

FINANCE & GENERAL BUSINESS DEPARTMENT MERIT GUIDELINES

10-1-07 Rev

VIII. FGB Department Merit and Annual Performance Evaluation and Rating Criteria

A. Departmental Merit Evaluation Process

1. Merit Evaluation Personnel Committee (MEPC) Selection

The FGB Merit Evaluation Personnel Committee (MEPC) will consist of **three tenured** faculty members, as annually decided by the FGB full-time faculty members. The MEPC is selected by November 15 or such other date specified in the University Academic Calendar. The FGB departmental representative(s) to the COBA Personnel Committee cannot serve on the departmental MEPC committee in the same evaluation period.

2. MEPC Report

The report of the MEPC shall include the performance evaluation rating of 1 to 5 in integers in each area (teaching, research and service) and supporting narrative for each faculty member evaluated. A numerical tally of the MEPC committee vote shall be recorded for each faculty member in each category evaluated. The MEPC shall forward its report to the FGB Department Head commensurate with University deadlines.

3. Department Head Review

The FGB Department Head also shall evaluate departmental faculty in accord with University deadlines and provide a supporting narrative. This merit evaluation process shall also serve as the ANNUAL REVIEW. The Department Head shall discuss with each faculty member the ratings recommended, performance for the evaluated year, along with goals and percentage weightings for the next year. Such discussion of merit ratings shall occur in February before the ratings are forwarded to the college Dean.

[4. Individual Option] [suspended]

If allowed in a given year, each FGB full-time faculty member may elect on an annual basis to be evaluated by (a) both the MEPC and Department Head or (b) Department Head only. The faculty member shall notify the chairperson of the MEPC of the election by the date merit application and supporting documentation are due in the Departmental Office in January. If the faculty member elects option (b), the ratings and narrative supplied by the Department Head shall substitute for that of the MEPC, as well as count as the Department Head's evaluation, and the faculty member waives the right to appeal the lack of a MEPC evaluation. *Because this is the strong sentiment of the faculty members in this department, we are retaining this as a portion of our document, even if we are not allowed to use the option at the present time.*

B. Appeal

If the faculty member disagrees with merit ratings given by the FGB MEPC, the FGB Department Head or the COBA Dean, the faculty member can appeal to the COBA Personnel Committee (or COBA Compensation Subcommittee) and may ultimately appeal to the Provost's Committee on Tenure and Promotion or such other appeal process as is annually established by the University in accord with the Faculty Handbook.

C. Merit Evaluation Guidelines and Weighting

1. Merit and Tenure/Promotion Relationship. The fact that a probationary or tenured faculty member or instructor has been evaluated at the “expected” or higher level for merit/equity compensation purposes does not guarantee reappointment, tenure or promotion. Ratings higher than the expected level, however, should be viewed as positive indications of progress toward tenure. COBA Promotion & Tenure criteria factors have been incorporated into this merit document as instructive to the application of merit determination elements and factors.

2. Annual evaluation of 2-year period for research only. All full-time faculty members [tenured, probationary and instructors] shall be evaluated annually. For research a rolling two-year time frame shall be evaluated; rather than equally averaging the two years, the cumulative accomplishment during the past two years shall be evaluated during each annual evaluation. The two year time frame shall be used for research merit only. For teaching and service, the single calendar year will be evaluated, but faculty members may include significant service assignments or projects that overlap multiple calendar years.

