Computer Information Systems (CIS) Department
Performance/Merit Evaluation Guidelines

These guidelines are designed to outline both the process and principles for conducting performance/merit evaluations within the CIS Department. The CIS Department agrees to utilize a single performance/merit process to satisfy the requirement of both the annual performance and merit evaluation. In September of each year, the tenured CIS faculty will review this document. Any changes or recommendations will be presented to the voting tenured faculty for approval. The CIS Department agrees to be in compliance with the latest edition of both the University Faculty Handbook and College of Business Administration (COBA) guidelines, particularly those sections, rules and procedures dealing with the awarding of merit compensation, in the implementation of these guidelines. In the event that the CIS Merit Guidelines are inconsistent with the Faculty Handbook and/or COBA guidelines, these two documents will take precedence over these departmental guidelines.

The CIS Personnel Committee will rely on these guidelines in developing performance/merit ratings for all full-time renewable instructors, tenure-track probationary faculty and tenured faculty. Performance evaluations will be conducted annually and based on performance during the previous calendar year in areas of teaching and service and the previous two years in research.

The performance/merit evaluation should not be confused with other equally important evaluations related to reappointment, tenure and promotion.   Although the guidelines for performance/merit will be similar to those for reappointment, tenure and promotion, there is a clear distinction in the purpose, process and outcomes associated with these evaluations.   While performance/merit evaluations provide some indication of progress by probationary faculty and/or those seeking promotions, it is important to note that independent evaluations for reappointment, tenure and promotion will be conducted. Therefore, it should be understood that performance/merit evaluations may not be sufficient for tenure and promotion.

CIS Department Personnel Committee

Selection
The CIS Department Personnel Committee consists of all tenured faculty members in the department.   A subcommittee of the Personnel Committee known as the CIS Merit Committee will be designated for the purpose of making merit decisions. CIS Merit Committee members will be elected by ranked members of the department by secret ballot. Elections will be held during the Fall Semester.   To provide consistency from year-to-year, members will serve staggered three-year terms. Following adoption of these guidelines, the Department will elect one tenured faculty member for a one (1) year term, another tenured faculty member for a two (2) year term and a third tenured faculty member for a three (3) year term.   Members may serve consecutive terms; however, no member will serve more than two consecutive three (3) year terms. After a lapse of one (1) year, former committee members may be re-elected.

Responsibility

The CIS Merit Committee will select its own chairperson. In addition, the Committee will be responsible for conducting the annual review of these guidelines and making recommendations to the faculty for changes. This committee will create a form/template for faculty to utilize in submitting annual performance/merit reports. The Committee will be responsible for receiving and reviewing individual reports. Initially, each committee member will independently review and rank each applicant in all three areas (teaching, research and service). Next, the Committee will meet to review applicants. The starting point for Committee deliberations will be a ranking based on the average of the individual Committee Member rankings. Taking into consideration both the recommended rating distribution (by area) and comparable performance, the Committee will assign ratings. An underlying principle in these deliberations, which must be conducted face-to-face, will be the expectation that comparable performance results in equal ratings. Once a consensus is reached regarding ratings, the Committee shall prepare a narrative evaluation for each applicant. In the event that the rating distribution in any of the three areas (teaching, research and service) is substantially different than the recommended 15% -5's, 35% - 4's and 50% - 3's distribution the Committee shall prepare an explanation for the Department Head and Dean. The Committee recommendations, ratings and narratives, and explanation of ratings distribution (if needed) will be forwarded to the Department Head.

Faculty will be assigned one of five ratings which correspond to the rating scales recommended by the President's Compensation Committee:

> Rating 5 – Exceptional
> Rating 4 – Commendable
> Rating 3 – Competent   **(viewed as "Expected" by the CIS Department!)**
> Rating 2 -- Development Needed
> Rating 1 -- Unsatisfactory

Performance/Merit Application & Evaluation Process

On an annual basis, faculty will be expected to specify the weight (percentage) each category (teaching, research and service) will have in their overall or composite performance/merit rating. Weights will be discussed with the Department Head in advance and approved by the Department Head during the annual review (January/February) for the coming year. Subject to approval by the Department Head and Dean, weights may be renegotiated if changes in a faculty assignment warrant a change. During the review the Department Head discusses with each faculty member the expectations of weights on teaching, research and service for the coming year. A form (see attached) specifying approved weights will be kept on file in the CIS Office.

