

2 **Compensation Plan**

3 **October 2007**

4 All ranked faculty in the Department of History are expected to participate in three broad areas of  
5 activity: Teaching, Research, and Service. All evaluations of ranked faculty, for whatever purpose,  
6 will be made in these three areas. All faculty members are expected to carry out their activities in a  
7 manner consistent with the American Historical Association's statement on *Standards of*  
8 *Professional Conduct*.\*

9 **1.0 Performance Reviews – Overview**

10 **1.1 Period of review**

11 All tenured faculty, probationary faculty, and renewable lecturers will submit annual performance  
12 reports to the department head. Performance evaluations shall be carried out on an annual basis  
13 for all faculty.

14 **1.2 Establishing weightings**

15 Each year, based on a schedule determined by the CHPA, all History Department faculty will  
16 discuss with the Department Head the desired percentage weightings to assign to each of the three  
17 areas of activity. Those weightings should be consistent with guidelines provided by the  
18 University and the College.

19 **1.3 Merit Evaluation Committee**

- 20 • Only tenured faculty members are eligible to serve on the Merit Evaluation Committee.  
21 • Faculty will not serve consecutive terms unless no other faculty members are eligible.  
22 • All ranked faculty are eligible to participate in Merit Evaluation Committee elections.  
23 • The department head will hold an election for the Committee during May.  
24 • The Committee will consist of five members with two-year staggered terms.  
25     ○ All ranked faculty will vote for three at-large members of the Committee.  
26     ○ The Professors and Associate Professors will elect one member each to the  
27     Committee.  
28 • New Committees will hold their organizational meeting within two weeks of election.  
29 • The Committee will select its own chair.  
30 • Committee members will not discuss Committee activities or their own activities on the  
31     Committee with anyone outside the Committee.  
32 • Members of the Committee who believe that the Committee itself is acting unfairly should  
33     discuss this issue with the Committee chair. If the issue is not resolved, members may  
34     bring such issues to the department head, dean, provost, or the Equal Opportunity Officer.  
35 • The charge of this panel is to:

---

\* <http://www.historians.org/pubs/free/professionalstandards.cfm>

- 36 ○ Provide the department head with narrative evaluations of the performance of each
- 37 faculty member.
- 38 ○ Provide the department head with performance rankings of each faculty member.
- 39 ○ Suggest changes to this Compensation Plan to the department as required by the
- 40 University or College, or to improve the plan.

#### 41 **1.4 Evaluation procedures**

42 1.4.1 Each faculty member's performance will be evaluated in each area by all five members of the

43 Merit Evaluation Committee.

44 1.4.2 The overall evaluation in each area will be taken as the median (not average) of the five

45 rankings.

46 1.4.2.1 Each committee member of the Merit Evaluation Committee will be evaluated by the chair

47 of the Personnel Committee together with the four other committee members.

48 1.53 Committee members will submit their evaluations anonymously through the departmental

49 secretary. Evaluations should be accompanied by a brief narrative assessment explaining the

50 ratings assigned for each area, justifying any rankings other than "3".

51 1.4.3 The department secretary will provide copies of the rankings and narratives to the chair of

52 the committee.

53 1.4.4 The Committee will meet to discuss evaluations for which there is no consensus and allow

54 Committee members to change their rankings and narratives if they choose to do so.

55 1.4.5 Each individual Committee members' narrative assessments and rankings will be forwarded

56 anonymously to the department head.

57

58 1.4.6 The Merit Evaluation Committee will evaluate faculty members exclusively on their

59 performance with respect to this document.

60

61 1.4.7 Probationary faculty members in their first year will not be assigned a rating of less than 3 in

62 any evaluation category.

63

64 1.4.8 Individual committee members will not seek out additional information, but the Committee

65 as a whole may do so.

#### 66 **1.5 Department Head review**

67 1.5.1 The department head will utilize narrative assessments and rankings from the Merit

68 Evaluations Committee, as well as consultation with Committee members, as a component in

69 assigning rankings.

