

**2007 DEPARTMENT GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATIVE PROCESSES:
FACULTY REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, TENURE AND MERIT
EVALUATION GUIDELINES FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF MARKETING
MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY**

The Marketing (MKT) department agrees to be in compliance with the latest edition of the Faculty Handbook and the latest revisions of the University and College of Business Administration (COBA) Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, including such rules and procedures dealing with the awarding of merit compensation. Revisions of the University and COBA guidelines will always take precedence over departmental guidelines.

The MKT department agrees to follow the general evaluation procedures of the University regarding the steps involved, appeal procedures, etc. Further, we agree to follow the general criteria for these decisions discussed and included requirements for promotion, teaching, research, service and merit. Sections in the Handbook state that "basic competence in itself is not sufficient to justify granting tenure..."

The following guidelines are intended to elaborate further upon the University guidelines to make them more explicit and assure standardization of these procedures within the College of Business Administration and Department of Marketing. Other documents such as the COBA "Scholarly Productivity Guidelines" and the Teaching Load Guidelines" should be consulted when considering standards and making evaluations.

The evaluation for reappointment, promotion and tenure should not be confused with the objectives setting process done by individuals, departments, and COBA. The objectives have to do with achieving ends that are relevant to current department and COBA goals and often reflect minimum requirements. Faculty members MUST keep in mind the requirements stated in this document that are used for promotion and tenure decisions and then formulate objectives that will lead to their desired outcomes that fit their needs, deficits, etc. Achieving yearly COBA and department objectives documents minimal standards and is not a guarantee that criteria for other administrative decisions have been met. This would depend upon how much those objectives are consistent with the requirements stated in this document.

I. Marketing Department Personnel Committee

What has heretofore been titled the Faculty Evaluation Committee will now be referred to as the Marketing Department Personnel Committee. It shall consist of a minimum of five (5) tenured ranked faculty; the majority will be of Professor rank. All members must be tenured. Members of the committee will be chosen annually by ranked members of the department by secret ballot at the first available opportunity. Members of the Committee may serve consecutive terms. Tenure, promotion, merit, and reappointment recommendations will be the responsibility of this Committee to the Department Head.

II. Regular Performance Reviews

Each year (annually) the faculty member will submit in writing and then formally discuss with the department head (1) results of prior performance and (2) objectives for forthcoming performance (*progressive performance expectations where pertinent*). After the meeting and consistent with the current Faculty Handbook and other University and COBA Guidelines, the department head will submit a written summary in the form of an annual evaluation to the personnel file, faculty member, and department personnel committee as required. This annual letter should include a discussion of areas in which more improvement is required.

III. Review of Faculty

Every year (annually) the Personnel Committee and then the department head will make a full and substantive performance review of probationary faculty and tenured, ranked faculty at the appropriate time. Student evaluations will be collected over a calendar year for each course taught fall and spring and the results of each professor's total courses taught averaged for evaluation purposes. Input for teaching and service shall be reviewed over a twelve (12) month calendar period; input for research shall be reviewed over the previous two (2) calendar years as a two-year rolling average. A letter of evaluation will be addressed to the faculty member, with copies sent to the department files and the dean.

IV. Special Review for Tenure Eligible Probationary Faculty

Two years prior to the final date to apply for tenure, the Personnel Committee and the department head will each conduct a pre-tenure review (usually considered the third year review), both will specify one of three outcomes, satisfactory, questionable, unsatisfactory. Copies will be sent to the candidate, department and dean.

V. Application for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

A. Outline of Procedure

The individual faculty member will initiate the action to be considered for tenure or promotion. For reappointment decisions, the department head and faculty will develop appropriate procedures. In all cases, the data upon which reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions will be made will include information provided by the individual faculty member as well as departmental data. It is the faculty members' responsibility to provide documentation to support their application, including all student evaluations, previous performance reviews, and Vita. The documentation could include letters of acceptances or copies of articles, evidence of a publication's peer-review process, course syllabi, letters of appointment for major service assignments, or anything the faculty member feels will help his/her case (see evaluation approaches discussed later in this document). Such documentation will be in accordance with University and COBA guidelines and will use the approved forms and meet deadlines as specified by that year's Academic Work Calendar.

