

MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

PERIODIC REVIEW OF REAPPOINTMENT (OR RENEWAL OF CONTRACT),
TENURE, PROMOTION GUIDELINES

DEPARTMENT:

Chemistry

COLLEGE:

CNAS

SEMESTER/YEAR OF CURRENT REVIEW:

SP 2020

SEMESTER/YEAR OF NEXT REQUIRED REVIEW:

2023

DEPARTMENT ADOPTION SIGNATURES:

Richard R. B.

3/2/2020

Department Personnel Committee Chair

Date

Bryan E. Bragg

3/02/2020

Department Head

Date

APPROVAL SIGNATURES:

James A. Jehmke

3/2/2020

Dean

Date

Chris Garg

3-4-2020

Provost

Date

2020

2023

THIS PLAN IS IN EFFECT FROM ~~XXXX~~, THROUGH ~~XXXX~~.

Department of Chemistry

POLICY ON EVALUATION, PROMOTION, TENURE, AND ANNUAL APPOINTMENT

Approved by Chemistry Faculty: February 18, 2020

Approved by Chemistry Department Head: February 24, 2020

Approved by Dean: March 02, 2020

Approved by Provost:

PHILOSOPHY

All ranked faculty in the Department of Chemistry are expected to participate in three broad areas of activity: Teaching, Research, and Service. All evaluations of ranked faculty, for whatever purpose, will be made in these three areas. All instructors in the Department are expected to participate in Teaching and Service, with Research optional. Specific activities included in each of these areas shall be as described below.

Faculty performance in these areas normally will be evaluated based on the departmental policy statement in accordance with Section 3.3 of the Faculty Handbook^{1,2}.

All faculty members are expected to carry out their activities in a manner consistent with the American Chemical Society's Code of Conduct (available from the American Chemical Society, and through its web site).

Teaching: Teaching includes, but is not limited to, all activities involving instruction of students in the classroom, advisement of students, direction of undergraduate and graduate research, independent readings, revision of courses and teaching methods, and participation in workshops and seminars devoted to instruction of students. Designing new courses, materials and methods for classroom use shall also be included in the teaching component.

Research: Research and scholarly productivity are expected to be in the faculty member's discipline or to be interdisciplinary work that draws from or makes a contribution to the faculty member's discipline. Research includes activities directed toward the discovery and elucidation of new chemical phenomena and laws, integrating already existing chemical knowledge, and producing new applications of chemical knowledge. Research may also include research in chemistry education that is consistent with the American Chemical Society's 1992 Chemistry Education Research report prepared by the American Chemical Society's Task Force on Chemical Education Research. Participation by students in research projects also serves as an important component of their education.

The Department recognizes that scientific publications and funding are important indicators of a faculty member's scholarly activities. In particular, a record of peer-reviewed publications and external funding through competitive grant processes represent important evaluations by the scientific community of the faculty member's achievements and potential.

Service: Service includes routine departmental functions, the committee and governance structures of the department, the college, and the university, and all activities contributing to the advancement of this department outside the university. This can include, but is not limited

¹ All references to the Faculty Handbook are based on the 2019 revision,

² This document is subject to periodic revision. See the Faculty Handbook Sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.3, and 4.8.7 for clarification of what version of the departmental policy statement is used for tenure and promotion decisions.

to, serving on boards and committees of professional organizations, government advisory panels, reviewing of papers submitted to professional journals, reviewing of textbooks, recruitment on behalf of the department, and contributions to the nation, the state, and the local community in matters of public concern. Faculty members are expected to assume some leadership roles in service activities.

1. PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

1.1 Overview of Evaluations

Evaluation of the performance of faculty members is carried out on a regular basis. Such reviews include regular annual reviews, special pre-promotion evaluations, and may include merit compensation reviews. Within the Chemistry Department, evaluations for Annual Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion are normally carried out first by the Evaluation Committee and the Personnel Committee (see Section 6 for descriptions of these committees), and then by the Department Head. When salary adjustments will include a merit component, evaluations for merit will be carried out by a separate Merit Evaluation Committee (described in a separate document) and by the Department Head.

Evaluations of probationary faculty must include peer reviews of classroom teaching by the Department Head and/or the Head's designee. There should be a minimum of two evaluations during the probationary period, and ideally, one of these should occur during the probationary faculty members first year of teaching.

1.2 Annual Reports

Based on a schedule provided by the Provost (see the Master Calendar on the Provost's website) and the CNAS Dean, each faculty member must submit an annual report detailing her or his teaching, research, and service activities and achievements for the stipulated reporting period. These annual reports will be utilized as components in the evaluation processes for annual appointment reviews for probationary faculty, for annual evaluations of all faculty members, for special pre-promotion reviews, and for merit evaluations (if applicable).

1.3 Annual Appointment Reviews for Probationary Faculty

Probationary faculty members will be evaluated annually as described in Section 4.6.3 of the Faculty Handbook. The Evaluation Committee will assess the probationary faculty member's progress based on annual reports and any other pertinent information on teaching, research, and service, and will present its findings to the Personnel Committee. Teaching in the first year of employment will not be weighted as heavily as in subsequent years. The Personnel Committee will report its findings and recommendation to the probationary faculty member and to the Department Head, who will make a separate recommendation. These annual reviews will serve as the bases for recommendations regarding the probationary faculty member's appointments, and will also be included in the individual's tenure reviews.