Individual performance weights approved should reflect the roles of individual faculty in fulfilling departmental needs and should be consistent with University and COBA – specific parameters that have been adopted.

While tenured faculty have the option of bi-annual review (Faculty Handbook 4.6), for purposes of merit, all faculty must participate in annual reviews. In the absence of extraordinary extenuating circumstances faculty failing to submit the requisite annual report by the designated deadline (Unless specified otherwise by the Provost, this will be 5 p.m. on the first day of the second week of Spring Semester classes) will automatically receive ratings of 1 in all three areas.

Full-time faculty will be expected to submit an annual report in the form specified by the Merit Committee. The departmental secretary will collect these forms on behalf of the Merit Committee, make a copy for each committee member and retain the original for the Department Head. Once submitted, annual reports will be considered final. Annual reports whose format is inconsistent and/or the content insufficient or incomplete can not be revised and are likely to adversely impact ranking/ratings.

As outlined above, the Merit Committee members will initially individually review the performance/merit reports. Next, the Merit Committee will hold one or more meetings to review the performance/merit reports for the purpose of arriving at rankings, assigning ratings, and drafting narrative evaluations. In select cases, the Merit Committee may find it necessary to request additional information to clarify or substantiate reported items. Once the Merit Committee concludes its deliberations, recommendations (ratings, narrative evaluations, and if necessary justification for rating distributions) will be forwarded to the CIS Department Head. Recognizing that annual reviews are personnel matters, neither the deliberations nor outcomes beyond individual ratings and narrative evaluations will be disclosed by the Merit Committee. To guide faculty in improving performance in subsequent years, the Merit Committee will be expected to provide general feedback on the level of performance associated with Exceptional (5) and Commendable (4) ratings for that evaluation cycle.

The CIS Department Head will review faculty annual reports and the Merit Committee recommendations. If necessary, the CIS Department Head will meet with the Committee to discuss the recommendations. The CIS Department Head will then prepare a narrative review and composite performance rating that reflects both performance and percentage weights for each of the three categories (teaching, research and service). As noted above, these weights will be determined at the start of each year. The CIS Department Head evaluations, consisting of narrative reviews and composite performance ratings, will then be forwarded to the Dean on or before the date specified in the compensation calendar. In the event that the composite rating distribution substantially deviates from the recommended 15% - 5's, 35% - 4's and 50% - 3's distribution the Department Head will also forward the Merit Committee's rationale for its distribution.

Prior to, or concurrent with, forwarding evaluations to the Dean, the CIS Department Head will provide the following to each faculty member:

1) A copy of the Personnel Committee's recommendation, narrative review and ratings;
2) A copy of the Department Head's recommendation to the Dean, narrative review and composite rating; and
3) A brief written rationale if the Department Head's ratings on any of the three performance dimensions differs from that submitted by the Personnel Committee.

If item 3 above is applicable, the Department Head shall also forward a copy of the rationale to the Personnel Committee.

As this evaluation also serves as the annual performance review, the Department Head will be expected to provide a narrative review to each faculty member addressing strengths and weaknesses, opportunities for improvement, expectations for the following period, etc.

Evaluation Guidelines

A faculty member's first responsibility is to student learning. Thus, each faculty member is obligated to create at the University, in the College, and in the Department/School, as well as beyond the classroom, an atmosphere of inquisitiveness and professional and community concern. The University, as noted in Section 3.1 of the current 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, COBA and the CIS Department afford much latitude to faculty members in how they structure that balanced approach. The CIS Department supports and encourages a wide range of performance related activities in the areas of teaching, research and service as this diversity collectively addresses the needs of the University, COBA, including AACSB accreditation requirements, and the CIS Department.

The CIS Department recognizes that some activities overlap more than one of the traditional evaluation categories of teaching, research and service. However, for the purpose of the performance/merit evaluation faculty members will be expected to record a given activity in a single area.   (For example: a textbook can count under research or teaching, but not both).