3. Weighting of Categories. Each faculty member shall negotiate with the FGB Department Head to determine his/her own percentage weights according to the Compensation Calendar and Implementation Plan <http://www.missouristate.edu/provost/27645.htm>

The University guidelines provide some flexibility regarding each of the three areas as long as they total 100 percent. University Performance Parameters establish the following ranges of weights, with possible exceptions for sabbaticals, leaves or special assignments. Recommended weights for COBA faculty are 40% Teaching, 40% Research, 20% Service, but each faculty member has a right to select weights within the range listed below. Recommendations of weight ranges from the **current University Faculty Handbook** are:

A. Tenured Faculty -- 9 hour TLE

Maximum	Minimum	Role
60%	30%	Teaching
60%	30%	Research
20%	10%	Service

B. Tenured -- 12 hour TLE

Maximum	Minimum	Role
80%	50%	Teaching
40%	10%	Research
20%	10%	Service

C. Probationary (Tenure-track) Faculty

Maximum	Minimum	Role
60%	45%	Teaching
50%	35%	Research
15%	5%	Service

D. Renewable Instructors

Maximum	Minimum	Role
90%	80%	Teaching
10%	0%	Research
20%	10%	Service

4. Individual Faculty Member’s Merit Packet:

a. Merit applications and supporting documentation are due in the Departmental Office on the date in established by the Compensation Calendar,

For 2008, the date is January 9.

The **first page** of the Merit Application shall succinctly summarize the categorical justification for the merit rating being sought separately in teaching, research and service **in accord with the template illustrated at the end of this document or such other template as is provided contemporaneous to the submission timeframe.** This summary can be used or modified by the faculty member to assist with documentation by the MEPC or Department Head and to provide the required feedback.

b. Additional explanation and documentation supporting merit ratings should be organized in the following order: (1) teaching, (2) research, (3) service. The faculty member shall be evaluated for the previous two years of research, and the previous calendar year for teaching and service.

D. FGB MERIT GUIDELINES

The FGB Department adopts the following FGB Guidelines for merit compensation evaluation of Teaching, Research/Scholarly Activity, and Service.

1. 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 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.*

Level 5 Exceptional: Performance **consistently** exceeds Expected. A high degree of proficiency is shown in **most** aspects of performance. Achievement of this level also is based on both the quantity of factors achieved and the quality of performance that indicate an **exceptionally high** level of performance.

Level 4 Commendable: Performance **frequently** exceeds Expected. 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 that indicate a **significantly higher** level of performance than "expected."

Level 3 Expected: Performance is consistently at expected levels. Applicant meets job basic requirements.

Level 2 Development Needed: Performance has fallen below Expected in evaluation period. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and improvement is required.

Level 1 Unsatisfactory: Performance is below Expected for two years in a row. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and immediate improvement is required.

2. Teaching:

A. CRITERIA for EVALUATING TEACHING:

1. Introduction:

Teaching is one of the most important activities of a faculty member. Effective classroom teaching performance and overall instructional effort are essential conditions to be demonstrated for reappointment, promotion and tenure and annual merit evaluation. As such, given the variety in types of classes, variance in class size and teaching loads offered by the FGB Department, it presents special challenges in measuring faculty members' teaching effectiveness. To objectively and fairly evaluate an individual's teaching performance in the teaching component of faculty evaluation requires consideration of multiple dimensions and facets of teaching and learning constraints and opportunities.

2. Student Evaluation Component:

a. **Student evaluations** are only one component of the evaluation, and cannot be the exclusive measure of teaching effectiveness. According to the Faculty Handbook 4.2.1.3, student evaluations shall **not constitute more than 50%** of the teaching factors evaluated for merit, tenure and promotion.

b. **Student evaluations may be most effective at measuring** student interaction with the faculty member, student perception of instructional delivery skills, whether there was an environment conducive to learning, if the course is challenging, clarity of delivery factors, timeliness of feedback and whether the faculty member follows the syllabus and keeps to the subject matter, as well as perceived fairness of teaching methods. Students may be able to judge the preparation and expertise of the faculty member to some degree, but may lack an understanding of a number of relevant factors regarding appropriateness of teaching methods for the course, relevance of course rigor and other factors affecting teaching effectiveness. Some of the content and the reasons for use of certain teaching methods (ex: critical thinking exercises) may not be fully appreciated by undergraduate students or by students without adequate work experience.