In years when merit evaluations are conducted, evaluations of probationary faculty members will be conducted after completion of merit evaluations by the department's merit evaluation panel. The individual's evaluation materials (for all years since hiring) and any reports from the merit evaluation panel will be forwarded to the Evaluation Committee, who will prepare a summary for the Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee will prepare

a summary statement for the probationary faculty member, noting both achievements and any deficiencies in progress toward tenure.

The Head shall not be a participant in the voting or deliberations of the departmental committees. Copies of the committee's and Head's recommendations shall be provided to the candidate, who must sign the Head's recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the evaluation before forwarding may occur (Faculty Handbook, Section 4.6.2).

1.3.1 Evaluation to Recommend Against Renewal of Appointment

One possible outcome of the annual evaluation for probationary faculty is a recommendation for non-reappointment (Faculty Handbook Section 4.6.3). For first year probationary faculty, this may be the result of the regular annual review.

A recommendation against reappointment should be based on the recognition by both the department's Personnel Committee and the Department Head that the probationary candidate is highly unlikely to achieve tenure. Evidence may include the following:

- The individual's ineffectiveness as a teacher coupled with an unwillingness or inability to make improvements.
- The individual's inability or unwillingness to initiate a meaningful research project.
- The individual's inability or unwillingness to work cooperatively with colleagues in departmental governance.
- Unethical behavior or other activities that would lead to dismissal according to Section 14.5 of the Faculty Handbook.

1.4 Department Head Review of Tenured Ranked Faculty

The Missouri State University Faculty Handbook (Section 4.6) calls for annual reviews of tenured faculty members.

After each evaluation, a tenured faculty member who may later be seeking promotion may request to have her or his documentation reviewed by the department's Evaluation Committee and Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee will prepare a summary of the faculty member's performance, indicating progress and deficiencies toward meeting promotion requirements.

1.5 Annual Workload Meeting

Each faculty member will also meet with the Department Head each year to discuss and negotiate workload and performance expectations. This meeting will normally be incorporated into the annual review of faculty members. (Missouri State University Faculty Handbook, Section 4.6.7).

1.6 Merit Evaluation

Evaluations for merit ratings will be carried out based, in part, on annual reviews as described above, consistent with Section 5.2 of the Faculty Handbook. Details of the evaluation process are described in a separate departmental document.

Both the Department's merit evaluation system and its guidelines for tenure and promotion are intended to value and reward excellence in performance. However, no quantitative link between merit evaluation scores and recommendation for tenure or promotion are either intended or implied.

2. TENURE POLICY FOR RANKED FACULTY

2.1 Philosophy

Only members of the ranked faculty are eligible for tenure. Tenure is based on a thorough evaluation of the candidate's total contribution to the University in teaching, research, and service. Basic competence in itself is not sufficient to justify granting tenure, for such competence is a prerequisite for the initial appointment. The decision to grant tenure is inherently and inescapably judgmental and is a deliberate action indicating that the individual has been selected as a member of the permanent faculty because of demonstrated high-quality performance and relative merit.

The central focus of faculty responsibilities is on facilitating student learning by creating environments in and outside the classroom that foster the acquisition and development of knowledge, curiosity, and skills as needed by a citizen in a modern, democratic society, and a global community. The awarding of tenure should thus result from the candidate's credentials as well as the extent to which these responsibilities have been fulfilled in the probationary period. The credentials and achievements, in the areas of teaching, research, and service, should reflect a sustained commitment by the candidate to both the goals of the department and the mission of the University.

2.2 Assessment of Tenure Progress during the Probationary Period

As part of each annual review, a probationary faculty member's annual review documents for all years since hiring will be assessed by the Evaluation Committee. The Evaluation Committee will provide a summary of the faculty member's performance to the Personnel Committee, who will determine whether progress toward tenure is satisfactory. Should the results be questionable, areas for improvement will be identified, and specific suggestions will be provided. If the progress is unsatisfactory, specific rationale will be provided.

The results of each review will be provided to the faculty member. Copies will be maintained by the Department and forwarded to the Dean (Missouri State University Faculty Handbook, Section 4.6.1, 4.6.2, and 4.6.3).

2.3 Application for Tenure

2.3.1 Eligibility

An Assistant Professor is minimally eligible to hold tenure after completing three years of academic service to Missouri State University. Normally, she or he will apply for tenure in her or his sixth year of probationary status. In all cases, the initial step of the tenure application will involve soliciting letters from external reviewers. As detailed in Section 2.3.4 of this document, this process must start in the spring of the prior academic year.

2.3.1.1. Eligibility for early tenure.

Individuals with exceptional records of accomplishments may apply for tenure in the fourth or fifth year (Section 3.3.1 of the Faculty Handbook). To qualify as exceptional, the candidate's record must greatly exceed in both quality and quantity the minimum requirements for tenure for both teaching and research. Evidence may include: teaching evaluations by both students and peers; awards for teaching; both the number of publications and the quality of

the journals in which they are published; exceptional external grant funding as a Principle Investigator; awards for research.

2.3.2 Process overview

The awarding of tenure is based upon the departmental statement of expectations provided to the faculty member upon employment and upon the regular yearly reviews, as well as the documentation presented by the candidate. The process commences when the candidate submits his/her application for tenure to the department Evaluation Committee according to the schedule provided by the Provost (see the Master Calendar posted on the Provost's website). As detailed in the following sections, this application will contain documentation and/or evaluation data of all teaching, research, and service activities during the probationary period. To this dossier, the Department Head will add any external review letters (see Section 2.3.4).

