

MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

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

DEPARTMENT: CLSE
COLLEGE: College of Education
SEMESTER/YEAR OF CURRENT REVIEW: Fall/2019
SEMESTER/YEAR OF NEXT REQUIRED REVIEW: Fall/2022

DEPARTMENT ADOPTION SIGNATURES:


Department Personnel Committee Chair Date 1-7-2020


Department Head Date 1/7/2020

APPROVAL SIGNATURES:


Dean Date 1-8-2020


Provost Date 5-26-20

THIS PLAN IS IN EFFECT FROM XXXX, THROUGH XXXX.

**PROMOTION, TENURE, and COMPENSATION PROCEDURES
DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELING, LEADERSHIP, AND SPECIAL EDUCATION
MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY**

Fall 2019 - Spring 2022

The mission of the Counseling, Leadership, and Special Education (CLSE) Department is to be recognized as a high-quality institution in the State of Missouri for the education and training of counselors, educators, administrators, and leaders in a variety of K-12, higher education, and, and special education settings. In light of this mission, all faculty activities that advance these goals form the basis for promotion, tenure, and appointment decisions. In addition, these guidelines, and the mission of CLSE, are consistent with the Public Affairs mission of Missouri State University.

Promotion, tenure, and appointment policies of the CLSE department are designed to be consistent with the MSU *Faculty Handbook* and other University policies. In particular, these include policies on the MSU Faculty Roles and Rewards and on Promotion, Tenure, and Faculty Appointment approved by the administration and by the Faculty Senate. This department's policies are also consistent with those of the College of Education mission to create a "Legacy of Learning." In cases of unforeseen conflict, policies shall have priority in the order listed above, with the MSU *Faculty Handbook* policies followed in all cases.

The guidelines and specific procedures contained herein represent the CLSE department's means for implementation of the evaluation processes set forth in the MSU *Faculty Handbook*, especially Section 4. These guidelines apply across the evaluation areas of tenure, promotion, and annual merit review.

I. DEPARTMENT PROMOTION, TENURE, AND COMPENSATION PROCEDURES

A. Committees and Membership

1. *CLSE Department Personnel Committee (DPC)*. The CLSE Department Personnel Committee (DPC) shall consist of all tenured members of the faculty, regardless of rank, including full-time instructors and clinical faculty with renewable appointments (except for those acting in a university administrative appointment, those who have been officially notified of termination for reasons other than retirement, those who are currently under sanction as defined in the *Faculty Handbook*, and those upon whose applications the committee would be acting). The DPC is the overarching department body related to faculty evaluation.
2. *CLSE Promotion and Tenure Committee (PT)*. The Promotion and Tenure Committee (PT) is comprised of the same individuals as the DPC but serves a more specific purpose and sometimes is a subset depending on which candidate's dossier is being evaluated. Individuals who vote on promotion decisions should be at or above the rank to which the candidate or future candidate aspires. All tenured faculty are expected to vote on the awarding of tenure, but shall abstain from any evaluation that involves a conflict of interest. The PT Committee establishes a Candidate Review Committee (CR) for each pre-tenure or pre-promotion review, preferably before the arrival of the materials for review to the committee. If only for a promotion, the committee may be called the Promotions Committee (PC).
3. *CLSE Compensation Committee (CC)*. A department Compensation Committee (CC) shall be comprised of a four-person panel elected annually from among the DPC, rotating such that no member shall serve for more than three years consecutively. Representatives from the four primary program areas shall be included (i.e., counseling, leadership, special education, and student affairs). The role of the CC is to evaluate, such as in years where merit is to be awarded, every faculty member's annual performance.