70 1.5.2 The department head will use weightings for each area of activity to construct a single

71 composite number for each faculty member.

72 1.5.3 The department head will provide the evaluated faculty member with:

- 73 • Copies of the Merit Evaluation Committee’s narrative reviews and the Committee’s ratings in  
74 the three performance areas  
75 • The department head’s own narrative review and ratings  
76 • A written rationale for any differences between the Committee evaluations and the department  
77 head evaluations

78 1.5.4 The department head will forward his/her evaluations to the CHPA Dean.

## 79 **1.6 Appeals**

80 The decision-making process for assigning annual salaries should foster an open and encouraging  
81 environment for faculty performance. Accordingly, faculty evaluations shall observe the highest  
82 standards of collegiality, be based on coherent, published policy and administered fairly. To ensure  
83 transparency, faculty shall be allowed to review the departmental evaluation process and his or her  
84 resulting performance ratings as well as provide a written response to a performance evaluation. A  
85 faculty member who is dissatisfied with his/her performance rating(s) may appeal the rating(s).  
86 Only a faculty member's final composite performance rating may be appealed.<sup>†</sup>  
87

88 1.6.1 A faculty member who is dissatisfied with his/her final composite performance rating should  
89 first request a meeting with the department head to discuss the processes and underlying rationales  
90 by which the performance rating was determined.  
91

92 1.6.2 After meeting with the department head, the faculty member may request a formal review of  
93 the rating by submitting a written appeal to the department head stating the reasons for questioning  
94 the rating.  
95

96 1.6.3 The department head must provide to the faculty member a written response to the appeal. At  
97 the request of the faculty member, the appeal, along with the department head response and other  
98 supporting materials, is forwarded to the dean.  
99

100 1.6.4 At any time, any employee who believes that they have been discriminated against under this  
101 policy for any reason not related to job performance may directly consult the Office for Equity and  
102 Diversity.

## 103 **2.0 Evaluation guidelines**

### 104 **2.1 Basic Required Materials**

105 All faculty members are expected to submit to the Merit Evaluation Committee the following basic  
106 materials:

- 107 • CHPA Faculty Activity Survey
- 108 • Narrative self-review of teaching, research and service
- 109 • All syllabi
- 110 • Student statistical evaluation scores of teaching
- 111 • Evidence of publications
- 112 • Evidence of ongoing research
- 113 • Evidence of service
- 114

---

<sup>†</sup> Faculty Handbook ¶5.3

115 To support ranking 4 or 5 in certain areas, additional evidence may be required as detailed in the  
116 sections 3.0, 4.0, and 5.0.

### 117 **2.2 Expectations for rating of 3 (Competent):**

118 For a rating of 3 for a category, the faculty member should perform well in the basic  
119 responsibilities outlined below, without any major deficiencies in any of these basic  
120 responsibilities. A rating of “3” will be the normal starting point for each evaluation, with faculty  
121 rankings adjusted up or down depending upon the evidence provided.

### 122 **2.3 Expectations for rating of 4 (Commendable) or 5 (Exceptional):**

123 For a rating of 4 or 5 for a category, the faculty member should perform well in all of the basic  
124 responsibilities outlined in below, and should, in addition, demonstrate significant contributions in  
125 several of the meritorious activities as indicated below. A rating of 4 indicates overall performance  
126 significantly above the basic responsibilities. A rating of 5 indicates overall outstanding  
127 performance.

### 128 **2.4 Rating of 1 (Unsatisfactory) or 2 (Development needed):**

129 Ratings of 1 and 2 reflect an assessment that the performance of the faculty member is  
130 significantly deficient. A rating of 2 for a category will normally indicate a significant deficiency  
131 in performance of at least one of the basic responsibilities outlined below. A rating of 1 for a  
132 category normally indicates significant deficiency in at least two basic responsibilities.

### 133 **2.5 Special exceptions:**

134 The examples of meritorious activities listed in this document do not include all possible  
135 meritorious activities. Faculty members whose professional activities do not fit readily into the  
136 examples contained in this document may request special consideration from the Committee in any  
137 area. Such requests must include appropriate documentation.

