4.1. Professional Productivity Mission for Clinical Faculty

Professional productivity includes translation of new knowledge into measurable improvements in clinical outcomes through practice and communications with peers, as well as original Research in any of the five modes identified in Section 4.2.2. Professional Productivity/Research advances knowledge and practices in clinical professions, promotes development of clinical faculty, and enhances the quality of clinical education for students. Although there is inevitable overlap with the Clinical Education and Service criteria, Professional Productivity/Research criteria focus on professional outcomes, recognition, and development.
4.3.4.2. Goals and Criteria for Evaluating Professional Productivity/Research

Below are the four goals with respective criteria for evaluating Professional productivity/Research. The first goal should be achieved for promotion.

1. Contributes knowledge to discipline.

Translates new knowledge in their discipline into measurable improvements in clinical practice and outcomes and/or translates clinical practice into new knowledge. The criterion for this goal requires communication of outcomes to peers through conference presentations, workshops, peer-reviewed and non-peer reviewed publications or sponsored research/contracts. Participation on masters committees, selection as a reviewer for a major funding agency, collaboration on Research in clinical settings, or the development of nationally recognized clinical service or practice standards also may be considered as evidence.

2. Application of clinical expertise to provide expert service to the local and professional community.

Evidence of positive outcomes within the practice setting may be documented through field assessments, employer surveys, or client/patient surveys. Evidence of recognition by professional peers in the form of awards, requests for service, commendations, citations, etc. may be considered as evidence.

3. Transmission.

Clinical faculty members meet this goal by documenting special accomplishments in sharing clinical expertise or Research with a broad audience.

4. Involvement of students.

Professional practice and scholarly activities are of added value to the University mission if the work involves students, either undergraduate or graduate, as active participants in the process.

4.4. Evaluation of Faculty with Research Appointments

The University recognizes the need to evaluate faculty members with specialized assignments according to the requirements of their appointment letters. Research faculty should be so designated in appointment letters. (Refer to Section 3.6.10 for a definition of this category.)

Research faculty members have the similar Research and Service requirements as those with standard appointments for performance review and promotion; however, Research output expectations are naturally higher since Teaching is not required. Refer to the Research and Service criteria for standard appointments in Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3.2. Evaluations of State Fruit Experiment Station Research Faculty shall be based on Research, Teaching, Outreach (see Section 3.6.10.1) and Service, commensurate with assigned duties.

4.5. Faculty Policies and Responsibilities

4.5.1. Teaching
4.5.1.1. Teaching Loads

Workloads for tenure-track faculty with standard appointments involve significant responsibilities for Research and Service in addition to Teaching responsibilities. Accordingly, average departmental Teaching loads for full-time research-active faculty should approximate 18 equated hours per academic year, and no faculty should be expected to teach more than 24 equated hours per academic year. Annual Teaching loads should typically be 24 equated hours per academic year for full-time Instructors with normal service loads, and up to 30 equated hours per academic year for full-time instructors with little or no Service expectation. Teaching assignments for Clinical and Research faculty will vary depending on details of their contracts.

4.5.1.2. Meeting Classes

Faculty members are expected to meet their assigned classes or to see that suitable alternate arrangements have been made for learning experiences for their students in the case of a required absence of the instructor because of unusual circumstances or because of attendance at a professional meeting. When instructors are unable to meet a class because of illness, they must call the departmental office and make arrangements to notify their classes concerning the cancellation of classes and new assignments or to make other arrangements for the classes that will be missed.

4.5.1.3. Course Policy Statements

Within the first week of classes the faculty member shall issue a written policy statement, in print or in electronic form, to each student summarizing the following, where items marked with asterisks have suggested language posted by the Provost:

1. Purpose: A statement of the general content of the course.

2. Course Objectives: A list of measurable and desirable outcomes to be achieved upon successful completion of the course.

3. *Attendance Policy: A statement of attendance policy consistent with that of the University, and the policies regarding late arrival and early departure.

4. *Academic Integrity Policy: A statement concerning the policies concerning plagiarism and cheating, including consequences.

5. Textbooks: A list of textbooks and other sources to be used for the course and whether they are recommended or required reading.

6. Test Dates: A statement concerning the announcement of test dates and the test dates if known. If the dates are unknown, approximations should be offered.

