

SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTANCY

FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES (approved 9-18-07)

The School of Accountancy (SOA) is one of six academic units within the College of Business Administration (COBA) at Missouri State University. These evaluation guidelines are consistent with University and COBA guidelines for the evaluation of faculty performance. As one of five business units within COBA, the SOA recognizes its obligations to help achieve COBA's mission. The guidelines found in this document pertain to two classes of faculty in the SOA, tenure-track faculty and full-time non-tenure-track instructors. Primary consideration is given to tenure track faculty, but where expectations differ for non-tenure track instructors such differences are noted.

These guidelines will direct decisions in the SOA regarding faculty performance evaluations for the purpose of annual compensation increases. The initial step in the faculty evaluation process will be the submission of an application by each faculty member in early January of each year. The evaluation period will be the previous calendar year. The application should include the faculty member's narrative assessment of performance in each area of evaluation (teaching, research, and service), including a rating of less than competent, competent, commendable, or exceptional for each area. The self-rating should address the performance factors from the evaluation document that were achieved during the evaluation period and include appropriate documentation.

Organization and Operation of the SOA Faculty Evaluation Committee

1. Five tenured faculty members will compose the SOA Faculty Evaluation Committee with no more than three members from any one rank. Members will serve for two years except that two members from the first election will serve one year only.
2. All eligible faculty members must stand for election and membership will be rotated so that all eligible faculty members will serve a term. After completing a term, a faculty member is not eligible to serve again until all eligible faculty members have been elected to serve.
3. The committee will be elected at large by the ranked, tenured faculty with the election to be held in November each year. Faculty members with spouses on the faculty will serve on the committee but spouses may not serve during the same term.
4. Selection of committee members will be by secret ballot with a separate election for each position. Each position will be elected by simple majority. If no faculty member receives a simple majority of the votes a runoff will be held between the two receiving the most votes.
5. The committee will select its own chairperson at a meeting called by the Director for that purpose.
6. A committee member will be excused during deliberations on the member's application as well as deliberations on the member's spouse's application. The committee will select a temporary chairperson to serve during deliberations on the chairperson.
7. The committee will write a narrative evaluation for each faculty member addressing performance in each of three areas of evaluation. The written evaluation will include a rating of less than competent, competent, commendable, or exceptional for each area.

Faculty Duties and Responsibilities

A faculty member's first responsibility is to *student learning*. Thus, each faculty member is obligated to help create at the University, in COBA, and in SOA, beyond the classroom, an atmosphere of inquisitiveness and professional and community concern. The University, as noted in the Faculty Handbook, and the College, as recorded in the COBA Vision, Mission, and Value Statements, expect faculty members to employ a balanced approach toward carrying out their responsibilities. The University affords much latitude to faculty members in how they structure that balanced approach. SOA and COBA understand and support the University's purposes. However, SOA and COBA have their own goals and objectives that include maintaining AACSB accreditation. Consequently, this document is influenced by SOA's and COBA's unique goals.

The previous paragraph refers to tenured or tenure-track faculty. Expectations differ for non-tenure-track lecturers. The difference relates primarily to research expectations. In most cases, maintenance of professional qualifications, as defined by the AACSB, substitutes for the more exacting research expectations required of tenured or tenure-track faculty, although for some lecturers, research and publication may substitute for maintenance of professional qualification. Other than this difference, expectations are similar. Importantly, expectations for teaching competence do not differ from those of tenured or tenure-track faculty. In addition, full-time lecturers should expect to perform service. The remainder of this document provides specific guidance as to what may constitute meritorious performance by SOA faculty.

Teaching Evaluations

Specific factors for assessing teaching are based on Appendix B of the Final Report of the President's 2006 Compensation Committee and Section 4.2.1.2 of the Faculty Handbook. Additional factors are influenced by AACSB accreditation standards as well as other positions taken by professional bodies with strong interest in business **and accounting** education.

