

## Department of Religious Studies Faculty Performance Evaluation Revised Fall 2007

### Prologue

The goals of the Department of Religious Studies Faculty Evaluation Plan are 1) to provide the best education possible to the students we serve, by helping faculty members achieve their highest professional goals in teaching, research, and service, and 2) to assist the department, college, and university in accomplishing their goals for the institution as guided by the Public Affairs Mission and the Long-range Plan.

Faculty are evaluated in three areas: teaching, research, and service. The criteria of the performance levels for faculty set forth in this document are informed by the University Compensation Report and the College's Performance Parameters. The criteria are broad, but they are not all inclusive. The Professional Standards Committee will consider other comparable accomplishments that are brought to its attention by the individual faculty member being reviewed. Multiple accomplishments at any level may improve the evaluation of a faculty member by the Professional Standards Committee. In each of the three areas, for a faculty member to be rated exceptional or commendable, she or he must meet the criteria not only for that level, but also for the competent level as well. The criteria for instructors differ in some levels; therefore, there is a separate section of the document that applies to full-time instructors. The criteria for competent performance set forth in this document do not supersede the stated requirements for tenure and promotion, and the criteria for all full-time faculty are consistent with the Faculty Handbook. If an inconsistency should be found, the Faculty Handbook will take precedence.

The Professional Standards Committee will take into account the effort that a faculty member has made and the quality of the outcomes that have been produced. Truly remarkable accomplishments by a faculty member will affect the Committee's evaluation.

The policies and procedures of the performance evaluation system of the Department of Religious Studies are governed by the policies of Missouri State University. According to these policies, all full-time faculty will be subject to an annual review of their performance by the Department's Professional Standards Committee.

### Documentation

At the beginning of January **each** year, all **full-time faculty** are required to submit a portfolio to the Professional Standards Committee documenting accomplishments in teaching, research, and service over the past calendar year, which meet the criteria specified below, as well as other significant accomplishments they would like to bring to the attention of the Committee. The Committee will not consider documentation that is unrelated to the criteria below or does not represent a significant accomplishment. For probationary faculty and faculty applying for promotion, the contents of the performance evaluation portfolio should be the same as the contents of the portfolio that accompanies application for annual reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

For the performance evaluation itself (exclusive of a promotion and/or tenure application) all faculty will be expected to include the following documentation:

1. a letter/report by the faculty member to the department head assessing her or his work (exclusive of self-rankings),
2. a copy of the ratios for student evaluations for the year/years under review, which includes quantitative grade distributions as supplied by the department head,
3. syllabi of courses taught, one exam from each different course and all quantitative data and all written comments from students,
4. documentation supporting her or his research and service claims as laid out in the letter to the department head.

If additional information is needed, regarding the materials submitted, the Committee will make the request.

The portfolios of faculty, who are being considered for performance review only, need not be as extensive as those of probationary faculty who are applying for tenure and promotion, or those of tenured faculty who are applying for promotion.

## **THE REVIEW PROCESS**

### **Department Level**

During January, the Professional Standards Committee will utilize the Department evaluation standards and guidelines below to conduct reviews of annual reports and will prepare narrative assessments of each faculty member. In addition, each member of the Committee will assign a tentative numerical rating on each of the three performance dimensions for each faculty member being reviewed. The Committee's narrative evaluations and tentative performance ratings will be forwarded to the department head.

The head will review faculty annual reports and the narrative assessments and tentative rating provided by the Professional Standards Committee. The department head will meet with the Committee to discuss the assessments and ratings. The department head will then prepare a composite performance rating that takes into account the percentage weights for each of the three categories of teaching, research and service agreed upon previously by the faculty member and the department head, consistent with applicable College criteria.

### **Information to be provided to the faculty member by the Department Head:**

1. Copies of the Professional Standards Committee's narrative reviews and the Committee's ratings on the three performance dimensions.
2. The department head's narrative review, ratings on the three performance dimensions and the composite performance rating. The composite rating will be proposed to the dean and the College council of heads for further consideration.
3. If the department head's rating on any of the three performance dimensions differs from that submitted by the personnel committee, the department head will provide a brief written rationale to the faculty member explaining the distinction.

### **College Level**

The dean will meet with the department heads and review the ratings provided by each department head (and the narrative assessments as necessary) to determine the final composite rating of each faculty member.