7. Examinations: A general idea of the material to be covered on each exam.

8. Grading Scale: A statement of the grading policy to be used in the course.

9. Term Papers (if applicable): A statement of the dates that term papers are due and general criteria used to determine how the papers will be graded.
10. Final Exam: A statement as to whether the final will be comprehensive or not, and a general idea of the subject matter to be covered.

11. Makeups: A statement of how or if makeups will be allowed for exams, papers, or other assignments.


15. *Emergency Response: A statement about pertinent information about safety issues, which may direct students to classroom-specific information posted on Blackboard.

Course policy statements must be on file in the appropriate departmental/school office.

4.5.1.4. Emergency Response Information

Faculty members must provide students with information about safety-related issues (emergency fire exits, safe locations for severe weather, active shooter, etc.) consistent with information provided by the Provost’s Office and posted on Blackboard.

4.5.1.5. Review Of Graded Work

After an examination prepared by a faculty member or any other assignment that has been graded, the work shall be made available to students so that the students can observe where they have succeeded or failed.

4.5.1.6. Class Records

All faculty members must keep accurate accounts of grades and attendance so that they will have factual information for a fair evaluation of each student. All faculty members must leave with their Department Heads/directors all grade books or a copy of all grade sheets at the time of leaving the employ of the University. In accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), student grades are not to be publicly posted.

4.5.1.7. Student Advisement

Student advisement is the process of assisting students in negotiating the curriculum in order to achieve their educational goals. The process also involves aiding students in thinking through and arriving at educational goals based on an understanding of what higher education is and how it relates to all areas of life.

All faculty members are expected to be knowledgeable of essential aspects of the curriculum and procedures of the University in order to provide accurate and timely advice to students, and should be able to assist in the advisement process through normal contacts with students both in the classroom and in the office. Most faculty members will be assigned individual student advisees for whom they share a particular responsibility for advisement throughout the student's experience at Missouri State University. Some departments may utilize either select faculty or staff for formal academic advising.
In the advisement process, faculty members may not make representations or commitments which are inconsistent with authorized University policies.

4.5.1. 8.  Office Hours

Office hours are times when faculty are available for direct consultation with students who are in their classes and with advisees. Availability for office hours usually implies presence in an office but, following departmental norms and consent of the Department Head, may be satisfied by other means, e.g., electronic consultation. All full-time faculty members must be available for office hours a minimum of five hours each week at times convenient for students. Part-time faculty must also be available for office hours, but the number of office hours may be less based on their teaching assignment; expectations for office hours should be specified in contract letters. The office hours must be posted in a place where students can see the notice and make plans to confer with the teacher. Faculty members are encouraged to accommodate students who cannot appear during the regular office hours because of schedule conflicts. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the appropriate Department Head.

4.5.1. 9.  Access to and Release of Student Academic Records


4.5.2.  Research

4.5.2.1.  Intellectual Integrity and Ethical Conduct

From 3.1.1, intellectual honesty is essential to the conduct of productive Research. Intellectual honesty demands avoidance of fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism.

Faculty members who do funded Research are obligated to meet standards for integrity specified by their sponsoring agencies. Some granting agencies impose standards on the conduct of Research by all faculty members as a condition on the receipt of grant funds by any faculty member. They include standards for ethical treatment of both human and animal subjects. Those faculty benefiting from such funds must, of course, follow such guidelines.

Ranked faculty and Instructors are full-time employees of the University during their contract periods. Faculty consulting engagements may benefit the University, but they must not interfere materially with faculty responsibility. Therefore, faculty members are obligated to report consulting activities to the University. (Refer to also Section 10.)

Finally, the Research of a faculty member may be constrained by codes of professional ethics particular to his or her discipline. Adherence to discipline-specific professional codes is an appropriate subject for peer review of Research performance.

4.5.2.2.  Intellectual Property

Some Teaching and Research outcomes are consequences of faculty effort assisted by University support. They may be commercially valuable. Guidelines for equitably sharing the proceeds of intellectual property between faculty and
the University are referenced in Appendix A.

4.5.3. Service

4.5.3.1. Service Responsibilities

Each full-time faculty member is expected to participate actively in the shared governance structure of the University by serving on departmental, college, and university committees and by assuming an appropriate share of the requisite duties. Service activities also expand opportunities for learning and shape the learning environment.

