

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY, ANTHROPOLOGY AND CRIMINOLOGY
Pay for Performance Review Guidelines
Approved September 18, 2007

A. The policies and procedures utilized by the Department for faculty evaluation are guided by, and consistent with, relevant aspects of the *Missouri State University Faculty Handbook*, the “compensation report” approved by the Board of Governors, and policies distributed by the College of Humanities and Public Affairs (CHPA) Dean’s Office and the Missouri State Provost’s Office. These policies also reflect the mission and goals of the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology.

B. Faculty at Missouri State University are expected to engage in professional activities that encompass three areas: teaching, research/scholarship, and service. The University’s “pay for performance” system requires a structured and consistent review of faculty performance. The purpose of this document is to specify the procedures and criteria used by the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology for faculty evaluation processes involving “pay for performance.”

C. For detailed information on various timetable, procedures involved after personnel evaluation decisions are made at the department level, and appeals, consult the *Faculty Handbook*, the *Academic Work Calendar*, or policies distributed by the CHPA Dean’s Office and the Provost’s Office. The Department policies and procedures operate within these established guidelines and describe the processes involved in making personnel evaluation decisions within our unit that will be forwarded to the CHPA Dean’s Office.

D. Each faculty member is responsible for assembling evidentiary documentation and submitting materials according to established deadlines. Departmental deadlines will be announced at least 30 days prior and distributed via e-mail by the Department Head.

E. The policies in this document will be reviewed each Fall Semester by the Department Faculty to assure compliance with the *Faculty Handbook* and other relevant policy statements, as well as the adequacy of department policies for handling personnel evaluations. Changes and amendments may only be made by a majority vote of the ranked faculty in the Department.

F. Faculty being reviewed for “pay for performance” are bound by the criteria in effect at the time of the review.

G. A university-level committee developed a compensation report designing a “pay for performance” system at Missouri State University. This report was submitted to President Michael Nietzel and the University community during the Spring Semester 2006. Soon after that report, President Neitzel endorsed most aspects of this report and submitted his recommendations to the Board of Governors. The Compensation Committee Final Report can be viewed at <http://www.missouristate.edu/president/committees/compensation/>. President Nietzel’s comments and endorsements are available at <http://www.missouristate.edu/President/fridayfocus/200603.htm>

H. When and How Often Faculty Performance Evaluations Occur:

✓ **First-Year Faculty:** Newly hired tenure-track faculty or continuing instructors who receive reappointment will be assigned an overall performance rating of “3” (the expected level of performance) in their first year unless there is compelling evidence for a different rating. First-year probationary faculty or instructors not recommended for reappointment will not be eligible for performance review.

✓ **Tenure-Track Probationary Faculty:** In their probationary period, tenure-track faculty will be initially evaluated for the “pay for performance” process beginning in their second year. Tenure-track faculty then will be evaluated every year under this compensation plan.

✓ **Tenured Faculty:** All tenured faculty members will be evaluated annually for the “pay-for-performance” process

✓ **Instructors:** Beginning with their second year, all instructors for whom there is a likelihood of reappointment will be evaluated annually. Instructors in temporary appointments will not be evaluated for “pay for performance.”

I. Each year prior to February 15, every full-time continuing faculty member (tenured, tenure-track, and continuing instructors) will meet with the Department Head to discuss their workload for the coming academic year. At this meeting, the faculty member will negotiate with the Department Head, a formula reflecting their workload and calculating their overall evaluation for the coming year using the following parameter value ranges established for faculty in CHPA. The Department Head will consider Department goals when agreeing to workloads and evaluation weights. The total workload must equal 100%:

Tenured Faculty with a nine or six-hour teaching load:

Minimum Weight	Performance Dimension (Role)	Maximum Weight
30%	Teaching	60%
30%	Research/Scholarship	60%
10%	Service	20%

Tenured Faculty with a twelve-hour teaching load:

Minimum Weight	Performance Dimension (Role)	Maximum Weight
50%	Teaching	80%
10%	Research/Scholarship	40%
10%	Service	20%

Probationary Faculty:

Minimum Weight	Performance Dimension (Role)	Maximum Weight
45%	Teaching	60%
35%	Research/Scholarship	50%
5%	Service	15%

Renewable Instructors:

Minimum Weight	Performance Dimension (Role)	Maximum Weight
80%	Teaching	90%
0%	Research/Scholarship	10%
10%	Service	20%

J. Faculty members with unusual workload situations, such as a sabbatical or other leave, may negotiate with the Department Head possible changes in their weightings for that particular year. Any weighting that falls outside the established parameters requires approval of the Department Head and CHPA Dean.