## 138 **3.0 Teaching Evaluation**

### 139 **3.1 General principles:**

140 Historians believe that good teaching entails accuracy and rigor in communicating factual  
141 information, and strives always to place such information in context to convey its larger  
142 significance. Integrity in teaching means presenting competing interpretations with fairness and  
143 intellectual honesty. Doing so supports the most important goal of teaching: exciting the interest of  
144 those who are encountering a new historical topic for the first time, leading them toward the  
145 insight that history is a process of living inquiry, not an inert collection of accepted facts.<sup>‡</sup>  
146 Teaching includes, but is not limited to, all activities involving instruction of students in the  
147 classroom or delivered through electronic media, advising of students, direction of undergraduate  
148 and graduate research, independent readings, revision of courses and teaching methods, and  
149 participation in workshops and seminars devoted to instruction of students. Teaching also includes  
150 the design of new courses, course materials, methods, and the offering of the department’s  
151 required courses. Grants which fund any of these activities are included as well.

---

<sup>‡</sup> Adapted from the AHA Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct, 2005

### 152 **3.2.0 Evaluating teaching effectiveness:**

153 3.2.1 To evaluate teaching effectiveness the Merit Evaluation Committee may use four kinds of  
154 evidence:

- 155 • Student statistical evaluations of teaching
- 156 • Student written comments
- 157 • Self-review
- 158 • Peer review of teaching materials

159

160 3.2.1.1 Student statistical evaluation:

161 Research indicates that student evaluation scores are reliable indicators of those characteristics of  
162 teaching which students can judge. The current evaluation instrument includes five questions  
163 which are likely to be both valid and reliable:

- 164 • 2. The teacher came to class well prepared and conducted the class in an organized fashion
- 165 • 3. The teacher presented the material for this class in a clear and understandable manner
- 166 • 6. The teacher treated students with respect
- 167 • 7. The teacher was accessible to students outside the classroom
- 168 • 9. The instructor is an effective teacher

169

170 3.2.1.3 Student written comments:

171 The student evaluation instrument contains space for written comments. Student comments may  
172 provide an explanation for the statistical evaluation. Faculty members claiming levels 4 or 5 may  
173 submit written comments as evidence in support of their claims. Faculty members producing  
174 composite scores weaker than 2.5 for any course must submit all student written comments to the  
175 Merit Evaluation Committee.

176

177 3.2.1.4 Self-Review

178 Faculty members claiming level 3 in teaching should provide the Merit Evaluation Committee  
179 with a brief self-review showing how they meet each of the characteristics of an effective teacher.  
180 Those claiming more meritorious levels will be expected to submit a more nuanced review of their  
181 teaching effectiveness discussing how they meet level 3 and addressing at least several  
182 characteristics of level 4 and 5. Self-review may also include descriptions of special assignments  
183 meant to diversify student experiences, the way in which courses meet accreditation goals,  
184 teaching awards, commendations, news stories, etc. and curricular grants.

185

186 3.2.1.5 Peer Review

187 The Merit Evaluation Committee will review the following items to determine teaching  
188 effectiveness:

- 189 • All syllabi
- 190 • Sample graded student assignments for each course to support claims of highly effective  
191 teaching
- 192 • Student written comments when appropriate under 3.2.1.3
- 193 • Copies of all advising notes when special claims are made for meritorious advisement
- 194 • Documentation of awards, grants, or other materials addressed in the self-review as part of  
195 a claim for highly effective teaching

196 **3.3.0 The evaluation process**

197 The Merit Evaluation Committee will use the four kinds of evidence listed in 3.2.1 to determine  
198 the appropriate level of teacher effectiveness. Claims of level 4 or 5 normally require evidence of  
199 meeting at least two of the criteria 3.4.2.

