

Economics Department

Compensation Plan Criteria in Research, Teaching and Service

(Amended October 2007)

Faculty weights for the three areas of faculty accomplishment, teaching, research, and service, are negotiated between the faculty member and the department head according to guidelines established by the college. Faculty with a teaching load reduced below the norm (e.g., a 6 hour teaching load to compensate for other assigned duties) will be allowed to negotiate these weights outside the normal college guidelines.

Assessment Measures: Research

The MSU Economics Department endorses a broad definition of research: the production and formal communication of creative scholarly works. The nature of research varies widely among different academic disciplines, but generally refers to the discovery, refinement, and synthesis of information and the application of information to the solution of problems. Research produces creative outcomes that are formally communicated to, and vetted by, peers. Scholarship, teaching, and research are all aspects of quality education. If teaching and its related activities are defined as the learning and communication of that which was already known, research is the discovery and communication of that which was not previously known.

In assessing an individual faculty member's contribution in the area of research for merit pay consideration, the following general principles are recognized and must be consistent with the University and College compensation plans.

Activities which lead to publications shall be weighted more heavily than other activities. Because of the high rejection rate in professional journals in economics, works in progress are included as indicators of research and scholarly activity. However, an article that is in progress will not count as a publication, peer-reviewed or otherwise. Faculty member may choose to count an article as a publication either when it is accepted or published but any given article may only be counted once.

Indicators of research scholarly activity are divided into three levels as given below in diminishing order of productivity. Indicators in category A will be of the highest productivity and count the most toward assessing research for merit pay purposes. Indicators in category B will be of a medium productivity. Indicators in category C will be of the lowest productivity.

Productivity Indicators:

Category A.

1. An article accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed academic print or electronic journal indexed by econlit/Journal of Economic Literature or equivalent. An article accepted in a high quality journal that is not peer-reviewed will also count in this category
2. A scholarly book published or in press (counts as category A for 2 years).
3. An edited collection of readings, provided a contribution of the editor is included (without the latter, this activity falls to category B).
4. Chapters authored in quality published or in press edited books that are peer reviewed (quality is determined by the committee).
5. Receipt of a major external research grant. Credit is awarded for either being the principal investigator or a co-investigator.

Category B.

1. An article accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed academic print or electronic journal that does not count as category A.
2. A chapter authored in a published or in press edited book that is editor selected.
3. Citations of the faculty member's research in peer reviewed scholarly articles, textbooks, and popular press. Self citations will not count in this area.
4. Receipt of an internal research grant or fellowship. Credit is awarded for either being the principal investigator or a co-investigator, or an independent evaluator.
5. Receipt of a minor external research grant or fellowship. Credit is awarded for either being the principal investigator or a co-investigator, or an independent evaluator.
6. A research award.
7. A presentation of original scholarly work at a national or international convention or conference where the process is selective or invited.
8. The inclusion of a previously published work in a compendium of readings.
9. An article of a scholarly nature accepted for publication or published in a non-refereed periodical.
10. Significant service on the editorial board of a professional journal. (Consideration will be given to the quality of the journal and responsibilities to the journal.)
11. Significant reviewer work of articles for academic journals. (Consideration will be given to the quality of the journal and the number of articles reviewed.)
12. Attendance at an international conference such as a conference sponsored by the Council on International Education Exchange.
13. Receiving a sabbatical.
14. The submission of a major external research grant or fellowship. Credit is awarded for either being the principal investigator, a co-investigator, or an independent evaluator.

Category C.

1. A grant or fellowship submitted for either external or internal funding. Credit is awarded for either being the principal investigator, a co-investigator, or an independent evaluator.
2. An article manuscript either near completion or submitted for publication in a refereed journal.
3. A book manuscript either near completion or submitted for publication.
4. A book chapter near completion.
5. Attendance at a research-related workshop.
6. Attendance at a grant-writing workshop.
7. Attendance at professional conference, convention, or other significant scholarly gathering.
8. Organizing, serving as a session chair, (Placed into service category) or Discussing papers at a professional conference, convention or other significant scholarly gathering.
9. Receipt of a small internal grant or fellowship.
10. Minor editorial work or reviewing for professional journals.