K. According to the calendar released by the Provost’s Office concerning the “pay for performance” deadlines in a given year, the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC), in consultation with the Department Head, will establish department deadlines for faculty to submit a portfolio forming the basis of their annual performance review and rating. The deadline typically will be the week prior to the beginning of Spring Semester. Each year by November 15, the FEC will provide specific details on what should be included in these portfolios along with the deadlines for submission. Faculty can expect documentation to contain the following (at a minimum):

- ✓ a cover letter or statement briefly explaining accomplishments in teaching, research/scholarship, and service during the review period. The teaching statement should be separate from the statements on research/scholarship and service.
- ✓ CHPA Faculty Activity Report(s) documenting activities during the review period.
- ✓ evidence of teaching and advising activities.
- ✓ evidence of scholarship.
- ✓ evidence of service.

L. The Department Head will provide the FEC with results from quantitative and qualitative data gathered through the standard CHPA teaching evaluation instrument for the two completed semesters preceding the review.

M. As stipulated in the university compensation report, ratings for teaching, research/scholarship, and service, as well as the composite rating assigned by the Department Head and CHPA Dean, will be as follows:

Rating	Rating Name	Rating Description
5	Exceptional	Performance/results consistently exceed competent levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in most aspects of performance.
4	Commendable	Performance/results frequently exceed competent levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in certain aspects of performance.
3	Competent	Performance/results are consistently at expected levels. Meets job requirements.
2	Development Needed	Some performance deficiencies exist. Performance improvement plan is to be established and improvement is required.
1	Unsatisfactory	Performance is consistently below acceptable levels. Performance improvement plan is to be established and immediate improvement is required.

N. After gathering all required and relevant information for the teaching, research/scholarship, and service evaluations, FEC will conduct performance evaluations and assign each reviewed faculty member a separate rating for teaching, research/scholarship, and service. FEC will write a brief narrative supporting these ratings.

O. FEC will not give faculty members an overall rating nor will they know the relative weights each faculty member assigned to the three faculty roles.

P. FEC will forward the ratings for teaching, research/scholarship, and service for each faculty member to the Department Head, according to the deadline established either in the Provost's calendar and/or negotiations between the Chair of the FEC and the Department Head.

Q. The Department Head will consider the faculty member's role weights, the input of FEC, and other relevant performance information to recommend a composite performance rating for each faculty member to the CHPA Dean. The Department Head then will meet with FEC to discuss any discrepancies between the ratings assigned by FEC and those determined by the Department Head, as an attempt to rectify these differences. Neither FEC nor the Department Head are under any obligation to alter their ratings. After this meeting, the Department Head will inform, in writing, each faculty member of the rating recommendations from FEC, the brief narrative provided by FEC, the Department Head's ratings and a justification for any differences from ratings assigned by FEC. At this time, the Department Head also will provide the composite rating based on the faculty member's weightings.

R. If a faculty member receives a final composite rating indicating a "development needed" or "unsatisfactory" performance, the Department Head in consultation with that faculty member will establish a written developmental plan.

S. The CHPA Dean, in consultation with the Department Heads in CHPA, makes final decisions regarding a faculty member's placement in the cost center's compensation matrix.

T. Faculty have the right to appeal their final composite performance rating assigned by the CHPA Dean. A faculty member wanting to appeal this rating should consult the Department Head for specific procedures. However, a general overview of the appeal process is available through either the CHPA Dean's Office, the Provost's Office, or the Faculty Senate Office.

U. In all cases involving evaluation of activities in teaching, research/scholarship, and service, the Faculty Evaluation Committee and Department Head have the authority to judge quality of activities when awarding a rating.

V. The Faculty Evaluation Committee and Department Head have the authority to consult other faculty members, both internal and external to the Department and University, for input on the quality, impact, or contribution of the faculty member's work in teaching, research/scholarship, and service.

W. Teaching Criteria-

1. It must be recognized teaching evaluation involves subjective judgments. The listed criteria below are designed to guide those judgments. It also must be recognized teaching evaluation outcomes can be affected by factors beyond a teacher's control. Thus, when evaluating teaching the Faculty Evaluation Committee must consider contextual constraints including:

- ✓ Class size: a seminar class with twelve students versus a section of SOC 150 with 150 students.
- ✓ Level of class: lower-level introductory courses versus upper division elective courses or senior seminars.
- ✓ Longevity of courses: new preparations versus long-standing courses for that instructor.
- ✓ Time of class: mornings, afternoons, evenings, or online.
- ✓ Teaching load: is the instructor teaching two courses, three courses, or even more during a particular semester?