4.6. Faculty Performance Evaluation Process

4.6.1. General Procedures

All full-time faculty members participate in regularly scheduled performance reviews. For probationary faculty, annual reviews are completed for the purpose of evaluating appropriate progress toward tenure, tenure review, and promotion review, as well as yearly performance review. Tenured faculty participate in an annual performance review, and, as appropriate, promotion reviews. Ideally, each ranked faculty member should be evaluated no more than once annually.

The Provost will publish in the annual Master Calendar a university-wide timetable for all academic personnel decisions. All reviews occur according to this schedule. Faculty members shall submit application and/or review materials for annual review, tenure, promotion, and performance review to the department by the department-specified deadline that is based on the Master Calendar. (Faculty who begin in January will be formally evaluated for the first time in their first full academic year of employment). Each department is expected to have a personnel committee and a published set of personnel guidelines as described in Section 4.8.4. (It is to be understood that all policies and procedures described herein for departments apply to any academic unit that has primary faculty evaluation responsibilities, for example, a school.) Each department is expected to create and use a "paper trail" of annual evaluations, and when appropriate, recommendations, in the tenure/promotion, promotion, and annual review process.

Annual reviews of progress toward tenure, tenure and promotion reviews, as well as annual performance reviews, proceed through a series of formal evaluations and recommendations beginning with the departmental personnel committee (herein referred to as the personnel committee). The personnel committee forwards its evaluation and recommendation to the Department Head. The Department Head forwards his or her evaluation and recommendation along with the department committee evaluation and recommendation to the Dean of the College. The Dean makes a recommendation on reviews of progress toward tenure, required performance evaluations, and sends a list of all required actions with appropriate documentation, to the Provost. For tenure and promotion, the Dean forwards his or her recommendations along with all previous recommendations to the Provost. The Provost makes the final recommendation for tenure and promotion decisions and sends positive recommendations to the President and the Board of Governors.

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.

Throughout the entire process, confidentiality of information must be maintained. Faculty members at every level of decision-making must assume personal responsibility to ensure confidentiality is not violated.

4.6.2. Specific Procedures

Each application for tenure and/or promotion and performance evaluation follows a similar series of steps as described below.

- The faculty member prepares appropriate application / review materials and documentation based on requirements of the Provost and departmental governance documents. For tenure and promotion applications, the assembled documentation will generally be referred to as the candidate’s dossier.

- The documentation (dossier) is submitted to the chair of the personnel committee based on a schedule posted by the Provost and then a series of evaluations commences, going from the personnel committee to the Head, from the Head to the Dean, from the Dean to the Provost, and for positive tenure and/or promotion recommendations, from the Provost to the President and Board of Governors.

- For tenure and/or promotion applications that require letters from external evaluators, the letters will be inserted into the dossier by the Head after the dossier is submitted to the personnel committee. Letters are requested based on guidelines from the Provost and discipline standards. These letters will not be available to the applicant until the process is completed (up to the initial recommendation by the Provost).

- At each step of the evaluation, the evaluating party (e.g., personnel committee, Head) provides a copy of the assessment, along with any recommendations, to the faculty member. The faculty member must undersign the evaluation to acknowledge receipt, but the signature does not imply that the faculty member endorses all that is stated in the evaluation.

- The faculty member may append a response to any evaluation before it is forwarded to the next evaluator. (Alternatively, the response may be delivered to the evaluator within two business days of the faculty member’s receipt of the recommendation.)

- In instances of disagreement between the recommendations at two successive levels (e.g., between the personnel committee and the Head), there should be a good faith effort to resolve differences.

- At each step of evaluation past the personnel committee, a written report of recommendations must be sent to each prior evaluator, e.g., from the Dean to both the Head and personnel committee. The report must provide rationale for any differences from recommendations made at lower levels.

- The Dean may request assistance in evaluations from the College Personnel Committee.

- For tenure and/or promotion applications, the Dean should normally forward to the Provost only the dossier containing key information (as specified by the Provost) but not supporting documentation. Supporting documentation should be forwarded only at the request of the Provost.
• For tenure and/or promotion applications, the Provost will forward positive recommendations to the President and Board of Governors.

• A candidate for tenure and/or promotion may choose to withdraw the application from consideration at any stage of the process.