The departmental Evaluation Committee will carry out a detailed review of candidate's applications and prepare a summary for the Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee will then make the initial recommendation, which is to be based on the material submitted by the candidate, external review letters, and the report of the faculty Evaluation Committee. The Evaluation Committee chair shall normally serve as the chair of the departmental Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee shall provide the candidate with the voting rationale for teaching, research, and service and will forward its recommendation, along with the documentation and evaluation data submitted by the candidate, to the Department Head for his / her independent evaluation and recommendation. Evaluations at higher levels of the administration will ensue as per Section 4 of the Faculty Handbook. This application does not preclude the regular yearly review by the Department Head.

At each level, the candidate will be informed of the result of the evaluation. Rebutting and/or appealing the tenure recommendation may take place at all administrative levels, as per Section 4.6.2 and Section 4.7 in the Faculty Handbook.

2.3.3 Documentation

The following sections detail the documentation that must be provided and the expectations that must be met. See the Provost's website for the specific order in which documents should be arranged (Provost's Office > Faculty Affairs > Faculty Resources > Tenure and Promotion > Faculty Evaluation Forms > Tenure and Promotion Application Checklist).

2.3.3.1 Professional statement

The professional statement serves as the centerpiece of the documentation, allowing the reader to readily evaluate the applicant's achievements and to recognize how she or he meets expectations for tenure. Key items of the statement include:

- A description of the individual's teaching philosophy and goals, along with an analysis of his or her achievements in teaching.
- A description of the individual's research program and accomplishments, with discussion of the significance of each scholarly production (i. e., publication, presentation, etc.) and their connections to each other.
- A description of the individual's service activities.
- Throughout the statement, the applicant should reference pertinent evidentiary materials (e.g., copies of publications, summaries of student evaluations) provided in the dossier.

- Throughout the statement, the applicant should address his or her responses to constructive criticism.
- The professional statement must articulate the ways in which the candidate has met or exceeded all departmental requirements for tenure and promotion.

2.3.3.2 Records of employment and prior reviews:

Copies of the following should be included:

- Letter of initial employment.
- Results of annual reviews.

2.3.3.3 Curriculum Vita

The applicant will provide a complete and up-to-date *vita*.

2.3.3.4 Teaching Documentation and Expectations:

The applicant should supply the following:

- Summary of all courses taught during the probationary period. These should meet CNAS workload policies for faculty.
- A copy of the course policy for each different course taught. These must meet guidelines described in the Faculty Handbook. (Faculty Handbook, Section 4.5.1.3).
- A syllabus for each course listing topics covered.
 - The topics covered must be consistent with the class's teaching objectives and must also meet General Education goals for classes so designated.
 - Where appropriate, topics should include discussion of alternate theories and scientific models, particularly where there is wide range of scientifically supported viewpoints.
- Documentation of course improvements, if any.
- Summary of all student evaluations. If the overall average of the student evaluations is below 4.0 (on a scale of 1 – 5, with 5 being the highest rating), tenure may be denied. Factors such as class size and class type may be taken into consideration if student evaluations are below 4.00.
 - For evaluations conducted using a prior system (scale of 1-5 with 1 being highest), the equivalent evaluation will be taken as 6.00 – (old system value).
 - If the evaluation instruments and/or the numerical system employed for student evaluations are changed, the specific requirement stated here will be adapted according to a replacement system accepted by the Chemistry Department.
- Copy of all teaching evaluations carried out by the Department Head and/or by other Chemistry Department faculty. Evaluations should be satisfactory as judged by the Personnel Committee; in the case of unsatisfactory reviews, the candidate should document changes made to address problems.

- Summary of teaching activities outside the classroom such as student research, a list of undergraduate and graduate research students, thesis titles, student presentations, and publications. For tenure and/or promotion, a faculty member must have mentored at least four different students for a minimum of one semester each, and at least one of the students should have been a graduate student.
- List of any awards, honors, or other recognition received.
- Any other materials that demonstrate the candidate's contribution to the Department and the University in the area of teaching.

2.3.3.5 Research Documentation and Expectations:

2.3.3.5.1 Required Documentation and Expectations

The candidate should provide the following:

- Copies of all publications including books, articles in refereed journals, patents, abstracts, and/or book (chemistry) reviews.
 - To be minimally eligible for tenure, the candidate must have at least two publications based on work since coming to Missouri State University. The following types of publications will be considered acceptable:
 - Research-based publications in refereed scientific journals.
 - Books, or chapters in multi-authored books, that are in the candidate's area of scientific expertise.
 - Issued patents in chemistry.
 - Research activity of proprietary projects may pose special problems because of restrictions on publications. An individual who intends to work on such projects may negotiate with the Department Head to allow documentation of a project's completion to count as one publication towards tenure and promotion. Any agreements about what would constitute adequate documentation need to be in writing and be in effect for at least one year prior to the tenure evaluation process (based on the deadline for submitting the tenure and promotion portfolio).
- Two publications represent a minimum. The merit of the publications and the candidate's contributions to them must also be considered, based on factors including the following:
- The publication should represent a significant body of scientific work, or a significant intellectual advance in the field of study.
 - For multi-author publications, the candidate's contributions toward the research must be clearly stated. A publication for which the candidate's contribution was essential to the research's success will be counted as a publication by the candidate. Contributions made by research students (undergraduate or graduate) working under the candidate's supervision will be considered contributions by the candidate.
 - Normally, publication by vanity presses (including "predatory publishers", i.e., open access journals that publish for author fees without rigorous peer review), trade publications, conference proceedings (unless externally reviewed), and campus, state and regional journals would not be acceptable. Any patent(s) must be in chemistry and must be based on work done since coming to Missouri State University.
- List of all presentations at professional meetings.