2. Student evaluations comprise 50% of a faculty member's performance rating in teaching. Peer evaluation comprises the remaining 50% of this rating. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will determine a rating for each faculty member on the student evaluation and peer evaluation dimensions to determine a faculty member's overall performance rating for teaching.

3. For the student evaluation aspect of the teaching performance rating, the following criteria are used for interpreting scores on the CHPA Teaching Evaluation instrument:

- ✓ For "competent" performance, an overall mean score close to the CHPA overall mean.
- ✓ For "commendable" performance, an overall mean score better than the CHPA overall mean.
- ✓ For "exceptional" performance, an overall mean score significantly better than the CHPA overall mean.
- ✓ For a "development needed" rating, an overall mean score significantly lower than the CHPA overall mean.
- ✓ For an "unsatisfactory" rating, an overall mean score significantly lower than the CHPA overall mean near the bottom of the CHPA distribution.

In the judgment of the FEC, these scores might be altered after considering qualitative student evaluation comments.

4. In order to demonstrate be considered for a "competent" performance in peer evaluation of teaching, a faculty member is expected at a minimum to:

- ✓ Give exams and quizzes covering material presented in class and consistent with chosen topics
- ✓ Proctor final exams or offer other academic experience during the scheduled final exam period.
- ✓ Give exams and collect assignments according to dates on the syllabus or provide reasonable notice of any changes.
- ✓ Utilize videos, presentations, lectures, and/or guest speakers for covering course topics and enhancing student learning.
- ✓ Provide syllabi and course policy statements outlining university policies, with clear grading criteria and a systematic course outline with topics covered.
- ✓ Keep posted office hours and effectively advise assigned students.
- ✓ Revise and/or update existing courses in assigned course load.
- ✓ Utilize up-to-date textbooks and relevant resource materials (current statistics, new research in the discipline, etc.).
- ✓ Incorporate cultural diversity into course content through syllabi, readings, assignments, videos and/or guest lecture presentations relevant to the course, when applicable.
- ✓ Supply reference letters for students when requested.

5. In order to demonstrate be considered for "commendable" performance in peer evaluation of

teaching, at a minimum a faculty member is expected to meet all criteria for “competent” outlined above **plus two** of the following:

- ✓ Demonstrate leadership in new curricular developments such as innovative courses, programs, and/or teaching approaches not previously offered or utilized in the Department.
- ✓ Demonstrate a willingness to teach a variety of courses and/or develop new courses in traditional, hybrid, or distance learning formats.
- ✓ Foster student interaction through the use of engagement strategies in at least one class, such as student presentations, debates, and team papers.
- ✓ Serve as a member of a committee for graduate or undergraduate student research projects (i.e., thesis, graduate paper).
- ✓ Serve as an instructor in their area of expertise in a recognized teaching or advising workshop.
- ✓ Serve as the program director/coordinator for an undergraduate program or the Director of Graduate Studies.
- ✓ Other documented activities deemed by the FEC as “commendable.”

6. In order to demonstrate be considered for “exceptional” performance in peer evaluation of teaching, at a minimum a faculty member is expected to meet criteria for “commendable” outlined above **plus an additional two** of the following:

- ✓ Receive department or professional organization recognition, teaching awards, advising awards, or curricular grants for the creation of innovative classroom materials.
- ✓ Receive department or student recognition or awards for excellence in participation in student academic life.
- ✓ Publication of an academic textbook (a faculty member can select to include this accomplishment under either, but not both, teaching or research/scholarship).
- ✓ Extraordinary contributions as the program director/coordinator for an undergraduate program or as Director of Graduate Studies.
- ✓ Other documented activities deemed by the FEC as “exceptional.”

7. To be rated as “development needed” in peer evaluation of teaching, at a minimum a faculty member demonstrates shows minor performance deficiencies in the criteria listed for “competent” above.

8. A faculty member will receive a rating of “unsatisfactory” in peer evaluation of teaching if the basic criteria for “competent” are absent.

