DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION
ANNUAL FACULTY MERIT EVALUATION PROCESS
Revised September 12, 2007
Revised October 12, 2009

PROCEDURES

Philosophy

In developing and implementing these evaluation procedures and criteria we are guided by and committed to what we hold to be essential characteristics of a fair and constructive process. We believe that the evaluation process should:

- Articulate specific guidelines and performance expectations;
- Focus on strengths and development, not on deficits;
- Allow for multiple paths to success;
- Contribute to consistent standards across all units/levels (e.g., departments, colleges);
- Include personal, individualized feedback
- Be clear regarding who is making decisions of merit;
- Have open and transparent processes and outcomes;
- Facilitate public recognition for performance; and
- Be aligned with standards and processes for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

Annual Reporting, Documentation and Review

All full-time faculty members are required to submit in January an annual report of their activities for the prior calendar year. These reports serve the dual purposes of informing annual department reports and forming the basis for annual performance reviews. The head is required to submit annual reports to the dean, who will with additional evaluation/response submit them to the Provost. The annual faculty reports contribute data for those reports. Probationary ranked faculty and lecturers anticipating renewal are evaluated annually and tenured faculty are evaluated annually.

Faculty members will make their annual report using a standardized department form. Examples of information to be reported on this form include:
- Awards
- Publications in refereed journals
- Monographs or books
- Presentations
- Funded research (proposals submitted, proposals funded)
- Graduate research advising

The annual report also will be used to document certain activities and accomplishments that are specific to the department's annual/biennial evaluation criteria, for example:
- Peer observations performed
- Committee activity
- Conferences, workshops attended

Communication Department faculty merit evaluations are based on a points system. Faculty will use the annual reporting form to summarize and briefly explain points earned for specified activities and accomplishments. In addition to the pre-established lists of activities and accomplishments, faculty members may propose other specific items they believe should count toward their evaluations

In addition to the annual report, the following documentation is required for faculty evaluations:*
- For **teaching**
  - Summary of numerical student evaluations for the evaluation period

- Narrative self-assessment of teaching effectiveness (500-word maximum)
        - Copies of course syllabi: one course per semester in the evaluation period with no courses repeated
- For **scholarship/creative activity**
        - Summary of scholarly/creative activity (500-word maximum)
        - For faculty with reassigned time for research, documentation of outcome for at least one current research project (e.g., conference paper, manuscript draft, summary of data analysis, grant application)
- For **service**
        - Summary of service activity (500-word maximum)

The committee and/or department head may request additional documentation as needed.

Committee Structure and Procedures

The departmental review committee will utilize the guidelines contained herein to prepare narrative evaluations and tentative performance ratings for each faculty member, which will be forwarded to the department head.

Although the points-based system reduce much of the subjectivity that otherwise might be involved in these faculty evaluations, it is the responsibility of the committee and the department head to confirm that points claimed by individuals are warranted, and the claim of points for identified activities or accomplishments does not guarantee those points will be affirmed by the committee and/or the department head. Furthermore, we expect the distribution of ratings will approximate the targets established in the Compensation Committee's Final Report (5=15%, 4=35%, 3=48%, 2=2%, 1=0%).

The departmental review committee shall consist of three members of the Personnel Committee elected by a majority of the department faculty. Initially, one member will be elected to a one-year term and two members to two-year terms; thereafter all members will serve two-year, staggered terms. Members may be re-elected to consecutive terms, but not more than two without the lapse of an intervening term.

Annual Review of Faculty Merit Compensation Evaluation Process

This document shall be reviewed annually each fall according to the compensation plan scheduled established by the Office of the Provost. Its contents may be altered or amended by a two-thirds majority vote of the department faculty.

STANDARDS FOR TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE ACTIVITY, AND SERVICE

The Compensation Committee's Final Report establishes the following definitions for the five rating levels.

5 Exceptional: Performance/results consistently exceed competent levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in most aspects of performance.
4 Commendable: Performance/results frequently exceed competent levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in certain aspects of performance.
3 Competent: Performance/results are consistently at expected levels. Meets job requirements.

