

# EVALUATION/COMPENSATION PROCESS

(revised 3/6/10)

## **Purpose of the Document**

This Missouri State University Evaluation/Compensation policy is intended to give clear guidance for departments to develop processes and criteria that fit their local environments.

The prescribed approach has been developed by the University Compensation Committee with feedback from faculty, department heads, and deans. It has been approved by the president.

## **Objectives of the Evaluation/Compensation System**

The evaluation/compensation system is based on a number of objectives:

- Motivate and reward high achievement of faculty
- Promote professional development as a culture in academic departments and in all aspects of university operations
- Establish objective and transparent guidelines for how funds are used for salary increases
- Generate accurate assessment that will be used to make decisions on allocation of resources and faculty assignments

# Evaluation/Compensation Process

## Essential Principles of the Evaluation/Compensation Process

The essential principles identified below are intended to help make the evaluation process more flexible while maintaining its integrity:

- 1. The criteria for evaluation (and changes to existing criteria) and the process of review must be developed by the department, then approved by the faculty, department head, dean, and the Office of the Provost.**
  - a. In the development of departmental criteria, all contiguous levels should be communicating so that the criteria are both appropriate for the particular discipline and equitably rigorous across the college.
  - b. In the spring after the evaluation process, the departmental review committee should determine if criteria or processes are adequate or require change. Any changes made must be approved by the faculty, department head, dean, and Office of the Provost. (The approval process is not necessary if criteria and process are not changed.)
  - c. Criteria used for evaluation must align with criteria used for reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions.
  
- 2. Evaluation processes will vary from department to department, but must follow these guidelines:**
  - a. The evaluation process must at some point include peer review. Peer review is defined as review by a faculty member's immediate colleagues according to departmental criteria.
  - b. The evaluation process must not include a forced distribution – i.e., scoring that is based on imposed distributions rather than those established by departmental criteria.

3. **So that there is clarity in the process, there must be communication between all the groups involved in the evaluation process, especially when there is disagreement between groups on assigned scores.**
  - a. Department heads must meet with their departmental review committees to discuss differences in scores. If the department head and departmental review committee do not reach a consensus in their assessments, the department head will provide a written rationale to the committee.
  - b. Department heads must meet with faculty members to discuss the scores that were assigned. For the evaluation process to be developmental, constructive, and meaningful, it must generate more than just a score.
  - c. When department heads and/or deans change scores, they must provide a written rationale to faculty members affected and to the departmental review committee.

**NOTE: Faculty members should contact the associate provost for faculty affairs in the Office of the Provost if any of the above principles or guidelines are not followed within their department or college.**

### **Evaluation/Compensation Process When Funding for the Raise Pool is 2% and Below**

NOTE: For current dates for the evaluation/compensation process please see the [MASTER CALENDAR for ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION](#).

#### **Faculty Level**

1. All faculty are required to submit annual reports to their department head every year and will be evaluated every year. This is a requirement of employment.
2. At the beginning of the evaluation year, faculty will meet with department heads to discuss and set performance weights for their teaching, research, and service. See Appendix A below for guidelines for Performance Weights and Workloads.

3. The performance weights may be renegotiated if changes in faculty assignments have an impact on the existing weights for teaching, research, and service.
4. For the evaluation process to be developmental, constructive, and meaningful, it must generate more than just a score. Therefore, after faculty are evaluated and scored, they will meet with their department heads to discuss their scores.

### **Departmental Review Committee**

1. Untenured persons may not serve on departmental review committees, unless otherwise approved by the department head, dean, and Office of the Provost.
2. During the beginning of the spring semester of each year (see the [Master Calendar for Faculty Evaluation for a specific date](#)) departmental review committees will evaluate their faculty according to departmental criteria.
  - a. As an option and upon agreement of the fulltime faculty of the department and the department head, the head may first evaluate and score faculty before the departmental review committee does its review, and make those scores available to the committee for its own review of faculty.
  - b. Criteria used for evaluation must align with criteria used for reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions.
3. The departmental review committee will assign a numerical score on each of the three performance areas (teaching, research, and service) for each faculty member being reviewed. Preferably, the departmental review committee will generate a brief narrative assessment for each numerical score submitted.
  - a. Departments have the option of giving their departmental review committees knowledge of the weights that faculty have assigned to their teaching, research, and service. The option used must be at the approval of the faculty, department head, and dean.
  - b. Half scores may be used in the evaluation – e.g., 3.5, 4.5.
  - c. For departments that have a menu driven evaluation system (where a score is determined by the number of points assigned for specific accomplishments), point values should represent the minimum required for a certain score and not be a guarantee of receipt of that score.