**Information to be provided to the faculty member by the Dean:**

1. The faculty member will receive from the dean his/her final composite rating.
2. If the dean's composite rating of a faculty member is different from the rating that the department head recommends, the dean will provide a brief written rationale to the faculty member, with a copy to the department head.

**Appeal**

Information on the appeals process is available from the office of the Dean of the College of Humanities and Public Affairs.

**Criteria for Performance Evaluation of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty Teaching**

**Level 5: Exceptional Teaching**

- Should have exceptional student evaluations, with an overall mean averaging substantially below the College mean in rigorous courses (as indicated, for example, by appropriate grade distribution and curricular materials) and very positive comments (As per the Faculty Handbook, student evaluations will count for no more or no less than 50% of one's teaching evaluation.)
- Peer evaluations of classroom performance and course preparation must be exceptional. (Specific attention will be given to instructional delivery skills, instructional design skills, content expertise, and course management. For more information about these areas see the "MSU Compensation Report, Appendix B: Evaluating Dimensions of Faculty Performance," [www.missouristate.edu/president/committees/compensation/finalreport](http://www.missouristate.edu/president/committees/compensation/finalreport).)
- Must show evidence of at least **two** of the following each year:
  1. Significant improvement in content or methodology of an existing course, including such things as service learning and training in and application of technological resources
  2. Receive a grant to support improving teaching
  3. National or international award/recognition of outstanding performance or preparation in teaching
  4. Evidence of efforts to enhance learning (This could include leading professional development activities, and such things as leading a workshop, or writing supplemental teaching material.)
  5. Evidence of exceptionally active and effective engagement with students' academic progress in such areas as undergraduate advising, graduate advising, thesis advisement and committee service, general education course assessment and others as deemed appropriate
  6. Make exceptional efforts to offer a diverse educational experience

7. Evidence of extraordinary and innovative efforts to engage students in learning (This could include such in-class activities as case studies, writing, visualizing, researching, and organized group discussions that relate to course objectives.)
8. Evidence of extraordinary and demonstrable efforts to enhance student success (This could include timely and pertinent feedback about improvement, ease of access to faculty member, and clear syllabi which accurately reflect what will occur in the class.)

#### **Level 4: Commendable Teaching**

- Should have commendable student evaluations, with an overall mean averaging below the College mean in rigorous courses (as indicated, for example, by appropriate grade distribution and curricular materials) and positive student comments (As per the Faculty Handbook, student evaluations will count for no more or no less than 50% of one's teaching evaluation.)
- Peer evaluations of classroom performance and course preparation must be commendable (Specific attention will be given to instructional delivery skills, instructional design skills, content expertise, and course management. For more information about these areas see the "MSU Compensation Report, Appendix B: Evaluating Dimensions of Faculty Performance," [www.missouristate.edu/president/committees/compensation/finalreport.](http://www.missouristate.edu/president/committees/compensation/finalreport/))
- Must show evidence of at least **one** of the following each year:
  1. Increasing accessibility to religious studies courses beyond one's typical assignments. These may include, but are not limited to, offering a new distance learning, online and continuing education courses, public lectures or workshops, or working with the community and public schools.
  2. Make commendable efforts to offer a culturally diverse educational experience
  3. Development or teaching of a new course that expands upon the department's offerings
  4. Submit a major external grant proposal
  5. Evidence of commendable efforts to engage students in learning (This could include such in-class activities as case studies, writing, visualizing, researching, and organized group discussions that relate to course objectives.)
  6. Evidence of commendable efforts to enhance student success (This could include timely and pertinent feedback about improvement, ease of access to faculty member, and clear syllabi which accurately reflect what will occur in the class.)

#### **Level 3: Competent Teaching**

- Should have student evaluations indicating competence, with an overall mean averaging near or slightly above the College mean in rigorous courses (as indicated, for example, by appropriate grade distribution and curriculum materials) and acceptable comments (As per the Faculty Handbook, student evaluations will count for no more or no less than 50% of one's teaching evaluation.)