Rather than attempt to prescribe specific criterion for achieving a particular level of performance in teaching, research and service, which would necessitate ongoing annual adjustments to approximate the recommended distribution, the CIS Department will rely on the judgment of its Merit Committee to first rank and next rate faculty based on their body of work during the reporting period. This approach is in the spirit of a "performance based" merit system and avoids creating false expectations based on minimum criterion. While the Merit Committee will strive for rating distributions approximating the recommended 15% - 5's, 35% - 4's and 50% - 3's in each area (teaching, research and service), in the absence of discernable differences in performance, they will err on the side of fairness and assign equal ratings for comparable performance.

To assist the Personnel Committee in assessing individual performance and arriving at equitable evaluations (i.e., ratings), the CIS Department has developed and approved general evaluation guidelines which specify, among other things, common factors for assessing/documenting performance, "relative" importance or value of said performance/evidence, and minimum expectations for achievement of a "Competent" (3) rating.   However, recognizing that exceptions are to be expected these guidelines are deemed exactly that "guidelines." The Personnel Committee is charged with using their best professional judgment in the evaluation process.

CIS Evaluation Guidelines

This section provides general evaluation guidelines to direct the CIS Merit Committee in completion of its duties. While some guidance is offered for assessing the "relative" importance or value of select performance/evidence, the CIS Merit Committee has the ability to make exceptions where warranted.   Minimum expectations for achieving "Competent" (3) are also described to assist the Committee in identifying faculty whose performance falls short of department expectations. In the event that CIS faculty receives an "Unsatisfactory" (1) or

"Development Needed" (2) rating, the CIS Department Head will be expected to develop a Performance Improvement Plan.

Teaching Evaluations

Consistent with the current Faculty Handbook, Section 4.2.1.2 (Goals and Criteria for Evaluating Teaching) and Section 4.2.1.3 (Documenting Teaching Effectiveness), and COBA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (Revised Sept 4, 2007), the CIS Merit Committee will be expected to consider numerous factors when evaluating teaching effectiveness for merit. These factors include, but are not limited to those listed below.

1. **COURSE DYNAMICS:** Number of courses taught, required v. elective, number of students enrolled, number of preparations/courses per semester, new course preparation, graduate v. undergraduate courses, traditional in person v. online v. distance learning format, Springfield campus v. Off-Campus, etc.

2. **METHODS USED**: Projects and activities used to foster learning and critical thinking skills; develop reasoning and application abilities; use of activities to foster independent and cooperative learning; fostering practical application of material; integration of professional readings; extent of writing assignments; timeliness and adequacy of feedback; quality of interaction with students; appropriateness of testing methods, grade distribution, course rigor and preparation indicators.

3. **ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE TEACHING:** Participation in workshops, seminars, conferences, educational trips; pedagogical reading or research; integration of new teaching methods; attendance at continuing education seminars; earning of professional or industry certifications.

4. **ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE CURRICULUM:** Revision of existing courses; development of new courses; preparation of materials to integrate technology, software or computer-based research into courses; grants for innovate teaching.

5. **TEACHING-RELATED SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES:** Publication of textbooks; development of teaching-related materials such as handbooks, and handouts; presentation or publication of pedagogical papers, cases or articles. **[Note: Per earlier reference, if publication of a textbook is documented under teaching, it can not be listed under research.]**

6. **SERVICE OR PUBLIC AFFAIRS RELATED-TEACHING ACTIVITIES:** Guest lecturer; mentor for other faculty members; collaboration to minimize barriers to learning; integration of public affairs theme into the curriculum, such as participation in distance learning, IDS 100, GEP 397, development or coordination of service learning opportunities for students.

7. **ADVISING OF STUDENTS:** Career or academic advisement of students; number of advisees; master's thesis advisor or master's level independent study; availability and assistance to students.