Evaluation factors are categorized into four dimensions recommended by the President's 2006 Compensation Committee. Possible sources of documentation for a faculty member claiming success on a specific factor are provided in parenthesis after the description of the factor. Where the suggested documentation indicates self-reporting and no other specification is provided, a faculty member should use judgment in supplying appropriate and persuasive support for the claim. Factors other than those listed below may be claimed, but as is the case with all factors claimed, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide documentation in support of those claims. Note that it is not necessary for a faculty member to achieve success on all factors to receive a high ranking in teaching. Furthermore, accommodation is made for faculty to rely more heavily on student evaluations, although not exclusively, or to rely more heavily on factors other than student evaluations, although also not exclusively. **It is recommended that copies of policy statements, assignment sheets, a representative sample of tests, projects, or other special assignments, and class grade distributions be included in the documentation.**

Teaching Outcome Dimensions

----- Dimension A -----

Instructional Delivery Skills: This dimension is “defined as those human interactive skills and characteristics which 1) make for clear communication of information, concepts, and attitudes, and 2) promote or facilitate learning by creating an appropriate effective learning environment.” In general, this is a student-reaction measure that can be measured appropriately through student evaluation items. The following factors relate to instructional delivery skills.

1. Students understand course objectives (student evaluations; self-reporting which may include particular questions on a test)
2. Is well prepared to teach class sessions (student evaluations; self-reporting)
3. Generally keeps to the subject matter as noted in syllabi and assignment schedules; deviations are *generally* attempts to make a point regarding the subject matter (student evaluations)
4. Works well with students who seek help at his or her office or **via e-mail when appropriate** (student evaluations)
5. Shows enthusiasm and/or professional interest in the subject (student evaluations)
6. Students learned the material covered in the course (self-reporting; student comments)
7. Students developed skills appropriate for the course level but which are not specifically part of the course material, e.g., verbal and/or written communication skills, or critical thinking skills in higher level courses (self-reporting; students comments)
8. Directs independent readings or independent student research projects; “note: directing these projects may be claimed for teaching evaluation; if the project is turned into a publication or presentation, *on which the student is a co-author*, the publication or presentation may be claimed also for research and scholarly productivity evaluation purposes.” (self-reporting; student attestation; administrator assessment)
9. Attends meetings, seminars or conferences or takes courses to improve course delivery skills (self-reporting)
10. Receives honors, awards or recognition for teaching effectiveness (self-reporting)

----- Dimension B -----

Instructional Design Skills: “This dimension is defined as those technical skills in 1) designing, sequencing, and presenting experiences which induce student learning, and 2) designing, developing, and implementing tools and procedures for assessing student learning outcomes.” Instructional design skills generally are assessed through a combination of self reporting and peer and administrator assessment. Generally, students are not capable of assessing a faculty member’s instructional design skills. The following factors relate to instructional design skills.

11. Courses taught were generally well-organized (self-reporting, peer assessment, administrator assessment)
12. If course content is determined by a departmental/school committee, the faculty member follows the content specifications established by the SOA (self-reporting; peer assessment; administrator assessment)
13. If course content is not determined by a SOA committee, content of course is deemed appropriate (self-reporting; administrator assessment)
14. Course content compares favorably in comprehensiveness, depth, uniqueness or rigor with the course content of like courses found in peer institutions (self-reporting; peer assessment)
15. Sequencing of the course material in general followed an understandable sequence (self-reporting, peer evaluation)
16. Courses taught covered most if not all of the material indicated by the professor that would be covered (self-reporting, student comments)
17. Examinations follow the content of the course coverage (self-reporting; peer assessment)