2 Development Needed: Some performance deficiencies exist. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and improvement is required.
1 Unsatisfactory: Performance is consistently below acceptable levels. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and immediate improvement is required.

The Special Case of Faculty With Administrative Reassigned Time

Some faculty members receive reassigned time to perform significant administrative roles in the department, including the Director of Graduate Studies, Basic Course Director, Assistant Department Head, Director of Forensics, and Director of the Center for Dispute Resolution. These individuals will negotiate with the department head the extent to which their responsibilities may fall under the teaching or research categories as well as service, and the amount of credit toward teaching, research, or service their performance in these administrative roles may contribute. Specifically, the departmental review committee will verify points earned in the areas of teaching, research, and service according to the pre-established lists and assign tentative ratings in those areas. The Head then will evaluate the extent to which administrative duties not reflected in the pre-established lists should be considered part of individuals' performance in the areas of teaching, research, and/or research and, if warranted, make adjustments in overall ratings.

Teaching

We believe it is the norm that faculty members meet department standards for competent teaching. Some indicators of competent teaching are easily observed and confirmed, such as maintaining appropriate syllabi or conducting teaching evaluations; others must be judged qualitatively and faculty thereby may demonstrate effectiveness to greater and lesser degrees. Further, some expectations focus on teacher inputs which can be made relatively clear, while others at least imply outcomes – such as facilitating student learning – which may need to be inferred from less direct evidence. Evaluation of teaching performance is based on consideration of these expectations taken as a whole rather than as a checklist of individual expectations.

For teaching, points accumulated towards a particular rating (level 3, 4, or 5) make one minimally qualified for that rating.

Level 3
A Level 3 rating in teaching assumes the individual is performing competently in the following broad areas:*
   1   Preparation
   2   Class Management & Student Interaction
   3   Evaluating Student Work
   4   Reflection & Self-Assessment

*These areas are described in detail in the Appendix to this document.

In addition to demonstrating competent teaching, we expect individuals to participate in development activities that enhance their teaching and the teaching of others, and to contribute to the teaching mission of the department beyond managing their own classes.

A Level 3 rating requires 5 points from the following development activities. An individual activity may be repeated a maximum of three times, but at least two different activities must be performed.

- Ask a peer to observe you teaching and provide you with feedback/consultation (1)
- Perform a peer observation of a colleague's classroom teaching and provide feedback/consultation (2)*
- Attend a formal faculty teaching development opportunity (e.g., ADC workshop, Showcase on Teaching, external conference related to teaching) (1)*
- Make a presentation at a faculty teaching development opportunity (e.g., ADC workshop, Showcase on Teaching, external conference related to teaching) (3)*
- Provide guest lecture in a colleague's class (1)*
- Participate in formal review of curriculum (3)*
- Serve on the department's program assessment review committee (3)*
- Serve as a mentor to a graduate assistant (3)*
- Direct an undergraduate or graduate independent study (3)
- Supervise a graduate seminar paper completed during the year (3)**
- For ranked faculty, carrying an advising load 40% above the departmental mean or 12.5 for instructors(5)*

*May be counted as teaching or service, but not both.
**May be counted as teaching or scholarship, but not both.

<u>Level 4 and Level 5</u>
A Level 4 rating requires meeting the requirements for Level 3 plus 20 points from the following with at least two categories represented. A Level 5 rating requires meeting the requirements for Level 3 plus 30 points from the following with at least two categories represented. An activity may be repeated a maximum of three times.

Recognition of Excellence in Teaching Performance
- Departmental teaching evaluations aggregate mean for "instructor" items of at least _____ (3)
- Departmental teaching evaluations aggregate mean for "instructor" items of at least _____ (5)
- MSU Online teaching evaluations of at least _____ (3)
- MSU Online teaching evaluations of at least _____ (5)
- Receiving an advising or teaching award at the departmental, college, local, or state level (5)
- Receiving an advising or teaching award at the university, regional, national, or international level (10)