- Peer evaluations of classroom performance and course preparation must show competency (Specific attention will be given to instructional delivery skills, instructional design skills, content expertise, and course management. For more information about these areas see the “MSU Compensation Report, Appendix B: Evaluating Dimensions of Faculty Performance,” [www.missouristate.edu/president/committees/compensation/finalreport](http://www.missouristate.edu/president/committees/compensation/finalreport).)
- Demonstrates organizational skill and mastery of the subject in the syllabus
- Demonstrates evidence of remaining current in the field
- Demonstrates competency in course management:
  1. Adheres to the MSU Faculty Handbook regarding the distribution and content of course policy statements (See section 4.5.1.2.)
  2. Meets classes on time and teaches the full period
  3. Returns graded materials within a reasonable time period
  4. Meets office hours and meets with students as needed
- Completes Master Advisor training and/or updates
- Evidence of competent advising of students
- Integrates the goals of the General Education program into the general education courses by identifying the desired knowledge and skills goals, and the relevance of the courses for both the major study and general education
- When appropriate, the effective use of technology as a tool for learning
- Encourage students to consider culturally diverse perspectives in the course assignments

### **Level 2: Development Needed**

- The overall mean on student evaluations averages above 2.0 (based on the College rating scale of 1.0 being the best score) in rigorous courses (for example, as indicated by grade distribution and curricular materials) and poor student comments
- Peer evaluations of classroom performances and course preparation indicate significant deficiencies
- Does not show evidence of being current in the field, or competency in advising
- Numerous indicators of weakness in course management

### **Level 1: Unsatisfactory**

- Unacceptable student evaluations
- Unacceptable peer evaluations
- Not keeping up in the field; no evidence of revision of courses
- Inadequate advising
- Inadequate course management

## **Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty Research and Scholarly Activity**

### **Level 5: Exceptional Research and Scholarly Activity**

- Must show evidence of at least **one** of the following:
  1. Depending on factors such as quality, level of peer review, and disciplinary contribution, books/monographs can be evaluated for 2-4

years. The department committee makes this determination, with approval by the department head and dean.

2. Publication of two refereed articles in books or journals or publication of one refereed article in a major journal
3. Publication of a book, edited by the faculty member which contains an article written by the faculty member
4. Receiving a major external research grant
5. Giving an invited prestigious national or international lecture or a series of lectures
6. Receiving an international or national award or prize for a publication or research contribution

#### **Level 4: Commendable Research and Scholarly Activity**

- Must show evidence of at least **one** of the following:
  1. A signed contract for a book (if counted here, no double counting when published)
  2. A letter of acceptance of a scholarly journal article
  3. An application for a major research grant (if counted here, no double counting when received)
  4. The receipt of an internal MSU grant or a small external grant
  5. Reading two scholarly papers at international or national conferences
  6. Receipt of a prize or award for a publication from a regional, state or local organization
  7. Articles in national or international newspapers and periodicals
  8. Publication of a scholarly non-refereed article

#### **Level 3: Competent Research and Scholarly Activity**

- Articulate a research agenda in annual review with Department Head, leading to a tangible outcome, which must include **two** of the following:
  1. Reading a scholarly paper at a regional or national meeting
  2. Presenting scholarly research on campus or at local meetings
  3. Submitting a manuscript to a refereed journal or a book publisher
  4. Submitting a small internal or external research grant proposal
  5. Publishing book reviews, encyclopedia or dictionary articles
  6. Reprinting of a scholarly article or book
  7. Attending a regional or national meeting or attending a workshop about research or grant writing or attending professional development events or classes to enhance research

#### **Level 2: Development Needed**

- Articulates an inadequate research agenda by doing only **one** of the items listed under competencies in Level 3.

#### **Level 1: Unsatisfactory**

- No evidence of significant research or scholarly activity
- No attendance at professional meetings

## **Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty Service**

### **Level 5: Exceptional Service**

- Must show evidence of at least **one** of the following each year:
  1. Service as an editor for a national or international journal
  2. Service as a major officer in a national or professional organization
  3. Receipt of a major grant or contract
  4. Fund-raising that results in a major donation to the university
  5. Giving a national or international lecture or a series of lectures to the general public
  6. Show evidence of outstanding leadership on campus by doing such things as serving as chair of faculty senate or service on multiple College and University committees
  7. Service as an unpaid professional consultant to national and/or international groups
  8. Service to another university as an unpaid consultant or as a member of an evaluation team
  9. Receipt of national and/or international professional recognition and honors for community or professional service to the field