- To be minimally eligible for tenure, the candidate must have made at least one oral research-based presentation at a regional, national, or international meeting, and one additional research-based presentation (oral or poster) at a national or international meeting.
- Copies of all proposals, grants, and/or contracts.
 - To be minimally eligible for tenure, the candidate ideally should have received at least one external research grant or research contract and submitted at least two external grant proposals; the candidate must accrue the equivalent of \$40,000 in grant funding (see description of equivalencies in Section 2.3.3.5.2 of this document), with at least \$25,000 from external grants or research contracts. Possible exceptions to requirements for external funding are covered in Section 2.3.3.5.3 of this document.
- Any other materials that demonstrate the candidate's contribution to the Department and the University in the area of research including both graduate and undergraduate student presentations.
- Publications, presentations, and grants focused on chemistry education will be evaluated by the committee to determine whether they represent research efforts and accomplishments as described in the American Chemical Society's Task Force on Chemical Education Research.
- List of paid consulting work
- List of professional meetings attended

2.3.3.5.2 Assignment Equivalencies for Grant Funding and Research Contracts

The policy recognizes the greater value of external funding specifically directed toward research-related activities.

- Co-authored grants: For any grant or research contracts described below that are co-authored by two or more persons, the total value of the grant or contract will be apportioned in terms of the relative contributions of each co-author.
- External grants, research contracts, and instrumentation grants received by the applicant as a Principle Investigator (or Co-PI): The full value of the grant or contract is counted (after apportioning among coauthors).
- Internal grants: These include Missouri State University Faculty Research grants, CASE (Center for Applied Science and Engineering) grants (not covered by the preceding item), and similar grants. Only half of the dollar value of the grant will count toward the candidate's grant funding. In addition, there is a cap of \$10,000 per internal grant toward the candidate's total.
- Collaborative grants involving institutions outside of Missouri State University will be evaluated based on the following key criteria.
 - Grant money evaluated as external funding:
 - Grant funds where the faculty member is a Principal Investigator on the proposal
 - Grant funds that are administered through Missouri State University

- Grant funds administered by outside institutions but which directly support Missouri State University faculty or students (e.g., travel money)
 - Grant funds evaluated as not counting toward the faculty member's funding:
 - Grants to an external institution which pay the faculty member for a service such as reviewing
 - Other cases: There may be scenarios in which an external grant for which the faculty member is not a Principal Investigator but which still supports the member's research. Those situations will require negotiation with the Department Head to clarify how the funding will be treated, ideally before the proposal is submitted.
- Grants of computer time and similar *in kind* grants will be counted as internal grants unless the applicant has previously negotiated a prior agreement to with the Department Head to count such grants as external grants. The candidate will be expected to provide verifiable documentation for the monetary value of such grants.
- A faculty member may petition to have funding normally classified as internal reassigned as external funding. Petitions will be reviewed by the Evaluation Committee and then the Personnel Committee, with the Personnel Committee's recommendation binding. Petitions must be presented within six months of the date on which the funding is acquired (or within six months of the acceptance of this policy change), and should be completed prior to the faculty member applying for tenure or promotion. Grounds for reassignment of a research grant or contract from internal to external funding would normally include evidence that the grant or contract was selected for funding through a competitive evaluation process, and that the faculty member contributed significantly to both the scientific content and preparation of the grant or contract.

2.3.3.5.3 Exceptions to Expectations for External Funding

The Chemistry Department maintains that acquisition of external funding for research is an important measure of a candidate's research achievements and potential, and the expectation of significant external funding in support of research will always be the Department's norm. However, the Department also recognizes that funding opportunities vary in different subdisciplines and that at times, there can be significant limitations to the availability of funding. If, in the judgment of the Chemistry Personnel Committee and the Department Head, the candidate has made an extensive good-faith effort to attain funding and has submitted proposals with excellent scientific merit, but has nonetheless been unsuccessful, the Department may waive the requirement for external funding. Expectations include the following:

- The candidate has applied for at least 5 external grants in support of his or her research (not instrumentation grants unless the instrumentation is central to the individual's research) during the probationary period. The total value of the grants should be such that, had they been funded, would amount to at least four times the candidate's deficit in external research funding (e.g., if the candidate has not received any external research funding, then the minimum would be \$100,000; if the candidate has received \$12,000 in external research funding, the deficit would be \$13,000, and the submissions would need to add up to \$52,000). The dollar value of the proposals toward external research funding will be as defined in Section 2.3.3.5.3 of this document, but with no unsuccessful external research grant counting for more than \$25,000.
- The proposals submitted should cover at least three different projects, i.e., the five (minimum) external grants should not just represent resubmissions of proposals for the same work.

- The candidate must provide copies of all proposals as well as all reviewers' scores and comments. These will allow the department to evaluate how the external reviewers evaluated the proposals' scientific merit. It is reasonable to expect at least one proposal resubmission following significant revisions based on reviewers' comments. The revisions should be clearly enunciated by the candidate.

It will be up to the Personnel Committee and the Department Head to determine whether or not the attempts demonstrate the candidate's good-faith effort to attain funding and the candidate's ability to propose projects of sound scientific merit.

