

Management Department Merit Guidelines, Draft, October 12, 2007

Missouri State University

Management Department

Faculty Merit Guidelines

October 12, 2007

Management Department Merit Guidelines

Purpose of These Guidelines

The purpose of this document is to provide a set of guidelines for administering the faculty merit pay process within the Management Department at Missouri State University. These guidelines are based on, and are consistent with:

1. The *Final Report* of the University Compensation Committee during the Spring of 2006 as modified by Missouri State University President, Dr. Michael T. Nietzel and approved by the Board of Governors .
2. The subsequent procedures adopted by the Office of the Provost regarding the sequencing of merit activities and the roles of the parties, including the Compensation 101 document and the Compensation Calendar.
3. The COBA productivity guidelines and other COBA requirements.
4. The *Faculty Handbook*.

The Contents of These Guidelines

These guidelines include:

- I. Descriptions of the roles of the various parties in the merit process including the roles of:
 - A. The Department Personnel Committee
 - B. The Department Merit Committee
 - C. The Department Head
 - D. COBA Personnel Committee Representative
- II. The sequence of periodic merit activities and the procedural guidelines.
- III. Guidelines for specific merit activities including:
 - A. Establishing dynamic role parameters.
 - B. The merit review period.
 - C. Documentation of merit activities.
 - D. Merit ratings
- IV. Guidelines for the development of merit criteria.
- V. A template for reporting merit activities

VI. THE ROLES OF THE VARIOUS GROUPS IN THE MERIT PROCESS

A. The Department Merit Review Committee

The **Department Merit Review Committee** is responsible for three specific activities:

1. Establishing recommendations for the specific performance criteria (consistent with Section IV of these guidelines) to be incorporated into the *Department Merit Guidelines* and forwarding those guidelines to the departmental faculty for discussion and approval.
2. To annually review the *Department Merit Guidelines* for problems and issues and to suggest changes that need to be made and forward those guidelines to the departmental faculty for discussion and approval.
3. To suggest any necessary changes regarding the procedures for the formation of the **Department Merit Review Committee** and forward those procedures to the departmental faculty for discussion and approval.

The committee will generate recommendations for specific performance measures and procedures based on the general criteria and application policies contained in these guidelines. These recommendations will be presented to the department as a whole for discussion and approval. Upon approval by a majority vote of the department faculty, the *Department Merit Guidelines* will be presented to the Dean and Provost for final approval. Upon final approval, the *Department Merit Guidelines* will guide merit decisions for all faculty.

Membership

The **Department Merit Review Committee** will be selected by a vote of the departmental faculty from among all faculty during the first departmental meeting of the year, usually in late August. This committee must have at least five (5) members and should include representatives from all ranks.

B. The Departmental Merit Committee

The functions of the **Departmental Merit Committee** include:

1. Establishing specific requirements consistent with University, COBA, and Management Department policies for the amount and type of documentation required from each departmental faculty member for the merit evaluation process.
2. Evaluating each faculty member's performance on the dimensions of teaching, research, and service by reviewing all merit materials and rating each dimension of teaching, research, and service based on each department's formal evaluation criteria. For each faculty member the committee will assign a merit score to each dimension using the scale and distributional limits described in Section III-D below.
3. Forwarding narrative evaluations and performance ratings to the **Department Head**.
4. Discussing performance ratings and narrative evaluations with the **Department Head**.

Membership - The membership of the **Departmental Merit Committee** will include a minimum of five tenured faculty. Service on the committee occurs in alphabetical order based on the faculty member's last name and participation is required. Exceptions to the alphabetical arrangement *may* occur to include representation from all discipline areas within the department. The committee members serve staggered two year terms in which at least two but no more than three members rotate off each year. The committee may include faculty members outside the department who are approved by Management Department faculty if too few members are available from within the department.

In order to limit the burden on individual faculty members, the Management Department faculty may, at their discretion, elect to use more than one committee to conduct merit review. If this occurs, each committees must meet the requirements listed above, and each will evaluate different performance areas (teaching, research, or service).

C. The Department Head

The **Department Head** will perform these functions:

1. Reviewing the ratings assigned to each performance dimension by the **Departmental Merit Committee**, and making any necessary modifications to the committee's ratings based on his or her interpretations of the *Department Merit Guidelines* and faculty merit documents.

Conflicting merit results occur when the **Department Head's** merit rating for an individual faculty member does not agree with the **Departmental Merit Committee** rating. When this occurs the **Department Head** should consult with the **Departmental Merit Committee**.

2. Applying the parameter weights to the final merit ratings to arrive at a composite score for each faculty member. Both the merit scores for each dimension and the composite scores for each faculty member will be forwarded to the **Dean**.

The **Department Head** should examine the **Departmental Merit Committee** results for consistent and uniform application of the department's performance criteria, and examine the final distribution of evaluation results (see III-D below). **Department Heads** should be aware that departments that have higher proportions of 5 and 4 ratings than the suggested 15% and 35% guidelines, and/or those that have overall ratings significantly higher than other departments in the college, will be subject to scrutiny at the college level. If a **Department Head** feels that merit results do not conform to the required limits because of errors made by the **Departmental Merit Committee**, the merit results should be returned to the **Departmental Merit Committee** for adjustment.

3. Meet with each individual faculty member on or before the date specified by the Compensation Calendar in order to:
 - a. Negotiate role parameter weights for the current year.
 - b. Provide copies of both the **Departmental Merit Committee's** and **Department Head's** narrative reviews and merit ratings.
 - c. Provide a rationale where committee and department head ratings differ.

D. COBA Personnel Committee Representative

The **COBA Personnel Committee** functions to advise the dean on matters relating to the development of the Compensation Matrix and to hear appeals from individual faculty members regarding performance evaluation outcomes.

The **COBA Personnel Committee Representative** will be selected by the dean from among two departmental faculty selected by departmental vote during the first departmental meeting of the year, usually in late August. These individuals will be selected from among tenured faculty members at the rank of full or associate professor.

VII. THE SEQUENCE OF DEPARTMENTAL MERIT ACTIVITIES

The merit process involves a sequence of activities culminating in a pay increase decision for each individual faculty member. Each year the sequence of activities includes the following:

- A. Early in the fall semester of each year each department will elect members to serve on the **Department Merit Committee** and **Department Merit Review Committee**.
- B. The **Department Merit Review Committee** will meet early in each year to review the merit process and suggest any changes that might be necessary.
- C. At the end of each year, the **Department Merit Committee** should forward guidelines to faculty regarding the content of the merit application and deadlines for filing the merit application.
- D. After the end of the year, individual faculty will forward their merit packets to the **Department Merit Committee**. The **Department Merit Committee** will review the merit packet and assign a performance rating and the written justification to each dimension of performance (teaching, research, and service) for each faculty member. The **Department Merit Committee** will forward the materials to the **Department Head**.
- E. After the **Department Merit Committee** has completed the merit rating recommendations, each **Department Head** will review the **Department Merit Committee's** evaluations. The **Department Head** can accept the **Department Merit Committee's** merit recommendations or make changes as necessary. The **Department Head** will consult with the **Department Merit Committee** regarding any changes in merit recommendations. The **Department Head** will apply the role parameter weights to each faculty member's performance dimension ratings to establish an overall weighted merit score. The performance dimension scores and the overall weighted score will be forwarded to the **Dean**.
- F. The **Department Head** will meet with each faculty member to notify him or her regarding final merit recommendations including a written justification of any changes made in the **Department Merit Committee's** merit recommendations. Each faculty member will negotiate the role parameters for the coming year during this meeting.
- G. The **Department Head** will review each department's weighted scores for consistency and fairness both within and across departments, and take necessary actions to address inequities in the application of the merit system across departments.

VIII. GUIDELINES ON SPECIFIC MERIT ACTIVITIES

A. Establishing the Dynamic Role Parameter

Central to the compensation process is the concept of *dynamic role parameters* in which faculty negotiate with the department head regarding weights placed on the various dimensions of performance. The *Compensation Committees Final Report* in *Section Two* states:

Each department, in collaboration with the college dean, should establish specific procedures for performance evaluation consistent with the policies of the University and also consistent with relevant college and department guidelines. An important step in this process is the negotiation of individual roles, which become the basis for the performance evaluation. The committee proposes that the University provide what Arreola (2000) calls "institutional parameter values" that set minimum and maximum weights for each of the faculty performance dimensions...