### **Level 4: Commendable Service**

- Must show evidence of at least **one** of the following each year:
  1. Service on a committee for national or international scholarly organizations
  2. Service on an editorial board of a national or international journal
  3. Service as a chair of a major university committee that is commendable in terms of effort or outcomes
  4. Service as an officer or a sectional chair of a regional organization
  5. Service as an unpaid professional consultant to local groups
  6. Service as a manuscript reviewer, program reviewer, competition judge
  7. Advising a student group or serving as an officer in a community organization in the area of a faculty member's expertise, and making a commendable contribution to that group or organization
  8. Receipt of local professional recognition and honors

### **Level 3: Competent Service**

- Evidence of service includes such things as
  1. Regular attendance at department meetings, as class schedules permit
  2. Participation on departmental and College committees
  3. Participation each year as a volunteer
  4. Participation in CHPA events (such as commencement, all-faculty College meetings, sponsored lectures, or symposia)
  5. Participation in professional organizations
  6. Presentations to community groups when requested

### **Level 2: Development Needed**

- Irregular participation in service activities as described in Level 3

### **Level 1: Unsatisfactory**

- Persistent refusal to serve on departmental, College, and university committees
- No evidence of activity in professional organizations

## **Criteria for Performance Evaluation of Instructors Teaching**

### **Level 5: Exceptional Teaching**

- Should have exceptional student evaluations, with an overall mean averaging substantially below the College mean in rigorous courses (as indicated, for example, by appropriate grade distribution and curricular materials) and very positive comments (As per the Faculty Handbook, student evaluations will count for no more or no less than 50% of one's teaching evaluation.)
- Peer evaluations of classroom performance and course preparation must be exceptional (Specific attention will be given to instructional delivery skills, instructional design skills, content expertise, and course management. For more information about these areas see the "MSU Compensation Report, Appendix B: Evaluating Dimensions of Faculty Performance," [www.missouristate.edu/president/committees/compensation/finalreport](http://www.missouristate.edu/president/committees/compensation/finalreport).)
- Must show evidence of at least **two** of the following:
  1. Significant improvement in content or methodology of an existing course, including such things as service learning and training in and application of technological resources
  2. Receive a grant to support improving teaching
  3. Evidence of efforts to enhance learning (This could include leading Professional development activities, and such things as leading a workshop, or writing supplemental teaching material.)
  4. Evidence of exceptionally active and effective engagement with students' academic progress in such areas as undergraduate advising, general education course assessment, and others as deemed appropriate
  5. Make exceptional effort to offer a culturally diverse educational experience
  6. Make exceptional effort in experiential learning, i.e., service learning or other structured activities that apply the course material to cultural and/or social issues
  7. Evidence of extraordinary and innovative efforts to engage students in learning (This could include such in-class activities as case studies, writing, visualizing, researching, and organized group discussions that relate to course objectives.)
  8. Evidence of extraordinary and demonstrable efforts to enhance student success (This could include timely and pertinent feedback about improvement, ease of access to faculty member, and clear syllabi which accurately reflect what will occur in the class.)

### **Level 4: Commendable Teaching**



- Should have commendable student evaluations, with an overall mean averaging or below the College mean in rigorous courses (as indicated, for example, by appropriate grade distribution and curricular materials) and positive student comments (As per the Faculty Handbook, student evaluations will count for no more or no less than 50% of one's teaching evaluation.)
- Peer evaluations of classroom performance and course preparation must be commendable (Specific attention will be given to instructional delivery skills, instructional design skills, content expertise, and course management. For more information about these areas see the "MSU Compensation Report, Appendix B: Evaluating Dimensions of Faculty Performance," [www.missouristate.edu/president/committees/compensation/finalreport.](http://www.missouristate.edu/president/committees/compensation/finalreport.))
- Must show evidence of at least **one** of the following:
  1. Increasing accessibility to religious studies courses beyond one's typical assignments. These may include, but are not limited to, offering distance learning, online and continuing education courses, public lectures or workshops, or working with the community and public schools.
  2. Make commendable efforts to offer a culturally diverse educational experience
  3. Submit a grant proposal
  4. Develop or teaching a new course that expands upon the department's offerings
  5. Evidence of commendable efforts to engage students in learning (This could include such in-class activities as case studies, writing, visualizing, researching, and organized group discussions that relate to course objectives.)
  6. Evidence of commendable efforts to enhance student success (This could include timely and pertinent feedback about improvement, ease of access to faculty member, and clear syllabi which accurately reflect what will occur in the class.)