2.3.3.6 Service Documentation and Expectations:

Documentation for Service should show that the candidate is contributing to the Department and University in the area of Service. The following items should be included.

- List of all committee work. Minimum expectations for tenure include satisfactory performance in departmental committees as assigned by the Department Head, and active membership on and contributions to committees at the College level or higher as indicated below:
 - for at least two years on university-wide committee(s), or
 - for at least three years on college-wide committee(s), or
 - for at least one year on a university-wide committee and one year as chair of a college-wide committee, or
 - for at least one year as chair of a university-wide committee.
 - Effective service in a leadership role in a professional organization will be considered equivalent to serving on a college-wide committee.
- List of unpaid consulting work that reflects professional service.
- List of community service related to the profession.
- Any other materials that demonstrate the candidate's Service contribution to the Department, the University, or the profession.

2.3.4 External Evaluations

2.3.4.1 Selection of external evaluators:

During the Spring Semester preceding the year of tenure review, the probationary faculty member and Department Head must schedule a meeting to discuss external reviewers. External reviewers must meet the following criteria:

Each evaluator should possess a terminal degree and should typically hold an academic appointment. Reviewers with academic appointments should be employed in institutions or programs at or above the level of the Missouri State University Chemistry program, typically offering at least a Master's degree in Chemistry or a field related to the probationary faculty member's area of expertise. The evaluator should hold a rank at or above the level to which the candidate is applying. When appropriate, reviewers holding terminal degrees may be drawn from research institutes, foundations, organizations or the private sector.

The applicant must disclose any prior relationship with evaluators. Individuals with whom the candidate has collaborated with or studied under are generally ineligible. Individuals with whom the candidate has a personal relationship are generally ineligible.

The applicant and Department Head will each propose a list of at least four potential evaluators, following guidelines posted on the Provost's website. From these two lists, four evaluators will be selected collaboratively, with at least two from each list. Both the Department Head and the candidate may seek assistance and/or advice from the Personnel Committee. Department Head is responsible for obtaining a sufficient number of reviews. If, in the Department Head's judgment, one or more of the selected evaluators is unlikely to respond in a timely manner, then the Department Head may select one or more additional evaluators in consultation with the candidate. The credentials of external reviewers must be approved by the CNAS Dean prior to contacting the reviewers.

2.3.4.2 Information and Documentation Given to Evaluators:

The Department Head will send copies of the following to each of the evaluators:

- A dossier containing copies of all of the documentation listed in Section 2.3.3 of this Policy Statement. (If the documentation includes books, it may be impractical to send one to each reviewer. Copies of relevant subsections will suffice for this purpose.)
- A copy of the departmental Tenure and Promotion Document relevant to the applicant's tenure and/or promotion.

The Department Head will, in a cover letter to the evaluator, request that the evaluator review the applicant's CV and documentation. Information on the candidate's teaching load should be provided to the evaluator so that she or he may evaluate the dossier in light of the applicant's overall workload. While the reviewer should be invited to consider the whole of the candidate's CV, he or she should be requested to focus primarily on the applicant's scholarship and research. The evaluator should also be clearly informed that the applicant will have access to the evaluation at the end of the review process. Evaluators should be requested to send their evaluations directly to the Department Head.

2.3.4.3 Handling and confidentiality of the external evaluations:

The Department Head shall collect all external evaluations and add those to the applicant's tenure and promotion package. The applicant should not have access to these until the end of the evaluation process.

2.3.4.4 Failure of evaluators to respond

The failure of evaluators to respond to the request for an evaluation will not prejudice the evaluation of the candidate's tenure application.

2.3.4.5 Timetable for external evaluations

The candidate and Department Head should start discussions regarding external reviewers by approximately March 31 of the academic year preceding tenure application. Ideally, the list of potential reviewers should be finalized by May 1. The Department Head may start contacting the reviewers once the list is finalized. Requests should be sent early enough so that all external reviewers would have adequate time to respond by October 1.

3. PROMOTION POLICIES FOR RANKED FACULTY

3.1 Philosophy and General Guidelines

Promotion within the Department is a key component of the reward system established by the University, and is to be viewed as a reward that follows from meeting performance expectations in teaching, research, and service, rather than as a right. In general, faculty who are awarded promotion will have demonstrated a continued record of accomplishments in roles that support the mission and goals of the Department. The rank of Associate Professor should reflect a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching, peer-reviewed scholarship, research, and service appropriate to the discipline. The rank of Professor should reflect those who are recognized leaders with a cumulative record of teaching effectiveness, of peer-reviewed scholarship and research, and of substantial service. Hence, each promotion should reflect a significant level of accomplishments and should not be awarded based primarily on years of service.

The Departmental Personnel Committee and the Department Head each shall make separate evaluations of the candidate. The decision for promotion will be based on the pertinent Department expectations (see Faculty Handbook Section 3.3), on regular reviews, and on the faculty member's cumulative performance since appointment to the present rank. Evaluations of applications will be in accordance with the Missouri State University Faculty Handbook for promotion (Sections 3.3 and 4.6). At each level, the candidate will be informed of the results of the evaluation. Rebutting or appealing of the evaluation recommendation may take place at all levels, as per Sections 4.6 and 4.7 of the Faculty Handbook. The promotion application shall not preclude the regular yearly review by the Department Head.