(All recommendations will originate from the department Personnel Committee and be forwarded to the department head.)

B. Process for Annual Appointments

Faculty are requested to *carefully* read and perform under the guidelines found in the Faculty Handbook. This section describes the fact that Faculty participate in five separate, but interrelated, evaluative processes: (1) a regular performance review by the department head, (2) a special assessment of tenure progress during the probationary period, (3) review of application for tenure, (4) review of application for promotion, and (5) for untenured, ranked faculty only, review of application for annual appointment. The candidate initiates the reappointment, submitting materials to the chair of the department Evaluation Committee. The committee's recommendation is then sent to the department head. The candidate signs the department head's recommendation and receives copies of both. The department head cannot be a committee member. The department head and the committee's recommendation are then sent to the dean.

C. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

The application for promotion...shall not preclude the regular yearly review. Evaluations will be based upon departmental statements of expectations provided to faculty upon employment, regular yearly reviews and documentation presented by the candidate. They will be evaluated according to performance in present rank. These criteria shall include the areas of teaching, research, and service and shall include appropriate levels of growth and development.

The departmental Personnel Committee shall evaluate each applicant separately for tenure and promotion. The committee will submit a separate evaluation form to the department head regarding the recommendation for or against promotion or tenure and the rationale behind its decision per the following evaluation criteria:

TENURE: Above average performance in teaching or research, expected performance in other two.

PROMOTION TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR: Above average performance in teaching or research, expected performance in the other two.

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR: Above average performance in two of the three criteria, expected performance in the other one or outstanding performance in teaching or research and expected performance in the other two.

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR: Outstanding performance in teaching or research and above average performance in the other two.

PROMOTION TO DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR: The Faculty Handbook gives explicit criteria for this rank.

The departmental committee will refer to departmental guidelines and requirements in regard to the assignment of the ratings (expected, above average, and outstanding performance).

VI. COBA Guidelines for Teaching, Scholarly Research, and Service Activities

The latest version of the University and General COBA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines for teaching, research, service and merit will be followed in the evaluation of faculty.

The following departmental guidelines are supplied to help further define the activities suggested in the University and COBA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines as related to teaching, research, and service.

A. Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching is among the most important responsibilities of any institution of higher education. Evaluating and improving on this activity is an ongoing and critical function of faculty of administration. Teaching effectiveness must be taken seriously with review and evaluation occurring on many levels. The attributes considered to be indicative of effective teaching vary among individuals and across disciplines.

1. Approaches to Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness:

The department recognizes that teaching effectiveness cannot be measured in isolation. It is related to the total workload of professors and must be looked at from the totality of what it means to be a member of the faculty.

It is the unanimous recommendation of the department that a reasonable period of time be used in assessing a faculty member's teaching effectiveness. For the faculty member in her or his first year, assessment increases, however, evaluating teaching effectiveness over multiple semesters becomes possible.

The department also recognizes that there are measures of teaching effectiveness that may be valid at one level of analysis and invalid at another. For example, accreditation and professional certification may be valid in determining the effectiveness of a program or department but questionable in measuring effectiveness of an individual professor. Employer and alumni surveys provide another example of program assessment that probably should be avoided as a measure of teaching effectiveness of individual professors.

The department also believes that multiple methods of measuring teaching effectiveness of individual faculty members are desirable. The department recognizes that different measures assess different aspects of teaching effectiveness and that each has advantages and disadvantages. Outlines of six approaches for a faculty member to prepare in the evaluation of their teaching effectiveness are provided below. The approaches should not be viewed as some minimum checklist. Instead, it is the department's intent to provide examples of approaches that might be used, factors of teaching effectiveness that each approach might measure, and factors for which the approaches might be less appropriate than other approaches. Effective classroom teaching performance and overall quality instructional effort are essential conditions to be demonstrated for reappointment, promotion and tenure.

2. Approaches:

a. Self-Evaluation (May also be peer reviewed)

Examples:

Portfolios

Narratives about approaches, philosophy, innovations, etc.

Periodic (semester, annual, three-year, etc.) summary of teaching effectiveness.

Periodic (semester, annual, three-year, etc.) plan for subsequent courses.