The college may set different parameters than the University as long as those values fall within the limits of the institutional parameter values. In addition, the committee recognizes that a different set of parameters may be appropriate for clinical faculty, another set will be necessary for lecturers, and still another set of parameters will be necessary for faculty holding administrative appointments. The committee recommends that the Office of the Provost establish performance dimensions and institutional parameter weights within which colleges and departments may operate.

Using the relevant college parameters, each faculty member must negotiate his or her specific role with the department head. The Compensation Committee makes no recommendation regarding the magnitude of these parameters or when they should be negotiated. We do, however, point out that the weights that are negotiated are important for compensation purposes because they will be used by the department head to arrive at a composite rating for an individual.

This language is supported by the *Faculty Handbook*, *Section 4* which further states at 4.2:

...each faculty member must negotiate his or her workload with the department head (within broad parameters approved by the provost), with the conditions of employment laid out clearly at the time of employment, and adjusted thereafter through negotiation with the department head and dean as approved by the provost...

In support of these requirements, each **Department Head** must meet with each individual faculty member early in each merit plan year to negotiate dynamic role parameters for the merit evaluation period. General weight limits for normal workloads are as follows:

General Role Parameter Weight Limits		
Dimension	Minimum Weight	Maximum Weight
Teaching	30 %	60 %
Research	30 %	60 %
Service	10 %	20 %

Because of COBA accreditation requirements and the need for all faculty to maintain acceptable levels of scholarly productivity, faculty members who negotiate a reduced role weight for research remain obligated to meet the COBA productivity requirements.

The negotiation of parameter weights assume the following:

1. The role parameters weights are not directly based on the proportion of time or effort spent on a particular dimension of faculty performance but they are, instead, a reflection of how the faculty member perceives his or her professional responsibilities, duties, resources, and values, and indicates the relative importance of activities to the individual faculty member. However, parameter weights should generally reflect one's teaching load and release time granted for other activities. No parameter weight should be allowed that disproportionately weighs any performance dimension and one's professional responsibilities.
2. Program administration is regarded as part of one's teaching responsibility rather than a service function and all activities undertaken as part of the administration of a program will be counted as teaching activities.
3. In circumstances where the faculty member has more than three hours of release time per semester, or in situations where alternative duties have been assigned to a faculty member, the role parameters may fall outside these guidelines as negotiated with the **Department Head** and approved by the **Dean**.

4. The range values are not offered as choices that can be made unilaterally by an individual faculty member. They must be negotiated with, and approved by, the **Department Head**.
5. If professional responsibilities change during the merit year, parameter weights may be re-negotiated between faculty member and the **Department Head**.

B. The Merit Period

There are two important aspects of the merit period. These include (1) when the merit rating process will occur, and (2) the designation of the time period over which merit evaluation will occur. The policies for the Management Department include:

1. **The Merit Review Process** - Merit review will occur annually based on the calendar established by the **Provost** and the deadlines established by the **Dean**. In general, individual faculty merit documents must be received by the **Department Merit Committee** by early January.
2. The Period of Evaluation is defined as follows:
 - a. **For Teaching and Service** - The calendar year period ending December 31 of the most recent merit year. For merit decisions made during the spring of 2008 the merit period is the calendar year beginning January 1, 2007 and ending December 31, 2007.
 - b. **For Research** - Because the department feels that research activities are often long-term activities, and to avoid year-to-year variations in research productivity, the period for considering research is a two-year rolling period ending December 31 of the most recent merit year. For merit decisions made during the spring of 2008 the merit period is the calendar year beginning January 1, 2006 and ending December 31, 2007. For any and all research activities, particularly journal publications and paper presentations, both the dates of acceptance and dates of actual publication and/or presentation must be included in the merit package.

C. Merit Documents

The template in Part V details the contents of the merit application, but all merit applications must include a *minimum* of the following:

1. A Cover Sheet with identifying information.
2. A summary and self-evaluation page requiring each faculty member to state the merit rating level he or she proposes as being the most accurate for each dimension.
3. A copy of the Academic Vita.
4. Teaching Documentation
 - a. Course-related documents including syllabi and course policies, samples of exams, quizzes, assignments, or other course activities.
 - b. Course administration activities including the number of students enrolled and number of students completing each class as well as final grade distributions.
 - c. Evidence of professional development activities.
 - d. Evidence from student evaluations.
5. Research Activities
 - a. A bulleted list of all research activities.
 - b. Paper and article acceptances must include a copy of the paper or article and a copy of the acceptance letter.
 - c. Published articles or papers must include a complete copy of the article or paper taken from the journal, proceeding, etc., as it appears in the published source and must include a copy of the table of contents of the source.
 - d. Copies of books, chapters, or textbooks published.
 - e. The source, amount, and purpose of grants received.
 - f. If compensation was received as part of the activity.
6. Service Activities

- a. For committee work each faculty member must document:
 - (1) the name and level of the committee (department, college, university)
 - (2) the purpose or charge of the committee
 - (3) the individual's role on the committee (member, chair, ex officio, etc.)
 - (4) the number of meetings attended by the individual and the actual time involved in that committee's work over the merit period
 - (5) the outcomes or products of the committee work

- b. For other service work each faculty member must describe:
 - (1) the nature and purpose of the activity
 - (2) the individual's role in the activity
 - (3) the amount of time spent engaging in the activity
 - (4) the degree to which the activity involved the faculty member's area of expertise
 - (5) the degree to which the activity supported valued university, college, or departmental outcomes
 - (6) whether the individual was compensated for the activity

D. Merit Ratings

The **Department Merit Committee** and the **Department Head** must assign merit ratings for each performance dimension to each faculty using the rating categories described below, and must comply with the restrictions in the distributional limits:

- Level 1: Unsatisfactory** Performance is far below departmental expectations. A *Performance Improvement Plan* is to be established with the **Department Head** and immediate improvement is required.
- Level 2: Development Needed** Performance is below departmental expectations. A *Performance Improvement Plan* is to be established with the **Department Head** and improvement is required.
- Level 3: Competent** Performance is consistently at expected levels and meets job requirements. As many as 50% of the faculty in a COBA department may be rated at Level 3 in research.
- Level 4: Commendable** Performance frequently exceeds Competent. To be rated at a Level 4 the individual's performance is above the average performance within the department. The merit criteria should be sufficiently rigorous so that about 35% of the department's faculty receive ratings at this level for a specific performance category.
- Level 5: Exceptional** Performance is among the highest levels in the department. To be rated at a Level 5 the individual's performance must be considerably above the average performance in the department. For each performance category in the department, criteria should be sufficiently rigorous so that about 15% of the department's faculty are rated at this level.

The performance scale and distributional limits are consistent with the University *Compensation Committee's Final Report*, Section 1, which states:

As a guideline, the committee offers distribution "caps" that can be used to assess whether unit managers (i.e., supervisors, department heads, etc.) are failing to make performance distinctions. In general, if meaningful performance evaluation is taking place, performance ratings can be expected to be distributed as follows: no more than 15% of the employees in the cost center would receive a composite performance evaluation score of "5"; no more than 35% would receive an evaluation score of "4"; and no more than 50% would receive an evaluation score of "3". Although valid individual performance evaluations should not be altered to fit a forced distribution,

marked deviations from these guidelines (for example, if all employees in a unit receive an evaluation score of 5) should be justified. Marked deviations at the cost-center level may indicate that the performance evaluation process is not being taken seriously, which is a problem that must be addressed by the cost-center head.

The July 31, 2007, *Compensation 101* guidelines from the Provost's office make it clear that the distributional limitations *are not absolute* and distributions can exceed the 15%/35% limits when a department has higher portions of faculty that exceed rigorous performance criteria. When any department's performance ratings for each dimension exceed the distributional limits listed above there must be ***substantial evidence*** to justify the ratings. Unsubstantiated ratings will be carefully scrutinized at the college level and may be reduced.

Important additional guidelines for the **Departmental Merit Committee** include:

1. Only whole number ratings for each performance category (teaching, research, and service) are allowed, no fractions or decimals can be used.
2. The departmental committee will not know the individual faculty member's parameter weights for teaching, research, and service, and merit decisions should not be affected by release time for specific activities.
3. The departmental committee will not assign an overall or composite score to the individual faculty member.

