

**Missouri State University
Greenwood Laboratory School
Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures
2010-2011
No changes**

-- Personnel Evaluation Criteria
-- Faculty Performance Review
--Annual Merit Rating, Annual Appointment, Promotion, Tenure
Effective: October 1, 2008

III. FACULTY REVIEW GUIDELINES: ANNUAL MERIT RATING, ANNUAL APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE

A. Personnel Committee

1. Selection of Personnel Committee

A five-member personnel committee will be selected on a rotation basis from separate lists of instructors and ranked faculty attempting to balance grade levels and experience. The list will be maintained in order of seniority. (See Appendix 1 for current list.) The composition of the Personnel Committee will be representative of current percentages of instructors and ranked faculty. Committee members will serve a two-year term (with the exception of the first year when three members will be assigned a one-year term by lot to ensure continuity in subsequent years).

2. Personnel Committee Responsibilities

This Committee shall address annual merit ratings for compensation. (A subcommittee will address matters of annual appointment, promotion, and tenure for ranked faculty. See B. below.)

Faculty will be responsible for maintaining documentation of all aspects of their work. Specific directions for submission will be provided.

The Committee shall assess the performance of the applicant in the teaching, scholarship, and service areas. At the request of the Committee, and at the option of the faculty member being considered, additional material may be submitted.

3. Greenwood Laboratory School Performance Parameters for Compensation

Faculty members will receive a numerical rating (1-5) in each of the chosen evaluation categories: The Performance Parameters rubric for each evaluation category will be assessed on the following rubric based on the percentage weight chosen by the faculty member:

Rating 5 = Exceeding expected performance in at least *five* ways

Rating 4 = Exceeding expected performance in at least *three* ways

Rating 3 = Meeting all *MSU Faculty Handbook* teaching responsibility criteria

Rating 2 = Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in an Expected manner in their teaching

Rating 1 = Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in an Expected manner in their teaching or persistent evidence of low quality teaching

These ratings will be multiplied by the percentage chosen by the faculty member in each of the three evaluation categories: Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Professional Service. For example,

if a faculty member chose 80% in teaching and 20% in service, then received ratings of 4 in Teaching and 3 in Professional Service, the computation would be:

$$\begin{array}{r}
 80\% \times 4 = 3.2 \\
 20\% \times 3 = \underline{.6} \\
 \text{Overall rating} \quad 3.8
 \end{array}$$

These parameters will be used in conjunction with Missouri State University's Performance Dimensions and Parameters for weighting as follows:

Probationary Faculty

Minimum Weight	Performance Dimension (Role)	Maximum Weight
45%	Teaching/Advising	60%
35%	Research/scholarships/creative activities	50%
5%	Service	15%

Instructors & Greenwood

Minimum Weight	Performance Dimension (Role)	Maximum Weight
80%	Teaching/Advising	90%
0%	Research/scholarships/creative activities	10%
10%	Service	20%

Performance Dimensions and University Parameters for Weighting:

Tenured—9 hour TLE

Minimum Weight	Performance Dimension (Role)	Maximum Weight
30%	Teaching/Advising	60%
30%	Research/scholarships/creative activities	60%
10%	Service	20%

Performance Dimensions and University Parameters for Weighting:

Tenured—12 hour TLE

Minimum Weight	Performance Dimension (Role)	Maximum Weight
50%	Teaching/Advising	80%
10%	Research/scholarships/creative activities	40%
10%	Service	20%

Note: Individuals who do not have a regular teaching load assignment (e.g. faculty on sabbatical or with release time) and first year faculty will not be disadvantaged by this rating system.

For faculty on sabbatical, their rating will be tied to the sabbatical research.

For faculty with release time, the weighting for their rating will be reflective of their assignment.

For first year faculty, a rating of 3 will be assumed unless their performance differs significantly from expectations for a new faculty member.

B. Annual Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (AAPT) Subcommittee

1. Selection of subcommittee

Ranked members of the Personnel Committee shall serve as the AAPT Subcommittee. If fewer than three, the next faculty member(s) on list of ranked faculty will also serve in order to maintain a minimum of three members on this subcommittee. If members of a certain level (Associate or Full Professor) are needed for promotion consideration and not available among the GLS ranked faculty, professors at the needed level will be selected from outside of Greenwood.