8. **STUDENT EVALUATIONS:** Summary scores from college standard course evaluation form (course rating, instructor ratings, interest in course, norms); written feedback from current and former students concerning teaching effectiveness. Tricotomy (student interest in topic), students' interaction with faculty member, maintaining an environment conducive to learning, whether the course is challenging, clarity of delivery factors, timely feedback should be considered.

9. **PEER EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING METHODS AND MATERIALS:** Examination of course syllabi, examinations, handouts, readings, student's assignments and feedback; assessment of classroom presentations skills, teaching methods and preparation.

10. **TEACHING AWARDS:** Faculty Recognition Award; teaching-related honors; recognition by student or professional organizations.

11. **OTHER:** Faculty wishing to document teaching-related performance that does not clearly fall into one or more of the categories above have the option of documenting such performance under this heading.

Documentation for Items #1 Course Dynamics and #8 Student Evaluation will be documented via a template/table with the expectation that faculty provide all relevant information. Documentation for the remaining categories will consist primarily of brief descriptions (bullet points). Faculty should only include items for which there is suitable evidence to support the claim.

To objectively and fairly evaluate an individual's teaching performance requires consideration of several important facets of teaching and learning constraints and opportunities. Student evaluations are useful indicators of teaching effectiveness, but there is evidence that extraneous factors can influence these ratings. Accordingly, **student evaluations** as a factor in the evaluation of teaching performance **shall not be given a weight that is more than 50% of all the factors used for the evaluation of teaching performance for merit.** Accordingly, student evaluations (Item 8 above) shall be used in combination with Items 1-7 and 9-11 described above. This multidimensional approach, relying on instructor inputs and student outputs, is thus consistent with Faculty Handbook 4.2.1.3, Documenting Teaching Effectiveness).

Minimum Expectations for Achieving "Competent"
Minimally CIS faculty must demonstrate/document the following to receive a rating of "Competent" (3) in Teaching:

1) Course Evaluations – Overall or composite average score for all courses greater than 3.50*.
2) Demonstrated Activities to Improve Teaching
3) Demonstrated use of Innovative Methods and/or Activities to Improve Curriculum

* Or equivalent for courses using alternative evaluation scales (e.g., On-line, MS CIS).

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. However, 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 COBA guidelines. In addition, the College is motivated by AACSB accreditation requirements, and as a consequence, the College requires that all 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 areas 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, COBA believes that fair evaluation must recognize that publication in some outlets brings more prestige to COBA and that some kinds of research take longer to complete. 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 COBA's mission than some forms of the scholarship of discovery. Although COBA 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 fully reflect the time differential.

The CIS Merit Committee will be expected to consider numerous factors when evaluating research/scholarly effectiveness for merit. These factors include, but are not limited to those listed below.

1. Unconditional acceptance or publication of a paper in one of the following "Premier IS/IT or business journals*
   a. MISQ
   b. ISR
   c. Communications of ACM
   d. Journal of MIS
   e. Decision Sciences

2. Unconditional acceptance or publication of a paper in other acceptable refereed journals**
3. Publication of a first edition IS/IT related college textbook
4. Publication of IS/IT related scholarly book
5. Publication of 2nd- or higher edition IS/IT related college textbook

6. Publication of chapter or other significant work in a college textbook
7. Unconditional acceptance or publication of a reprinted paper (from refereed journal)
8. Recipient of external funding greater than $25,000 for research related grant proposal***
9. Unconditional acceptance or publication of a paper in the proceedings of a regional, national or international professional meeting
10. Invited presentations
11. Unconditional acceptance or presentation of a paper at a regional, national or international professional meeting

* To recognize both the prestige of such publications and the time and effort required to achieve such publications, faculty publishing in these select "Premier" journals will receive an "Exceptional" (5) rating for two years irrespective of other scholarly productivity.

** "Acceptable" journals are defined as infield (IS/IT related) that are of sufficient quality to satisfy AACSB requirements for credentialing as "academically qualified."

*** Qualifying grants/grant proposals must have a reasonable expectation of generating one or more published journal articles.

Note: In all cases, items can be claimed (i.e., reported) when accepted or published, but not both.