c. **Course dynamics can influence both student evaluations and teaching effectiveness.** Student evaluations can be influenced by Course Dynamics including number of courses taught, number of credit hours taught, number of students enrolled in each course, required v. elective courses, number of preparations per semester, graduate v. undergraduate courses, traditional in person v. online v. distance learning format, new course preparation, time of day taught, Trichotomy (student interest in topic), and grade distribution. Each faculty member shall include in his/her merit packet relevant course dynamics variables for each course taught.

d. Because of all of the factors affecting student evaluations, the composite scores, and the fact that these scores can be used for no more than 50% of the evaluation of the teaching component of merit, the **target student evaluation scores** listed under the Standards section are just targets and **are not guarantees of a particular merit rank.**

e. Each faculty member shall report his/her COBA student **evaluation scores** for the **first seven questions and questions 14 through 20** for the relevant fall and spring semesters [*as the current instrument is devised. Any changes in the instrument may change the sequence and relevance. The MEPC will have access to all scores*]. Unless otherwise determined by the college, each faculty member only has to be evaluated in two classes per semester, but normally should, if possible, select different courses. [*During a faculty member's first two semesters*

teaching at Missouri State University the faculty member shall be evaluated in all class sections.] At the faculty member's option, the faculty member may include one evaluation score from summer, intersession or special session; such additional teaching assignments may also be used to demonstrate additional emphasis on the teaching component. A professor may selectively turn in teaching evaluation comments to support a particular teaching dynamic; however, the entire packets of student evaluation comments shall be available to the MEPC and Department Head [The FGB department maintains a full archive of the student evaluations].

3. Other Dimensions of Teaching Effectiveness:

Effective teaching results from the combination of many factors, as recognized and given in the Faculty Handbook (4.3.1.2) and COBA Promotion & Tenure Guidelines:

COURSE DYNAMICS: Examples of course dynamics factors include number of courses taught, number of credit hours taught, number of students enrolled in each course, required versus elective courses, number of preparations per semester, graduate versus undergraduate courses, traditional in person versus online versus distance learning format, time of day taught, Trichotomy, new course preparation, and grade distribution.

METHODS USED, COURSE RIGOR and FOSTERING of APPLIED LEARNING: 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. Professor establishes and delivers high standards of achievement for students, with course rigor appropriate for the level and subject matter; grade distribution.

APPROPRIATENESS of COURSE CONTENT and DELIVERY: The degree to which course content and delivery foster course coverage goals of department, extent to which course delivery compares favorably in comprehensiveness, depth, uniqueness or rigor with the course content, appropriateness of examination methods in fostering understanding of application of material; whether course is well-organized with logical sequencing of content, effective utilization of class time are relevant.

EXPERTISE and ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE TEACHING: Improvements in expertise may be demonstrated by class preparation, activities for keeping current and overall expertise, 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 are also indicators of efforts to improve teaching. The teacher must keep abreast of new developments in his or her field.

ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE CURRICULUM: Examples of improvement include revision of existing courses or curriculum; development of new courses; preparation of materials to integrate technology, software or computer-based research into courses; grants for innovative teaching.

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 could all be considered teaching-related scholarly activities.

SERVICE OR PUBLIC AFFAIRS RELATED-TEACHING ACTIVITIES:

Integration of public affairs themes or service component; 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 are examples of activities included for consideration of teaching activities.

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 are relevant elements of consideration for teaching activities.

STUDENT EVALUATIONS: (see D.2.2) 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. Trichotomy (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 (only as described in D.2.a.2.a.) as components of student evaluations.

PEER EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING METHODS AND MATERIALS:

Examination of course syllabi, examinations, handouts, readings, student=s assignments and feedback; assessment of classroom presentation skills, teaching methods and preparation (as will be conducted by the MEPC, and not as a required secondary peer evaluation as may be the case of the Promotion & Tenure guidelines, though such reports may be included in the merit package).

TEACHING AWARDS: Faculty Recognition Award; teaching-related honors; recognition by student or professional organizations are relevant indicators of teaching effectiveness.