### **Level 3: Competent Teaching**

- Should have student evaluations indicating competence, with an overall mean averaging near or slightly above the College mean in rigorous courses (as indicated, for example, by appropriate grade distribution and curricular materials) and acceptable comments (As per the Faculty Handbook, student evaluations will count for no more or no less than 50% of one's teaching evaluation.)
- Peer evaluations of classroom performance and course preparation must show competency (Specific attention will be given to instructional delivery skills, instructional design skills, content expertise, and course management. For more information about these areas see the "MSU Compensation Report, Appendix B: Evaluating Dimensions of Faculty Performance," [www.missouristate.edu/president/committees/compensation/finalreport.](http://www.missouristate.edu/president/committees/compensation/finalreport.))
- Demonstrates organizational skill and mastery of the subject in the syllabus
- Demonstrates evidence of remaining current in the field
- Demonstrates competency in course management as evidenced by:
  1. Adheres to the MSU Faculty Handbook regarding the distribution and content of course policy statements (See section 4.5.1.2).
  2. Meets classes on time and teaches the full period

3. Returns graded materials within a reasonable time period
  4. Meets office hours and meets with students as needed
- Completes Master Advisor training and/or updates if assigned advisees
  - Evidence of competent advising of students if assigned advisees
  - Integrates the goals of the General Education program into the general education courses by identifying the desired knowledge and skills goals, and the relevance of the courses for both the major study and general education
  - When appropriate, the effective use of technology as a tool for learning
  - Encourage students to consider culturally diverse perspectives in the course assignments

### **Level 2: Development Needed**

- The overall mean on student evaluations averages above 2.0 (based on the College rating scale of 1.0 being the best score) in rigorous courses (as indicated, for example, by appropriate grade distribution and curricular materials) and poor written comments
- Peer evaluations of classroom performances and course preparation indicate significant deficiencies
- Does not show evidence of being current in the field, or competency in advising
- Numerous indicators of weakness in course management

### **Level 1: Unsatisfactory**

- Unacceptable student evaluations
- Unacceptable peer evaluations
- Not keeping up in the field; no evidence of revision of courses
- If advising, inadequate advising
- Inadequate course management

## **Instructor Research and Scholarly Activity**

### **Level 5: Exceptional Research and Scholarly Activity**

- Must show evidence of at least one of the following:
  1. Submitting a manuscript to a refereed journal or a book publisher
  2. Presenting a scholarly paper at a regional or national conference

*Instructors may also qualify for Level 5 by doing one of the things required for Level 5 by tenured and tenure-track faculty as noted below:*

- Must show evidence of at least **one** of the following:
  1. Publication of a scholarly book by a reputable press
  2. Publication of two refereed articles in books or journals or publication of one refereed article in a major journal
  3. Editing a book which contains an article written by the editor
  4. Receiving a major external research grant
  5. Giving an invited prestigious national or international lecture or a series of lectures

6. Receiving an international or national award or prize for a publication or research contribution

#### **Level 4: Commendable Research and Scholarly Activity**

- Must show evidence of at least one of the following:
  1. Presenting scholarly research on campus or at local meetings
  2. Submitting a small internal or external research grant proposal
  3. Publishing book reviews, encyclopedia, or dictionary articles, and other non-refereed articles

*Instructors may also qualify for Level 4 by doing one of the things required for Level 4 by tenured or tenure-track faculty as listed below:*

- Must show evidence of at least **one** of the following:
  1. A signed contract for a book (if counted here, no double counting when published)
  2. A letter of acceptance of a scholarly journal article for publication
  3. An application for a major research grant (if counted here, no double counting when received)
  4. The receipt of an internal MSU grant or a small external grant
  5. Reading two scholarly papers at international or national conferences
  6. Receipt of a prize or award for a publication from a regional, state or local organization
  7. Articles in national or international newspapers and periodicals
  8. Publication of a scholarly non-refereed article

#### **Level 3: Competent Research and Scholarly Activity**

- Articulate a research agenda in annual review with Department Head, leading to a tangible outcome, which must include **both** of the following:
  1. Attending a regional or national meeting
  2. Involvement on campus to enhance research, such as attending a grant writing workshop or a research presentation or attending a professional development event or class to enhance research

#### **Level 2: Development Needed**

- Articulates an inadequate research agenda by doing only **one** of the items listed under competencies in Level 3.