Faculty members may ask the compensation committee to treat a specific scholarly activity at a category higher than indicated above or to include a non-listed activity as a productivity indicator when the nature of the activity required more extensive effort or when the activity is not adequately reflected in the lists of productivity indicators. In that case, the compensation committee will meet with the faculty member to discuss and determine the activity's value and category.

A given activity will only be counted in the highest of the three categories during a given annual evaluation period. For example, an article that is submitted to a refereed journal (category C), has revisions requested by the journal (category B), and is accepted for publication (category A) in the in same year will only count in category A. A given activity may count multiple times in different years.

Merit Ratings

The compensation committee will generally use the following criteria for assigning a merit rating to each faculty member for scholarly activity.

5. Merit Rating is Exceptional

To be considered for this rating, the faculty member must have had significant outcomes leading to grants and/or peer-reviewed acceptances/publications and have a research agenda that is advanced enough to lead to similar outcomes in the near future. The faculty member must have had at least one scholarly activity from category A. In addition, several more from categories B and C would be required.

4. Merit Rating is Commendable

To be considered for this rating, the faculty member must have had significant outcomes that will soon lead to grants and/or peer-reviewed acceptances/publications and have a research agenda that is advanced enough to lead to similar outcomes in the near future. The faculty member must have had at least two scholarly activities from category B. Several more from category C would also be expected.

3. Merit Rating is Competent

To be considered for this rating, the faculty member must demonstrate an active research agenda that will eventually lead to grants and/or peer-reviewed acceptances/publications. The faculty member must have had, at minimum, two scholarly activities from category C or one scholarly activity from category B.

2. Merit Rating is Development Needed

To achieve this rating, the faculty member would demonstrate a mostly inactive research agenda. This rating would be achieved by failing to meet the criteria for merit rating 3 above.

1. Merit Rating is Unsatisfactory

To achieve this rating, the faculty member would demonstrate a totally inactive research agenda. This rating would be achieved if the faculty member fails to meet the criteria for merit rating 3 for two consecutive years.

Assessment Measures: Teaching

Each faculty member will construct a brief Teaching Area Portfolio listing activities and teaching area accomplishments. Each faculty member will provide a brief summary of the faculty member's teaching activities for the annual evaluation period. This summary report will provide the current year's FEC an overall perspective as to what the faculty member accomplished or attempted to accomplish (work in progress) in the teaching area for the time period in question, and establish in part the basis of the assigned rating in the teaching area. The portfolio will include descriptions of activities such as those listed below.

These indicators of meritorious teaching activity are divided into three levels in diminishing order of productivity. Indicators in category A are of the highest productivity and count the most toward assessing teaching for merit pay purposes. Indicators in category B will be of a medium productivity. Indicators in category C will be of the lowest productivity. The category lists below are extensive but not intended to be exhaustive. If the faculty member feels that significant work has been done that is not clearly covered in the below descriptions, that faculty member can and should present his or her case to the FEC.

Peer evaluation will include four items with each of the four areas assessed in a 4 point grading scale as follows: (1) Excellent, (2) Good, (3) Fair, or (4) Needs Improvement.

1. Student recruitment as measured by the percentage of 155/165 students of faculty who later become majors or minors with majors weighted twice as much.
2. Grade distribution by type of course (principles, upper division, graduate) with both GPA and percent of A's and B's used.
3. A teaching portfolio and summary of teaching activities as described above.
4. Mandatory classroom visits every semester
 - o Two people will visit, one the department head and another a random committee member.
 - o The visit will be announced to faculty within a two to three week time frame for one class per semester.
 - o Faculty who teach both upper division/graduate classes and principles will have one of each visited each year.

Productivity Indicators:

Category A.