IX. MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT GUIDELINES ON DEVELOPING MERIT CRITERIA

The *Compensation 101* document makes it very clear that the locus of the development of performance criteria are at the department level and states:

The pay for performance system at Missouri State requires that the faculty assert control over the plan within their departments [p.2]

In keeping with the spirit of the *Compensation Committee Final Report*, and *Compensation 101* these Management Department guidelines provide for the following:

1. A set of general performance criteria that the **Departmental Merit Committee** *must* consider in evaluating faculty performance.
2. A set of minimum standards of performance that all faculty must meet in order to demonstrate performance at a competent level (Level 3).
3. Rather than set specific guaranteed performance standards for commendable (Level 4) or exceptional (Level 5) performance, this document suggests minimum eligibility standards that serve to qualify one for the merit rating but do not guarantee that level. The determination of the final rating is based on the application of the criteria by, and the professional judgment of, the **Departmental Merit Committee**. This is consistent with the language of *Compensation 101* on page 3 and bullet point 2.

An Important Note Regarding Legal Issues in Performance Appraisal

The merit process is inextricably related to promotion and tenure activities. Thus, the department must be aware that the merit criteria for the department and the merit outcomes must be consistent with promotion and tenure procedures and decisions. It is difficult, if not impossible, to defend merit results that are inconsistent with subsequent reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions. Therefore, the departments is obligated to insure that appraisal criteria reflect promotion and tenure requirements, that merit criteria are consistently and uniformly applied, and that merit outcomes support reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions .

An Important Note Regarding Confidentiality

The merit process is confidential. Merit Committee members are not allowed to discuss the deliberations, comments, or outcomes of committee meetings with others or outside of the meeting room.

A. Management Department Performance Guidelines for Teaching

Based on Section 4 of the 2007 *Faculty Handbook*, effective teaching is a requirement for all University faculty and a demonstration of effective teaching is required for tenure, promotion, and *required performance reviews*.

The dimensions of effective teaching and the descriptions of alternative criterion measures presented in this document are consistent with the language of the *Faculty Handbook* and the Management Department's tenure and promotion standards, and are based on the discussions and materials of the workshop series on the evaluation of teaching presented by the Missouri State University Academic Development Center during the spring semester of 2007. These Management Department guidelines for the evaluation of teaching embrace the conclusions of the workshop in offering the following conclusions:

1. Teaching is a multidimensional activity. There is *no single measure adequate to assess the total domain of teaching effectiveness*. Each department must identify the different dimensions of teaching effectiveness valued by that department.
2. Different and multiple measures should be used to assess different dimensions of teaching. Each department should consider multiple measures of teaching effectiveness, and the validity of each specific measure for assessing the dimension of teaching effectiveness it presumes to measure.
3. Teaching is more than classroom activities. It includes activities involving communicating with students outside the classroom, advising students, the design of courses, engaging with others in curricular development and assessment activities, and engaging in activities aimed at professional development.
4. Teachers do not all face similar sets of circumstances in terms of the students with whom they must interact, the purpose and content of courses, and the context of teaching. Evaluating teaching performance equitably in the face of these differences can be exceedingly difficult.

Based on these conclusions, the Management Department has adopted a set of teaching dimensions based on the twelve possible dimensions of teaching found in G. Roger Sell's draft from the spring 2007 teaching workshop, "Frameworks for Formative and Summative Evaluation of Teaching: Putting it all Together." These dimensions are consistent with the work of others including R.A. Berk's (2005) taxonomy, R. A. Arreola's (2004) work on faculty evaluation, as well as the conclusions of a 1998 Missouri State University Faculty Senate committee on evaluating teaching. Each dimension includes alternative criterion measures that can be used to assess each dimension.

DIMENSIONS OF TEACHING- A TAXONOMY

Based on the language of the *Faculty Handbook* at Section 4.2.1.2, the objective of “developing educated persons ...is of paramount importance” for all faculty members to succeed as a teacher. To achieve that goal, the Management Department views two areas to be particularly important. To achieve competent levels of performance, all faculty in the Management Department must satisfy the ***Critical Dimensions*** that define teaching performance as **Developing Educated Persons** in Section I below by:

- (A) Demonstrating that teaching is effective in cultivating the knowledge base and skills of students, and:
- (B) Demonstrating continued efforts to engage in professional development activities.

To achieve a Competent rating (Level 3), adequate performance reflecting these two areas must be demonstrated. Support for meritorious teaching at the Commendable (Level 4) or Exceptional (Level 5) levels can be demonstrated through a combination of:

1. Exceptional levels of effectiveness in these critical dimensions A and B.
2. Additional evidence that satisfies the Exceptional Modes of Teaching in Section II below.

The complete taxonomy of teaching effectiveness is outlined below. Complete descriptions of the dimensions and criterion measures are included in the pages that follow:

I. Developing Educated Persons

Critical Dimensions

A. Demonstrated Effectiveness in Cultivating Students’ Knowledge Base and Skills

1. Instructor Inputs (weighted at 40%)
 - a. Presenting Instruction
 - b. Student Perceptions of Learning and Performance Feedback
 - c. Course Management
2. Student or Class Outcomes (weighted at 30%)
 - a. Assessing Learning Processes and Outcomes
 - c. Course Rigor and Content
 - d. Faculty Productivity Indicators

B. Professional Development (weighted at 30%)

1. Subject Matter Knowledge

2. Self-Development

Optional Dimensions

A. Demonstrated Effectiveness in Cultivating Students' Knowledge Base and Skills

1. Mentoring, Supervising, and Supporting Students
2. External Recognition

B. Professional Development

1. Contributing to Other's Development
2. Curricular Design and Development

II. Exceptional Modes of Teaching

- A. Outstanding Performance as a Classroom Teacher
- B. Experiential Learning
- C. Accessibility
- D. Diversity

SPECIFIC TEACHING DIMENSIONS AND CRITERIA

The following describes the various teaching dimensions and supporting evidence:

X. Developing Educated Persons

CRITICAL DIMENSIONS FOR TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

A. Demonstrated effectiveness in cultivating students' knowledge base and skills both basic and specialized within a specific discipline.

1. Instructor Inputs

This teaching dimension includes the areas of **Presenting Instruction, Student Perceptions of Learning, Providing Feedback, and Course Management**. The professor teaches the course in a manner that intellectually challenges and stimulates students. The professor's instruction is characterized by organization and clarity, enthusiasm for the subject, and the ability to stimulate student interest to continue learning in course-related areas. The professor develops student rapport and is open to student views. The professor fulfills his or her responsibility to meet classes and use class time effectively, to post and keep office hours, and to provide student access to consultation. The professor fulfills his or her responsibilities by distributing policy statements, course materials, and assignments in a timely manner, defining course objectives and expectations, and returning completed assignments and exams to students in a reasonable period of time. Professor provides timely and useful feedback on assignments and exams so students can identify their course-related strengths and weaknesses, and ways in which they can improve their learning and performance. The course is characterized by clarity and appropriateness of course learning objectives, fairness and adequacy in the assessment of student learning and student grading.

Weighting and scoring: This dimension is weighted at 40% of the total weight for teaching. The Department Merit Committee may assign a score to this dimension based on the overall evaluation of these possible criteria using the 1-5 merit scale (see Table 1):

COBA Faculty Evaluation Results - Because of the limits of the current COBA faculty evaluation instrument and its scoring protocols, the major source of information for this dimension is two composite evaluation scores. These are:

- (1) The composite faculty evaluation score from items 1-7:
 1. Course objectives and requirements were stated early in the class.
 2. Grading is consistent with course objectives and requirements.

3. Professor appears to be adequately prepared for class.
4. Professor is effective in presenting and clarifying material.
5. Professor's teaching methods promote learning.
6. Professor provides an opportunity to discuss questions about grades and course material.
7. Overall this is an effective teacher, considering the subject matter being taught

(2) The composite score from additional items 14-20:

14. Professor's instruction relates to the subject matter of course.
15. Professor uses the class time effectively.
16. Professor returns work in a timely manner.
17. Professor responds to student inquiries.
18. Professor teaches the course in an intellectually challenging manner.
19. Professor shows enthusiasm for the subject matter of the course.
20. Professor includes practical applications or relevant examples.