#### **Level 1: Unsatisfactory**

- No evidence of significant research or scholarly activity
- No attendance at professional meetings

### **Instructor Service**

#### **Level 5: Exceptional Service**

- Must show evidence of at least **one** of the following:
  1. Receipt of a major grant or contract
  2. Show evidence of outstanding leadership on campus by doing such things as serving as a member of faculty senate
  3. Advising a student group or serving as an officer in a community organization in the area of a faculty member's expertise, and making an exceptional contribution to that group or organization
  4. Service as an unpaid professional consultant to national and/or international groups
  5. Receipt of national and/or international professional recognition and honors for community or professional service to the field

#### **Level 4: Commendable Service**

- Must show evidence of at least **one** of the following:
  1. Participation on college committees
  2. Multiple presentations to community groups at a commendable level
  3. Service as an unpaid professional consultant to local groups
  4. Receipt of local professional recognition and honors

#### **Level 3: Competent Service**

- Regular attendance at department meetings, as class schedules permit
- Participation in department committees
- Participation each year as a volunteer
- Participation in CHPA events as required (such as commencement, all-faculty College meetings, sponsored lectures, or symposia)
- Participation in professional organizations
- Presentations to community groups when requested

#### **Level 2: Development Needed**

- Irregular participation in service activities as described in Level 3

#### **Level 1: Unsatisfactory**

- No evidence of competent service

### **Criteria for Performance Evaluation of the Blanche Gorman Strong Endowed Chair in Protestant Studies**

The Blanche Gorman Strong Endowed Chair in Protestant Studies in the Department of Religious Studies at Missouri State University is recognized as an exceptional position that has been awarded on the basis of a scholar's distinctive achievements. Accordingly, this Chair will be evaluated by criteria defined for his/her distinctive roles. It should be noted that pursuant to the document entitled "Policies and Procedures for Administration of The Blanche Gorman Strong Chair of Protestant Studies," the standard teaching load

for this Chair is six hours per semester and the criterion of visibility is an important factor in evaluating the performance of the Chair.

## **Teaching**

### **Level 5: Exceptional Teaching**

- Should have exceptional student evaluations, with an overall mean averaging substantially below the College mean in rigorous courses (as indicated, for example, by appropriate grade distribution and curricular materials) and very positive comments (As per the Faculty Handbook, student evaluations will count for no more or no less than 50% of one's teaching evaluation.)
- Peer evaluations of classroom performance and course preparation must be exceptional (Specific attention will be given to instructional delivery skills, instructional design skills, content expertise, and course management. For more information about these areas see the "MSU Compensation Report, Appendix B: Evaluating Dimensions of Faculty Performance," [www.missouristate.edu/president/committees/compensation/finalreport/](http://www.missouristate.edu/president/committees/compensation/finalreport/).)
- Must show evidence of at least **two** of the following each year:
  1. Significant improvement in content or methodology of an existing course, including training in and application of technological resources
  2. Receive a grant to support improving teaching
  3. National or international award/recognition of outstanding performance or preparation in teaching
  4. Evidence of efforts to enhance learning (This could include leading professional development activities, and such things as leading a workshop, or writing supplemental teaching material.)
  5. Evidence of exceptionally active and effective engagement with students' academic progress in such areas as undergraduate advising, graduate advising, thesis advisement and committee service, general education course assessment and others as deemed appropriate
  6. Make exceptional efforts to offer a diverse educational experience
  7. Evidence of extraordinary and innovative efforts to engage students in learning (This could include such in-class activities as case studies, writing, visualizing, researching, and organized group discussions that relate to course objectives.)
  8. Evidence of extraordinary and demonstrable efforts to enhance student success (This could include timely and pertinent feedback about improvement, ease of access to faculty member, and clear syllabi which accurately reflect what will occur in the class.)

### **Level 4: Commendable Teaching**

- Should have commendable student evaluations, with an overall mean averaging below the College mean in rigorous courses (as indicated, for example, by appropriate grade distribution and curricular materials) and positive student comments (As per the Faculty Handbook, student evaluations will count for no more or no less than 50% of one's teaching evaluation.)