18. Accepts fair share of new preparations or difficult teaching assignments, including, but not limited to, high student-volume classes, evening classes and above average assignment of graduate level classes (self-reporting; administrator assessment)
19. Works well with colleagues in multiple-section classes (peer evaluation, self-reporting)
20. Makes effective use of instructional technology (self-reporting; student comments)
21. Develops new material or innovative teaching techniques, unrelated to instructional technology (self-reporting; student comments)
22. If appropriate for the course, students are required to perform written or oral communication at an appropriate level (self-reporting)
23. If appropriate for the course, students are required or encouraged to work in groups at an appropriate level (self-reporting)
24. If appropriate for the course, content includes material or requirements that help develop the students' abilities to think critically and perform other higher cognitive skills at an appropriate level (self-reporting)
25. Course content includes parameters or content specifications recommended by professional organizations of the discipline (self-reporting)
26. Integrates into the course other courses in the discipline or courses outside the discipline that effectively demonstrates the association between the course being taught by the instructor and these other courses and disciplines (self-reporting; student comments)
27. Accepts more than fair share of new preparations or difficult teaching assignments, including, but not limited to, high student-volume classes, evening classes and above average assignment of graduate level classes (self-reporting; administrator assessment)
28. Establishes and enforces high standards of achievement for students and delivers a generally rigorous course appropriate for the level (self-reporting, peer evaluation, administrator evaluation)
29. Includes difficult and/or newly developed issues that are generally not addressed in the assigned textbook
30. Course includes a service-learning component (self-reporting)
31. Course includes attention to the relationship of course content to public affairs (self-reporting)
32. Course made a significant impression on students' awareness of public affairs issues (self-reporting; student comments)
33. Attends meetings, seminars or conferences or takes courses to improve course design skills (self-reporting)

----- **Dimension C** -----

Content Expertise: This “dimension is defined as that body of skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced education, training, and /or experience.” Students are not generally competent to assess this dimension. Student evaluation forms should not include these types of questions with the exception that students are competent to report the degree to which the faculty member appears to be knowledgeable in the subject matter being taught. The primary assessment of this dimension should be through peer (MSU or other like or higher-level University) and SOA Director review. The following factors relate to content expertise.

34. Possesses a requisite, basic knowledge of the subject matter taught in the course (self-reporting, peer assessment, administrator assessment)
35. Possesses and maintains in-depth knowledge of the subject matter taught in the courses (self-reporting, peer assessment, administrator assessment)
36. Attends meetings, seminars or conferences or takes courses that address difficult or newly developing issues appropriate for inclusion into course content (self-reporting)

----- **Dimension D** -----

Course Management: This dimension “is defined as those bureaucratic skills in operating and managing a course including, but not limited to, timely grading of examinations, timely completion of drop/add and incomplete grade forms, maintaining published office hours, arranging for and coordinating guest lecturers, and generally making arrangements for facilities and resources required in the teaching of a course.” This can be assessed through items on student evaluations and by the department head or school director. The following factors relate to course management.

37. Course policy statement specifics adhere to the requirements of the University for all course policy statements (self-reporting; administrator review)
38. Meets classes regularly (student evaluation)
39. Meets classes generally on time (student evaluation)
40. Schedules and keeps required office hours and **timely responds to e-mails from students and others** (self-reporting, peer assessment, administrator assessment)
41. Complies in a timely manner with reporting requirements of and other reasonable requests from the University, COBA, and SOA regarding teaching-related data, e.g., attendance, grades (midterm and final), and assessment data (administrator review)
42. Except for rare circumstances, final examinations (or other meaningful course termination activities) are given at the time and place established by the University (self-reporting; administrator review)
43. Major examinations follow generally the time plan found in the course policy statement (self-reporting; student evaluations)
44. Provides adequate time for reviewing test items during class sessions and/or in his or her office (self-reporting; peer assessment, student comments)
45. Feedback on assignments submitted by students was provided in a timely manner (student evaluations)
46. Major papers or projects taken up were returned in a timely manner (student evaluations)
47. Periodic tests were returned in a timely manner (student evaluations)

Determination of Teaching Performance Levels

Faculty will be ranked in one of five levels which correspond to the rating scales recommended by the President's Compensation Committee. Level 5 (Exceptional) is the highest level achievable by a faculty member, while level 1 (Unsatisfactory) is the lowest level. The SOA Merit Committee will evaluate each applicant's teaching file and classify all applicants in accordance with the recommendations of the MSU Compensation Committee. The following Level descriptions are illustrative, representing a minimum threshold for consideration of that Level, but not an absolute guarantee.

Level 1: Unsatisfactory. Performance is below Competent for two years in a row. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and immediate improvement is required. See Level 3 for a description of Competent performance.

Level 2: Development Needed. Performance has fallen below Competent. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and improvement is required. See Level 3 for a description of Competent performance.