Scores for each measure from each section taught must be reported and a weighted average score for each must be calculated. The Merit Committee should evaluate scores based on guidelines provided in the section on **Rules for Using Student Evaluation Scores** described in these guidelines below.

Student Comments - All student comments must be included as part of the faculty evaluation process.

Faculty Member Comments - Explanations of and critical reflections on evidence from students and colleagues regarding teaching effectiveness, major strengths and weaknesses in the learning assessment and grading system for courses taught by instructor, which kinds of feedback are used and why, and evidence of impact of feedback, and strengths and weaknesses in managing courses.

Peer Evaluation - Interpretive summary of student ratings and comments for courses taught by instructor over review period. Direct observation and/or feedback from students. Explanations of and critical reflections on learning assessment methods, grading system used, and major strengths and weaknesses in student feedback for courses taught by instructor.

2. Student or Class Outcomes

This dimension includes **Assessing Learning Processes and Outcomes, Course Rigor,** and **Faculty Productivity Indicators** - The adequacy and appropriateness of course and learning objectives, pedagogical techniques, course content, course outcomes, and or demonstrated gains in student learning associated with course objectives. The professor has high expectations of students in terms of the quality and rigor of assignments and exams. Course grade distributions are appropriate to the nature and level of the class. Faculty teaching productivity (workload indicators) including measures of the numbers of students and classes taught must be considered but should not be given limited weight.

Weight: This dimension is weighted at 30% of the total weight for teaching. The Department Merit Committee may assign a score to this dimension based on the overall evaluation of these possible criteria using the 1-5 merit scale (see Table 1):

Faculty Member Statement - Explanations of and critical reflections on course objectives, learning techniques, grading system, used. **Review of course activities and projects.** Description of major strengths and weaknesses in gains in student learning outcomes (pre-test and post-test).

Peer Evaluation - Assessment of major strengths and weaknesses in the learning objectives, learning techniques, and grading systems, and grading outcomes for courses taught by instructor. **Review of course activities and projects.** Direct observation and/or feedback from students.

Measures of Course Rigor - Grade distributions for all classes taught must be reported and used to assess course rigor.

Work Load - Number of courses taught and student enrollment must be reported.

Note: The department may allow additional measures of learning as evidence of the effectiveness of one's teaching. These may include various outcome measures that assess learning. While these measures may be useful, the committee should exercise caution when considering some outcome measures. Many are subject to threats to internal validity not present with other measures of teaching effectiveness. Therefore, outcome measures should be used judiciously. Other measures such as scores on standardized tests (such as the CPA or PHR accreditation exams) are subject to contamination (forces outside the individual faculty member's control), and while useful to assess academic programs, should be used with caution as indicators of individual teaching effectiveness. Examples of outcome measures might include some of the following, or similar measures:

- Scores on departmental or standardized final exams.
- Pretest-posttest results.
- Performance on standardized exams.

*Important note: Undergraduate program assessment results **may not** be used as evidence of learning. When the COBA Assessment Committee developed the program assessment measures, the Committee, based on faculty concerns, agreed that assessment results were never to be used to evaluate individual faculty performance. Therefore, individual faculty members **are not allowed** to incorporate these scores into their merit documents.*

B. Professional Development

The Faculty Handbook at Section 4.2.1.2 states that evidence of continuing professional development contributes to developing educated persons. Student evaluations of faculty are generally not appropriate for this aspect of teaching. The dimensions of this requirement include:

1. Subject-Matter Knowledge

The degree to which the faculty member maintains currency, breadth, depth, and mastery of knowledge relevant to course content.

Weight: This dimension is weighted at 15% of the total weight for teaching. The Department Merit Committee may assign a score to this dimension based on the overall evaluation of these possible criteria using the 1-5 merit scale (see Table 1):

Faculty Member Statement - Explanations of and critical reflections on evidence of possession and development of knowledge related to course content.

Peer Evaluation - Description of major strengths and weaknesses in the subject-matter knowledge of courses taught by instructor based on review of course content, instructor's vita, and professional activities

2. Self- Developing

One's efforts and achievements in developing one's knowledge and skills for teaching and in experimentation to improve student learning. Possible criteria include:

Weight: This dimension is weighted at 15% of the total weight for teaching. The Department Merit Committee may assign a score to this dimension based on the overall evaluation of these possible criteria using the 1-5 merit scale (see Table 1):

Possible criteria include:

Faculty Member Statement - Instructor's list and explanation of professional development activities and efforts to improve course-related teaching and learning for a particular review period. Critical reflections on evidence of knowledge and skills enhanced in teaching-related professional development activities and changes for improvement.

Peer Evaluation - Evaluation of instructor's efforts and achievements for continuing professional development and teaching improvement.

OPTIONAL DIMENSIONS FOR TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Evidence from the following dimensions may be used to support teaching performance above the Competent Level (Level 3):

A. Demonstrated Effectiveness in Cultivating Students' Knowledge Base and Skills

1. Mentoring, Supervising, and Supporting Students

The professor supervises or mentors students including serving on thesis committees, involving students in research opportunities, supervises internships and independent studies, or provides career support (e.g., assisting students in job search assistance, continued educational opportunities, career advice, etc.). Possible criteria include:

Faculty Documentation - Explanations of and critical reflections on evidence of the effects of student mentoring, supervision, and assistance. Documentation of activities involving students in research, writing recommendation letters, etc.

Peer Evaluation - Evaluation of the significance of mentoring activities..

1. External Recognition for Students or Faculty

Awards or other external recognition for student work produced in the course, or for preparation of students. Possible criteria include:

Faculty Documentation - Documentation and description of external recognition.

Peer Evaluation - Evaluation of the significance of external recognition.

B. Professional Development

1. Contributing to Others' Development for Teaching

Support of colleagues in their professional development for teaching, including involvement in department, college, and/or university initiatives for the enhancement of teaching and learning. Possible criteria include:

Faculty Documentation -- Instructor's list and explanation of contributions to teaching initiatives at the department, college, and university levels and contributions to the professional development of colleagues for a particular review period. Critical reflections on evidence of contributions to teaching-related initiatives beyond one's own courses.

Peer Evaluation - Evaluation of the significance of developmental activities.

2. Designing Courses and Curricula

Reflective needs assessment of student backgrounds, interests, and curriculum requirements; appropriate objectives and evaluation methods; relevant content and active learning strategies; effective use of classroom/distance learning technologies. Possible criteria include:

Faculty Documentation - Instructor's description of new courses developed and existing courses taught for review period. Explanations of and critical reflections on personal philosophy of teaching and major decisions in course design.

Peer Evaluation - Evaluation of curricular activities undertaken by instructor.

XI. Exceptional Modes or Qualities of Teaching

The Faculty Handbook at Section 4.2.1.2 states that the items in the following list are not "individually prescriptive" but they are inclusive of teaching and may be considered. Management Department merit policies do not *require* these dimensions as evidence of an expected level of teaching, or as evidence of a levels of performance above the expected level. However, evidence of these Exceptional Modes of Teaching will be considered as additional supporting *evidence* of outstanding performance.

A. Outstanding Performance as a Classroom Teacher

1. Receiving external rewards for teaching or classroom activities.

B. Experiential Learning

1. Evidence of efforts to develop citizen scholars; applying course material to social issues or problems.

C. Accessibility

1. Efforts to increase accessibility to education beyond typical assignments:
 - a. Distance learning
 - b. Online and continuing education
 - c. Public lectures or workshops

D. Diversity

1. Efforts to bring diversity to students' educational experiences:
 - a. Guest speakers with diverse views
 - b. Exposing students to unfamiliar environments
 - c. Requiring students to seek out diversity

Possible Criterion Measures:

Faculty Documentation - Description of activities undertaken.

Peer Evaluation - Evaluation of activities undertaken by instructor.

CRITERION MEASURES OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

This section is a guideline for the **Department Merit Committee** regarding how different criterion measures of teaching performance should be used.

Student Evaluation or Reaction Measures

Student evaluation measures regarding individual faculty performance are important measures of teaching effectiveness and include:

- Ratings on items and dimensions of formal student evaluation forms.
- Student comments or complaints
- Student interviews or focus groups.