The relative importance/value of the factors described above is reflected in their ordering. First and foremost, all CIS faculty are expected to satisfy AACSB and COBA research expectations pertaining to publications in refereed journals. When assessing journal articles for comparative purposes the CIS Merit Committee will take into consideration: 1) overall reputation and journal quality (applicant supplied evidence will be considered); 2) nature of authorship, sole v. co-author (In the case of co-authorships, applicants should specify approximate contribution on a percentage basis); 3) number of co-authors; 4) nature and length of paper; and 5) acceptance rates. **While CIS faculty members may elect to publish "in field" (IS journals,) the multidisciplinary nature of information systems has, and will continue to result in publications in a wide variety of disciplines including a significant number outside of business (e.g., heath care, engineering, education). IS/IT related papers published in non-IS/IT publications that will satisfy AACSB credentialing requirements will be deemed relevant for the purpose of merit.**

Minimum Expectations for Achieving "Competent"
Minimally CIS faculty must demonstrate/document the following to receive a rating of "Competent" (3) in Research:

1) Unconditional acceptance or publication of one paper in an "acceptable" refereed journal during the prior two years.

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.

Internal Service

University Service
     Officer in the Faculty Senate or Graduate Council
     Chair on a major University Committee
     Member of a major University Committee
     Member of other University Committees
     Departmental Representative on the Faculty Senate

College Service
     Chair of COBA Council
     Chair of other COBA Committees
     Member of other College Committees

Departmental Service
     AITP Faculty Advisor
     Chair of CIS Departmental Committee
     Member of CIS Departmental Committee
     Contributes to overall CIS Departmental success by attending meetings, actively supporting and participating in departmental initiatives (e.g., Computer Day, Recruitment and Retention) and fulfilling reporting requirements in a timely manner.

External Service

Professional Service/Membership
Officer and/or board member of a national professional organization (IS/IT related)
Editor or co-editor for an IS/IT related publication
Officer and/or board member of a state or regional professional organization (IS/IT related)
Track chair for a regional, national or international meeting of a professional organization
Editorial review board of a scholarly or professional journal
Reviewer of papers, discussant or session chair for a regional, national, or international meeting of a professional organization.
Maintains active membership in at least one IS/IT professional organization

Community Service
Serves on a civic board or comparable post at the state or national level that brings prestige to the CIS Department, COBA and/or University.

Per the recommendations of the 2007 COBA Merit Review Committee, before any external service is considered for merit purposes, required service to the University, COBA and one's Department must be accomplished.   In most cases, the relative importance/value of the factors described above is reflected in their ordering. However, the CIS Merit Committee must take into consideration the nature, importance and demands (frequency and length of meetings and other associated time commitments) of service assignments.   Other forms of service can and should be considered by the CIS Merit Committee, particularly when that service offers comparative value to the department, COBA and/or institution and requires comparable time and effort.

Minimum Expectations for Achieving "Competent"
Minimally CIS faculty must demonstrate/document the following to receive a rating of "Competent" (3) in Service:

1) Active membership in one professional organization
2) At least two forms of internal service for ranked faculty and one form of internal service for renewable instructors.
3) Contribution to overall CIS Departmental success by attending meetings, actively supporting and participating in departmental initiatives (e.g., Computer Day, Recruitment and Retention) and fulfilling reporting requirements in a timely manner.

CIS Department
Annual
Performance\Merit Weights

For the Period, Jan. 1, 20___ thru December 31, 20___

Name: _____

Teaching: _____ %

Research   _____ %

Service   _____ %

Requested By: _____   _____
                                    (Applicant signature)   (date)

Approved By: _____   _____
                                    (Department Head signature)   (date)

University Performance Parameters (Weights) As of 12/06

Teaching
- Tenured – 9-hour TLE   30-60%
- Tenured—12 hour TLE   50-80%
- Probationary   45-60%
- Renewable Instructors   80-90%

Research
- Tenured – 9-hour TLE   30-60%
- Tenured—12 hour TLE   10-40%
- Probationary   35-50%
- Renewable Instructors   0-10%

Service
- Tenured – 9-hour TLE   10-20%
- Tenured—12 hour TLE   10-20%
- Probationary   5-15%
- Renewable Instructors   10-20%