2. Subcommittee Responsibilities

The AAPT Subcommittee shall inspect all items made available by the Department Head and all those provided by the individual being reviewed for annual appointment, promotion, and tenure. The Committee shall assess the performance of the applicant in the teaching, scholarship, and service areas. At the request of the Committee, and at the option of the faculty member being considered, additional material may be submitted.

Appendix 1

2010-2011 Greenwood Faculty (Years at Greenwood Laboratory School, including current school year)

<u>Full-time ranked faculty</u>	<u>Served on GLS Committee</u>	<u>Served on COE Committee</u>
Johnson, Shae (27)	2007-2009, 2009-10	2007-2009
Dunlop, Vicki (23)	2006-2007	
Ruhe, Richard (20)	2010-2012	
Gibson, Kathy (17)	2010-2012	2006-2008

Full-time Instructors – eligible for tenure at Greenwood only

Baldwin, Sue (16)	2007-2009
Davison, Dave (8)	2008-2010
Hedgpeth, Kent (8)	2009-2011
Taylor, Darren (8)	2010-2012
Martin, Jill (7)	2006-2007
Sutton, Vicki (6)	
Flanders, Janelle (5)	2009-2011
Burch, Abby (5)	
VanGorden, Todd (5)	
Kleeschulte, Melanie (4)	
Weir, Cathie (4)	
Crowder, Rebecca (3)	
Milburn, Diana (3)	
Fearing, Cory (2)	
Hammerschmidt, Melinda (2)	
JulieAnn Jenkins (1)	

Note: Tonia Tinsley is part-time (Instructor) at Greenwood, but full-time at MSU.

2010-2011 Greenwood Personnel Committee

Janelle Flanders (2009-2011)
Kent Hedgpeth (2009–2011)
Kathy Gibson (2010-2012)
Richard Ruhe (2010-2012)
Darren Taylor (2010-2012)

Appendix 2

Each faculty member must identify activities they deem important on Performance Review Chart.

The faculty member must submit a brief written statement supporting the inclusion of activities on the Performance Review Chart. See Appendix 3. This statement may include hours, audience, justification of significance of the activity, and other criteria deemed necessary. Each statement should be limited to no more than one paragraph. Documentation should be available upon Committee request.

Meeting all *MSU Faculty Handbook* teaching responsibility criteria;

Examples of Teaching (See Descriptors for more possibilities)

To be considered a ranking of exceptional (5) teaching activities may typically include but are not limited to:

Evidencing engagement in the scholarship of teaching;

Course development activity (e.g., alignment with standards/competencies, updating, revising materials);

Curriculum development activity;

Counseling/consulting;

Coordination of academic program;

Contribution to the public affairs mission;

Innovative use of instructional technology;

Development of Internet courses; or curriculum/instructional efforts

To be considered a ranking of commendable (4) teaching activities may typically include but are not limited to:

Course development activity (e.g., alignment with standards/competencies, updating, revising materials);

Curriculum development activity;

Counseling/consulting;

Coordination of academic program;

Contribution to the public affairs mission;

Innovative use of instructional technology;

Development of Internet courses; or curriculum/instructional efforts

To be considered a ranking of mastered (3) teaching activities may typically include but are not limited to:

Meeting all *MSU Faculty Handbook* teaching responsibility criteria;

Providing evidence of effective teaching and utilization of technology integration

These examples are only guides for the committee; the final rating shall be a consensus of professional judgment among the Compensation Committee members after considering all relevant information.

Examples of Research and Scholarly/Creative Activity

To be considered a ranking of exceptional (5) scholarship activities may typically include but are not limited to:

A publication in a nationally refereed journal as primary or co-author

Non-published research accepted for publication but not yet published in a referred journal

At least one juried presentation, performance, or exhibit at the national level and/or two or more presentations at state level

Author, editor, project manager or production specialist of major published educational curriculum material including electronic media at national level

Award of internal or external grant, typically \$5,000 or above

To be considered a ranking of commendable (4) scholarship activities may typically include but are not limited to:

A publication with national, regional, or state level distribution

A juried presentation, performance, or exhibit at the regional or state level
Author, editor, project manager or production specialist of major published educational curriculum material including electronic media at regional or state level
Award of internal or external grant

To be considered a ranking of mastered (3) scholarship activities may typically include but are not limited to:
Some level of participation in support of other's research
A presentation, performance, or exhibit at the local level or in the community, or non-juried at state & national levels
Formal dissemination of written service learning component
Grant proposal submitted

These examples are only guides for the committee; the final rating shall be a consensus of professional judgment among the Compensation Committee members after considering all relevant information.