B. Standards for Evaluating Teaching:

1. Standards & Documentation

All members seeking a “3” “expected” rating or higher shall include:

- a. list of courses taught, along with relevant Course Dynamics Factors listed in D.2.A.3. of Teaching Criteria
- b. cumulative evaluation scores for each question from COBA Student Evaluation Instrument Questions 1-7, and 14-20, for which there is a rebuttable presumption that the faculty member will have at least a **3.75** for the combined average of Questions 1-7, 14-20 of student evaluation instrument to earn a “3” rating, to be considered along with other qualitative factors. *Student evaluations cannot be the sole method for demonstrating teaching merit level*

Faculty members seeking a “4” or “5” shall include items a & b above, plus additional standards and documentation:

- a. syllabus for each course;

b. there is a rebuttable presumption that faculty members earning a 4 or 5 rating will have at least a **4.0** for the combined average of Questions 1-7, 14-20 of student evaluation instrument, with the other qualitative factors determining whether a 3, 4 or 5 rating is assigned. *Student evaluations cannot be the sole method for demonstrating teaching merit level.*

c. **documentation** of other indicators of quality instruction, critical thinking exercises and rigor from the “Other Dimensions of Teaching Effectiveness” (FGB Guidelines D.2.A.3.). See the Faculty Handbook 4.2.1.3 regarding documenting teaching effectiveness. FGB Faculty member do *not* have to use the Handbook chart, but may find it instructive in determining ways to document teaching effectiveness.

3. Research:

A. Introduction:

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). Tenure-track faculty members are expected to engage in some mode of scholarship, contribute to the college’s AACSB publication expectations and publish in peer reviewed journals or other discipline-specific appropriate publication outlets. See parameters regarding rating of publications. **QUALITY** will be considered, as well as quantity of scholarly outputs.

B. Supporting Documentation:

For each article listed under research, a copy of that article shall be included for all merit applicants. For co-authored articles, the faculty member shall explain his/her role. Sole authored articles and articles with collaborative work of two authors will generally be valued more highly than articles with three or more authors. Documented justifications should accompany exceptions. In addition for merit ratings of “4” or “5”, the category of the article shall be identified and its quality and contribution to the discipline should be discussed.

C. Determination of Research/Scholarly Productivity Performance Levels:

Quality, rather than quantity is the goal. Although the following quantity and participation variables will provide evidence to help support a particular level rating, **quality** of the contributions will also be evaluated in the final determination of merit ratings for research.

Level 5: Exceptional: Performance consistently exceeds Expected levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in most aspects of performance. This level requires on an annual basis achievement of at least two outcomes from Outcome Group **C**, and on a biennial basis achievement of either

1. At least three outcomes from Group B, or

2. At least one outcome from Group **A**.

Level 4: Commendable: Performance frequently exceeds Expected 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 Group **C**, and, on a biennial basis achievement of two outcomes from Group **B**, or
2. On a biennial basis achievement of at least three outcomes from Group **C** and at least one outcome from Outcome Group **B**.

Level 3: Expected. Performance is consistently at expected levels. Faculty member meets job requirements. This level requires

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

Level 2: Development Needed. Performance has fallen below **Expected**. A performance Improvement Plan is to be established and improvement is required to improve performance to the “Expected” level.

Level 1: Unsatisfactory. Performance is below **Expected** for two years in a row. A performance Improvement Plan is to be established to achieve “Expected” level and teaching workload may be adjusted to reflect inadequate contribution to research, while the faculty member is still expected to satisfy the expected level for research.

D. Research/Scholarly Productivity Outcome Groups:

----- **Group C** -----

1. Submits a paper to and has it sent out for review by a journal which satisfies the requirements of Outcome Group **B** or **A**
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
8. Publishes an invited article that does not qualify in Group **B** or **A** [Based on the prestige of the invitation and quality of the journal, a faculty member may individually make a case for treatment of a substantial invited article in Outcome Group **B**.]