1. Student evaluations that lie within the following range: 1 to 1.65.
2. Peer evaluations of Excellent or Good in at least three categories.
3. Participation in the London Program or other faculty exchange programs such as a Fulbright award.
4. A refereed publication in the area of economic education (the faculty member may choose to list this under research).
5. Teaching courses that impose heavy workloads and/or serve pressing departmental needs or have consideration because they have lower evaluations because of student population. Specific examples of such courses would be ECO 490/690 (499), ECO/HCM 504, and ECO 610. Faculty members may argue for inclusion due to heavy workload based on total number of students taught, number of preparations, and large sections in principles, upper division, and graduate courses. These heavy workloads may only count as a category B rating; depending on the individual case.
6. Innovative classroom activities that significantly improve teaching. This may only count as a category B rating, depending on the individual case.
7. Publication of a textbook or having the text in press.

Category B.

1. Student evaluations that lie within the following range: 1.66 to 2.
2. Peer evaluations of Fair or Good in at least three categories.
3. Presentations in teaching seminars/conferences on or off campus.
4. Advising a high percentage of the department's majors (30 % or more when under 100 majors).
5. Presentations at advising workshops.
6. Obtaining a grant in the area of economic education.
7. Receiving a teaching award.
8. Developing significant classroom experiments to support teaching effectiveness.
9. Developing significant interdisciplinary course materials.
10. Construction of on-line course materials.
11. Attending teaching seminars/conferences off campus.

Category C.

1. Teaching evaluations that lie within the following range: 2.01 to 2.51.
2. Peer evaluations of Fair in at least three categories.
3. Attending teaching seminars/conferences on campus.
4. Preparations to teach ITV and/or on-line course sections.

5. Development and implementation of electronic materials in existing courses.
6. Improving and up-dating course materials.
7. Preparing to teach a course for the first time, including GEP 397 sections.
8. Attending advising workshops.
9. In-progress grant writing to develop teaching materials and lessons for economics courses,
10. Undertaking other activities in the pursuit of improved economic education.
11. Demonstrated student advising activities.
12. Developing classroom teaching aids to support teaching effectiveness.
13. Guest lectures in classes on campus.

Additional Teaching Information/Data to be supplied to the FEC

- a. A Basic Data set providing courses taught per the relevant semesters, grade distributions, which course sections, if any, are technology driven (On-line, ITV, etc.). This activity constitutes in part, a peer review.
- b. Teaching Evaluations: Faculty will be judged against their departmental peers based on college averages.

These additional materials in combination with the teaching portfolio will be used by the department's FEC to establish the merit rating of each faculty member in the area of teaching.

Merit Ratings

5. Merit rating is Exceptional:

The 5 rating carries a demonstrated record of exceptional teaching performance. The 5 rating demonstrates teaching leadership. To be considered for a 5 rating the faculty member would need at least two items from category A, and a combination of other activities from categories B and C. For the 5 rating some substitutability between categories will be allowed.

4. Merit rating is Commendable:

The 4 rating indicates a commendable performance. To be considered for a 4 rating the faculty member would normally need one category A item, and at least a second item from category B and several items from category C. For the 4 rating some substitutability between categories will be allowed.

3. Merit rating is Competent:

The competent faculty member is engaged and active. Evidence supporting a 3 rating implies at least two items from category C or one from B.

2. Merit rating is Development Needed:

The 2 rating indicates nonperformance in the teaching area. Evidence supporting a 2 rating would be a lack of commitment to undertake the above listed activity items. Evidence of negative performance (for example, a failure to meet office hours or poor advising habits) usually accompany the 2 rating.

1. Merit rating is Unsatisfactory:

The 1 rating indicates a sustained disengagement from teaching. Since performance would be consistently below acceptable levels it is presumed that the awarding of a 1 rating would most likely occur only after one or two 2 ratings had been awarded to the faculty member in question. Evidence supporting a 1 rating would be a sustained record of no significant activity as regarding all items in categories A through C, including a persistent record of teaching evaluations near the bottom of the distribution. Clearly the deficiencies mentioned above in the 2 rating will also exist in the 1 rating.