Level 3: Competent: Performance is consistently at expected levels. Meets job requirements. This level requires achievement of:

1. the first five factors of Dimension A: Instructional Delivery Skills, and
2. the first eight factors of Dimension B: Instructional Design Skills, and
3. the first factor of Dimension C: Content Expertise, and
4. the first six factors of Dimension D: Course Management.

Level 4: Commendable: Performance frequently exceeds Competent. A high degree of proficiency is shown in certain aspects of performance. Achievement of this level is based on both quantity of factors achieved and the quality of performance on those factors. This level requires achievement of:

1. all factors required to be ranked Level 3: Competent, and
2. a selection of additional factors that indicate a significantly higher level of performance than Competent.

Level 5: Exceptional: Performance consistently exceeds Competent. A high degree of proficiency is shown in most aspects of performance. Achievement of this level also is based on both quantity of factors achieved and the quality of performance on those factors. This level requires achievement of:

1. all factors required to be ranked Level 3: Competent, and
2. a selection of additional factors that indicate an exceptionally high level of performance, clearly above Commendable.

Note: Student Assessed Factors

Achievement of an individual factor assessed via the student evaluation instrument can be demonstrated by a minimum item average score on that factor of 3.5 for Level 3 (Competent) and 4.0 for both Level 4 (Commendable) and Level 5 (Exceptional). Alternately, achievement of all factors measured via the student evaluation instrument can be demonstrated by an overall or composite minimum average score across all factors equal to 3.75 for Level 3 (Competent) and 4.20 for both Level 4 (Commendable) and Level 5 (Exceptional).

Note: Assessment of Performance Level

The determination of performance level in teaching is a subjective evaluation made by considering all factors a faculty member claims to have achieved. The number of factors claimed and the level of proficiency demonstrated are both important in this evaluation. Hence, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to substantiate any claims of achievement and proficiency.

Research/Scholarly Productivity Evaluation

Scholarly activities take many and varied forms. Objective and fair evaluation of an individual's research and scholarly activities requires consideration of the quality, quantity, and nature of outlets for dissemination of research. Research may involve four different modes of scholarship: scholarship of discovery (original research), scholarship of integration (review and integration of prior research), scholarship of application (application of current knowledge and innovations to important practices), and scholarship of teaching (involving students in research and the process of inquiry and discovery). The Compensation Committee left to the Department/School and College exact dimensions for research evaluation. Section 4.2.2.2 of the Faculty Handbook offers additional overall criteria for evaluating research regardless of the category of scholarship involved. These overall criteria are incorporated into SOA guidelines. In addition, the SOA is motivated by AACSB accreditation requirements, and as a consequence, the School requires that all tenure-track faculty members engage in some mode of scholarship and publish in acceptable outlets, primarily peer-reviewed journals. Such research should expand knowledge and/or demonstrate growth in one or more area of expertise. All categories or modes of scholarship are acceptable.

Evaluation of faculty research performance follows the general guidelines of the University. Within those guidelines, however, SOA believes that fair evaluation must recognize that publication in some outlets brings more prestige to SOA and COBA and that some kinds of research take longer to complete. In that regard, the COBA Dean has established a Research Award, consisting of money and an automatic Level 5 rating for two years, for an extremely high quality journal article. SOA Faculty who believe they have published in such a journal, can apply for the Award, subject to concurrence by the SOA Merit Committee, the SOA Director, and the COBA Dean. On the other hand, faculty members should recognize that MSU does not offer a doctoral program in business or accounting and that the scholarship of integration and the scholarship of application in general are more appropriate to the SOA: and COBA's mission than some forms of the scholarship of discovery. Although the SOA does not wish to discourage the scholarship of discovery, faculty members should be aware that in general, most forms of the scholarship of discovery require more time to complete than most forms of the scholarship of application or integration, and that any additional credit given for the scholarship of discovery relative to that given for the scholarship of application or integration may not fully reflect the time differential. Outcomes from research and scholarly activity follow.