Course materials (syllabi, policy statements, samples of assigned work, projects, sample of exams).

Representative samples of work turned in by students.

Evidence of significant course or curriculum development.

Instructional methods (including instructional technology).

Summary of field-based learning experiences (practice, student teaching, internships, field work, service learning).

Computer based instruction.

On-line course information.

Laboratory materials.

Summary of individual student projects supervised (special reading courses, honor components, etc.).

Summary of graduate student seminars and theses supervised.

Possible Factors of Teaching Effectiveness to Evaluate:

Organization of courses

Clarity of goals, procedures and expectations

Appropriateness of contents to curricular objectives

Being prepared

Rigor of courses

Knowledge of discipline

Extent of student involvement

Fairness of policies

Number of preparation over period of time

Ability to express things clearly in writing

Respect for students

Interest and action toward improvement of teaching

Use of instructional technology

Course development activities

Should not be used to evaluate

Oral communication skills

Enthusiasm

b. Student Evaluation of Instruction:

Examples:

Ratings on various items/dimensions (standardized form or forms)
Written comments
Documented student interviews, individual or group between faculty and/or administration

Possible Factors of Teaching Effectiveness to Evaluate:

Clarity of learning objectives and expectations
Organization of course
Relationship between exams/assignments and course objectives and content
Presentation skills
Ability to present material clearly
Availability to assist students
Willingness to assist students
Fairness of applying policies
Respect for students
Faculty member's efforts to motivate and involve students
Encouragement of questions/comments from students
Willingness to provide adequate and timely feedback to students (including returning assignments and exams in a timely manner).

Should not be used to evaluate:

Professors' knowledge of subject matter
Faculty members' competence
Course rigor

c. Peer Evaluation

Classroom visits and observation
Review of portfolio (see self-evaluation)
Review of course materials
Review of videotapes of class presentations
Scholarship of teaching (publications and presentations)
Research in subject (as a measure of currency and knowledge)
Possible Factors of Teaching Effectiveness to Evaluate:

Knowledge of subject matter
Use of appropriate methods and instructional support
Rigor of course
Presentation skills (if observing)
Non-verbal communication skills
Organization of class materials
Appropriateness of content
Faculty members' responsiveness to student needs
Appropriateness of reading materials, text and exams

Should Not be Used to Evaluate:

Being prepared
Availability and willingness to assist students
Clear expectations
Enthusiasm
Fairness

d. Learning Outcome Measures:

Examples:

Standardized testing (when and where available)
MFAT or similar nationally normed exams (for program assessment only)
Pattern of final grade distribution (used in appropriate context)
Students' performance on group final
Students' performance on field-based instruction (for program assessment only)

Possible Factors of Teaching Effectiveness to Evaluate:

Factors of knowledge, information, and/or skills gained by the students.

Should Not Be Used to Evaluate:

Any factor other than factors of knowledge, information, and/or skills gained by the students

e. Alumni and/or Employer Feedback FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION ONLY:

Examples:

Surveys
Focus groups
Interviews

Possible Factors of Teaching Effectiveness to Evaluate:

Relevance of course/program content to later situations
Development of personal growth, values, etc.
Courses in program that benefited most
Suggested changes in program
Areas of deficit in courses, programs, or those graduating from the program.

Should Not Be Used to Evaluate:

Teaching effectiveness of individual faculty member

f. Administrator Evaluation: (Primarily department head)

Possible Factors of Teaching Effectiveness to Evaluate:

Availability to students
Participation in curricular development
Appropriate use of instructional technology

3. Recommended Evaluation Procedures/Expectations (In accord with Faculty Senate Action 18-97/98 adopted 2/12/98):

The department is responsible for preparing procedures for evaluating teaching effectiveness for teaching faculty in the department in accordance with the University and COBA rules and procedures.

The department should be explicit about what factors of teaching effectiveness are to be measured and how these are to be assessed. This information shall be communicated to all faculty.

The department should review procedures used to measure teaching effectiveness at least every three years.

The department should avoid using a single approach to evaluating teaching effectiveness. It is recommended that student evaluation of instruction be one of the approaches used. Student evaluation, however, should be used with other appropriate approaches.