Demonstration of Creativity or Innovation in Teaching
- Documentation of creativity or innovation in instructional design in one class (3)
- Documentation of creativity or innovation in instructional design in multiple classes. (5)
- Development of a new course (5)
- Development of a course for distance format delivery (e.g., online, telecourse) (5)
- Receipt of an internal grant for teaching (may count here or in the next section, but not both places) (3)*
- Receipt of an external grant for teaching (may count here or in the next section, but not both places) (10)*
- Participation in Missouri London program (20)
- Participation in China Abroad program (20)

Activities Designed to Extend Knowledge of Teaching
- Publishing a teaching-related article in a state journal (5)*
- Publishing a teaching-related article in a regional, national or international journal (10)*
- Presentation of a teaching-related paper at a conference (may count as teaching or scholarship, but not both) (3)
- Provision of teaching related to professional expertise to university audiences (2)**
- Provision of teaching related to professional expertise to external audiences (3)**
- Receipt of an internal grant for teaching (may count here or in the prior section, but not both places) (5)*
- Receipt of an external grant for teaching (may count here or in the prior section, but not both places) (10)*
- Conducting a teaching-related pre-conference session at a regional or national conference (5)*

Demonstration of Extended Commitment to Instructional Issues
- Service on university or college committee related to curricular or classroom management issues. (2)**
- Chairing a university or college committee related to curricular or classroom management issues. (5)**

- Participation in at least three (3) single-session student development or recruitment events. (3)**
- Participation in ongoing (multi-session) student development or recruitment activities, including SOAR, IDS 110, UHC 110, etc. (5)**
- Any one (1) of the Development Activities listed above not already applied toward the Level 3 rating. (1-3)

* May be counted as teaching or scholarship but not both
**May be counted as teaching or service, but not both.

<p style="text-align:center">Scholarship/Creative Activity</p>

In consultation with the department head and with approval of the dean, faculty members negotiate, within stated parameters, the extent to which scholarship/creative activity is expected as part of their workloads. Ranked faculty members with time reassigned for research activity will meet different expectations than lecturers teaching 12-hour loads, for example. All faculty members, however, must maintain a minimal level of engagement in scholarship of the discipline at least with respect to their teaching assignments. *Note: Many of the items listed below might be counted justifiably as instances of either teaching or service. Individuals may make their cases for such substitutions, subject to judgments of the evaluation committee and the department head.*

For scholarship and creative activity, points accumulated towards a particular rating (level 3, 4, or 5) make one minimally qualified for that rating.

Level 3
A Level 3 rating requires 15 points from the following. Individual activities may be repeated a maximum of three times, but at least three different activities must be performed.

- Presented at a COM colloquia (3)
- Attended a COM colloquia (1)
- Participated in grant writing workshop (1)
- Served on a minimum of two thesis committees completed during the year (3)
- Teaching a graduate level research methods course (3)
- Reviewed manuscripts for state, regional, national or international conference (3)**
- Has a research project in progress (2)
- Supervising a seminar paper completed during the year (2)*
- Attended a regional, national or international conference (2)
- Attended university colloquia (Provost Research Forum or equivalent) (1)
- Attended colloquia from another department (1)
- Attended a state conference (1)
- Served as a respondent to a panel at a state conference (1)
- Made a guest research presentation in another class (1)*' **
- Taught undergraduate research methods course (COM 210 or other) (3)

*May be counted as scholarship or teaching, but not both.
**May be counted as scholarship or service, but not both.

Typically ranked faculty members in the department receive three (3) hours of reassigned time for scholarly activity. This reassigned time is to enable individuals to engage in scholarly activity that goes beyond the activities listed in the preceding two sections. In order to receive at least a rating of "3," individuals with reassigned time for research must:

- Maintain at least one active research project at all times (meaning, such as, be collecting data, not just planning to start something someday)
- Document at least one outcome/product of the project, i.e., demonstrable activity. For example, conference paper presentation, data analysis, survey dissemination, project summary, publication, grant application,

colloquium, showcase presentation, new chapter, manuscript submitted for review, roundtable discussions, speaking in the role of expert, recognition of research.

For reassigned time to be renewed, individuals must receive at least a rating of "3" for the period during which reassigned time was received. Over a period of several years, it is expected that research activity will reach fruition in peer-reviewed publication; therefore, continued ratings of "3" are not sufficient to warrant subsequent renewals of reassigned time.