4. Departmental review committees will reconsider and if necessary make suggestions to refine departmental criteria and the review process during the spring semester after the evaluation process is completed.
  - a. Suggested changes to the criteria and/or review process must be approved by a vote of all fulltime faculty in the department.
  - b. Suggested changes to the criteria and/or review process will then be forwarded to the department head for review and approval.

### **Department Head**

1. Department heads must evaluate all fulltime faculty annually.
2. The head will review each faculty member's annual report, the narrative assessment, and numerical scores provided by the departmental review committee.
  - a. As an option and upon agreement of the fulltime faculty of the department and the department head, the head may first evaluate and score faculty before the departmental review committee does its review, and make those assessments and scores available to the committee for its own review of faculty.
3. Department heads must meet with their departmental review committees to discuss differences in scores. If the department head and departmental review committee do not reach a consensus in their assessments, the department head will provide a written rationale to the committee.
  - a. If the departmental review committee and the department head cannot come to an agreement, both scores will be forwarded to the dean for resolution.
4. The department head will then assign a composite numerical score that takes into account the percentage weights for each of the three performance areas (teaching, research, and service) agreed upon previously by the faculty member and department head.

5. By the requisite date (see the [Master Calendar for Annual Faculty Evaluation](#)) department heads will meet with faculty to discuss the scores they were assigned. For the evaluation process to be developmental, constructive, and meaningful, it must generate more than just a score.
  - a. The department head will provide faculty with the departmental narrative assessments and numerical scores (in all three areas).
  - b. If the department head's rating on any of the three performance areas differs from that submitted by the departmental review committee, the department head will provide a brief written rationale to the faculty member explaining the difference.
6. By the requisite date (see the [Master Calendar for Annual Faculty Evaluation](#)) the department heads will send the departmental assessments, the three numerical scores, and composite scores for their faculty to their deans for further consideration.
7. Department heads will review any changes to the departmental criteria and/or the review process that the faculty sends forward. This will be done in the Spring semester after the evaluation process is completed.
  - a. Any changes approved by the head will be forwarded to the dean for review and approval.
  - b. If no changes are suggested or approved, no further action is necessary.

### **College Level**

1. Untenured persons may not serve on college review committees, unless otherwise approved by the department head, dean, and Office of the Provost.
2. The dean will meet with the department heads and review the narrative assessments and scores provided by each department head in order to determine the final composite score of each faculty member.
  - a. Deans may use their college review committees in determining scores for faculty.

3. The dean will provide all faculty who are reviewed a final composite score by the requisite date (see the [Master Calendar for Annual Faculty Evaluation](#)).
  - a. If the dean's score of a faculty member differs from the department head's score, the dean will provide the faculty member with a brief written rationale for the change, with a copy to the department head and departmental review committee.
4. Deans will keep records of scores for use when the funding for the raise pool rises above 2%.
5. The normal evaluation and compensation process is to stop at this stage. That is, deans and college review committees will **not** develop compensation matrices for the composite scores. Instead, the composite scores will be kept for use until the funding for the salary pool rises above 2%.

### **When Funding for the Salary Pool Rises Above 2%**

1. When the availability of funding for the salary pool rises above 2%, faculty will average their composite scores (total of yearly composites divided by number of years) for each year that funding was not available in order to determine an overall composite score.
2. Averaged composite scores of performance during lean years will be utilized only in the first year that the funding pool rises above 2% and not be carried forward as part of the formula for merit pay into subsequent years.
3. Faculty with exceptionally strong levels of performance during lean years who wish to be considered for additional performance based adjustments may use the existing university salary equity adjustment process ("A faculty member may file with his or her Department Head a request for a salary adjustment if that faculty member believes that his or her salary is inconsistent with the salaries of other individuals of similar training, experience, and job performance." [Faculty Handbook, sec. 5.6]). Adjustments based on averaged scores for lean years will be applied in the first year the funding pool is above 2% and not during the lean years themselves (although faculty can apply for an equity adjustment at any time).