4. *CLSE Candidate Review Committee (CR)*. This subcommittee is comprised of approximately three individuals, including a mentor selected by the faculty member to be reviewed, one person from the candidate's discipline and one from outside the discipline within the PT Committee. Additional members are possible for each person being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion if deemed necessary by the PT Committee. This committee shall be charged with conducting an initial review of materials of candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion to assess their scholarship, teaching, and service. It will write an initial review of 1) the alignment of the submitted materials with the guidelines, and 2) the quality of the materials to be provided to the larger PT Committee for their consideration, further review, and voting. If applicable, the selected mentor is encouraged to provide a written descriptive, not evaluative, review within the CR Committee. The CR must complete its review at least one week, preferably 10 days, prior to the date by which the PT's review is due. In situations where the PT and CR Committees are comparable in size, the CR Committee will disband and allow the PT Committee to fulfill its functions.
 5. The precise terms of every appointment, including terms for appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, and annual review shall be stated in the initial appointment contract letter. The conditions of appointment may vary between individuals in the various programs within the CLSE department.
- B. This document is to be reviewed and potentially revised every three years by the faculty in the CLSE department. It may also be amended in the intermediate time. The typical process for these revisions is the formation of a taskforce to consider revisions, including suggestions from any faculty members, the presentation of initial suggestions to the department for feedback, further revisions and presentation of those revisions if necessary, and a vote by the majority of the department faculty. Revisions from the tri-annual review, or amendments, go into effect for the subsequent academic year.
 - C. The guidelines in effect at the time of hire or promotion are those to which the faculty member is to be evaluated unless the faculty member elects to use newer guidelines or the guidelines are older than six years at the time of evaluation. As per the *Faculty Handbook*, the guidelines in effect at the time of hire are to be signed by the faculty member and the Department Head and placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file.
 - D. Both the initial contract with the University and the annual discussions with the Department Head present opportunities for role specialization for each faculty member. Evaluation of a faculty member is to be consistent with the member's role as determined by those factors. Nevertheless, the *MSU Faculty Handbook* clearly requires performance in all of the three traditional areas of teaching, research, and service as a prerequisite to tenure and to promotions. Therefore, roles of those faculty members with an interest in tenure or in promotion must be framed with the Department Head in such a way as to permit demonstration of a high level of performance in all three areas in order to be eligible for consideration for tenure or promotion. Ideally, the decisions regarding individual faculty member role specialization should be discussed among the program area faculty to increase awareness of individual faculty expectations and provide stronger overall support for the entire program.
 - E. Mentoring is an essential component of successful promotion and tenure processes. The CLSE Department Head should assure that all faculty members are engaged in mentoring, either as mentors or mentees, as appropriate to their rank, tenure status, and expertise. The mentor is intended to serve in a non-evaluative, non-advocacy role, but may provide further clarification of committee feedback to the mentee, only upon the request of the mentee and respecting confidentiality of the contributions of individual members of the PT Committee.

II. DEPARTMENT PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESSES

All processes shall follow the schedule of and adhere to the deadlines published in the Calendar for Faculty Evaluation prepared by the Provost's office and distributed before each academic year. The pre-tenure or pre-motion faculty member's application will be presented to the Department Head and then to the chair of the PT Committee, who will help protect the security of the application. The PT Committee will make the original recommendation in all cases involving promotion, tenure, or appointment after initial review by the CR Committee.

A. Schedule for and Procedures of PT Evaluations

1. Every faculty member on probationary or tenure appointment shall be evaluated. Evaluation of probationary appointees shall be conducted early in the second semester of their first year, and toward the end of their third semester, so that there will be a reasonable basis for decisions to reappoint in accordance with the schedule in the MSU and College of Education Policies on Promotion and Tenure and Faculty Evaluation. To clarify, a new tenure track faculty member is evaluated in their second, third, fourth, sixth, eighth, tenth and eleventh semesters (counting fall/spring semesters only) by the PT Committee.
2. Tenured faculty will be evaluated by the Department Head every year after their first tenured appointment, with two reviews occurring within the second year in keeping with the PT Committee's reviews.
3. Below is a table that provides approximate times, procedures and those who are responsible for promotion and tenure procedures. The Office of the Provost provides evaluation calendars, sometimes distinct for different groups of faculty or different elements of evaluation, which should additionally be consulted.

Approximate Time	Procedure	Person or Committee Responsible
Late June	Provide list to Office of the Provost of faculty applying for tenure and/or promotion in the following academic year, including for instructors and clinical faculty.	Dean
Early July	Compile external review materials and provide to Department Head.	Pre-promotion and pre-tenure faculty candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion in the following academic year
Early July	Send external review materials to reviewers who have agreed.	Department Head
Early September	Provide external reviewers letters to Department Head.	External Reviewers
Late September	Submit final dossiers and second year reviews for PT Review to Department Head for review.	Pre-promotion and pre-tenure faculty candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion
Late September	Second year dossiers are submitted to Department Head	Second Year Faculty
Late September	Submit final dossiers and second year reviews to PT Committee (with external letters included, if applicable).	Department Head
Early October	Provide a written evaluative review of final dossiers and second year reviews to PT Committee.	CR Committee