Student evaluation measures should be used to evaluate:

- Presentation skills of the faculty member
- Ability to present clear course objectives
- Ability to present material effectively
- Efforts to motivate and involve students
- Perceptions of a faculty member's willingness to treat students fairly
- Perceptions regarding treating students with respect and dignity
- Willingness to assist and encourage students
- Providing students reasonable access and timely feedback

Student evaluation measures should not be used to assess:

- Course rigor
- Student learning
- Faculty member subject knowledge or course content

Rules for Using Student Evaluation Scores

The **Department Merit Committee** should exercise caution in the interpretation of formal student evaluation instruments. The following guidelines apply:

1. The *Faculty Handbook* at Section 4.2..1.3 limits the weight of student evaluations to 50% of the weight for overall teaching performance. Table 1 provides a guide for appropriately weighing evaluation scores within the dimensions.
2. No student evaluation score, *in and of itself*, is evidence of exceptional teaching in the absence of additional documentation supporting other dimensions of teaching effectiveness. Historically, research does not show high correlations between

teaching evaluation results and independent measures of student learning. Therefore, evidence beyond high student evaluation results is required as evidence of exceptional teaching performance.

3. The department can not use automatic cut scores on evaluation results as singular evidence of demonstrating a particular merit level.
4. The committees should recognize the influence of contextual factors when considering student evaluation results. Evaluations differ systematically based on course level, subject matter, student interest, course difficulty, and other factors, and evaluation of scores should be interpreted within the limitations of the context.
5. Committees should consider the limits of practical and statistical significance in the numerical outcomes of student evaluation scores. For example, in a given semester, scores of 3.9 and 4.2 are often not statistically different and are the result of contextual differences in courses and students.
6. Because of the limitations of contextual factors and statistical significance, teaching evaluations scores *should not be norm referenced* (faculty compared to each other) in the merit process. Individual scores should be interpreted relative to the criteria they assess not relative to other faculty member's scores. Only scores that are substantially different from departmental norms should be considered as different from other scores.
7. For merit purposes, the emphasis should be given to specific items on a student evaluation instrument that relate to specific dimensions of teaching rather than on total average scores.
8. For levels of performance above Expected (Level 3) the individual should include faculty evaluations from *all sections taught* during spring and fall semesters, not from selected sections only.

Faculty Member Comments and Documentation

Faculty member comments should generally be limited to bulleted points documenting specific activities. These statements should be brief, factual, and descriptive. Comments may also include explaining, or interpreting specific processes, activities, or outcomes, but these comments should be brief and to-the-point. **Do not engage in hyperbole!**

Peer Evaluation

An essential measure of teaching performance is review by faculty colleagues. Peer review can address:

- Appropriateness of course content and methods
- Appropriate levels of course rigor
- Organization and course management skills
- Self-development activities
- Subject matter knowledge
- Presentation and communication skills.

Peer review should include:

- Review of student evaluation results and student comments
- Critical review of course materials and philosophy statements.
- Course grade distributions.
- Assessment of professional development activities to assess subject knowledge.

Peer review may involve classroom visits and direct observation, but normally will be accomplished in the role of evaluating course documents and activities as a member of the **Department Merit Committee**.

DESCRIPTION OF CRITERION LEVELS FOR TEACHING

The Management Department has adopted an approach to evaluating teaching performance that requires each faculty member to demonstrate first that he or she has achieved competent ratings on a set of Critical Dimensions of teaching relating to instructor inputs, student outcomes, and professional development. Earning a higher merit rating is a function of achieving merit ratings above the competent level on the Critical Dimensions and/or demonstrating additional activities from Optional Dimensions and/or Exceptional Modes or Qualities of teaching (see Table 1).

Using Table 1, the **Department Merit Committee** may elect to calculate a composite score by rating each dimension using the 1-5 merit scale and summing the products of weights times ratings. Scores for the Critical Dimensions of Teaching may be adjusted by evidence from the Optional Dimensions and Exceptional Modes of Teaching to arrive at an overall teaching composite score for each faculty member. This score can be used as an aide in assigning final teaching merit ratings. Also included in Table 1 are the approximate weights to give each of the dimensions of performance.

Table 1: Critical Performance Dimensions for Competent Performance			
Critical Performance Dimensions	Weight	Committee Rating	weight x rating = Dimension Score
A-1 Instructor Inputs a. Presenting Instruction b. Student Perceptions of Learning and Performance Feedback c. Course Management	40%		
A-2 Student or Class Outcomes a. Assessing Learning Processes and Outcomes b. Course Rigor and Content c. Faculty Productivity Indicators	30%		
B-1 Subject Matter Knowledge	15%		
B-2 Self-Development	15%		
Composite Score on Critical Dimensions			
Adjustments Based on Optional Dimensions			
Overall Composite Score			

Requirements for Competent (Level 3) Performance

To receive a Level 3 rating the faculty member must demonstrate a Competent (Level 3) level of performance in the area **I. Developing Educated Persons**. This includes demonstrated effectiveness in *Critical Dimensions* relating to cultivating students' knowledge base and skills including both **(A) Instructor Inputs and Student or Course Outcomes**, and **(B) Professional Development**. These *Critical Dimensions* are listed in Table 1 above.

For merit purposes establishing specific, objective, and measurable standards for teaching performance is probably neither possible nor desirable. Measuring teaching performance is inherently subjective and the **Department Merit Committee** must use careful, considered, professional judgement. When examining items from student evaluations of faculty, the committee should consider ratings relative to the *entire context* of the teaching environment (nature of the course, the course trichotomy, the course level, the delivery mechanism, etc..) and avoid making decisions based on differences resulting from varying contextual factors across courses, or small differences in scores that are neither practically nor significantly different.

To perform at the expected level, individual faculty members should receive satisfactory (Competent or Level 3) scores on each of the *Critical Dimensions* listed in Table 1. However, in evaluating the various dimensions of teaching performance, the **Department Merit Committee** may take a *compensatory* approach by considering the totality of the evidence presented by the faculty member. This is particularly true so that an individual faculty member deficient in a dimension listed in Table 1 can compensate by evidence of:

1. Exceptional performance in other dimensions listed.
2. Performance in other dimensions not included in Table 1 (such as mentoring students or external recognition).
3. Activities from the Exceptional Modes of Teaching criteria.

Requirements for Commendable or Exceptional Performance

The Management Department Merit Guidelines do not set specific performance standards for ratings at Level 4 (Commendable) and Level 5 (Exceptional). These guidelines recognize that evaluating teaching performance is, at best, an imprecise activity. Setting hard-and-fast standards of performance would likely produce dysfunctional results with little improvement in the validity of the final decisions. With the recognition that University guidelines allow for 35% Commendable and 15% Exceptional ratings, the philosophy of these merit guidelines is to describe the dimensions and criteria that the **Department Merit Committee** must consider and allow committee members to assign merit ratings to faculty members based on their best professional judgment of each individual's relative performance. The **Department Merit Committee** should use a clinical judgement process and consider the totality of all performance indicators.

To be *minimally eligible* for a Level 4 or 5 the individual faculty member must first exhibit satisfactory performance in all the *Critical Dimensions* shown in Table 1. For those individuals satisfying this condition, evidence of Commendable (Level 4) or Exceptional (Level 5) performance is based on the following:

1. The individual must demonstrate *above average* performance in the *Critical Dimensions* described in A-1 of Table 1.
2. The individual must demonstrate suitable levels of course rigor and content.
3. The individual must demonstrate evidence of Professional Development including evidence of Subject Matter Knowledge and Self-Development activities.
4. The individual must demonstrate a suitable level of Faculty Productivity in teaching. The Departmental Merit Committee should place an appropriate but not excessive weight on course workload in its deliberations.
5. The individual may document other exceptional activities as evidence of Commendable or Exceptional performance from optional teaching dimensions including:
 - Mentoring, Supervising, and Supporting Students
 - Activities Contributing to Other's Development
 - Curricular Design and Development activities
 - External Recognition activities
6. The individual can demonstrate activities that qualify as *Exceptional Modes or Qualities of Teaching* including:
 - Receiving external rewards for teaching or classroom activities.
 - Evidence of experiential learning such as efforts to develop citizen scholars or applying course material to social issues or problems.
 - Evidence of efforts to increase accessibility to education beyond typical assignments including distance learning, online and continuing education, and public lectures or workshops.
 - Evidence of efforts to bring diversity to students' educational experiences such as guest speakers with diverse views, exposing students to unfamiliar environments, or requiring students to seek out diversity in assignments or activities.