- Peer evaluations of classroom performance and course preparation must be commendable (Specific attention will be given to instructional delivery skills, instructional design skills, content expertise, and course management. For more information about these areas see the “MSU Compensation Report, Appendix B: Evaluating Dimensions of Faculty Performance,” [www.missouristate.edu/president/committees/compensation/finalreport.](http://www.missouristate.edu/president/committees/compensation/finalreport.))
- Must show evidence of at least **one** of the following each year:
  1. Increasing accessibility to religious studies courses beyond one’s typical assignments. These may include, but are not limited to, offering a new distance learning, online and continuing education courses, public lectures or workshops, or working with the community and public schools.
  2. Make commendable efforts to offer a culturally diverse educational experience
  3. Submit a major external grant proposal
  4. Develop or teaching a new course that expands upon the department’s offerings
  5. Evidence of commendable efforts to engage students in learning (This could include such in-class activities as case studies, writing, visualizing, researching, and organized group discussions that relate to course objectives.)
  6. Evidence of commendable efforts to enhance student success (This could include timely and pertinent feedback about improvement, ease of access to faculty member, and clear syllabi which accurately reflect what will occur in the class.)

### **Level 3: Competent Teaching**

- Should have student evaluations indicating competence, with an overall mean averaging near or slightly above the College mean in rigorous courses (as indicated, for example, by appropriate grade distribution and curriculum materials) and acceptable comments (As per the Faculty Handbook, student evaluations will count for no more or no less than 50% of one’s teaching evaluation.)
- Peer evaluations of classroom performance and course preparation must show competency. Specific attention will be given to instructional delivery skills, instructional design skills, content expertise, and course management. For more information about these areas see the “MSU Compensation Report, Appendix B: Evaluating Dimensions of Faculty Performance,” [www.missouristate.edu/president/committees/compensation/finalreport.](http://www.missouristate.edu/president/committees/compensation/finalreport.))
- Demonstrates organizational skill and mastery of the subject in the syllabus
- Demonstrates evidence of remaining current in the field
- Demonstrates competency in course management:
  1. Adheres to the MSU Faculty Handbook regarding the distribution and content of course policy statements (See section 4.5.1.2.)
  2. Meets classes on time and teaches the full period
  3. Returns graded materials within a reasonable time period
  4. Meets office hours and meets with students as needed
- Completes Master Advisor training and/or updates
- Evidence of competent advising of students

- Integrates the goals of the General Education program into the general education courses by identifying the desired knowledge and skills goals, and the relevance of the courses for both the major study and general education
- When appropriate, the effective use of technology as a tool for learning
- Encourage students to consider culturally diverse perspectives in the course assignments

### **Level 2: Development Needed**

- The overall mean on student evaluations averages above 2.0 (based on the College rating scale of 1.0 being the best score) in rigorous courses (for example, as indicated by grade distribution and curricular materials) and poor student comments
- Peer evaluations of classroom performances and course preparation indicate significant deficiencies
- Does not show evidence of being current in the field, or competency in advising
- Numerous indicators of weakness in course management

### **Level 1: Unsatisfactory**

- Unacceptable student evaluations
- Unacceptable peer evaluations
- Not keeping up in the field; no evidence of revision of courses
- Inadequate advising
- Inadequate course management

## **Blanche Gorman Strong Endowed Chair in Protestant Studies Research and Scholarly Activity**

### **Level 5: Exceptional Research and Scholarly Activity**

- Demonstrates exceptional engagement in visible activities related to research (as indicated, for example, by receiving grants and awards for one's scholarship; by the organization of panels or participation in national scholarly meetings or forums; by presenting a series of invited research lectures; by the engagement of other scholars with one's work; by the publication of articles and bylines in newspapers; and by other examples of visible research activity). The degree of visibility in research may be demonstrated by measures other than the number of activities performed.
- Must show evidence of at least **one** of the following:
  1. Depending on factors such as quality, level of peer review, and disciplinary contribution, books/monographs can be evaluated for 2-4 years. The department committee makes this determination, with approval by the department head and dean.
  2. Publication of two refereed articles in books or journals or publication of one refereed article in a major journal
  3. Publication of a book, edited by the faculty member which contains an article written by the faculty member
  4. Receiving a major external research grant