<u>Level 4 and Level 5</u>
A Level 4 rating requires meeting the requirements for Level 3 plus 20 points from the following. A Level 5 rating requires meeting the requirements for Level 3, plus 30 points from the following; including at least one refereed publication. An activity may be repeated a maximum of three times.

Grant Activity
- Applied for funding for an internal MSU grant (1)
- Received funding for an MSU internal grant (3)
- Applied for funding for an external grant (5)
- Received funding for an external grant (10)*

Submission
- Submitted a manuscript to a state, regional, national or international conference (1)
- Submitted a manuscript for review to a state, regional, national or international journal (3)

Conference Work
- Presented a competitively selected paper at a state conference (5)*
- Presented a competitively selected paper at a regional, national or international conference (10)*
- Received award for a refereed paper or panel accepted at STAM, regional, national and international conference (5)
- Organized and chaired a panel at a state, regional, national or international conference (3)
- Submitted a proposal for a panel at a state, regional or national conference (2)
- Served as a respondent to a competitively selected papers panel at a regional, national or international conference (2)

Journal Work
- Served as the editor of a state, regional, national or international journal (10)**
- Served as an associate editor of a state, regional, national or international journal (3)**

Publication
- Earned a contract to publish a book (5)
- Published in a state journal (5)
- Published an original book (15)
- Published a textbook (15)
- Published in a refereed regional, national or international journal (10)
- Published a chapter in an edited work (5)
- Revised an original theoretical book (5)
- Revised a textbook (5)
- Published a book review in a regional, national, or international journal (3 maximum of 6)
- Published conference proceedings (5)

Other
- Served as a member of a thesis committee during the year (1)
- Supervised a thesis completed during the year (5)
- Chaired a seminar paper completed during the year (3)
- Invited to make research presentation at another institution (2)**

*May be counted as scholarship or teaching, but not both.
**May be counted as scholarship or service, but not both.

<div align="center">Service</div>

All full-time faculty members are responsible for contributing in service to the department, college, university, discipline, and community, although relative activity in the respective levels will vary across individuals and within individuals over time. It is expected that all full-time faculty members will:

- Attend department meetings regularly (graduate faculty attend graduate faculty meetings)
- Conform to the standards of professionalism and collegiality outlined in the Personnel Committee's Policies and Procedures Manual
- Attend departmental events

For service, points accumulated towards a particular rating (level 3, 4, or 5) make one minimally qualified for that rating.

Level 3
A Level 3 rating requires 15 points from the following. Individual activities may be repeated a maximum of three times, but at least three different activities must be performed.

- Participate in at least three single-session development or recruitment events (e.g. majors' fair, recruitment events, meeting with prospective students) (3)*
- Participate in ad hoc department work, as asked (1-3)
- Be an active member a university, college, and/or department committee (2)
- Have a peer observe classroom teaching and provide feedback/consultation (1)*
- Perform a peer observation of a colleague's classroom teaching and provide feedback/consultation (2)*
- Attend a formal faculty teaching development opportunity (e.g., ADC workshop, Showcase on Teaching, external conference related to teaching) (1)*
- Make a presentation at a faculty teaching development opportunity (e.g., ADC workshop, Showcase on Teaching, external conference related to teaching)* (3)
- Provide guest lecture in a colleague's class (1)*
- Participate in formal review of curriculum (3)*
- Serve on the department's program assessment review committee (3)*
- Provide professional service to the community (1)
- Attend, participate or contribute in a department, college, or university event (e.g., COM Week, Public Speaking Showcase judge, COM 210 poster session judge) (2)
- Advise a student organization (e.g., IABC, PRSSA, LPH or Women in Communication (5)
- Engage in professional activities at national, regional, and/or state levels (e.g., NCA, review papers for conferences or serve on association committees) (2)
- Participate in public affairs outreach (e.g., service learning, application of expertise, service on boards, community initiatives, officer for organization) (2)
- Provision of teaching related to professional expertise to external audience (3)*
- Serve as a mentor to a graduate assistant (3)*
- Served on departmental seminar paper review committee (3)
- For ranked faculty, carrying an advising load 40% above the departmental mean (5)*
- Instructors may receive one point for every advisee up to a maximum of 15 points (15)

*These activities may count toward either teaching or service, but not both.