Examples of Service

To be considered a ranking of exceptional (5) service activities may typically include but are not limited to:
Hold a leadership position in a state or national professional organization
Significant service on committees beyond those required by all faculty (i.e. North Central)
Consulting activities at the national, regional, or state level
Honor or recognition at state regional or national level
Volunteer in a sustained leadership position at the state or national level in professional organization

To be considered a ranking of commendable (4) service activities may typically include but are not limited to:
Hold a leadership position in a professional organization at the local level
Serve in a leadership position of an ongoing committee either in the local community, university, College, or Greenwood. or serve on no fewer than two additional committees beyond those required by all faculty (i.e. North Central)
Consulting activities at local or district level
Honor or recognition at Greenwood, college, university or local level
Volunteer in a sustained leadership position at the local level in community or professional organization

To be considered a ranking of mastered (3) service activities may typically include but are not limited to:
To serve on one additional committee beyond those required by all faculty (i.e. North Central)
Membership and participation in professional organizations
Volunteering in professional and community organizations

These examples are only guides for the committee; the final rating shall be a consensus of professional judgment among the Compensation Committee members after considering all relevant information.

Faculty Evaluation Rubric for Teaching

Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric matrix below. These examples are only guides for the committee; the final rating shall be a consensus of judgment among the GLS Compensation Committee members after considering all relevant information.

It is required that each performance indicator includes the following: hours, descriptor, and documentation (kept by faculty member in cases where validation is necessary). Including a time commitment will allow the committee to better evaluate the significance of the activity. Numbers are meant as guidelines only, and the Compensation Committee will use their professional judgment when considering the evidence.

Excellent (5)	Above Expected (4)	Expected (3)	Progressing (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Exceeding above expected performance in at least <i>five</i> ways, including, but not limited to: Evidencing engagement in the scholarship of teaching; Course development activity (e.g., alignment with standards/competencies, updating, revising materials); Curriculum development activity; Counseling/consulting; Coordination of academic program; Contribution to the public affairs mission; Innovative use of instructional technology; Development of Internet courses; or curriculum/instructional efforts	Exceeding expected performance in at least <i>three</i> ways, including, but not limited to: Evidencing engagement in the scholarship of teaching; Course development activity (e.g., alignment with standards/competencies, updating, revising materials); Curriculum development activity; Counseling/consulting; Coordination of academic program; Contribution to the public affairs mission; Innovative use of instructional technology; Development of Internet courses; or curriculum/instructional efforts	Meeting all <i>MSU Faculty Handbook</i> teaching responsibility criteria; Providing evidence of effective teaching and utilization of technology integration	Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in an Expected manner in their teaching.	Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in an Expected manner in their teaching or persistent evidence of low quality teaching.

Example:
HOURS

DESCRIPTOR

DOCUMENTATION

10 hours	Development of Earth Science teaching unit	Possible samples would include, but not be limited to: section of curriculum guide, sample lesson plan, sample activities, student work, resources cited
----------	--------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Descriptors of Quality Teaching:

- Student, parent, or practicum evaluations and/or student feedback (50% or less of the evidence provided)
- course syllabi and policy statements
- alignment of courses with standards/competencies
- samples of assignments, examinations, or work turned in by students
- course or curriculum development
- evidence of instructional methods and evidence of instructional technology utilization
- on-line course information
- special access opportunities such as distance learning delivery
- providing opportunities for out-of-class application, field work, or service learning
- evidence of academic and career advising
- evidence of continuing professional education, advanced study, e.g., certificates
- honors and awards for teaching
- written comments by students
- student outcome data related to course objectives and program assessment
- peer evaluations by appropriate program faculty
- publications and presentations related to teaching
- cooperative scholarship with students, including publications, presentations, awards (finished product must be based upon written curriculum)
- supervision and interaction with college practicum students, site-based students, student teachers, including hours spent, types of interactions (lesson plan development, methodology discussions, counseling—including face-to-face or electronic meetings)
- completion of course work, degrees, certifications