5. Giving an invited prestigious national or international lecture or a series of lectures
6. Receiving an international or national award or prize for a publication or research contribution

#### **Level 4: Commendable Research and Scholarly Activity**

- Demonstrates commendable engagement in visible activities related to research
- Must show evidence of at least **one** of the following:
  1. An application for a major research grant (if counted here, no double counting when received)
  2. The receipt of an internal MSU grant or a small external grant
  3. Reading two scholarly papers at international or national conferences
  4. Receipt of a prize or award for a publication from a regional, state or local organization
  5. Articles in national or international newspapers and periodicals
  6. Publication of a scholarly non-refereed article

#### **Level 3: Competent Research and Scholarly Activity**

- Demonstrates some engagement in visible activities related to research
- Articulate a research agenda in annual review with Department Head, leading to a tangible outcome, which must include **two** of the following:
  1. Reading a scholarly paper at a regional or national meeting
  2. Presenting scholarly research on campus or at local meetings
  3. Submitting a manuscript to a refereed journal or a book publisher
  4. Submitting a small internal or external research grant proposal
  5. Publishing book reviews, encyclopedia or dictionary articles
  6. Reprinting of a scholarly article or book
  7. Attending a regional or national meeting or attending a workshop about research or grant writing or attending professional development events or classes to enhance research

#### **Level 2: Development Needed**

- Articulates an inadequate research agenda by doing only **one** of the items listed under competencies in Level 3.
- Little engagement in visible activities related to research

#### **Level 1: Unsatisfactory**

- No evidence of significant research or scholarly activity
- No attendance at professional meetings
- No engagement in visible activities related to research

### **Blanche Gorman Strong Endowed Chair in Protestant Studies Service**

#### **Level 5: Exceptional Service**



- Demonstrates exceptional engagement in visible activities related to service (as indicated, for example, by participation in notable, national committees and editorial boards; by participation in university and college initiatives, by showing leadership on campus, in the community, regionally, and/or nationally to promote one's area of study; by public lectures on campus, in the community, regionally, and/or nationally; by interviews in newspapers, on the radio, and/or on television; and by other examples of public scholarship). The degree of visibility in service may be demonstrated by measures other than the number of activities performed.
- Must show evidence of at least **one** of the following each year:
  1. Service as an editor for a national or international journal
  2. Service as a major officer in a national or professional organization
  3. Receipt of a major grant or contract
  4. Fund-raising that results in a major donation to the university
  5. Giving a national or international lecture or a series of lectures to the general public
  6. Show evidence of outstanding leadership on campus by doing such things as serving as chair of faculty senate or service on multiple College and University committees
  7. Service as an unpaid professional consultant to national and/or international groups
  8. Service to another university as an unpaid consultant or as a member of an evaluation team
  9. Receipt of national and/or international professional recognition and honors for community or professional service to the field

#### **Level 4: Commendable Service**

- Demonstrates commendable engagement in visible activities related to service
- Must show evidence of at least **one** of the following each year:
  1. Service on a committee for national or international scholarly organizations
  2. Service on an editorial board of a national or international journal
  3. Service as a chair of a major university committee that is commendable in terms of effort or outcomes
  4. Service as an officer or a sectional chair of a regional organization
  5. Service as an unpaid professional consultant to local groups
  6. Service as a manuscript reviewer, program reviewer, competition judge
  7. Advising a student group or serving as an officer in a community organization in the area of a faculty member's expertise, and making a commendable contribution to that group or organization
  8. Receipt of local professional recognition and honors

#### **Level 3: Competent Service**

- Demonstrates some engagement in visible activities related to service
- Evidence of service includes such things as
  1. Regular attendance at department meetings, as class schedules permit
  2. Participation on departmental and College committees
  3. Participation each year as a volunteer

4. Participation in CHPA events (such as commencement, all-faculty College meetings, sponsored lectures, or symposia)
5. Participation in professional organizations
6. Presentations to community groups when requested

**Level 2: Development Needed**

1. Little engagement in visible activities related to service
2. Irregular participation in service activities as described in Level 3

**Level 1: Unsatisfactory**

1. Persistent refusal to serve on departmental, College, and university committees
2. No evidence of activity in professional organizations
3. No engagement in visible activities related to service

Revision approved by the department on 12 September 2007, with a revision approved on 26 September 2007.