Direct comparisons or rankings of faculty between departments should be avoided; although, teaching instrument scores, from departments in the same college using a common instrument, can be useful.

If statistical data are used in assessing teaching effectiveness, some understanding of statistical analysis is expected of those doing the assessment.

Evaluation should be made within the context of general type and nature of course (graduate, general education, upper division, etc.)

For tenure and promotion decisions, College committees, Deans and the Vice President for Academic Affairs should honor the recommendations of the department and department head in all but the most unusual circumstances. This requires rigorous evaluation by the Department Personnel Committee and the department head.

The numerical ratings on the student evaluation forms are an important source of information. However, student evaluations will not be considered as the only factor in judging teaching effectiveness. There is evidence that student ratings are influenced by extraneous factors, although the main influence seems to be the teacher's performance on a variety of dimensions. Thus, the numbers represent general values but certainly not specific points. Due to the

influence of student interest, physical environment, course grades, etc., the student evaluations must be considered in view of the trichotomy ratings, the average rating for that course, the number of students, and the level of students.

In summation, effective teaching results from the combination of many factors. To objectively and fairly evaluate an individual's teaching performance requires consideration of several important facets of teaching. Examples include, but are not limited to:

1. Courses taught: undergraduate or graduate, number of students enrolled, student credit hours, new course preparation involved, number of preparations per semester.
2. Other teaching activities: guest lecturers, number of independent readings, and other teaching activities.
3. Directing a master's thesis as chairman or as a significant advisor.
4. Activities to improve teaching: new teaching methods, professional upgrading (participation in workshops, institutes, seminars, conferences, educational trips, pedagogical reading and research, etc.).
5. Activities to improve curriculum: revision of existing courses, development of new courses, preparation of materials to integrate new equipment or software into existing courses.
6. Development of other teaching related materials.
7. Student evaluations of teaching: summary scores from college standard course evaluation form (course rating, instructor rating, and interest in course).
8. Peer evaluations of teaching methods and materials, course syllabi or policy statements, examinations, students' written assignments, handouts, presentation skills.
9. Teaching awards, honors, recognition by student organizations, etc.

NOTE: For criteria purposes, directing a master's thesis may be EITHER under Teaching or Service Activities depending on the situation, but not under both.

10. Academic advising: number of advisees, willingness to assist students, etc.
11. Publications of textbooks, cases, or other pedagogical material.

NOTE: For criteria purposes, textbooks, cases and pedagogical material may be EITHER under Teaching or Scholarly Activity depending upon the situation, but NOT under both.

FOR AACSB REPORTING PURPOSES, THESE MATERIALS SHOULD BE REPORTED AS SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY.

Reprint(s) of publications should not count as additional articles or publications but can be used as general evidence of well-recognized contribution to the field.

B. Research and Scholarly Activity

The following items are examples (not exhaustive) of what should be considered in judging a faculty member's scholarly endeavor. It should be construed to include theoretical or empirical discovery research, applied research, applying other's discoveries to new contexts, written cases with instructor's manual, computer software, and textbooks and other pedagogical writing. The "Marketing Department Guidelines" provide additional assignments of items for numerical point values.

1. Publication of articles in national peer-reviewed journals, regional peer-reviewed journal and non-peer-reviewed journals.
2. Publication of scholarly book or monograph by national or international publishers or university presses, completed chapters in books currently under contract and/or in progress, and articles as chapters in edited books for which one is given public credit in print.
3. Publication of textbooks, cases, or other pedagogical material.
4. Book reviews and essays published in peer-reviewed journals.
5. Monographs published and disseminated by foundations or government agencies.
6. Monographs or essays written for and published by professional associations, philanthropic organizations, and non-peer-reviewed articles.
7. Reprints of articles previously published in edited books or in peer-review journals.
8. Presentation of papers at state, regional, national, and international professional meetings that result in published refereed proceedings.
9. Invited presentations at state, regional, national and international professional meetings.
10. Presentations of papers at state, regional, national, and international professional meetings that do not result in professional publication.
11. Research proposals successfully funded and grant reports emanating from such projects.
12. Research proposals submitted but not funded.
13. Research projects in active progress.
14. Development of software.