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

1. Has an article, case or other material published or unconditionally accepted for publication in a journal of respectable quality with a reasonable and clearly defined review process. (Each article counts as only one publication; the acceptance and publication cannot be separately counted.) Regional law reviews, specialty law reviews (sponsored by an organization other than the ABA, ALSB or an ABA accredited law school) and bar journals shall qualify automatically in Outcome Group **B**, in addition to business journals listed in Cabell's.
2. 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
3. Has contributed a chapter or other significant work to a college textbook
4. Has a college textbook published in a second or higher edition

5. Has a book published, other than a college textbook, related to an appropriate business discipline
6. Receives a regional best paper award

----- **Group A** -----

1. 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*
2. 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
3. Has a college textbook published in the first edition
4. Receives national recognition for particular research or publications
5. Receives a best article award

* High-level journals appropriate to the faculty member's discipline fall within Group A. A publication in any of the journals listed below will automatically qualify in Group A without further validation. Publication in the following journals shall count for each author, even if the journal is not in the author's primary discipline, as long as that author's contribution is substantiated. (Where more than two authors are involved, the article will count as ½ article unless the faculty member can show substantial contribution for the article for it to count as a full article.) In addition, publication of an article in another COBA departments' A (top) journal list shall also count in Group A in the FGB Department. For other publications or specialty journals to qualify in Group A, the faculty member must explain why publication in that journal should be viewed as "an exceptional accomplishment" because of low acceptance rate, prestige, review process or significant contribution to one's field. Recognition through an award or other validation may assist in that determination.

Group A High Level Journals for FGB Department

Because the Finance and General Business Department supports many disciplines, journals that are discipline-specific are listed below for Group A. This list is not exhaustive. Publication in these journals will be examined along with the faculty member's contribution to the article and other scholarly activities to determine performance ratings.

Finance:

- Financial Management
- Journal of Banking and Finance
- Journal of Business Finance & Accounting
- Journal of Finance
- Journal of Financial Economics
- Journal of Financial Research
- Journal of Financial & Quantitative Analysis
- Journal of Money, Credit and Banking
- Review of Financial Studies

Insurance:

- Journal of Risk and Insurance
- Tort & Insurance Law Journal

Law:

- American Business Law Journal
- Journal of Legal Studies Education
- National law reviews

(published by American Bar Association or a law school accredited by the ABA)

Real Estate:

- Real Estate Economics
- Journal of Real Estate Research

E-Business Journals:

- Communications of the ACM
- MIS Quarterly
- Information Systems Research
- International Journal of Electronic Commerce
- Electronic Commerce Research
- Harvard Business Review
- Electronic Markets
- Journal of Management Information Systems
- Journal of Electronic Commerce Research
- European Journal of IS

4. Service:

A. Introduction:

Service evaluation is based on the degree of the faculty member's contribution to his or her Department/School, College, University, profession, and community. **Each faculty member shall list his/her University committee service, designating it as departmental, college or university service.** The vast majority of service claimed by a faculty member will normally be service to the University, College and department. While faculty members are encouraged to participate in Public Affairs outside the university setting, service within the university and to one's discipline should meet the "expected" level before the faculty member claims other types of external service for merit purposes. (*See Faculty Handbook 4.2.3.2.*) The faculty member should explain the nature of the service, the level of University service, the role (ex: chairperson, member, reviewer) and provide approximate time estimates or document involvement in service activities if the faculty member is seeking a Level 4 or Level 5 rating in service.

B. Weighting service:

An FGB faculty member shall be able to receive additional weight for particularly time-consuming committee assignments, chairing projects and professional service offices. The faculty member should explain why such additional credit is warranted. If a faculty member accepts time-consuming committee assignment(s) or office after the percentages are set for a year, the faculty member shall have the right to adjust upward the percentage allocated to service. Reassigned or release time for service will be considered part of the workload and percentages should be adjusted accordingly. The amount of release time must be reported.