Assessment Measures: Service

“Each full-time faculty member is expected to participate actively in the shared governance structure of the University by serving on departmental, college and university committees and by assuming an appropriate share of the requisite duties.” (FH 2.3.1.3) Service also includes providing expertise to professional organizations within the discipline as well as outside constituencies such as businesses, industries, schools, community organizations and colleagues in other university programs as they contribute both to the University’s missions and the faculty person’s development. The Economics Department at Missouri State expects faculty members to share Departmental work—chiefly by serving on committees at Department, College and University level, contributing to the economics discipline, and using their professional skills to serve one or more constituent groups of the community.

Faculty members should maintain a *portfolio* to document their service accomplishments. The portfolio will include descriptions of activities such as those listed below. These indicators of meritorious teaching activity are divided into three levels in diminishing order of productivity. Indicators in category A are of the highest productivity and count the most toward assessing service for merit pay purposes. Indicators in category B will be of a medium productivity. Indicators in category C will be of the lowest productivity. The category lists below are extensive but not intended to be exhaustive. If the faculty member feels that significant work has been done that is not clearly covered in the below descriptions, that faculty member can and should present his or her case to the FEC. Large numbers of activities in lower categories may increase a faculty member’s overall ranking.

Category A

1. Service as a major officer in a national or state professional organization and/or in a public sector agency.
2. Serving as any faculty senate officer. e.g. Chairperson, Chairperson-Elect, etc.
3. Principal contributor to a major accomplishment of the department, the university, or the community, e.g., being the major organizer of a professional conference.
4. Serving as chair or principal contributor of a major university or college committee.
5. Service to another university as a consultant or as a member of an evaluation team
6. Receipt of a community service award.

Category B

1. Significant contribution to departmental, college, and/or university committees (it is the faculty member’s obligation to provide evidence of this contribution).
2. Active member of major university committee (Graduate Council, College Council, Faculty Senate, Budget and Priorities Committee, etc.).
3. Making a significant contribution in a professional capacity in a community, state or regional activity (may qualify as a Category A at the discretion of the committee).
4. Significant contributions on committees in other MSU departments or units.
5. Providing professional expertise to media including acceptance for publication of an article or book review in the local newspaper.
6. Organizing panels/workshops on topics of national, regional and/or local interest.
7. Making presentations at panels, workshops, schools, community organizations.
8. Advisor to student organizations.
9. Published book reviews.
10. Serving as a session chair at a conference.

Category C

1. Participation in departmental, college and/or university committees appropriate to rank
2. Participation in CHPA events (such as commencement, all-faculty college meetings, sponsored lectures, or symposia).
3. Participation in professional organizations.
4. Giving a presentation to a community organization.
5. Active professional participation in and/or contribution to a campus or community organization or institution.
6. Making a contribution that helps enhance the public affairs mission of the university.
7. Attendance at meetings, conferences, or seminars related to faculty service activities.
8. Developing ancillary course materials for publishers.
9. Reviewing textbooks.
10. Organization of a session at a regional, national, or international convention or conference.
11. Unpaid professional consulting activities (must document nature and extent of activities).

Merit Ratings

The compensation committee will generally use the following criteria for assigning a merit rating to each faculty member for scholarly activity.

5. Merit Rating is Exceptional

Evidence supporting a rating of 5 would include items from Category A and Category B and at least 2 items from Category C including C1.

4. Merit Rating is Commendable

Evidence supporting a rating of 4 would include items from Category B and at least 2 items from Category C including C1.

3. Merit Rating is Competent

Evidence supporting a rating of 3 would include at least 2 items from Category C including C1.

2. Merit Rating is Development Needed

A faculty member will receive a rating of 2 (development needed) if he/she fails to meet the criteria listed for rating 3 above. This ordinarily implies failure to serve competently on committees. Refusal to serve on departmental committees also moves the faculty member towards a 2 rating.

1. Merit Rating is Unsatisfactory

A faculty member will receive a rating of 1 (unsatisfactory) if he/she fails to meet the criteria listed for rating 3 above for two consecutive years and provides minimal evidence of service involvement.