Variations in the steps outlined above may occur as outlined for specific types of evaluations. For example, for pre-tenure reviews, the review process will normally end at the departmental level.

4.6.3. Annual Reviews for Probationary Faculty

Annual reviews following the procedures outlined in Section 4.6.2 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:

1. that progress toward tenure/promotion is satisfactory

2. that progress toward tenure/promotion is questionable, identifying areas for improvement and providing specific suggestions

3. that progress toward tenure/promotion is unsatisfactory, providing specific rationale

In all cases the committee will provide clear feedback, identifying areas for improvement, making specific suggestions or recommendations regarding continued appointment or non-renewal, and provide appropriate rationale in the event the committee recommends non-renewal.

The evaluation will proceed as described in Section 4.6.2 through the Dean, who will report recommendations to the Provost. The Provost may elect to review any annual evaluation and recommendation.

The schedule of annual appointments is in accordance with the AAUP “Standards for Notice of Non-reappointment.”

• First-year faculty: continuation of appointment to a second year or notified of non-reappointment by March 1 of the first year.

• Second-year faculty: continuation of appointment to a third year or notified of non-reappointment by December 15 of the second year of service.

• Third-year faculty: continuation of appointment to a fourth year or notified of non-reappointment 12 months before expiration of the appointment.

• Fourth-year faculty: continuation of appointment to a fifth year or notified of non-reappointment 12 months before expiration of the appointment.

• Fifth-year faculty: continuation of appointment to a sixth year or notified of non-reappointment 12 months before expiration of the appointment.
Sixth-year faculty: tenured or notified of non-reappointment 12 months before expiration of appointment.

4.6.4. Tenure/Promotion Review (Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor Rank)

4.6.4.1. Year of Application

In most cases, a probationary faculty member must apply for tenure/promotion no later than the sixth year of employment (except when the tenure clock has been temporarily stopped – see Section 3.8.1) to remain employed beyond the seventh year. In cases where the faculty member has negotiated for a shorter probationary period, the final tenure application year is specified in the faculty member's initial letter of employment. Candidates denied tenure by the Provost in the final year for application are not permitted to reapply. 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.

4.6.4.2. 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.
4.6.5. Promotion Review (Promotion from Associate Professor Rank to Professor Rank)

4.6.5.1. 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.

4.6.5.2. 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 by the department head. The process for promotion review follows the steps outlined in Section 4.6.2.

4.6.5.3. Application Process for Promotion for Non Tenure-Track Faculty (Instructor, Clinical Faculty, Research Faculty)

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 process for promotion review follows the steps outlined in Section 4.6.2.

4.6.6. Annual Performance Review

Performance evaluations shall be conducted annually for all full-time faculty (Section 4.6.6.1) and, for per course faculty after completion of each teaching assignment (see Section 4.6.6.2).

The annual evaluation process should foster an open and encouraging environment for faculty performance. Accordingly, faculty evaluations shall observe the highest standards of collegiality, be based on coherent published policy, and administered fairly.

4.6.6.1 Performance Reviews for Full-Time Faculty
The Department Head shall seek the written input of the departmental personnel committee on each faculty member and recommend a composite rating to the Dean of the college in which the department is located. However, in years when there will be no performance-based component to salary adjustments, the full-time faculty of a department may, by majority vote, opt to forgo a review by the departmental personnel committee; in those years, the review process shall start with the Department Head. The Dean shall either endorse or modify the recommended rating. In instances where the Dean modifies the rating, the Dean must provide a compelling rationale for the change in writing to the Department Head, to the departmental personnel committee, and to the affected faculty member.

At least five numerical or categorical ratings are to be used. The ratings are to be designed to recognize both outstanding and unsatisfactory performances as well as those appraised as degrees of good or satisfactory. Each department shall develop a clear set of expectations for satisfactory performance in the categories of Teaching, Research, and Service. (Outreach and Professional Productivity will be evaluated for those faculty for whom these are considered responsibilities.)

At each step of the evaluation process, the faculty member must be informed on the results of the evaluation, including an explanation for each numerical or categorical rating. A faculty member who is dissatisfied with his or her evaluation may append a written response to the evaluation before it is forwarded to the next evaluator.