Merit Ratings Below the Expected Level

Level 1 or 2 ratings may be given to individual faculty members who do not exhibit satisfactory performance in one or more dimensions shown in Table 1.

Below Expectations (Level 2)

The faculty member will have unsatisfactory performance in one or more of the dimensions described in Table 1 with little or no compensatory performance in other areas. Faculty rated at this level are required to develop a performance improvement plan with the Department Head to address deficiencies in this area.

Unacceptable (Level 1)

Faculty members will be rated at Level 1 when unsatisfactory performance is exhibited in multiple dimensions in Table 1, when performance is grossly deficient in one or more dimensions in Table 1, and/or when individuals previously rated at Level 2 have failed to show significant progress in meeting the objectives of the performance improvement plan. All individuals at this level are required to draft a new performance improvement plan with the Department Head to address deficiencies in this area.

B. Management Department Performance Guidelines for Research

The criterion measures listed below describe the types of activities that are most valued in determining meritorious performance and serve as a guide for the decisions made by the **Departmental Merit Committee**. These departmental performance criteria describe what types of contributions are most valued by the department and what types of activities and outcomes provide the most support for Competent (Level 3), Commendable (Level 4), and Exceptional (Level 5) performance outcomes.

Important Note: The Evaluation Period

The Management Department will use a **two year rolling average** to consider scholarly productivity consisting of the two consecutive calendar years immediately prior to the year in which the evaluation occurs.

All scholarly activity occurring during that time period can be included including any evidence of published work, evidence of unconditional acceptances, or any other evidence pertaining to scholarly activity.

Types of Research Activities

This section provides examples of different types of activities that fall under research categories that can be used to describe different levels of performance. The *Faculty Handbook* at *Section 4.2.2* describes five modes of scholarly activity. Four of these modes: Discovery, Application, Synthesis, and Criticism are especially valued as research activities within COBA and the Management Department, and have been incorporated into the criteria described below.

The **Departmental Merit Committee** must consider the performance categories carefully in defining the nature and level of activities that define excellent performance, and must exercise considered professional judgment, both when deciding whether a faculty member's contribution fits a specific category, and on evaluating the significance of the contribution.

5. **Discovery:** Defined by the *Faculty Handbook* as, "Gaining knowledge of or ascertaining the existence of something previously unknown or unrecognized." This consists of original empirical and theoretical scholarship and is an essential element of the mission of the University, COBA, and the Management Department . While evidence of the scholarship of discovery may not necessarily be *required* for the highest level of research performance, it does provide strong evidence of outstanding research quality and must be considered during the merit review process. Examples of discovery include:
 - a. Original research findings published in scholarly journals.
 - b. Scholarly books or monographs that advance understanding.
 - c. Successful external grant applications for research.
 - d. Presentation of original research findings at national or international, peer-reviewed

professional meetings

6. **Application:** Defined in the *Faculty Handbook*, as “using established knowledge to solve significant problems.” It is an essential element of the mission of the University, COBA, and the Management Department. This mode refers to the application of research to solve significant problems that require professional expertise, and includes applied empirical research, integrative scholarly works, and practitioner-oriented publications. These types of activities involving integrative and applied research are required for tenure and promotion. Consequently, considerable evidence of application is required as evidence of outstanding performance. Examples might include:
 - a. Published professional or applied research journal articles.
 - b. Presentation of integrative or applied research at national, peer-reviewed meetings (paper or case presentations).
 - c. Successful external grant applications for applied research.

7. **Synthesis and Criticism:** Defined in the *Faculty Handbook*, as “bringing knowledge together from disparate sources to produce a whole work that is greater than the sum of its parts,” and “using established values...to evaluate quality of artifacts.” This mode is an important element of the mission of the University, COBA, and the Management Department. It refers to the application of professional expertise to produce position papers, scholarly reviews and criticism, or transmit knowledge to a broader audience, and may be considered as evidence of meritorious performance. Examples include:
 - a. Published textbook summarizing existing research.
 - b. Published literature reviews or position papers.
 - c. Published critical reviews of scholarly projects.

8. **Professional Development and Other Research:** Professional development and related activities are recognized as essential elements of the mission of the University, COBA, and the Management Department. This category includes activities designed to maintain professional competence in one’s field. All faculty *must* engage in one or more of these activities, but they alone are *not sufficient* for either tenure and promotion or to achieve an expected level of performance. Examples include:
 - a. Participating in professional organizations and activities.
 - b. Staying abreast of current literature of the field.
 - c. Contributions in others' published work such as textbooks chapters, readings books, case books, and other ancillary materials.
 - d. Editorial responsibilities: professional publications, proceedings, and other discipline-related media.
 - e. Editorial/manuscript reviewer for scholarly and/or professional publications, textbook publishers, professional conferences.
 - f. Discussant/attendance at international, national, regional, and local conference.
 - g. Serving as a consultant to groups outside the university
 - h. Sharing knowledge with a broad audience by serving as a professional consultant or by

actively involving students in research activities.

General Guidelines for Evaluating Research

The **Department Merit Committee** must evaluate the individual faculty member's work using the following standards consistent with the *Faculty Handbook*:

9. All publications *must* be evaluated on the basis of the quality of the work based on the following criteria:
 - a. The reputation of the journal or publishing outlet based on publication standards set by the department or on the expert judgement of members of the **Department Merit Committee**. Evidence provided by journal acceptance rates may be considered, but these should not be used as definitive evidence of journal quality because published acceptance rates such as those in Cabell's are self-reported and have questionable reliability and validity.
 - b. Evidence of the independence and legitimacy of the review process (this may be established by providing copies of reviews).
 - c. Subsequent reviews of the article, book, or other contribution presented by the faculty member.
 - d. Awards or recognition received by the faculty member.
 - e. Evidence of recognition provided by citation indices.
 - f. External letters of evaluation.
 - g. Critical evaluation of the research content based on reviews by **Department Merit Committee** members.
 - h. Any other evidence of the quality of the contribution.
10. Significant evidence of the level of the faculty member's *individual contribution* on the basis of authorship *must* be considered. In general, single authorship is highly valued, and dual authorship, or first authorship on publications with three or fewer authors, will be given considerable weight as evidence of one's individual contribution. Contributions with more than three authors will be considered, but should be given lesser weight in proportion to the number of authors.
11. Scholarly activity should reflect the faculty member's general academic field and works outside his or her broadly defined field should be discounted. Truly interdisciplinary efforts are encouraged, particularly where the faculty member can bring his/her expertise to bear with professional peers on difficult or unusual problems, or to facilitate the creative redefinition of issues. This guideline is not designed to discourage faculty members from exploring interdisciplinary activity, but to discount the value of an abundance of out-of-field publications as evidence of "exceptional" performance *where the contribution of the author is in doubt*, unless this criterion is satisfied. Multiple authored, out-of-field publications, in particular, should not be considered as evidence of "excellent" or "commendable" research performance.

12. The level of research activity above the minimum requirements *must* be considered. The volume of activity may not compensate for lack of quality, but will provide additional evidence of performance above the level of competent performance.
13. Other significant evidence of discovery, application, integrative, or applied research such as successful grant applications, presentations at national or international professional meetings, textbook writing, etc., *must* be considered.
14. Evidence of being continuously and actively engaged in professional development through individual study, attendance at professional meetings and conferences, active involvement in professional organizations, or other significant personal development activities, is required at all levels.
15. Strong evidence that faculty member serves as a resource person with regard to scholarship and research activities of others is required for commendable or exceptional performance. The faculty member will serve as a conduit of essential information through:
 - a. Attending and participating in professional activities
 - b. Reviewing and critiquing recent work
 - c. Addressing problems significant to the public that require professional expertise
 - d. Serving as a consultant to groups outside the university
 - e. Sharing knowledge with a broad audience
 - f. Involving students in research activities

Management Department Requirements for Research Productivity

The Management Department merit guidelines for research require that *specific minimum standards* of performance be demonstrated for a Level before a rating of Exceptional (Level 5), Commendable (Level 4), or Competent (Level 3) can be considered.