Mid-October	Submit written evaluation of final dossiers and second year reviews to Department Head.	PT Committee
Early November	Provide written evaluation to second year faculty candidates.	Department Head
Early November	Second year faculty candidates have three business days to respond to Department Head's written evaluation.	Pre-promotion and pre-tenure faculty candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion
Mid-November	Provide evaluation to the Dean.	Department Head
Early December	Provide evaluation to candidate.	Dean
Early February	Build Blackboard or other CLSE digital template Annual Report for Department Head.	All faculty members
Early February	Submit dossiers for Annual Review to Department Head.	Pre-promotion and pre-tenure faculty members
Early February	Provide dossiers to the PT Committee.	Department Head
Early February	Designate CR Committee for each pre-promotion and pre-tenure faculty candidate.	PT Committee
Mid-February	Provide the CR Committee with a descriptive review.	Mentor (if applicable)
Mid-February	Write an evaluative review and present it to the PT Committee.	CR Committee
Early March	Provide written evaluative review to the Department Head.	PT Committee
	Faculty candidates have three days to respond with signature to Dean's evaluation.	Pre-promotion and pre-tenure faculty candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion
	Sends evaluation to Office of the Provost with the Provost required materials.	Dean
Mid-March	External reviewers are discussed	Department Head and fifth year faculty
Mid-March	Submit equity adjustment requests to the Dean.	Department Head
Late March	Send personnel action forms for tenure and promotion to Provost's Office.	Dean
Early April	Send written evaluative review to Dean.	Department Head
Mid-April	Present equity adjustment requests to the Provost.	Dean
Late April	Complete written evaluative review. Acquire pre-promotion and pre-tenure faculty candidate's signature.	Dean
Early May	Decide on list of potential reviewers and request participation from reviewers with materials to be sent in early July. Process continues until four reviewers agree.	Pre-promotion and pre-tenure faculty candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion in the following academic year AND Department Head
May	Action on positive Tenure and Promotion recommendations. With negative tenure decisions, the Provost issues a termination notice and a personnel action is created in the subsequent year whereby the Board then acts on the termination.	Board of Governors

B. Promotion and/or Tenure Dossier

Please refer to the Provost’s Website for procedures at time of application. Pre-promotion and/or pre-tenure faculty members initiate this process by submitting a dossier to the Department Head who forwards these materials to the chair of the DPC by a date specified by that committee. The faculty member will assemble a dossier consisting of the items described below, some of which are required by the *Faculty Handbook*. This dossier must be submitted by the due date to the Department Head and cannot be changed once it is submitted, except for additions to the curriculum vita with the approval of the relevant faculty committee prior to the committee’s completion of recommendation, with supporting documentation if requested from the faculty committee. The dossier includes the Provost’s binder, with all of its included materials, plus a second collection of materials in digital form (i.e., Blackboard portfolio) or hard copy (i.e., CLSE binders), which includes:

- A profile consisting of candidate’s current curriculum vitae and a personal summary statement between 2-5 pages describing the faculty member’s research agenda and teaching and service philosophies
- Annual teaching, research/scholarship, and service narratives that include accomplishments, goals, plans, and how feedback from previous years was addressed
- A table summarizing all course evaluation averages by semester
- Matrices for teaching, scholarship/research, and service, which includes the location of relevant evidence
- Evidence/documentation related to teaching, scholarship/research, and service, particularly when not clearly known throughout the program or department
- Summary tables with all past annual and cumulative evaluation ratings of the faculty member by the DPC, Department Head, and Dean (see example below)

Year	Reviewer	Date	Overall Assessment	Teaching	Research	Service
2018	CLSE DPC Committee	2/27/2019	Satisfactory	Satisfactory: Excellent (5)	Satisfactory: Above Expected (4)	Satisfactory: Expected (3)
2018	Department Head	3/1/2019	Satisfactory	Satisfactory: Excellent (5)	Satisfactory: Above Expected (4)	Satisfactory: Expected (3)
2018	Dean	3/5/2019	Satisfactory	Satisfactory: Excellent (5)	Satisfactory: Above Expected (4)	Satisfactory: Expected (3)

- Faculty members being considered for tenure should include all reappointment letters; faculty members being considered for promotion should include all letters of evaluation since their last promotion.
- External review letters (Additional guidelines for external reviewers can be found on the Provost’s website.)
- Departmental guidelines to be used for evaluation, which should be those provided to the faculty member at the time of hire for tenure and initial promotion or newer; those within the last six years or newer for additional appointments.
- In exceptional circumstances, the above documents may be supplemented by other sources of evaluative information offered by the faculty member or requested by the CR or PT Committee.