Each recommendation must also be reported back to prior evaluators, e.g., the Dean must report her/his recommendation back to the Department Head and the Departmental Committee, along with a written explanation for any changes in recommendations.

Each faculty member should have an opportunity to meet directly with the Department Head to discuss his or her (her) annual review as well as to establish goals and support for the next year. These discussions may be incorporated into the workload assignment negotiation (Section 4.6.7).

A faculty member may appeal the performance rating to the College Compensation Committee.

4.6.6.2 Performance Reviews for Per Course Faculty

A performance evaluation for each per course faculty member must be completed after each teaching session (i.e., semester or summer session). The evaluation shall be the responsibility of the Department Head, and should be based on the per course faculty member’s reliability and effectiveness in completing Teaching assignments. Evaluations should be based on meeting contract requirements and on the department’s criteria for Teaching evaluation. Departments must have a plan in place for providing feedback to per course faculty within established timelines.

4.6.6.3 Performance Evaluation Appeals Process

A faculty member who is dissatisfied with his/her performance rating(s) may appeal the rating(s). The faculty member’s request for review, along with any supporting materials, shall be forwarded to the College Personnel Committee.

The faculty member’s request for review and the accompanying recommendation of the College Personnel Committee shall continue to the Dean and if still unresolved, to the Provost. If either the Dean, or the Provost, if necessary, does not concur with the appeal of the faculty member, he/she shall send to the faculty member who is appealing, a written explanation of the reasons for not concurring.
Any faculty member who believes that he or she has been discriminated against for any reason not related to job performance may consult the Office for Institutional Equity and Compliance. In the event a pattern of misapplication of departmental policies in evaluating faculty performance is detected, a faculty member may file a grievance through the Academic Personnel Grievance Process (APGP) process.

4.6.7. Work Assignment Negotiation

Work assignments are negotiated between the faculty member and the Department Head at the time of the annual review. If a change in a work assignment is needed before a review is done, the Department Head will negotiate that change with the faculty member. In making an appropriate assignment, the Department Head will take into consideration the needs of the department, and the professional objectives and recent productivity of the faculty member. The Department Head must make assignments within the parameters set by the University for expected workloads.

4.7. Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment Review

4.7.1 Composition and Responsibilities of the Provost’s Personnel Committee (PPC)

The Provost’s Personnel Committee (PPC) shall consist of the chairs of each of the six College’s Personnel Committees. If an appeal involves a faculty member from the Darr School of Agriculture or the Department of Library Science, the chair of the affected unit’s personnel committee will also serve. In all cases, a PPC member with any conflict of interest must be replaced by an alternate selected by his or her college.

The Provost shall be responsible for convening this committee, which will review promotion, tenure, and reappointment decisions. The PPC shall select a chairperson who shall be responsible for making an annual report to the Faculty Senate during the first fall meeting of its work.

4.7.2. Grounds for a PPC Appeal

Appeals based on denial or granting of promotion, tenure or reappointment shall be filed with the Associate Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, and shall proceed to the Provost's Personnel Committee. No finding of a prima facie case by the Associate Provost of Faculty and Academic Affairs is required. A PPC appeal may be filed to challenge the denial of reappointment, tenure or promotion substantially affected by:

1. failure to use for evaluation of tenure and promotion the appropriate criteria in effect for that faculty member (see Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2), or

2. failure to consider the substantive merits of the applicant's performance and fulfillment of appropriate University expectations, or

3. substantial failure to follow Faculty Handbook procedures, or

4. failure to provide timely notice for non-reappointment of probationary faculty as defined in Section 4.6.3, or

5. arbitrary and capricious failure to evaluate the faculty member in a fair manner and by comparable standards used to evaluate other faculty members being considered for reappointment, tenure or the same
rank promotion, or

6. retaliation for exercising academic freedom of speech or political speech/affiliation

4.7.3. Provost’s Personnel Committee (PPC) Review Process

4.7.3.1. Appeal Related to Reappointment, Tenure, or Promotion

An appeal or claim related to reappointment, granting of tenure or promotion decisions shall be initiated with the Associate Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs and filed in the Faculty Senate Office. Such an appeal may be initiated by a tenured or tenure-track faculty member to challenge denial of reappointment, tenure or promotion. Non-tenure track faculty may challenge denial of promotion, but not reappointment.