Research/Scholarly Productivity Outcome Groups

----- Outcome Group A -----

1. Submits a paper to and has it sent out for review by a journal which satisfies the requirements of Outcome Group B or C
2. Has a paper accepted for presentation at a regional, national or international meeting
3. Has a paper published in the proceedings of a professional meeting
4. Submits a research proposal for University funding
5. Submits a grant proposal for external funding in an amount equal to or greater than \$25,000 and for which there is a reasonable expectation of inspiring one or more publishable journal articles
6. Performs significant research for textbook development
7. Has an article reprinted that has been previously published in a peer-reviewed journal

----- Outcome Group B -----

8. Has an article, case or other material published or unconditionally accepted for publication in a journal of respectable quality with a reasonable review process.* (Can be claimed when accepted or when published but not both)
9. Receives external funding in an amount equal to or greater than \$25,000 but less than \$150,000 for grant proposals which have reasonable expectations of inspiring one or more publishable journal articles
10. Has contributed a chapter or other significant work to a college textbook
11. Has a college textbook published in a second or higher edition
12. Has a book published, other than a college textbook, related to an appropriate business discipline

----- Outcome Group C -----

13. Has an article, case or other material published or unconditionally accepted for publication in a high-level academic journal appropriate for the faculty member's discipline** (Can be claimed when accepted or when published but not both)
14. Receives external funding in an amount equal to or greater than \$150,000 for grant proposals which have reasonable expectations of stimulating one or more publishable journal articles
15. Has a college textbook published in the first edition
16. Receives national recognition for particular research or publications

* *Cabell's provides documentation of review processes and surrogate measures of quality, e.g., review process, acceptance rates and readership, for a large number of journals. If a journal is not listed in Cabell's, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide evidence of the review process and quality.*

** *The specific determination of what constitutes a high-level academic journal appropriate for the faculty member's discipline is left to the department/school. The intent, is that the number of journals considered high-level in any one discipline will be small, and therefore, a publication in one of these journals will be perceived as an exceptional accomplishment.*

Determination of Research/Scholarly Productivity Performance Levels

Faculty will be ranked in one of five levels which correspond to the rating scales recommended by the President's Compensation Committee. Level 5 (Exceptional) is the highest level achievable by a faculty member, while level 1 (Unsatisfactory) is the lowest level. The SOA Merit Committee will evaluate each applicant's research file and classify all applicants in accordance with the recommendations of the MSU Compensation Committee. The following Level descriptions are illustrative, representing a minimum threshold for consideration of that Level, but not an absolute guarantee.

Level 1: Unsatisfactory. Performance is below Competent for two years in a row. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and immediate improvement is required. See Level 3 for a description of Competent performance.

Level 2: Development Needed. Performance has fallen below Competent. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and improvement is required. See Level 3 for a description of Competent performance.

Level 3: Competent: Performance is consistently at expected levels. Meets job requirements. This level requires

1. On an annual basis achievement of at least one outcome from Outcome Group A, and
2. On a biennial basis achievement of one outcome from Outcome Group B.

Level 4: Commendable: Performance frequently exceeds Competent levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in certain aspects of performance. This level requires

1. On an annual basis achievement of at least one outcome from Outcome Group A, and
2. On a biennial basis achievement of two outcomes from Outcome Group B.

Level 5: Exceptional: Performance consistently exceeds Competent levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in most aspects of performance. This level requires

1. On an annual basis achievement of at least one outcome from Outcome Group A, and
2. On a biennial basis achievement of either
 - a. at least three outcomes from Outcome Group B, or
 - b. at least one outcome from Outcome Group C.

Service Evaluation

Service evaluation is based on the degree of the faculty member's contribution to his or her Department/School, College, University, profession, and community. Many factors go into successful service activities. Representative factors that are considered in evaluating service activities follow. Note, however, the list is not intended to be exhaustive. **It is recommended that a service log be maintained and submitted with the merit application.**

Service Outcome Groups

----- Outcome Group A -----

1. Generally cooperates with reasonable requests from the University, COBA and SOA regarding filling out reports and participating in meetings or other activities that are requested of all University, COBA or SOA faculty members, e.g., annual performance reports, faculty meetings, and commencement ceremonies.
2. Maintains active membership in at least one professional organization related to the faculty member's discipline.