Level 4 and Level 5
A Level 4 rating requires meeting the requirements for Level 3 plus 15 points from the following. A Level 5 rating requires meeting the requirements for Level 3, plus 25 points from the following. An activity may be repeated a maximum of three times.

- Chairs major university committee (Faculty Senate, Presidential or Provosts Task Force, Faculty Handbook Revision Committee, Graduate Council etc.) (10)
- Member of a major university committee (3)
- Chairs a college or university committee (5)
- Member of a college or university committee (3)
- Chairs a college or university search committee (5)
- Member of a college or university search committee (2)
- Plans major dept/college/university event (like Showcase on Teaching, Public Speaking Showcase, a university/college wide workshop, or conference) (5)
- Faculty senate, college council, or graduate council representative (2)
- Serves on a community board (2)
- For ranked faculty, carrying an advising load 40% above the departmental mean; for instructors it is 12.5% above the departmental mean.
- Noteworthy sustained community visibility as a result of expertise (appearances on local/national news, newspaper/magazine articles, commendation from city) (2)
- Holds office or assumes major role in regional or national discipline related organization (NCA/ICA officer, division or interest group chair, STAM office, etc.) (10)
- Journal Editor (10)
- Served as an associate editor of a state, regional, national or international journal (3)**
- Served as the editor of a state, regional, national or international journal (10)**
- Receives university service award or major community service award or recognition (10)
- Serves as an assigned mentor for probationary faculty (5)
- Serves as a mentor for one or more faculty members (3)

*May count toward either service or teaching, but not both.
**May count toward either service or scholarship, but not both.

Appendix
Department of Communication
Statement on Standards for Competent Teaching

We believe it is the norm that faculty members meet department standards for competent teaching. Some indicators of competent teaching are easily observed and confirmed, such as maintaining appropriate syllabi or conducting teaching evaluations; others must be judged qualitatively and faculty thereby may demonstrate effectiveness to greater and lesser degrees. Further, some expectations focus on teacher inputs which can be made relatively clear, while others at least imply outcomes – such as facilitating student learning – which may need to be inferred from less direct evidence. Evaluation of teaching performance is based on consideration of these expectations taken as a whole rather than as a checklist of individual expectations.

A rating of "3" in teaching assumes the individual is performing competently in the following broad areas:*
- Preparation
- Class Management & Student Interaction
- Evaluating Student Work
- Reflection & Self-Assessment

- **Preparation**
  o Maintain syllabi appropriately (e.g., include required elements, follow university policies, furnish copies to department)
  o Be prepared for each class session
  o Be current and knowledgeable in one's content areas
  o Design course content to facilitate student learning
  o Provide variety of ways for students to access course content, i.e., use varied instructional strategies, as appropriate
  o Have a variety of current examples, applications to help students access course content
  o Provide different ways for students to demonstrate learning, as appropriate to the courses being taught
- **Class Management & Student Interaction**
  o Meet classes regularly – or, in the case of online classes, maintain appropriate contact with students and manage progress of the course
  o Enforce university policies (e.g., academic integrity, harassment and discrimination policies, confidentiality)
  o Communicate information to students clearly (e.g., instructions, expectations)
  o Be regularly available and responsive to students (e.g., keeping office hours, responding to emails, keeping course web page current)
  o Guide class discussion effectively, as appropriate to specific classes
  o Become and maintain one's status as a Master Advisor (if advising undergraduates)
  o Generate critical thinking, curiosity, enthusiasm in students
- **Evaluating Student Work**
  o Evaluate student work and provide meaningful feedback
  o Return graded assignments in a timely manner
  o Apply high standards in evaluating student work
- **Reflection & Assessment**
  o Conduct teaching evaluations for each class each semester
  o Annually engage in reflective self-assessment
  o Have student evaluations consistent with department means over time