4.7.3.2. Burden of Proof

The burden of proof shall be on the party initiating the appeal to demonstrate its case by the preponderance of the evidence.

4.7.3.3. PPC Review


4.7.3.4. Report

Upon completion of its review, the PPC shall prepare a written report divided into findings of fact and recommendations with supporting reasons which shall be presented to the Provost and the faculty member within 5 business days of the conclusion of the hearing. A minority report also may be prepared.

4.7.3.5. Implementation or Appeal of Recommendation

If the Provost agrees with the PPC recommendations, the Provost shall promptly implement the recommendation of the PPC unless the faculty member appeals the results of that recommendation in writing, stating the reasons therefore within 10 business days of the receipt of the PPC Findings and Recommendations. Such appeal shall be filed at the Provost's office. The Provost will include whatever additional information and investigation the Provost determines necessary and promptly forward that information and PPC Findings and Recommendations to the President for Final Determination. If the Provost decides not to adopt the PPC recommendations, the faculty member may appeal that decision in the same manner set forth herein.

4.7.3.6. Unavailability of APGP Appeal Process
If a faculty member reviewed under the PPC process is denied promotion, tenure or reappointment any given year, that faculty member cannot file a separate Academic Personnel Grievance.

4.8. Evaluation-Related Policies

4.8.1. Applicant's Rights

All faculty evaluations are based on university-level criteria and the guidelines and expectations specified in departmental and college documents and any specific contractual agreements that may exist.

Faculty applying for tenure will be evaluated according to their performance in accumulated assignments since employment at MSU unless otherwise negotiated at the time of initial employment. Faculty applying for promotion will be evaluated according to performance in present rank. If credit towards promotion is given for years in prior assignment, corresponding professional activities during those years of credit shall be considered in the promotion review process as long as they are contiguous to present assignment.

4.8.2. Responsibilities for Tenure and Promotion Applications

4.8.2.1. Applicant’s Responsibilities

Each faculty member making application is responsible for assembling evidentiary documentation, for making the case in support of the application, and for submitting materials according to established format and deadlines. The faculty member shall have access to all materials submitted to the head, with the exception to external review letters, which will remain confidential until the initial recommendation by the Provost. Recommendations at each level will be based upon data supplied by the candidate as well as that collected by the department, such as student evaluation results.

4.8.2.2. Responsibilities for External Reviews

For tenure track actions, external reviews, based on criteria provided in departmental guidelines, will be solicited by the Department Head to aid each tenure/promotion or promotion decision. External reviewers will normally be selected from comparable institutions; however, individuals whose expertise make them specifically suitable to serve as reviewers may also be selected with approval of the Dean (see the Provost’s website for specific qualifications). Departments must, in their policy documents, define the role of the personnel committee in this process: the committee’s role may range from formal input on the selection process and approval of the reviewer list to availability for advice and consulting at the request of either the Head or the candidate. Four external reviewers will be identified collaboratively by the faculty member, the Department Head and, to the extent specified in the department’s governance documents, the departmental personnel committee. If the faculty member and Head cannot agree on the list of four reviewers, each shall select two. The list of reviewers will be submitted to the Dean who will certify that the selection process has followed guidelines. Reviewers may then be contacted.

The Department Head is responsible for obtaining a sufficient number of reviews. The Department Head should contact selected reviewers early in the process (ideally during the Spring) to determine if they would be willing to provide reviews; when a timely review appears unlikely, an alternate reviewer should then be identified. The absence of review will not be allowed to prejudice the tenure or promotion candidacy of the faculty member.
4.8.3. Departmental Personnel Committees

Departmental personnel committees serve as the initial evaluating bodies for all faculty evaluations (except as indicated in Section 4.6.6.1). Personnel committees are normally made up of all tenured faculty members in the department with restrictions as noted below. Departmental personnel committees may include non-tenure track faculty for certain evaluations as described in Section 4.8.3.1 below. The personnel committee may designate subcommittees for specific assignments as described in its departmental guidelines.