3.2 Performance Expectations for the Ranks

3.2.1 Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

To be eligible for promotion from the rank of Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, the candidate must have attained tenure at Missouri State University (or, if hired with tenure, have satisfied minimal requirements of departmental tenure policy) and have met the University's years of academic service requirements (Section 3.3.2 of the Faculty Handbook).

A candidate who has satisfied all requirements for tenure will have also met requirements for promotion to Associate Professor.

3.2.2 Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

To be minimally eligible for promotion from the rank of Associate Professor to Professor, the candidate must have met the University's years of academic service requirements. Associate Professors normally become eligible to apply for promotion during their fifth year of service (Faculty Handbook, Section 3.3.2). Individuals with exceptional records may apply for early promotion. To qualify as exceptional, the candidate's record must greatly exceed in both quality and quantity the minimum requirements for promotion to Professor for both teaching and research. Evidence may include: teaching evaluations by both students and peers; awards for teaching; both the number of publications and the quality of the journals in

which they are published; exceptional external grant funding as a Principle Investigator; awards for research.

Faculty applying for promotion to Professor (Section 3.3.3 of the Faculty Handbook) must have demonstrated a sustained commitment to teaching, research, and service, and accomplished from the time of promotion to Associate Professor (or of hiring, if hired at that rank) the following:

1. A minimum of **FOUR** publications based on research initiated since coming to Missouri State University. Criteria for the acceptability of publications are the same as those for tenure.
2. A minimum of two oral research-based presentations at a regional, national, or international meeting, and two additional research presentations (oral or poster) at a national or international meeting.
3. At a minimum, achieve funding of grant proposals equivalent to those required for tenure listed in Section 2.3.3.5 of this document. For promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, there will be no exception to the expectation for external research funding.
4. In addition to continuing satisfactory performance on departmental committees, display visible and effective involvement in service at College or University level, such as service on College Council, Faculty Senate, Graduate Council, and similar organizations. The minimum service requirements are the same as those for tenure as listed in Section 2.3.3.6 of this document.
5. Continue satisfactory performance in teaching as evidenced by student evaluations, involvement in undergraduate and graduate research and development of new course materials. Specific expectations are the same as in Section 2.3.3.4 of this document, except that teaching evaluations by the Department Head and/or faculty peers is not normally required unless the Department has identified a problem with the individual's teaching. In such cases, evidence must be provided showing that any problems have been addressed.
6. Display a leadership role in a college, university, or professional organization by serving as a committee chair or organization officer.
7. Satisfy all criteria for promotion set forth in the current Faculty Handbook.
8. External evaluations, as described in Section 2.3.4 of this document, are required for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor. If the candidate has applied for promotion in either of the prior two years, he or she will have the option of either keeping any or all of the external review letters, or of soliciting additional letters from external evaluators. If more than two years has lapsed, new external evaluations will be required. The procedure and timeline for identifying evaluators and soliciting their input is as described in Section 2.3.4 of this document.

3.3 Procedures

The procedures for promotions are the same as given for the tenure application in Section 2.3 of this document, but with the specific requirements given in Section 3.2. If an individual

is applying for both tenure and promotion at the same time, a single application package will be sufficient. In all cases, the professional statement must articulate how the candidate has met or exceeded all requirements for the promotion.

3.4 Pre-Promotion Reviews

Tenured faculty members may request a pre-promotion review one to two years prior to application for promotion. This review is optional, and the decision not to request a pre-promotion review does not preclude a favorable review at the time of application for promotion.

The faculty member will submit to the head of the Evaluation Committee the documentation required for promotion. The documentation will be considered by the Departmental Evaluation and Personnel Committees and the Department Head. The Personnel Committee and Head will each specify in writing to the requesting faculty member one of the following three outcomes:

1. that progress toward promotion is satisfactory
2. that progress toward promotion is questionable, identifying areas for improvement and providing specific suggestions
3. that progress toward promotion is unsatisfactory, providing specific rationale

4. PROMOTION POLICIES FOR INSTRUCTORS

4.1 Philosophy and General Guidelines

Promotion to Senior Instructor within the Department is a key component of the reward system established by the University, and is to be viewed as a reward that follows from meeting performance expectations in teaching and service, rather than as a right. In general, Instructors who are awarded promotion to Senior Instructor will have demonstrated a continued record of accomplishments in roles that support the mission and goals of the Department. The Departmental Personnel Committee and the Department Head each shall make separate evaluations of the candidate. The decision for promotion will be based on the Department expectations provided at employment, regular yearly reviews, and on the faculty member's cumulative performance since appointment to the present rank. Evaluations of applications will be in accordance with the Missouri State University Faculty Handbook (Section 4). At each level, the candidate will be informed of the results of the evaluation. Appealing of the evaluation recommendation may take place at all levels, as described in the Faculty Handbook. The promotion application shall not preclude the regular yearly review by the Department Head.

4.2 Performance Expectations for Promotion to Senior Instructor

The key requirements for promotion are outlined in Section 3.5.2 of the Faculty Handbook:

An Instructor who has demonstrated excellence in teaching and service at Missouri State University for at least five years may be appointed as a Senior Instructor. Senior Instructors are expected to provide leadership in teaching, contribute to course and curriculum development and provide appropriate university service. Senior Instructors may participate in research or creative activities.