Important note: Achieving any Level's minimum standards qualifies the individual faculty member to be considered by the Departmental Merit Committee for that Level's merit rating, but does not guarantee that any individual faculty member will be awarded that Level's rating. That decision is inherently judgmental and will be based on the Departmental Merit Committee's professional judgment of the individual's total portfolio and performance relative to other individual faculty members.

These standards for each level include the following:

Exceptional Performance (Level 5)

A faculty member may be eligible for Level 5 in several ways. The examples listed below illustrate several ways to meet the minimum level of scholarly productivity necessary for evidence of Exceptional Performance. In general, activities must be evaluated based on the level of the faculty member's *individual contributions*, the *quality* of the activities, and the *overall level* of activity.

In addition to these specific examples, all faculty at Level 5 *must* meet the COBA minimum productivity guidelines, and there *must* be supporting evidence of continuous professional development. These examples of minimum levels of scholarly activity that follow are illustrative and are not intended to be exhaustive:

1. Evidence of the scholarship of discovery as supported by the acceptance and/or publication of an article in an elite and prestigious peer-reviewed journal of the caliber of *Academy of Management Journal*, *Personnel Psychology*, *Decision Sciences*, or journals of similar reputation for highly selective peer review and overall quality. The faculty member must provide sufficient evidence to justify the claim of high quality. Significant evidence of the faculty member's *individual contribution* on the basis of authorship *must* be considered, and the activity must be evaluated based on the quality of the contribution.
2. Evidence of the scholarship of application as exhibited by the acceptance and/or publication of at least three peer-reviewed articles in outlets of suitable quality (based on the guidelines described in this document below and on the Merit Review Committee's professional judgment) where there is substantial individual contribution based on authorship. In general, articles with more than three authors and those appearing in sources with a reputation of questionable rigor in the review process will not qualify for this category. Significant evidence of the faculty member's *individual contribution* on the basis of authorship *must* be considered, and the committee may exercise its professional standards to assess the overall quality of the contribution.
3. Evidence of the scholarship of application, synthesis, or criticism as exhibited by the acceptance and/or publication of at least six peer-reviewed articles in suitable outlets. Multiple authors will be considered but the committee must exercise its professional standards to assess the overall level and quality of the contribution to assess its suitability for a rating at this level.
4. Evidence of successful and significant grant activity. The committee may exercise its professional judgment to assess the overall quality of this contribution. In general wide distributed internal grants (such as summer research grants will not qualify for this level).

Commendable Performance (Level 4)

A faculty member may be eligible for Level 4 in several ways. The examples listed below illustrate several ways to meet the minimum level of scholarly productivity necessary for evidence of Commendable Performance. In general, activities must be evaluated based on the level of the faculty member's *individual contributions*, the *quality* of the activities, and the *overall level* of activity.

In addition to these specific examples, all faculty at Level 4 *must* meet the COBA minimum productivity guidelines, and there *must* be supporting evidence of continuous professional development. These examples of minimum levels of scholarly activity that follow are illustrative and are not intended to be exhaustive:

1. Evidence of the scholarship of application as exhibited by the acceptance and/or publication of at least two peer-reviewed articles in outlets of suitable quality where there is substantial individual contribution based on authorship. In general, articles with more than three authors and those appearing in sources with a reputation of questionable rigor in the review process will not qualify for this category. Significant evidence of the faculty member's *individual contribution* on the basis of authorship *must* be considered, and the committee may exercise its professional standards to assess the overall quality of the contribution.
2. Evidence of the scholarship of application, synthesis, or criticism as exhibited by the acceptance and/or publication of at least four peer-reviewed articles in suitable sources. Multiple authors will be considered but the committee may exercise its professional standards to assess the overall quality of the contribution to assess its suitability for a rating at this level.
3. Evidence of successful and significant grant activity. The committee may exercise its professional judgment to assess the overall quality of this contribution

Competent Performance (Level 3)

For any faculty member to be rated at Level 3 the minimum expectation can be demonstrated by either of the following:

1. The faculty member demonstrates that he or she is currently meeting the COBA minimum productivity guidelines for scholarly activity. Currently this requires that the faculty member demonstrate the publication of at least three peer reviewed publications over the previous five year period including the merit review period based on evidence in the faculty member's vita.
2. Submission, acceptance, or publication of a peer-reviewed article during the merit period.

In addition, the faculty member must include evidence of professional development activities or other forms of scholarly activity acceptable to the **Departmental Merit Committee**.

Below Expectations (Level 2)

Individuals who can demonstrate some activity involving scholarship of application, synthesis, or criticism over the COBA minimum productivity guidelines for research period (the most recent five years), but who *both* (1) currently fail to meet the minimum productivity guidelines, *and* (2) have no current scholarly activity involving scholarship of application, synthesis, or criticism, will be rated at Level 2 *if* they can demonstrate an acceptable level of professional development activity. Faculty rated at this level are required to develop a performance improvement plan with the Department Head to address deficiencies in this area.

Unacceptable (Level 1)

Individuals who have no evidence of acceptable activity involving scholarship of application, synthesis, or criticism over the COBA minimum productivity guidelines for research period (the most recent five years), *and* no current acceptable scholarly activity, *and/or* those who fail to demonstrate an acceptable level of professional development, will be rated at Level 1. In addition, individuals previously rated at Level 2 who fail to meet the expectations of their professional improvement plan will be rated at Level 1. All individuals at this level are required to draft a new performance improvement plan with the Department Head to address deficiencies in this area.

C. MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT PERFORMANCE GUIDELINES FOR SERVICE

Each faculty member is expected to make professional contributions through service to the Department, the College, the University, the regional community, and to his or her discipline as one of the requirements for promotion and tenure. Consequently, faculty must meet a variety of service-related criteria in order to achieve a level of meritorious performance.

The *Faculty Handbook* provides a taxonomy of service activity that forms the basis for the COBA service performance criteria.

Types of Service

The following describes service activities that fall under four categories of service: University Citizenship, Professional Service, Public Service, and Professional Consultation. The examples that follow are not meant to be either exclusive or exhaustive. The **Department Merit Committee** must exercise considered professional judgment, both when deciding whether a faculty member's contribution fits a specific category, and in evaluating the significance of the contribution.

1. University Citizenship

Citizenship activities relate to active participation in the shared governance structure of the Department, the College, and the University. This may also include contributing to activities within the University focused on professional development or participating in campus discussions. These activities do not necessarily involve the faculty member's area of professional expertise. Examples include:

- a. Attending and participating in departmental activities.
- b. Developing and implementing University/College/Department policy through active participation in the collegial decision-making process such as committees and other mechanisms for shared governance.
- c. Collaborating with others in developing activities aimed at professional development.
- d. Participating in organizations focused on shared governance or professional development.
- e. Attending and participating in a variety of activities involving governance or professional development.

2. **Professional Service**

This dimension of service describes service in terms of the faculty member's contributions to professional organizations within his or her professional field. Examples include:

- a. Holding memberships in professional organizations and/or participating in the activities of one or more professional organizations.
- b. Holding an elected office or other position of leadership in professional organizations.
- c. Editing a national, regional and/or local professional journal.
- d. Participating at professional meetings in the capacity of moderator, track chairperson, discussant, speaker, reactor.
- e. Advising a student professional organization.

3. **Public Service**

This dimension of service refers to using one's professional expertise, professional knowledge, and professional skills to serve community, state, national, or international constituents. These types of activities include:

- a. holding board membership or other positions of leadership or participation in community organizations.
- b. Volunteer work that uses one's professional expertise.

4. **Professional Consultation**

This dimension of service requires evidence of providing professional expertise to business, industry, community organizations, and colleagues. Consultation services to external constituents within the faculty member's area of professional expertise is included in this category. Examples of activities include:

- a. Serving as an invited speaker and or providing and developing training for community organizations outside the university.
- b. Assisting public organizations with developing business plans, strategies, policies, or providing financial, management, marketing, or other unpaid professional consulting services.

- c. Involvement in special projects for the department, college, or university, or profession, or community; work on innovative solutions to community or university problems.
- d. Teaching courses or seminars.