----- Outcome Group B -----

3. Serves on a committee of the University, COBA, or SOA.
4. Serves as a reviewer of papers, a discussant, or a session chair for a regional, national, or international meeting of a professional organization.
5. Serves on a board, as an officer, or other position in local professional or civic organization.
6. Performs other acceptable service, including service of a public affairs nature, requiring a comparable level of time and effort as the other activities in this group.

----- Outcome Group C -----

7. Serves as chair of a University, COBA or SOA committee.
8. Serves as the SOA Senator in the MSU Faculty Senate.
9. Serves as a track chair for a regional, national, or international meeting of a professional organization.
10. Serves on the editorial review board of a scholarly or professional journal.
11. Performs other acceptable service, including service of a public affairs nature, requiring a comparable level of time and effort as the other activities in this group.

----- Outcome Group D -----

12. Serves as the immediate past Chair of the MSU Faculty Senate.
13. Serves as a regional officer of a professional organization related the faculty member's area of business expertise that brings prestige to the SOA and which requires of the faculty member much more time than serving as the chair of a University, COBA or SOA committee.
14. Serves on a civic board or comparable post at the state or national level that brings prestige to the SOA, to COBA, or to the University and which requires of the faculty member much more time than serving as the chair of a University, COBA or SOA committee.
15. Performs other acceptable service, including service of a public affairs nature, requiring a comparable level of time and effort as the other activities in this group.

----- **Outcome Group E** -----

16. Serves as the Chair or Chair Elect of the MSU Faculty Senate.
17. Serves as the faculty advisor or co-advisor to a key business student professional organization or other similarly *highly active* student organization, preferably with national ties, that brings prestige to the University, COBA, or SOA and which requires of the faculty member an enormous amount of time.
18. Serves as a national or international officer of a professional organization related the faculty member's area of business expertise that brings prestige to SOA and which requires of the faculty member significantly more time than serving as the chair of a University, COBA or SOA committee.
19. Serves as the editor of a scholarly or professional journal.
20. Performs other acceptable service, including service of a public affairs nature, requiring a comparable level of time and effort as the other activities in this group.

Determination of Service Performance Levels

Faculty will be ranked in one of five levels which correspond to the rating scales recommended by the President's Compensation Committee. Level 5 (Exceptional) is the highest level achievable by a faculty member, while level 1 (Unsatisfactory) is the lowest level. The SOA Merit Committee will evaluate each applicant's service file and classify all applicants in accordance with the recommendations of the MSU Compensation Committee. The following Level descriptions are illustrative, representing a minimum threshold for consideration of that Level, but not an absolute guarantee.

Level 1: Unsatisfactory. Performance is consistently, defined as two years in a row, below acceptable levels. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and immediate improvement is required. See Level 3 for a description of Competent performance.

Level 2: Development Needed. Performance has fallen below Competent. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and improvement is required. See Level 3 for a description of Competent performance.

Level 3: Competent: Performance is consistently at expected levels. Meets job requirements. This level requires on an annual basis:

1. Achievement of all outcomes from Outcome Group A, and
2. Achievement of one of either
 - a. at least two outcomes from Outcome Group B, or
 - b. at least one outcome from Outcome Group C.

Level 4: Commendable: Performance/results frequently exceed competent levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in certain aspects of performance. This level requires on an annual basis:

1. Achievement of all outcomes from Outcome Group A, and
2. Achievement of one of either
 - a. at least two outcomes from Outcome Group B and one outcome from Outcome Group C, or
 - b. at least one outcome from Outcome Group B and one outcome from Outcome Group D, or
 - c. an equivalent combination of outcomes from Outcome Groups B-D.

Level 5: Exceptional: Performance/results consistently exceed competent levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in most aspects of performance. This level requires on an annual basis:

1. Achievement of all outcomes from Outcome Group A, and
2. Achievement of one of either
 - a. at least one outcome from Outcome Group B and at least one outcome from Outcome Group E, or
 - b. an equivalent combination of outcomes from Outcome Groups B-E.