Ranking of Marketing Department Journals

The department has determined that academic journals are to be considered within the category of “Elite,” “A,” “B,” or “C”. Traditionally the following journals have been recognized as extremely difficult to have a manuscript acceptance: *The Journal of Marketing*, *The Journal of Marketing Research*, *The Journal of Consumer Research*, *Management Science*, and *Decision Sciences*. Should a faculty member publish a manuscript in one of these “Elite” journals, the faculty member should be duly rewarded. Given that it may require a review process of two years or more to publish in one of these elite journals, the reward should include a monetary award of \$1000 dollars from the Dean of COBA. The monetary rewards are of course subject to availability from the Dean. Other journals may be considered for the “Elite” category with proper documentation.

Journal quality for merit evaluation purposes should be examined from the perspective of a) overall reputation and journal quality (it is the faculty member’s responsibility to support quality claims), b) whether the journal was sole-authored or co-authored. Each faculty member should indicate his or her percentage of contribution to the article. Legitimate exceptions may exist, and those should be presented, documented, and explained. Sole authored articles should be valued more than multiple authored manuscripts. Equally, an article with two authors should be valued higher than a journal with three authors. Lead authorship on a manuscript might also be considered more valuable than being second or third authors. Each of these situations assumes articles that have been published in similar quality journals. While it is an important collegial approach for tenured faculty to help new faculty through co-authoring efforts, it is also important that new faculty be able to demonstrate their ability to publish independently. Finally c), the number of articles a faculty member has at the end of a reporting period, along with the number of co-authors in those articles, and the quality of the published journals, should be used to rank each faculty members research efforts in their respective departments. Articles that develop and empirically test new theory should be rated as higher quality than articles which simply reflect a position statement by the author(s). So called “weekend articles” and journals published in very low quality publications are to be avoided. The number of unique references cited in the manuscript may also be helpful in determining article quality. Faculty are encouraged to publish in a variety of journals requiring various levels of difficulty; including those requiring theory development, empirical theory testing, applications of theory, and other suitable outlets. A blended strategy is important. The full article copied from the journal, should be included with the merit application. Faculty members should clarify their total contributions to each article.

Books provide prestige to the University and to the College of Business Administration. In some cases, students have actually chosen Missouri State University because COBA faculty authored major manuscripts and textbooks. Therefore, the existing merit guidelines regarding the value of books for merit should be honored. Proceedings and presentations of faculty are also important research efforts, although their value must be tempered by the value placed on them by AACSB. Journal articles are clearly more valuable to COBA in maintaining AACSB accreditation, and therefore should be more valuable than proceedings and presentations for merit purposes.

Major research grants received by faculty members must also be considered for merit purposes. If the faculty member receives significant release time or a large monetary stipend, this information must be presented in his or her merit application. Such grants should also result in future publications.

C. Service

Service includes activities performed within a college or department, such as committee work and special assignments delegated by a dean or department head. Service also includes activities performed on behalf of University-wide task forces or committees, or on behalf of local, regional, national, or international professional or community organizations. Activities to be considered include the following examples:

1. Membership and elected office, or other position of leadership held in professional organizations(s) (for example, committee membership, chairing, etc.).
2. Special assignments for professional organizations; for example, directing seminars, conducting workshops, advising student organizations.
3. Participation at professional meetings in the capacity of moderator, track chairperson, speaker, reactor, discussant.
4. Work performed in a professional consultant capacity.
5. Professional honors.
6. Membership or leadership in department, college or University committees or task forces.
7. Involvement in student organizations.
8. Teaching courses or seminars through the Continuing Education Program, Center for Business and Economic Development, or any other University sponsored seminar.
9. Directing a master's thesis as chairman or as a significant advisor.
10. Special University, college, or department assignments deemed significant.
11. Community, regional, state, and national activities deemed significant.
12. Other professional activity.

D. Standards for Evaluation

The evaluation plans describe the standards that are appropriate for each of the areas to be evaluated (teaching, research and service). It is the applicant's responsibility to provide evidence of the peer-review or refereed process for all publications and to substantiate rationale for achievement in each

of the areas of teaching, research and service as level 1, level 2, level 3, level 4, or level 5.

The policy defining procedure for review of the department for evaluation purposes will be reviewed annually by departmental faculty.