Management Department Requirements for Service

The Management Department's merit guidelines for service require that *specific minimum levels* of performance be demonstrated before a rating of Exceptional (Level 5), Commendable (Level 4), or Competent (Level 3) can be considered. While, it is difficult to describe the specific kinds of activities required for each level because of the wide variety of activities in which faculty are engaged, the committee should evaluate each faculty member based on the commitment of time and effort required by the service activity, the importance of the activity to the department, college, university, or the profession, the visibility and recognition of the activity, and/or the degree to which the activity utilizes the faculty member's professional skills and expertise. These requirements include the following:

Competent Performance (Level 3)

For any faculty member to be rated at Level 3 the minimum expectation is that the faculty member meet obligations with respect to **University Citizenship** and **Professional Service**:

1. **University Citizenship** - Meet his or her obligations to the department, the college, and the university by participating in shared governance activities. This includes regularly attending meetings within the department and college, serving on committees to develop or implement policy, attending and participating in professional activities.
2. **Professional Service** - Engage in professional service is required to the extent that the faculty member participates in professional activities and organizations.

Exceptional Performance (Level 5)

For any faculty member to be rated at Level 5 the faculty member must meet obligations for University Citizenship and Professional Service described at Level 3. In addition the faculty member must demonstrate one or more of the following:

1. That he or she has assumed a leadership role in multiple and/or important University Citizenship activities.
2. That he or she has sustained levels of Professional Service that place considerable demands on the faculty member's time, skills, and expertise and bring recognition to

the department, college, or university.

3. That he or she has assumed highly visible unpaid Public Service or Professional Consulting roles that place considerable demands on the faculty member's time, skills, and expertise and bring recognition to the department, college, or university.

Service activities at Level 5 are those that (1) place considerable demands on the faculty member's time, (2) are visible and important, (3) enhance the reputation of the department, college, university, and/or (4) substantially contribute to the welfare of the university, the public, or the profession.

Commendable Performance (Level 4)

For any faculty member to be rated at Level 4 the faculty member must meet obligations for University Citizenship and Professional Service described at Level 3. In addition the faculty member must demonstrate one or more of the following:

1. A high level of university citizenship including substantial involvement in shared governance activities.
2. The faculty member may be engaged in high levels of professional or public service that place demands on the faculty member's time and expertise.
3. Be involved in activities producing outcomes that benefit students, other faculty, staff, or the general public.

Factors in Considering Merit Ratings for Service

Departmental guidelines should recognize that individual faculty do not necessarily have to perform activities in all of the categories of service to be rated as "Exceptional."

A rating of "exceptional" for the individual faculty member's performance should be validated by significant contributions in some combination of the criteria mentioned above.

The **Department Merit Committee** must consider the following:

16. The nature or type of each service activity. Roles such as editorships, offices in professional organizations, professional service awards, etc. shall be judged according to such factors as visibility, prestige, activities and accomplishments involved.
17. The impact of the service activity on the Department, College, or University, and on one's profession.

18. The significance of the contribution made by the individual faculty member based on the individual's role in the activity and on the time and/or level of effort involved.
19. The degree to which participation and/or leadership in campus or community activities or projects involve the use of one's professional expertise.
20. The degree to which the activity was compensated.

V. THE TEMPLATE FOR THE MERIT APPLICATION

All faculty must include the information described in this template in the order described.

Note on Faculty Comments - - Many dimensions call for *bulleted lists*. This means exactly what it says. The faculty member must provide one-sentence bulleted lists of activities, not long narrative statements. Comments must be brief and in the form of bulleted points. The **Departmental Merit Committee** *will not read* individual statements for each dimension longer than about 250 words.

Note on Peer Evaluation - Peer evaluation is conducted by the **Department Merit Committee** based on the information provided and each committee member's expert judgment.

A. Identifying Information

A cover sheet with identifying information including name, department, and merit period.

B. Academic Vita

A current copy of the faculty member's academic vita.

C. Teaching Documentation

Included in the Appendix:

Required of all Faculty:

The following documents must be included in a separate appendix:

- course syllabus for each course taught.
- samples of completed assignments or student projects for each course
- sample exams for each course
- Student evaluation results must come from *all sections of all courses taught* during spring and fall semesters (not just selected courses)
- Copies of *all comments* from student evaluation forms
- Other supporting documentation for optional dimensions
- Supporting documentation for exceptional modes of teaching.

Documentation for Each Teaching Dimension

Each performance dimension is listed below with documentation required of all faculty.

I. Critical Performance Dimensions

A-1. Instructor Inputs

COBA Faculty Evaluation Results A-1 Instructor Inputs				
Course Number	Section Number	Course Title	N	Composite Score Items 1-7
Weighted Average Composite Score Items 1-7				
Course Number	Section Number	Course Title	N	Composite Score Items 14-20
Weighted Average Composite Score Items 14-20				

Student Comments: You may provide summary comments. Include all comment sheets in the appendix sorted so that only those with written remarks appear in the front.

Faculty Member Comments- Include as bulleted points.

A-2. Student or Class Outcomes

Include the following course-related documents in the appendix by class taught in the following order:

1. Copy of course syllabus or course policies statement

2. Samples of exams and quizzes
3. Samples of assignments and course activities.

Faculty Member Statement- Include as bulleted points.

Course Rigor - For each class report the distribution of grades as follows:

Course	Number of Reported Grades for Course					
	A	B	C	D	F	N
Total N						
Proportions						

Work Load - Provide the following information:

Course Number	Course Title	Semester	Number of Students	Number of Credit Hours
Totals				

B-1 Subject Matter Knowledge

Faculty Member Statement - provide a bulleted list of activities documenting subject matter knowledge including date, location, and nature of the activity.

B-2 Self Development

Self-Evaluation Statement - provide a bulleted list describing activities undertaken for self-development including date, location, and nature of the activity.

Evidence from Optional Dimensions and Exceptional Modes of Teaching

Important Note: The following items are required only of those individuals requesting a Level 4 or Level 5 merit rating in teaching. Faculty comments should include bulleted lists of activities undertaken including date, location, and nature of the activity for the dimensions that apply:

A - 1 Mentoring, Supervising, and Supporting Students

A - 2 External Recognition

B - 1. Contributing to Other's Development

B - 2 Curricular Design and Development

II - A Outstanding Performance as a Classroom Teacher

II - B Experiential Learning

II - C Accessibility

II - D Diversity

D. Research Documentation

Each faculty member will provide the following documentation to support his or her claims:

1. A list of complete citations of published works that include the following
 - title of the work and date published
 - name of publishing outlet, date published, volume and number, and page numbers
 - description of publishing outlet (i.e., academic journal, practitioner journal, online publication, book chapter)
 - list of coauthors and description of authorship (i.e., first, second, etc.)
 - type of review process (blind peer review, editorial review) and number of reviewers
2. Where the individual is making a claim of publishing in an elite source, a bulleted list of evidence of quality such as journal rankings, reviews, etc., to support the claim.
3. A bulleted list of works unconditionally accepted including the information in #1 above.
4. A bulleted list of works under review including the information in #1 above.
5. A bulleted list of professional activities including:
 - meetings attended and paper presentations
 - professional presentations
 - professional editing, reviewing, critiquing, and related activities
 - bulleted list of other activities for the committee to consider
6. Other documentation such as:
 - bulleted list of awards and honors received by the faculty member

The following documentation must be included in an appendix of supporting documentation in the same order as it appears in the bulleted lists:

- a copy of each published work as it appears in print.
- evidence of indicators of quality (if needed)
- a copy of letters of unconditional acceptance for works in press.
- copies of other works for committee consideration.
- other documentation as required by the committee.

E. Service Documentation

The faculty member may include a bulleted list describing service activities. Supporting documentation of results or work outcomes may be included in the appendix.

University Citizenship, Professional Service, Public Service, and Professional Consultation must be described using this format.

University Citizenship Service Activities				
number of meetings attended	total time spent on activity	name of activity (university, college, department)	Purpose of activity	Outcome of activity

Professional Service Activities		
date(s) of activities	time spent on activities	Describe the purpose of the activity, its outcomes, and its relationship to the profession

Public Service Activities <i>(not required for Level 3 documentation)</i>		
date(s) of activities	time spent on activities	Describe the purpose of the activity, its outcomes, and its relationship to the profession

Professional Consultation Activities <i>(not required for Level 3 documentation)</i>			
date(s) of activities	time spent on activities	Describe the purpose of the activity, its outcomes, and its relationship to the profession	was activity compensated?