The important criteria are therefore:

- Years of service to the Department
- Excellence in teaching, with demonstration of leadership
- Excellence in performance of university service

4.2.1 Years of Service

Promotion to Senior Instructor requires five years of full-time appointment as an Instructor (not including summers). Individuals who were reclassified as Instructors but whose prior appointment responsibilities were substantially equivalent to those of Instructors should be allowed to count that time toward the five year requirement. However, the five years appointment as Instructor represents a minimum requirement, and years of service, by themselves, do not serve as the basis for promotion to Senior Instructor.

4.2.2 Expectations for Teaching

The central focus of an Instructor's teaching responsibilities is to facilitate student learning by creating environments in and outside the classroom that foster the acquisition and development of knowledge, curiosity, and skills as needed by a citizen in a modern, democratic society, and a global community.

Excellence in teaching should be demonstrated by evidence that could include student evaluations, student outcomes and student performance, peer evaluations, the ability to advise and/or mentor students, the ability to contribute to curricular and course development, and similar evaluations that may depend on an individual Instructor's teaching assignments. Numerical teaching evaluations are only one component of the evaluation process. However, there is an expectation that, for promotion to Senior Instructor, the overall (five-year) average of the student evaluations should not be below 4.00 (on the scale of 1-5 with 5 being the highest); factors such as class size and class type may be taken into consideration if student evaluations are below 4.00. Student evaluations based on different numerical rating systems will be adjusted as described in Section 2.3.3.4 of this document.

Leadership in teaching may be demonstrated by the Instructor's ability to take leading roles in curricular and course development, to actively participate in and contribute to successful grant writing for funding (internal and/or external) to support teaching activities, and to take on other teaching-related responsibilities that require the Instructor's initiative.

4.2.3 Expectations for Service

An Instructor should show a sustained and willing participation in service activities at the Department and at the College and/or University level. For promotion to Senior Instructor, there will be an expectation of active and effective participation in assigned committees, and

evidence of the ability to contribute at a level beyond simple membership on committees, e.g., serving as Chair or Co-Chair of a committee, or serving actively on a subcommittee.

4.2.4 Expectations for Research

Instructors are not required to participate in research activities, but may do so depending on their personal interests and availability of opportunities. An Instructor who has research activities or accomplishments (grants, publications, etc.) based on work since starting work within the Chemistry Department may cite these when applying for promotion to Senior Instructor. However, there is no requirement for research, and the absence of research activities or accomplishments will in no way be prejudicial against an Instructor's promotion.

4.3 Documentation for Promotion to Senior Instructor

4.3.1 Professional statement

The professional statement serves as the centerpiece of the documentation, allowing the reader to readily evaluate the applicant's achievements and to recognize how she or he meets expectations for promotion. Key items of the statement include:

- A description of the individual's achievements in teaching. In particular, the candidate should clarify identify any leadership roles in teaching activities.
- A description of the individual's service activities. In particular, the candidate should identify those service activities that demonstrate significant contributions beyond routine committee membership.
- If the candidate has been involved in research activities and wishes to have his or her research accomplishments considered in the promotion decision, the Professional Statement should include a description of the individual's research program and accomplishments, with discussion of the significance of each scholarly production (i. e., publication, presentation, etc.) and their connections to each other.
- Throughout the statement, the applicant should reference pertinent evidentiary materials (e.g., copies of publications, summaries of student evaluations) provided in the dossier.
- Throughout the statement, the applicant should address his or her responses to any constructive criticism.
- The professional statement must articulate the ways in which the candidate has met or exceeded all departmental requirements for promotion to Senior Instructor.

4.3.2 General documentation:

- Curriculum vita
- Letter of initial employment.
- Results of annual evaluation.

4.3.3 Teaching documentation

It is the candidate's obligation to demonstrate both excellence and leadership in teaching, and to provide supporting documentation. Documentation must include the following:

- Summary of all courses taught during the past years, or since initial appointment within the Department.

- Copy of key documentation for each different course taught:
 - Course policy statement and syllabus
 - Examples of assignments and exams
 - Provide explanation of how assignments and exams are consistent with course goals.
- Summary of all student evaluations. If the overall average of the student evaluations is below 4.00 (on the scale of 1 – 5 with 5 being the highest), promotion may be denied. Factors such as class size and class type may be taken into consideration if student evaluations are below 4.00.
- Copy of any teaching evaluations carried out by the Department Head and/or by other Chemistry Department faculty.

Additional documentation to support excellence and leadership in teaching may include items such as the following.

- Documentation of on-line course materials and design (if on-line components used)
 - Examples of how on-line materials were utilized.
 - Examples of feedback received concerning on-line course components.
- Documentation of course improvements, if any.
 - Examples of changes made in course design, presentation methods, laboratory experiments (including introduction of new laboratories), etc.
- Documentation of serving as a laboratory coordinator
 - Examples of materials provided to teaching assistants and/or storeroom staff
- Documentation of curricular development activities.
 - Include evidence of changes in course offering and/or content.
- Summary of teaching activities outside the classroom
- List of any awards, honors, or other recognition received.
- Grants intended to support teaching activities
 - Copies of grant proposals intended to support teaching activities
 - Indicate whether or not grants were funded.
 - For completed projects, provide copies of final reports.
 - For projects in progress, provide a summary of any grant-related activities, and evidence of any progress toward meeting the project's goals.
 - If applicable, include evidence for managing grants.
- Any other materials that demonstrate the candidate's contribution to the Department and the University in the area of teaching.