Faculty will be reviewed annually, but tenured faculty can elect to be evaluated on an average of the past two years. The annual compensation review will also be used as the annual performance review for faculty.

Weights must also be assigned to each faculty member with regard to teaching, research and service. The past history in Marketing, for the regular tenure track faculty member, has been to place equal emphasis on teaching and research with lesser emphasis on service. This approach was necessary for COBA to acquire and maintain AACSB accreditation. Our emphasis is in harmony with the mission for a master's level school. Smaller unaccredited programs would have a higher weighting on teaching and the doctoral granting schools would have higher weighting on research. Therefore, our future emphasis for the traditional tenure track or tenured faculty member needs to be in the historical Marketing Department format. The expected norm for the Marketing faculty member is nine credits of teaching per semester, plus scholarly activity resulting in a minimum of two peer reviewed journals over the past five years, plus service activity as appropriate. Please note that current AACSB standards require each department to have 90 percent of the faculty be academically or professionally qualified. The above expectations and output meet the requirements for accreditation purposes. However, it is important to note that there are exceptions to the normal requirements based upon reassigned time for special circumstances (grant buy-outs, director of graduate programs, special projects, auditorium classes, etc.). Therefore, during the annual review, the department head discusses with each faculty member the expectations of weights on teaching, research and service for the coming year. So as to ensure equitable treatment across the College, significant variances must be approved by department head and the dean.

The merit process involves each individual faculty member deciding, with their respective department head's support, what percentages of their efforts they want to be measured in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The University guidelines provide some flexibility regarding each of the three areas as long as they total 100 percent. For any one reporting year for tenure track faculty, teaching effort may be negotiated from 35 to 50 percent, research from 40 to 60 percent, and service from 10 to 20 percent of an individual's yearly evaluation. For Instructors, the percentage of effort can range from 80 to 90 percent for teaching, from 0 to 10 percent for research, and from 10 to 20 percent for service. It is also important to recognize that for COBA to maintain AACSB accreditation, all faculty members must contribute in the area of research. This is an especially important consideration, given that AACSB accreditation requires that 90 percent of all COBA faculty members must be considered either academically or professionally qualified. This requirement includes both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty. To be academically qualified, tenure track faculty must have a doctorate in their discipline of instruction and have authored at least two refereed journal articles over the past five years. Professionally qualified faculty must have relevant professional experience related to their area of instruction and some scholarly activity within the past five years. As such, the

COBA Merit Committee feels that every faculty member must contribute to reaching the 90 percent faculty-qualification requirement.

Note: To maintain AACSB International accreditation, a performance ratio of 40/40/20 is the general standard weighting required of tenure track, scholarly active, ranked Marketing faculty to maintain a minimum level of general production in teaching (40), scholarly activity/research (40) and service (20). However, in those circumstances where significant additional activity is requested, then this ratio can be slightly altered for tenure-track full time faculty. For example, those teaching a 12-hour load could be considered for a 50/30/20 performance index. For Lecturers teaching a four-course large enrollment load, they might in some circumstances have a ratio of teaching, research and service of 70/20/10, depending on the needs of accreditation standards and other requirements. Regardless, these ratios need to be discussed in advance with and approved by the department head the year before evaluation.

MARKETING DEPARTMENT GUIDELINES FOR MERIT

The guidelines approved by the Marketing Department will be used annually as a basis for evaluating the performance of the department's faculty members. The resulting performance ratings from all departments will then be used by COBA to determine annual compensation increases for all COBA faculty members. Note that the performance evaluations also may provide an indication of progress by probationary faculty; however, distinctly different guidelines exist for tenure and promotion decisions. Therefore, it should be understood that performance evaluated as competent for compensation purposes is not sufficient for tenure and promotion. The tenure and promotion guidelines will be the basis for determining tenure and/or promotion.

The guidelines found in this document pertain to two classes of faculty in the Marketing Department: tenure-track faculty and full-time non-tenure-track lecturers. Primary consideration is given to tenure track faculty, but where expectations differ for non-tenure track lecturers such differences are noted.