B. PT Evaluation

After submission of the dossier, the CR Committee will provide a written evaluation as explained above after reviewing the candidate's materials. The PT will use these evaluations to write an evaluative letter. The Department Head shall not be a participant in the voting or deliberations of the departmental committees.

The written recommendations for promotion or tenure from the PT Committee will include the following data and information:

- Reference to the documents and other data used as the basis for the PT recommendation;
- An evaluation of the effectiveness of the faculty member on each of the evaluative criterion areas (i.e., teaching, research, and service), and an evaluation summary;
- Specific feedback and recommendations for growth and development within the next review year and/or within the time period before a final tenure or promotion review;
- Signatures of faculty eligible to vote who support the recommendation*;

*The PT Committee will work to include the variety of perceptions of the individuals on the committee and their substantiation based on the evidence provided and criteria used. Though the goal of the PT Committee is to include the diversity of perspectives, a minority may file a report, signed by each member of the minority, which will be forwarded with the majority recommendation, if a viewpoint is not adequately represented in the view of the minority.

The schedule of evaluations, disposition of written PT recommendations, and the procedures for appeal of PT recommendations follow the procedures approved for the College of Education and the University at large. Data and evidence submitted for merit/market compensation purposes may be used as the basis for PT evaluative processes as well.

C. Disposition of PT Evaluations

The written PT evaluation will be copied and distributed as follows:

- Original to Department Head for departmental file (PT Committee responsibility)
- Copy to Dean's Office (distributed by the Department Head)
- Copy to faculty member being evaluated (distributed by the Department Head)

(As per the *Faculty Handbook*) The PT Committee will make the initial recommendation and forward the recommendation for a one-year reappointment, or for non-reappointment, with the dossier of materials to the Department Head, who will then add his or her recommendation and forward both recommendations and the dossier to the Dean. The Dean will make his or her recommendation for annual appointment and notify the Provost of all reappointments and non-reappointments. The Provost may elect to review any annual appointment recommendation. Copies of all three recommendations shall be provided to the candidate. For the purpose of acknowledging that they have been received, the candidate must undersign the recommendations from the committee, the Head/Director, and the Dean before they are forwarded. Signing the recommendation does not imply that the candidate endorses all that is stated therein. The candidate may append a response before the recommendation is forwarded (this response will remain attached throughout the recommendation process).

D. Appeals of PT Recommendations

Appeals based on denial or granting of promotion, tenure, or reappointment shall be filed with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, and shall proceed to the Provost's Committee on Tenure and Promotion (PCTP). No finding of a prima facie case by the Associate Provost of Faculty Affairs is required. A PCTP appeal may be filed to challenge the denial of reappointment, tenure, or promotion substantially affected by:

- Failure to use the appropriate criteria in effect for evaluation of tenure and promotion for that faculty member, or
- Failure to consider the substantive merits of applicant's performance, and fulfillment of appropriate University expectations, or
- Substantial failure to follow *Faculty Handbook* procedures, or
- Failure to provide timely notice for non-reappointment of probationary faculty as defined in the *Faculty Handbook*, or
- Arbitrary and capricious failure to evaluate the faculty member in a fair manner and by comparable standards used to evaluate other faculty members being considered for reappointment, tenure or the same rank promotion, or
- Denial of reappointment, tenure or promotion based on gender or other protected status, or
- Retaliation for exercising academic freedom of speech or political speech/affiliation.

E. Responsibility

The Department Head has the ultimate responsibility for ensuring that the PT evaluations are conducted in accordance with approved university, college, and department procedures.

F. Schedule for Notification of Appointment/Non-Reappointment

[*Faculty Handbook*] The schedule of annual appointments for probationary faculty is in accordance with the AAUP “Standards for Notice of Non-reappointment.”