## Appeals Process

Faculty may only appeal their final composite performance ratings. Faculty will be provided clear information on the salary implications of the composite ratings prior to the deadline for submitting appeals to the department head (see [Master Calendar](#) for deadlines).

Faculty who are dissatisfied with their final composite performance ratings should first request a meeting with the department head to discuss the process and rationale by which the performance rating was determined.

After meeting with the department head, the faculty member may request a formal review of the rating by submitting a written appeal to the department head that states the reasons for questioning the rating.

At the request of the faculty member, the appeal, along with the department head's response and other supporting materials, is forwarded to the dean.

The dean sends the appeal to the College Review Committee (or the College Personnel Committee) for consideration.

The College Review Committee should make use of the departmental performance criteria, the narrative and ratings from the departmental review committee, the department head, and summary descriptive measures (mean, median, etc) of the ratings of department faculty. If necessary, additional information may be requested by the committee in the process of its deliberations. The college review committee will provide a written summary of its recommendation to the dean.

If the dean makes a decision on the appeal that is different from that recommended by the college review committee, the dean must provide a written rationale to the committee for that decision.

The faculty member may continue the appeal to the Provost, who will review all written documents associated with the appeal. The Provost may, at his/her discretion, meet with the faculty member. The Provost's decision on the appeal is final. If the Provost's decision is different from the decision recommended by the college committee, the Provost must provide to the faculty member a written rationale for that decision.

Only the final composite performance rating itself can be appealed. Individuals who are successful on appeal will receive the salary increase merited by their revised performance rating. The actual percentage salary increase associated with each performance rating is not subject to appeal.

This is the only appeal process to be utilized for appeals of the performance rating. Other grievance procedures, as outlined in the Faculty Handbook, are not applicable.

At any time, any employee who believes they have been discriminated against for any reason not related to job performance may consult the Office for Equity and Diversity.

# Appendix A: Performance Weights and Workloads

At the beginning of the evaluation year, faculty will meet with department heads to discuss and set performance weights for their teaching, research, and service. These weights should reflect the faculty member's workload or assignment, as well as the desires and needs of the faculty member and needs of the department. For example, a faculty member with a six hour teaching load would have higher weights for research or service.

Department heads are expected to insure that faculty with reassigned time for research or service produce documented outcomes that justify the reassigned time.

Performance weights may be renegotiated if changes in faculty assignments have an impact on the existing weights for teaching, research, and service.

Upon approval from the Provost, departments in colleges that have a large number of clinical faculty or instructors, or have a unique feature of a discipline, may be permitted to use a pilot or experimental workload model that does not follow the recommended weight system. In these instances, there would need to be a well delineated plan for implementation that includes separate standards for both merit and tenure/promotion to account for the extra emphasis placed on teaching.

Note that grant activity is counted in the performance category in which the grant/contract work is most applicable – teaching, research, or service.

## I. Tenured Faculty – 9 hour Teaching Load Equivalent (TLE)

Minimum Weight	Performance Category	Maximum Weight
30%	Teaching/Advising/Program Director/Accreditation Activity	60%
30%	Research/scholarship/creative activities	60%
10%	Service	20%

## I. Tenured Faculty – 12 hour TLE

Minimum Weight	Performance Category	Maximum Weight
50%	Teaching/Advising/Program Director/Accreditation Activity	80%
10%	Research/scholarship/creative activities	40%
10%	Service	20%

## III. Probationary Faculty

Minimum Weight	Performance Category	Maximum Weight
45%	Teaching/Advising	60%
35%	Research/scholarship/creative activities	50%
5%	Service	15%

## IV. Renewable Lecturers & Greenwood Faculty

Minimum Weight	Performance Category	Maximum Weight
80%	Teaching/Advising	90%
0%	Research/scholarship/creative activities	10%

10%	Service	20%
-----	---------	-----

**V. Research Faculty (Mountain Grove, CASE, or as designated in appointment letter or approved by Provost)**

Minimum Weight	Performance Category	Maximum Weight
0%	Teaching/Grad Student Advising	25%
65%	Research/scholarship/creative activities	90%
10%	Service/Outreach activities	20%

**VI. Library Faculty**

Minimum Weight	Performance Category	Maximum Weight
60%	Librarianship (includes teaching)	80%
10%	Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities	30%
10%	Service	20%