X. Research/Scholarship Criteria-

1. A manuscript is considered “published” when it appears in print, galley proofs, or is accepted unconditionally (with no revisions required). **However, faculty may only claim credit once for a given published manuscript.**

2. Faculty with a six-hour reassignment for research/scholarship during one or both semesters carry the expectation of additional scholarly productivity beyond the standards described in sections X.3, 4, 5, and 6

below. The FEC will make a judgment on the appropriateness of a rating in research/scholarship for these faculty, keeping in mind their teaching load. However, in general faculty with a six-hour teaching load are expected to produce at least one additional outcome from the list of stated criteria for ratings of “competent,” “commendable,” “exceptional,” or “development needed” in order to receive that rating.

3. In order to demonstrate be considered for “competent” performance in research/scholarship a faculty member is expected at a minimum to accomplish and satisfactorily document **at least two** of the following:

- ✓ Paper presented at an academic or professional conference.
- ✓ Published encyclopedia article, book review, critical essay, or comparable work.
- ✓ Multiple authorship of a published scholarly publication (article or book chapter).
- ✓ Receive an internal research grant or fellowship.
- ✓ Submit an external grant proposal.
- ✓ Active engagement in the research process, documented by materials such as manuscripts or grant proposals in progress, data collected, article submitted, etc.
- ✓ Serve as referee of a scholarly book manuscript.
- ✓ Serve as referee for a scholarly journal manuscript.
- ✓ Receive a research sabbatical.
- ✓ Other items deemed of equal value by the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

4. In order to demonstrate be considered for “commendable” performance in research/scholarship a faculty member is expected at a minimum to accomplish and satisfactorily document **at least one** of the following:

- ✓ Solo or lead author of a refereed chapter published in a scholarly volume.
- ✓ Solo or lead author of an article published in a refereed regional journal, including online journals.
- ✓ Joint authorship of a scholarly article published in a major or top-tier journal.
- ✓ Receive an external research grant.
- ✓ Receive an external research fellowship.
- ✓ Serve as editor of a journal of refereed articles or an academic series.
- ✓ Other activities deemed of equal value by the Faculty Evaluation Committee.
- ✓ Four items listed above as criteria for a “competent” rating in research/scholarship.

5. In order to demonstrate be considered for “exceptional” performance in research/scholarship a faculty member is expected at a minimum to accomplish and satisfactorily document **at least one** of the following:

- ✓ Solo or lead author of a published scholarly book (Depending on factors such as quality, level of peer review, and disciplinary contribution, books/monographs can be evaluated for two to four years. The FEC makes this determination, with approval of the Department Head and Dean).
- ✓ Editor of a scholarly volume of contributed works containing original scholarly writing by the faculty member (chapter, introduction, conclusion, etc.).
- ✓ Solo or lead author of a scholarly article published in a major or top-tier refereed journal.
- ✓ Publication of an academic textbook (a faculty member can select to include this accomplishment under either, but not both, teaching or research/scholarship).
- ✓ Receive a major external grant.

✓ A combination of items in the “competent” and/or “commendable” categories deemed of equal value by the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

6. To be rated as “development needed” in research/scholarship a faculty member at a minimum must accomplish and satisfactorily document at least one of the items listed under “competent” above.

7. A faculty member will receive an “unsatisfactory” rating in research/scholarship if there is no evidence of research or scholarship.

Y. Service Criteria-

1. In order to demonstrate “competent” performance in service a faculty member at a minimum is expected to:

✓ Provide active service on two department committees or task forces. An individual assignment within the department (i.e. Library Representative, sponsor of a student organization or honor society, editor of a program Website or the department newsletter) may substitute as one, but only one, of these department level responsibilities.

✓ Serve the college, university, profession, or community in one additional active capacity.

2. In order to demonstrate “commendable” performance in service a faculty member at a minimum is expected to accomplish all criteria reflecting a “competent” performance and **both** of these additional activities:

✓ Participate in more than the minimum number of activities required for a “competent” rating.

✓ Serve in a leadership role (i.e., chair, head, or officer) for a department, college, university, professional, or community committee/task force/organization producing a significant documented outcome.

3. In order to demonstrate “exceptional” performance in service a faculty member at a minimum is expected to accomplish all criteria reflecting a “competent” performance and **either** of these additional activities:

✓ Provide effective leadership on several department, college, university, professional, and/or community service committee/task force/organization. Several significant outcomes must be documented.

✓ Provide active service as a member of an exceptional number of department, college, university, professional, and/or community service committees/task forces/organizations with documented significant outcomes.

4. Faculty members will receive a rating of “development needed” in service if, at a minimum, they fail to meet both criteria listed for “competent” performance above as long as there is evidence of service involvement.

5. Faculty members will receive a rating of “unsatisfactory” in service if they fail to meet either criteria listed for “competent” performance above and provide no evidence of service involvement.