Faculty must understand that the new merit system not only requires a measurement of the **quantity** of a faculty member's performance, but also must include an examination of the **quality** of a faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service. It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide both the list of items that they want considered for merit, and to provide supporting material, referenced to the specific areas of teaching, research, and service. Specific merit subjects should be referenced in bullet format in the main merit summary document with supporting documentation attached as an appendix.

Another important consideration is that all COBA faculty members must realize and understand that the new existing merit system is based on a forced distribution system. This forced distribution system was designed and formulated by the University Compensation Committee, not the College of Business. The University Compensation Committee has determined that approximately 15 percent of the faculty should be in the top ranking of a level 5, that approximately 35 percent of the faculty should be in the next highest ranking of a level 4, and that approximately 50 percent of the faculty should be considered average in the level 3 category. The fact that the new system artificially forces approximately half of the faculty into the "average" category is potentially problematic regarding faculty motivation and collegiality.

Faculty Duties and Responsibilities

A faculty member's first responsibility is to *student learning*. Thus, each faculty member is obligated to help create at the University, in the College, and in the Department/School, beyond the classroom, an atmosphere of inquisitiveness and professional and community concern. The University, as noted in Section 2.3 of the current Faculty Handbook, and the College, as recorded in the COBA Vision, Mission, and Value Statements, expect faculty members to employ a balanced approach toward carrying out their responsibilities. The University affords much

latitude to faculty members in how they structure that balanced approach. COBA understands and supports the University's purposes. However, COBA has its own goals and objectives supported by the University that include maintaining AACSB accreditation. Consequently, this document is influenced by COBA's unique goals.

The previous paragraph refers to tenured or tenure-track faculty. Expectations differ for non-tenure-track lecturers. The difference relates primarily to research expectations. In most cases, maintenance of professional qualifications, as defined by the AACSB, substitutes for the more exacting research expectations required of tenured or tenure-track faculty, although for some lecturers, research and publication may substitute for maintenance of professional qualification. Other than this difference, expectations are similar. Importantly, expectations for teaching competence do not differ from those of tenured or tenure-track faculty. In addition, full-time lecturers should expect to perform service. The remainder of this document provides specific guidance as to what may constitute meritorious performance by Marketing.

Teaching Evaluations

Specific factors for assessing teaching are based on Appendix B of the Final Report of the President's 2006 Compensation Committee, Section 2.3.1.1 of the current Faculty Handbook, and Section 2.3.1.1.3 of the Proposed Amendments to the Faculty Handbook, which even if not adopted offer structure beneficial for AACSB accreditation purposes. Additional factors are influenced by AACSB accreditation standards as well as other positions taken by professional bodies with strong interest in business education.

Evaluation factors are categorized into four dimensions recommended by the President's 2006 Compensation Committee. Possible sources of documentation for a faculty member claiming success on a specific factor are provided in parenthesis after the description of the factor. Where the suggested documentation indicates self-reporting and no other specification is provided, a faculty member should use judgment in supplying appropriate and persuasive support for the claim. Factors other than those listed below may be claimed, but as is the case with all factors claimed, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide documentation in support of those claims. Note that it is not necessary for a faculty member to achieve success on all factors to receive a high ranking in teaching. Furthermore, accommodation is made for faculty to rely more heavily on student evaluations, although not exclusively, or to rely more heavily on factors other than student evaluations, although also not exclusively.

It is again the faculty members' responsibility to provide both the item for merit consideration and its supporting documentation. The overall teaching score does provide an excellent measurement of how the faculty member is perceived by students in the classroom, and as such must be incorporated into the overall evaluation. Students are our customers and we must take their evaluations seriously. No matter how rigorous an instructor or professor is in the classroom, they still must present the material to the student in a clear and interesting manner. Good teaching is more than just covering the material.

Determination of Teaching Performance Levels

The following point system was designed by the Marketing Department Personnel Committee to

quantify the achievements of faculty in the area of teaching.

There are two components to the teaching evaluation: student evaluation scores and additional teaching factors. When combined, an overall teaching merit level will be determined for a **one year** time period. The following point system was designed by the Marketing Department Personnel Committee to quantify the additional teaching factors component over a **one year** time period.

Note: According the MSU administration, these are the minimums required to reach each possible merit level, they do not guarantee the faculty member will receive this level of merit.