4.3.4 Service documentation

- List of all committee work (note any leadership roles)
- List of consulting work (note whether it was paid or unpaid)
- List of professionally-related community service

- Any other materials that demonstrate the candidate's contribution to the Department and the University in the area of service

4.3.5 Research documentation (optional)

- List of all publications including books, articles in refereed journals, patents, abstracts, and/or book (chemistry) reviews.
- List of all professional presentations.

List of all proposals, grants, and/or contracts (proposals, grants, and contracts aimed at supporting teaching activities may be included in the documentation for Teaching).

5. REVIEW PROCESSES AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

5.1 General Responsibilities Outlined in the Faculty Handbook

The faculty member seeking tenure and/or promotion and members of the Evaluation Committee should become familiar with the following definitions, procedures and deadlines established by the University:

- Faculty Handbook, Section 3.3 of the Faculty Handbook – Requirements for Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenure-Track Faculty.
- Faculty Handbook, Section 4.5 – Faculty Policies and Responsibilities.
- Faculty Handbook, Section 4.6 – Faculty Performance Evaluation Process and Section 4.8, Evaluation-Related Policies
- Provost's Academic Work Calendar and any alterations in that calendar from the CNAS Dean.

5.2 Responsibilities and Rights of the Applicant

- The candidate shall initiate the tenure and/or promotion process. Supporting materials (see Sections 2.3.3, 3.3, and 4.3 of this document) are to be provided by the candidate to the chair of the Evaluation Committee.
- With the exception of the external reviews, the candidate shall have access to all materials submitted by the Evaluation Committee to the Department Head.
- In the event of a negative recommendation by the promotion and tenure committee, the candidate has the right to request a documented vote of the committee members. Each member shall indicate on the ballot the rationale for his or her vote and sign the ballot. The numerical outcome of this vote will be forwarded to the Department Head and Dean.
- The candidate will be furnished with written documentation of the decision at each level of evaluation (promotion and tenure committee and Head) and a summary of comments as to the reason(s) for the decision.
- The confidentiality of information shall be maintained throughout the evaluation process.

5.3 Responsibilities of the Department Evaluation Committee, Department Personnel Committee, and Head

The composition of the Departmental Evaluation Committee is detailed in Section 6.1. The Evaluation Committee will carry out a detailed review of candidate's applications and prepare a summary for the Department Personnel Committee. The Evaluation Committee should note in particular the requirements for tenure and/or promotion that the candidate has achieved and any requirements that the candidate has not achieved. The Evaluation Committee serves primarily in an advisory role, and does not need to make a specific recommendation to the Department Personnel Committee.

The composition of the Departmental Personnel Committee is detailed in Section 6.2 of this document. The Personnel Committee shall review and evaluate the applicant's tenure and/or promotion materials. It is the responsibility of each member of the committee to thoroughly review the applicant's materials.

The Personnel Committee will forward its recommendation to the Department Head. If the recommendation of the Head differs from that of the committee, there shall be a good faith effort to resolve these differences. If resolution is not possible, the Head must submit in writing compelling reasons for the decision not to accept the committee's recommendation.

6. MEMBERSHIP OF THE DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE AND PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

6.1 Evaluation Committee

The Evaluation Committee of the Chemistry Department shall consist of four ranked faculty members elected to four year terms by all faculty members. Reviews will normally be carried out by the three longest serving members of the committee, with the most-recently elected member of the committee serving as an alternate when another member is excused because of a conflict of interest. The longest-serving member of the committee will normally serve as the committee's chair. Of the four members of the Evaluation Committee, only one may be untenured.

In the event that the Evaluation Committee should cease to exist upon reorganization of the departmental committee structure, the role described for that committee will be taken over by a departmental committee designated by the department faculty.

6.2 Personnel Committee

For annual appointments and tenure recommendations, the Chemistry Department Personnel Committee will be comprised of all tenured faculty members within the department except for the Department Head. For promotion recommendations, it will consist of all tenured faculty members at or above the rank to which the candidate is applying (except for the Department Head). (See Section 4.8.3 of the Faculty Handbook.) The chair of the Evaluation Committee will normally serve as the chair of the Personnel Committee unless that individual is ineligible to serve on the Personnel Committee, in which case the Personnel Committee will elect an alternate.

The Personnel Committee must include at least five eligible members. If there are not enough faculty at or above the rank to which the faculty member aspires, Department Head

and faculty member may submit a list of possible committee members for the dean's consideration and appointment (Faculty Handbook, Section 4.8.3.2).

7. GRADUATE FACULTY

7.1 Attaining Graduate Faculty Status

Minimum requirements for graduate faculty status are described in Section 3.11 of the Faculty Handbook. Faculty members who meet those requirements and who gain an affirmative vote from the majority of the Department's graduate faculty and approval from the Department Head and Dean will be recommended to the Graduate College for graduate faculty status.

7.2 Removal from Graduate Faculty Status

A graduate faculty member who is no longer research-active may be removed from graduate faculty status upon a supermajority (two-thirds) vote of all other graduate faculty within the department, the recommendation of the Department Head and the Dean, and a vote for removal from the Graduate Council.

Grounds for removal from graduate faculty status may include prolonged periods (greater than five years) without any publications, inactivity in research efforts, lack of engagement with graduate students in research activities, and inability or refusal to contribute to graduate-level teaching.

8. REVISION OF THE POLICY DOCUMENT

The Chemistry Department guidelines for teaching, research and service will be reviewed periodically by the Chemistry Department policy committee. For any specific circumstances not directly covered by this document, relevant sections of the Faculty Handbook will apply.