Normally, the personnel committee should have at least five qualified members. In the event that the department has fewer than five eligible faculty members, see Section 4.8.3.2 below for options. The personnel committee operates as an autonomous faculty body, and therefore the Department Head shall not participate in personnel committee proceedings or make decisions regarding its composition or actions. Tenured faculty members who have administrative assignments that require them to participate in personnel review at a higher level shall not participate in personnel decisions within his or her home department. A faculty member with a potential conflict of interest (usually evaluating a spouse) should not participate in the evaluation process for annual appointment, tenure, or promotion. 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. An exception to this occurs when the applicant is applying for promotion to Distinguished Professor, where faculty at the rank of Professor or above may participate.

The committee selects a chair who is responsible for working with the head, for convening the committee's meetings, for assuring that committee processes are carried out with integrity, and for writing (or delegating the writing of) personnel recommendations based on the deliberations of the committee.

The candidate's credentials and/or application will be presented to the chair of the personnel committee (or of the subcommittee), who will undertake the security of the application dossier to assure appropriate confidentiality. At the time of evaluation for annual review of appropriate progress toward tenure, required performance reviews, promotion or tenure, the personnel committee will have access to the candidate's current vita, other documentation of Research, Teaching, and Service as required by the Provost and/or department, as well as all prior personnel reviews generated by the Dean, Department Head and personnel committee.

If there is a personnel subcommittee, it will present its recommendations to the full personnel committee, whose vote will establish the departmental faculty recommendation for a personnel action. 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, there shall be a good faith effort to resolve these differences. If resolution is not possible, the Department Head must offer in writing compelling reasons for disagreeing with the committee's recommendation before advancing his or her recommendation to the Dean.

4.8.3.1 Non-Tenure Track Faculty on Departmental Personnel Committees

Non-tenure track faculty may not participate in evaluations of tenure-track faculty. However, departments may choose to allow non-tenure track faculty to participate in promotion evaluations of other non-tenure track faculty, provided that the evaluator is at or above the rank sought by the applicant.

4.8.3.2 Options When a Departmental Personnel Committee Has Fewer Than Five Members
Ideally, any committee evaluating a colleague for annual review of appropriate progress toward tenure, required performance reviews, promotion or tenure should have a minimum of five qualified members, but some departments may have insufficient qualified faculty to meet this expectation. Options include:

- Allowing the department to proceed with the evaluation with as few as three qualified faculty from the department.
- Supplementing the departmental committee with faculty from other departments (normally from the same college) who, based on rank, would qualify. The additional faculty should never increase the size of the committee to more than five total. These additional faculty are to be selected by the Dean, based on recommendations by the Head and the faculty member.

The option (or combination of options) selected should be negotiated with and approved by the Dean.

### 4.8.4. College Personnel Committees

All colleges shall have a personnel committee. The College Personnel Committee (CPC) will be comprised of one elected representative from each department of the College. Representatives should normally be selected from a department’s tenured Professors. In some cases (e.g., when there are few faculty at Professor rank in a department), the Dean may permit a department to elect a tenured Associate Professor as its representative. Each College Personnel Committee must also have a representative of non-tenure-track faculty (elected by the College’s non-tenure-track faculty) who will serve on the committee on matters involving non-tenure-track faculty members. The non-tenure track faculty member must recuse himself or herself on any matters dealing with tenure-track faculty. If a department has no tenured faculty, the department may be represented on the College Personnel Committee for purposes of discussing compensation issues. The department will elect one faculty member to represent the department for the discussion of compensation.

If a college committee serves in an advisory capacity only on matters of tenure, promotion, and continuation of appointment, it generally should not be required to supply a written recommendation.

For the role of the College Personnel Committee in compensation, see Section 5.3.

### 4.8.5. Departmental Personnel and Governance Documents

All departments, schools and other academic divisions with faculty evaluation responsibilities must maintain current personnel and governance documents that are fully compliant with the University Faculty Handbook. All recommendations within the review process must adhere to the standards and requirements identified in the departmental documents. Departmental documents minimally must contain the following:

1. Specific guidelines or expectations for tenure, promotion and annual review of appropriate progress toward tenure; the policy must contain a progression of expectations, e.g., minimal expectations for annual appointment are not sufficient for tenure or promotion.
2. Clarification of what the department will recognize as Research and how it may be evaluated.
3. Criteria for “exceptional records of accomplishments: that could lead to early tenure and/or promotion. These criteria must require performance that significantly exceeds the normal expectations for tenure or promotion. Specific examples of exceptional accomplishments should be provided. At a minimum, accomplishments in both Teaching and Research must be exemplary.
4. Departmental personnel committee structure, rules and procedures
5. Required and recommended materials for application dossiers, following formats specified by the Provost;
6. A statement regarding policies for adding materials to the application dossier after the departmental
deadline
7. Generic calendar specifying approximate dates of submission and review for all actions
8. Faculty mentoring policies
9. Policies and procedures for required performance evaluations for tenure track faculty
10. Policies and procedures for evaluating non-tenure track faculty
11. Descriptions of all other self-governance policies and procedures within the department, school or program, including procedures for amending the governance document itself.