200 **3.4.0 Characteristics of effective teaching**

201 3.4.1 All effective (competent) teachers are expected to:

- 202 • Prepare appropriate syllabi (including General Education goals where required) and  
203 teaching materials for all assigned classes
- 204 • Meet classes reliably and on time
- 205 • Notify the department head in advance about any class period that he or she must miss due  
206 to professional commitments or personal reasons
- 207 • Competently communicate appropriate material to classes. Lecture material should be up-  
208 to-date and instructor should be aware of relevant developments in the field
- 209 • Provide fair and timely feedback to students by returning exams and assignments in a  
210 timely manner
- 211 • Exhibit quality teaching as reflected in evaluations by students. Evaluation may include  
212 student evaluations for all statistically-evaluated courses over the period of merit  
213 evaluation. Note that numerical course evaluations should not be a primary criterion for  
214 determining teaching rankings because those are affected by many factors besides teaching  
215 quality (e.g., by class sizes, majors versus non-majors courses, difficulty level of courses,  
216 etc.
- 217 • Competently advise undergraduates

218  
219 3.4.2 Highly effective (commendable and exceptional) teachers:

- 220 • Offer a new course or courses which they have not offered previously
- 221 • Redevelop courses in new media such as television, online, and DVD
- 222 • Teach departmental courses such as Writing II, Historiography, or the Senior Seminar.
- 223 • Receive superior statistical teaching evaluations together with strong written comments  
224 from students
- 225 • Show innovation in teaching and/or in preparation of teaching materials. This might derive  
226 from attending workshops and teaching seminars. Attending workshops is not in and of  
227 itself meritorious.
- 228 • Actively supervise undergraduate student advanced reading, internships, or research
- 229 • Actively supervise graduate research.
- 230 • Submit one or more grant applications to support teaching activities or receive funding to  
231 support teaching activities
- 232 • Publish a textbook, or accept a contract to write or edit a textbook
- 233 • Win internal or external awards for teaching
- 234 • Prepare undergraduates for graduate or professional schools
- 235 • Train students to analyze primary sources and think critically about history

236 **3.5 Characteristics of ineffective teaching**

237 3.5.1 Weak statistical evaluation scores (from  $2.5 \geq 3$ ) suggest the possibility that the instructor is  
238 ineffective (level 1 or 2). Such scores need to be explained in the self-evaluation. Scores weaker  
239 than 3.0 indicate ineffective teaching (level 2).

240

241 3.5.2 Failure to comply with the expectations listed under 3.4.1 may lead to ranking of level 1 or 2  
242 depending on the severity of the deficiency.

## 243 **4.0 Research Evaluation**

### 244 **4.1.0 General principles:**

245 The process of research is understood as the production and formal communication of original  
246 creative, scholarly work. Research both advances knowledge in a particular specialized academic  
247 field and encourages individual faculty development; it enhances the quality of education students  
248 receive.<sup>§</sup>

### 249 **4.2.0 Evaluating research:**

250 4.2.1 To evaluate research the Merit Evaluation Committee may use:

- 251 • Self-review
- 252 • Products of effective research, e.g. books, articles.
- 253 • Evidence of progress in research, e. g. research materials, grant applications, drafts of  
254 articles or chapters

#### 255 4.2.1.2 Self-review

256 For a new project, a faculty members will submit a brief narrative (1-2 pages) explaining what  
257 they are working on and why it is historically significant, citing previous major works and  
258 suggesting how their project will stand in relation to them. The narrative should also include a  
259 tentative research agenda which might include archives visits required and estimates of how much  
260 time will be needed for research (i.e., “the next three summers”) and for writing (i.e., “two  
261 summers”).  
262

263  
264 In the following year(s) faculty members will submit an update: a brief narrative describing what  
265 has been accomplished, where the project stands in relation to completion (including where it is in  
266 the publication process), and any modifications of the scope and nature of the project.

### 267 **4.3.0 The evaluation process**

268 The Merit Evaluation Committee will use the three types of evidence listed in 4.2.1 to determine  
269 the appropriate level of research effectiveness to be assigned to faculty.