Sample Descriptor Documents:

Syllabi	Effective implementation of assignments in lieu of classroom teaching
Student assignments	Student, parent, practicum evaluations
Exams curriculum guides	Counseling/consulting documents
Program materials	Classroom websites
Peer and administrative observations	Work with MSU faculty or staff
Other written materials	Documentation of seminars, workshops and conferences attended: programs, registration materials, handouts
Honors and recognitions of teachers' or students' written work	Documentation of course work completed
Program listings	Documentation of professional literature read: annotated bibliography
Letters of commendation	Personal goals plan
Media reports	Bi-annual review
Student participation in contests	Confirmation of offices held in professional organizations
Public non-senior exhibitions	
Performances	
Tournaments	
Student academic performance, including: test results, portfolios, or work samples	

Faculty Evaluation Rubric for Service

Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric matrix below. These examples are only guides for the committee; the final rating shall be a consensus of judgment among the GLS Compensation Committee members after considering all relevant information.

It is required that each performance indicator includes the following: hours, descriptor, and documentation. Including a time commitment will allow the committee to better evaluate the significance of the activity. Numbers are guidelines only. Numbers are meant as guidelines only, and the Compensation Committee will use their professional judgment when considering the evidence.

Excellent (5)	Above Expected (4)	Expected (3)	Progressing (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Extends beyond above expected performance to include service activities that demonstrate <i>sustained success in one or more areas</i> , i.e., Professional Service, Public Service, or Professional Consultation.	Service extends beyond expected performance to include service activities that demonstrate <i>attained success in one or more areas</i> , i.e., Professional Service, Public Service, or Professional Consultation	Demonstrated success in University Citizenship as evidenced by contributing fairly to the task of shared governance; and attained success in one additional area, i.e., Professional Service, Public Service, or Professional Consultation	Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in an Expected manner in service.	Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in an Expected manner in service.
Service Area	Examples of Service Activities			
1. University Citizenship: serving the University and Greenwood and contributing fairly to the task of shared-governance	<p>-Departmental service (e.g., participation on curriculum revision committee ; departmental policy revision committee; faculty search committee member; department Library representative; member of North Central accreditation committee); supervising Greenwood athletic and dance functions; academic other departmental committees</p> <p>-College service (e.g., member of Dean’s faculty advisory or budget priorities committee; chair or member of COE Graduate Program Committee; faculty, administrator, or staff search committee member; College Council; College Compensation committee; other)</p> <p>-University service (e.g., chair or member of University committees such as Graduate Council, Library Advisory Committee, University Assessment Committee; PEC; Faculty Senate; Faculty Concerns; administrator or staff search committee member; other)</p> <p>-Additional service activities (e.g., task force chair or committee member; providing professional development activities; participating in campus discussions, and expanding opportunities for shaping the learning environment); or other service activities</p>			

<p>2. Professional Service: contributing to professional organizations within the faculty member's field</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Chairing or serving as a board member or officer of a professional organization at the local, state, national, and/or international levels; -Serving as an editor or member of an editorial board of a professional journal at the state, national, and/or international levels; -Serving as a reviewer or guest reviewer for a professional journal at the state, national, and/or international levels; -Sponsoring an active student organization; -Sponsoring or advising additional Greenwood activities, clubs, functions -Providing mentoring or advising; -Providing opportunities for student experiences outside the expectations of teaching - Other service activities, awards, honors agreed upon by faculty and compensation committee
<p>3. Public Service: serving community, state, national or international public constituents</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Writing op eds or other articles in newspapers or other print or electronic media or on television or radio, etc. -Providing presentations to support individuals and groups of individuals in local communities, states, the nation, and other countries -Volunteering for local, community, state. national, and international organizations - Other service activities, awards, honors
<p>4. Professional Consultation: providing professional expertise to different individuals or groups</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Providing professional expertise to business, industry, schools, community organizations, and colleagues in other university programs through collaborative projects, presentations, or specific consultations -Providing unpaid consultation services to external constituents within the faculty member's professional expertise - Other service activities, awards, honors agreed upon by faculty and compensation committee