The tenure and promotion document of each department shall be reviewed by a departmental committee at least every three years. This review is to ensure that the guidelines appropriately reflect the goals and mission of the department and remain in compliance with the criteria, goals and mission of the University community. The departmental review committee will first forward the reviewed document with or without changes to the departmental faculty for approval. Upon receipt of faculty approval, the document will 1) be forwarded to the Department Head for review; 2) after review of the Department Head forwarded to the Dean for review; 3) and after review of Dean forwarded to the Provost’s Office for review and final approval. A department’s tenure and promotion guidelines are under the purview of the departmental faculty. If compelling reason or explanation is provided (by the Department Head, Dean, or upper administration) to the faculty for modifications, it is the responsibility of the departmental faculty to consider suggested modifications, and for all parties to make a good faith effort to work collaboratively in achieving resolution. Administrators’ recommendations should be based on issues of compliance and clarity.

Specifically, all departmental policies must meet the following requirements:
1. The department's personnel and governance document shall be presented in writing to the candidate at the time of employment. If it is expected that some of these criteria will be met at different points in a faculty member's career, the timetable must also be placed in writing with notification given to the Office of the Provost and Office of Human Resources.
2. The guidelines shall be appropriate to the discipline, achievable, and consistent with university criteria.
3. Promotion to a higher faculty rank requires documentation of sustained performance within rank at the level required by the University. Distinctions between performance expectations for the various ranks must be clearly and specifically stated in writing.
4. Only verifiable job performance indicators are valid considerations for personnel decisions.
5. Departmental guidelines will emphasize performance outcomes, meeting clearly stated goals and objectives and professional achievements. Guidelines shall be specific so that they can be applied consistently within a department.
6. Differential Research guidelines may be applied to faculty members within a department whose professional specialties differ substantially in construction and delivery, as long as they do not disadvantage one group over another. For example, studio artists would generally be held to a different set of performance measures than art historians in the same department.

4.8.6. Documentation

Both the faculty member and the Department Head shall maintain complete documentation for all aspects of the review of that faculty member's promotion, tenure, and annual review of appropriate progress toward tenure. This requirement shall begin at the date of employment.

Documentation shall include, but not be limited to, letters of understanding at the time of hire; applicable departmental guidelines signed by faculty member and Department Head; participation in teaching improvement activities; any recommendations made by departmental personnel committees prior to the final review; previous
annual reviews, required performance reviews, and annual letters from the Department Head; summaries of all teaching evaluations; committee assignments and results; proposals written or grants received; and other documentation of Research activities.

At the time of evaluation for required performance reviews, promotion, tenure, or annual review of appropriate progress toward tenure, the candidate shall submit to the personnel committee a current vita as well as all the documentation that has been maintained up to that time. Additional materials supporting Teaching, Research, and Service activities may also be submitted as required by the department/school/college. The personnel committee shall have access to all information to be used in the decision regarding Teaching, Research, or Service.

4.8.7. Faculty and Department Head Procedural Agreement

Each department shall supply new faculty with a copy of the departmental tenure and promotion guidelines in effect on the date of hire. During the first month of full-time employment, the new faculty shall meet with the Department Head 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 and Department Head 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 probationary period of a faculty member pursuing tenure and for promotion, the faculty member has the right to remain within the domain of the guidelines under which he or she was hired or elect to be evaluated with 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 provided to the faculty member. For applications for promotion to Associate Professor separate from the tenure application, see Section 3.4.1 regarding the departmental policy in effect. For promotion to Professor, see Section 3.4.2 for the departmental policy in effect.

Should the negotiated faculty workload change subsequent to the original agreement, this amendment to the faculty member’s and Department Head's procedural agreement shall be reflected in all future evaluations.