### 270 **4.4.0 Characteristics of effective research**

271 4.4.1 To receive a ranking of “3” in research, a faculty member should demonstrate significant  
272 progress in ongoing scholarly research that has the potential of peer-reviewed publication or  
273 dissemination in a venue appropriate to the subject. Faculty may demonstrate such progress  
274 through any one of the following activities:

- 275 • engaging in significant reading of new secondary literature in their field of research at the  
276 beginning of a project
- 277 • conducting research in primary sources
- 278 • writing and/or revising drafts of articles or book chapters
- 279 • delivering a paper at a state, regional, national or international conference
- 280 • Submitting an external grant application or applications

---

<sup>§</sup> Faculty Handbook, Section 4.2.2.1



281 • Receipt of an internal research grant  
282 4.4.2 Expectations for rating of 4 ( Highly Meritorious) or 5 (Exceptional): For a rating of 4 or 5  
283 the faculty member should perform well in all of the basic responsibilities and should also  
284 demonstrate significant contributions above those expected for a rating of 3. A rating of 4 should  
285 indicate overall performance significantly above the basic responsibilities. A rating of 5 should  
286 indicate overall outstanding performance.

287  
288 Level 5 – (Exceptional) The following guarantees a ranking of 5  
289 • Publication or unequivocal acceptance of a scholarly monograph within the last three years  
290 • Publication or unequivocal acceptance of two or more scholarly articles in referred journals  
291 or chapters in scholarly monographs, or equivalent work.

292  
293 Level 4 – (Highly Meritorious) The following guarantee a ranking of 4  
294 • Publication or unequivocal acceptance of a scholarly article in a referred journal, a chapter  
295 in a scholarly monograph, or equivalent work.  
296 • An advance contract for a scholarly monograph in progress (requires evidence of progress)  
297 • Principle Investigator in receipt of an externally funded grant.

298  
299 Note: Ranking of 4 for a scholarly article, chapter, grant, or equivalent work is the minimum  
300 guaranteed by this compensation policy. The author may claim a higher ranking based on  
301 considerations such as the quality of the journal, or receipt of an award or other special  
302 recognition.

### 303 **4.5.0 Characteristics of ineffective research**

304 Faculty members merit a rank below Level 3 if deficient in the area of research. Faculty members  
305 merit Level 1 by failing to engage in research. Faculty members merit Level 2 by failing to  
306 demonstrate significant progress in ongoing scholarly research that has the potential of peer-  
307 reviewed publication or dissemination in a venue appropriate to the subject.

### 308 **4.6.0 Faculty with 6 and 12 hour teaching loads**

309 Tenured and tenure track faculty members normally have 3 hours of reassigned time for research.  
310 Those faculty members with 6 or more hours of reassigned time in research should be more  
311 productive than those with 3 hours. Performance expectations for those with 6 hours of reassigned  
312 time should be correspondingly greater than those with 3 hours of reassigned time for the  
313 assignment of merit. The expectations for those who do not receive 3 hours of reassigned time for  
314 research will be correspondingly less.

315  
316 4.6.1 Faculty without reassigned time for research  
317 Faculty members without reassigned time for research are expected to keep current with their  
318 fields of specialization. Expected activities might include:

- 319 • Book reviews
- 320 • Conference attendance
- 321 • Conference papers
- 322 • Minor publications

323  
324 4.6.2 Faculty with 6 hours reassigned to research  
325 Faculty members with 6 hours reassigned to research are expected to maintain a research agenda  
326 leading to significant publication. This may be demonstrated by:  
327 • A contract to publish a monograph through a leading scholarly venue



- 328 • The publication or unequivocal acceptance of articles at an average of two every three  
329 years in leading scholarly journals

## 330 **5.0 Service Evaluation**

### 331 **5.1.0 General principles**

332 Faculty service in the History Department serves three purposes: to support the academic tradition  
333 of shared governance, to support the professional and organizational needs of the discipline, and to  
334 bring the products of department work to the public for its benefit.

335  
336 University service in support of shared governance includes, but is not limited to, service on  
337 program, departmental, college and university committees and task forces. Professional service  
338 includes but is not limited to, contributions to professional organizations within the field of history.  
339 Public service includes the use of professional skills and expertise to serve community, state,  
340 national or international public constituents.