Sample Descriptor Documents:

Documentation of committee assignments and attendance at department, college or university level
Documentation of sponsorship of student activities
Honors or recognition of service
Documentation of consulting activities

Documentation of office held in professional or educational service organization
Documentation of in-service workshop presentations
Documentation of level of involvement in civic or cultural organizations
Documentation of progress toward personal goals

Faculty Evaluation Rubric for Research/Scholarship

Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric matrix below. These examples are only guides for the committee; the final rating shall be a consensus of judgment among the GLS Compensation Committee members after considering all relevant information.

It is required that each performance indicator includes the following: hours, descriptor, and documentation. Including a time commitment will allow the committee to better evaluate the significance of the activity. Numbers are guidelines only. Numbers are meant as guidelines only, and the Compensation Committee will use their professional judgment when considering the evidence.

Excellent (5)	Above Expected (4)	Expected (3)	Progressing (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
At least five scholarship products from Categories A, B or C.	At least three scholarship products from Categories A, B or C.	At least two scholarship products from Category A	Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in an Expected manner in scholarship.	Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in an Expected manner in scholarship.

CATEGORY A

- Grant(s) that have been funded with report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) (including electronic media) --typically <\$5,000.
- State and local presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s).
- Non-refereed publication(s) and electronic media.
- Submissions for publication that have not been accepted for publication.
- Scholarly, creative work(s), performance, exhibit and electronic presentation(s)
- Grant and contract proposal(s) as well as accompanying report(s) emanating from such project(s).
- Student/faculty collaborative research project(s).
- Peer Reviewer for journal.
- Research consultant.
- Honors or awards for research.
- Reprints of articles previously published in edited books or referenced journals.
- Preparation and dissemination of custom texts, reading packages, or ancillary materials (with citations) for one's own courses.
- Secondary authors

CATEGORY B

- Scholarly/research articles published in regional or state peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media.
- Articles published in major national discipline-based, print-based or electronic media (including journals).
- Student research projects mentored by faculty members resulting in state/regional peer-reviewed publications
- Primary author, editor, project manager or production specialist of published journals or educational curriculum material including electronic media.
- Reviews for university self-studies that require substantial faculty effort.

- National or regional scholarly peer-reviewed conference presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s).
- National or international awards for research

CATEGORY C

- Scholarly/research articles published in international/national peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media
- Student research projects mentored by faculty members resulting in international/national peer-reviewed publications
- Author or editor of scholarly book(s).
- Author or editor of book chapter(s), monograph(s), anthology(ies), published production script(s), either print-based or other electronic media.
- External grant applications that require substantial faculty effort.
- Principal investigator for external grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media (typically \$5,000+).
- Primary author of NCATE Folio or Professional Organization Folio.

Sample Descriptor Documents

Citation of publication

Websites that demonstrate research and or scholarly activity

Creative work sample

Gallery exhibit or performance

Honors or recognition of work

Grants associated with publications, creative efforts or teaching

Advisement on published books and/or scholarly resources

Developed service learning or other educational component

Evidence of participation in research project or creative effort

Evidence of grant proposal

Proposal form and letter of acceptance for competitive or refereed presentations/creative efforts

Copy of conference program

Honors or recognition of presentation/creative effort

Following are documents for you to use to record your information...

Appendix 3
Performance Review Chart
Greenwood Laboratory School

Faculty Member's Name: _____ Rank: _____

Date Submitted: _____

Teaching		
Hours	Descriptor	Documentation

Perceived Rating _____

Justification/Explanation _____

Research and Scholarly/Creative Activity			
Hours	Descriptor	Documentation	Category

Perceived Rating _____

Justification/Explanation _____

Professional Service			
Hours	Descriptor	Documentation	Service Area (for ex. University Citizenship, Professional Service, Public Service, Consultation)

Perceived Rating _____

Justification/Explanation _____