C. Determination of Service Performance Levels:

Many factors go into successful service activities. Representative factors that are considered in evaluating service activities are listed in the Service Outcome Groups; however, the list is not intended to be exhaustive. Refusal to serve on a particular committee shall not preclude a faculty member from receiving an expected, commendable or exceptional rating, as long as the faculty member can demonstrate other satisfactory service.

Level 5 Exceptional: Performance/results consistently exceed Expected 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 **E**, and
2. Achievement of one of either:
 - a. at least one outcome from Outcome Group **D** and at least one outcome from Outcome Group **A**, or
 - b. an equivalent combination of outcomes from Outcome Groups **D-A**.

Level 4 Commendable: Performance/results frequently exceed Expected 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 **E**, and
2. Achievement of one of either:
 - a. at least two outcomes from Outcome Group **D** and one outcome from Outcome Group **C**, or
 - b. at least one outcome from Outcome Group **D** and one outcome

from Outcome Group **B** or **A**
c. an equivalent combination of outcomes from Outcome Groups **D-B**.

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

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

Level 2 Development Needed: Performance has fallen below **Expected** Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and improvement is required.

Level 1 Unsatisfactory: Performance is consistently, defined as two years in a row, below **Expected** levels. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and immediate improvement is required.

D. Service Outcome Groups:

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

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

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

1. Serves on a committee of the University, COBA, or Department/School
2. Participates in recruitment activities, career fairs, commencements, etc.
3. Serves as a reviewer of papers, a discussant, or a session chair for a regional, national, or international meeting of a professional organization.
4. Serves on a board, as an officer, or other position in local a professional or civic organization.
5. 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** -----

1. Serves as chair of a University, COBA or Department/School committee or major university project.
2. Serves as a Senator in the MSU Faculty Senate.
3. Serves as a track chair for a regional, national, or international meeting of a professional organization.
4. Serves on the editorial review board of a scholarly or professional journal.
5. Performs other acceptable internal or external 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 **B** -----

1. Serves as the immediate past Chair of the MSU Faculty Senate.
2. Serves as a regional officer of a professional organization related the faculty member's area of business expertise that brings prestige to the Department/School and which requires of the faculty member much more time than serving as the chair of a University, COBA or Department/School committee.
3. Serves on a civic board or comparable post at the state or national level that brings prestige to the Department/School, 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 Department/School committee.

4. 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 A** -----

1. Serves as the Chair or Chair Elect of the MSU Faculty Senate.

2. 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 Department/School and which requires of the faculty member an enormous amount of time.

3. Serves as a national or international officer of a professional organization related the faculty member's area of business expertise that brings prestige to the Department/School and which requires of the faculty member significantly more time than serving as the chair of a University, COBA or Department/School committee.

4. Serves as the editor of a scholarly or professional journal.

5. 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.

EVALUATION FORM:

Faculty Annual Evaluation
January 1, 20__ to December 31, 20__

Faculty Name:

Department:

Current Rank:

Current Date:

This form is to be used for reporting your achievements in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service during the calendar year identified above. However, significant research outcomes from Research Outcome Groups A and B achieved in the immediately preceding year also can be reported as explained in the Departmental Faculty Evaluation Guidelines.

Annual Evaluation Summary for Merit	
Professor rank and name	
Department	
Year	
I. Teaching:	Level
II. Research:	Level
III. Service:	Level

Teaching: Class Report							
Semester	Course Number & section	Credit Hours	Number of Students	Traditional v. Distance Learning v. Online	Trichotomy	Mean Student Evaluation	Grade Distribution
Spring 2007							
2007 Summer/ Intersession							
Fall 2007							
	Totals						

Research Outcomes Achieved: (List outcomes achieved within each Research Outcome Group and provide citations and comments where appropriate.)	
Group A	
Group B	
Group C	

Service Outcomes Achieved: (List outcomes achieved within each Service Outcome Group and provide comments where appropriate.)

Group A	
Group B	
Group C	
Group D	
Group E	