341  
342 Faculty members are sometimes reassigned time to permit concentration on a particular service  
343 activity. Because reassigned time should allow the faculty member to be more productive in that  
344 activity, the performance expectations should be correspondingly greater for the assignment of  
345 merit. Having reassigned time for service, per se, should in no way detract from the faculty  
346 member's ability to receive a meritorious rating for the activity. The faculty member's record of  
347 accomplishment should, however, reflect an increased level of achievement commensurate with  
348 that reassigned time.

### 349 **5.2.0 Evaluating service**

#### 350 **5.2.1 To evaluate service the Merit Evaluation Committee may use three** 351 **kinds of evidence:**

- 352 • Self review  
353 • Products of Service  
354 • Peer review (for levels 4 and 5)

##### 355 356 5.2.1.1 Self-review

357 Faculty claiming level 3 in service should provide the Merit Evaluation Committee with a brief  
358 self-review showing how they met each of the criteria for level 3 of service. Those claiming more  
359 meritorious levels will be expected to submit a more nuanced review of their service discussing  
360 how they meet level 3 and at least some of the criteria for level 4 and 5. Self-review for those  
361 claiming level 4 or 5 should include more than merely a list of committees or other service tasks.  
362 It should address duties, efforts expended in and accomplishments resulting from such service.

##### 363 364 5.2.1.2 Products of Service and Peer Review

365 The Merit Evaluation Committee will review the following items for faculty claiming level 4 or 5  
366 in service:

- 367 • Products of service (reports produced, policies established, reviews completed, etc.)  
368 • Evaluations of faculty service produced by committee chairs, community organizations,  
369 student organizations, etc.

370 **5.3.0 The Evaluation process**

371 The Merit Evaluation Committee will use the two kinds of evidence discussed in 5.2.1 to  
372 determine the appropriate level of service to be assigned to faculty. Faculty seeking level 4 or 5 in  
373 service should demonstrate highly effective performance in activities comparable to those listed in  
374 5.4.2.

375 **5.4.0 Characteristics of effective service**

376 5.4.1 To achieve level 3 in service, faculty members should

- 377 • Regularly attend department meetings
- 378 • Actively participate on department committees
- 379 • Display a willingness to serve on college and university committees

380 Frequently participate in department-sponsored activities such as History Day, History Bowl, the  
381 Mid-America Conference, the alumni dinner, etc. (Faculty need not attend every department  
382 function to be judged competent in the area of service.)

383

384 5.4.2 Examples of service worthy of level 4 or 5 include but are not limited to highly effective  
385 service

- 386 • As chair or member of a particularly labor-intensive department committee (e. g. Personnel  
387 Committee, Merit Evaluation Committee, search committee)
- 388 • As chair or member of a particularly labor-intensive college or university committee (e. g.  
389 PEC, CGEIP, Faculty Senate)
- 390 • As the main organizer for a significant academic conference (e. g. Mid-America, Missouri  
391 Conference, and other comparable conferences)
- 392 • As the primary coordinator of History Day, History Bowl, or the Alumni Dinner
- 393 • Of a professional nature beyond the University
- 394 • Principle Investigator in receipt of a grant in support of professional service

395 **5.5 Characteristics of ineffective service**

396 Faculty members merit a rank of 1 or 2 if deficient in the area of service. A merit ranking of 2  
397 indicates a level of service that is noticeably below expected levels. A merit ranking of 1 indicates  
398 a negligible level of service. Examples of service indicative of merit ranking of 2 include:

- 399 • Often miss department meetings without cause
- 400 • Often ignore departmental committee responsibilities
- 401 • Often refuse service related to all department sponsored activities such as History Bowl  
402 and History Day
- 403 • Often refuse invitations to serve the University or discipline in a professional capacity

404

405 Habitual refusal to perform any of the services mentioned in 5.4.1 indicates a level of engagement  
406 worthy of a merit ranking of 1.