- First-year faculty: continuation of appointment to a second year or notified of non-reappointment by March 1 of the first year.
- Second-year faculty: continuation of appointment to a third year or notified of non-reappointment by December 15 of the second year of service.
- Third-year faculty: continuation of appointment to a fourth year or notified of non-reappointment 12 months before expiration of the appointment.
- Fourth-year faculty: continuation of appointment to a fifth year or notified of non-reappointment 12 months before expiration of the appointment.
- Fifth-year faculty: continuation of appointment to a sixth year or notified of non-reappointment 12 months before expiration of the appointment.
- Sixth-year faculty: tenured or notified of non-reappointment 12 months before expiration of appointment.

G. Exceptional Record of Accomplishment

As per the *Faculty Handbook*, individuals with exceptional records of accomplishments may apply for tenure in their fourth or fifth year (as adjusted for credit granted toward tenure upon hire). The earliest any Assistant Professor may apply for tenure is during the third year of probationary status, regardless of the number of years granted toward tenure at the time of hiring. As per the *Faculty Handbook*, candidates who apply early for tenure may reapply up to and including the final year they are eligible to apply. Exceptional records of accomplishment are defined as performance that significantly exceeds the normal expectations for tenure or promotion. An example of an exceptional record of accomplishment must include outstanding teaching and research, such as performing in the Excellent category in these areas for at least three years at a level substantially above the minimum for the Excellent rating.

III. TENURE-TRACK ACADEMIC POSITIONS

[As per the *Faculty Handbook*] Persons who hold tenure-track positions are in the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, (Full) Professor, or Distinguished Professor. These ranks are defined below.

Assistant Professor

A faculty member in the academic rank of Assistant Professor is one who has demonstrated achievement or potential in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service appropriate to their discipline.

Associate Professor

A faculty member in the academic rank of Associate Professor is one who has demonstrated a sustained record of achievement and effectiveness in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service appropriate to their discipline.

(Full) Professor

A faculty member in the academic rank of (Full) Professor is one who has demonstrated a sustained record of achievement and effectiveness in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service appropriate to their discipline and is recognized as a leader with a cumulative record in these same three areas.

Distinguished Professor

A faculty member in the academic rank of distinguished professor is one who has demonstrated a sustained record of achievement and effectiveness in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service (appropriate to their discipline) and is recognized as a leader with a cumulative record in these same three areas. In addition, as this is a rank beyond Professor, the distinguished professor has demonstrated extraordinary accomplishment in Research.

IV. GUIDELINES FOR TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE: TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

A. Teaching

Teaching is defined as course instruction that is conducted under the auspices of MSU. It includes on- campus and off-campus teaching; research advisement in which instruction is the primary objective (directing Seminar projects, membership on CLSE student committees); dissertation committees; preparation of course materials; development of new courses and online courses, procurement and preparation of class and laboratory equipment and supplies; program coordination, advisement, paper or project grading and supervision of practice, fieldwork, and internship experiences.

Quality teaching is characterized by student achievement of course or field placement objectives, mentoring students in research, attention to holistic student development, scholarship of teaching and learning, attentive advising, curricular and co-curricular materials, and fostering high impact student engagement and learning experiences.

1. Minimum Levels of Performance for Consideration for Tenure and Promotions

Expected Performance—The minimum required to be considered for Tenure is achieved by:

- Meeting all *Faculty Handbook* teaching responsibility criteria of developing educated persons.
- Providing evidence of effective teaching which includes examples of competence and individual student growth in courses.

- Student evaluation ratings (on a 5-pt. scale; 3.01-3.5 where 5 is the highest) (A candidate may rebut this presumption of unacceptability based on average evaluation, improvements in evaluations, or other facts and/or circumstances particular to his or her teaching experience beyond student evaluations.)

Above Expected Performance—The minimum required to be considered for promotion to Associate is achieved through sustained performance in teaching, as evidenced by documentation of:

- Achieving student evaluations >3.51 on a 5-pt scale, where 5 is highest); and exceeding expected performance in at least three ways, including, but not limited to, the following:
- Peer-reviewed publications/ presentations in scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL)
- Chairing substantial new program and/or course development activity for their discipline or closely related disciplines in which they teach
- Multiple mentored student research projects, especially beyond course load
- Awards or recognition of extraordinary individual student or student organization advisement
- Coordination of academic program(s)
- Being the primary author on a CAEP or SPA accreditation, or CAS self-study
- Demonstration of students' successful completion of course objectives
- Documented leadership of substantial revisions to or innovations of curricular and/or co-curricular activities
- Fostering high impact student engagement and learning experiences, such as study away or service-learning, cultural competence experiences with diverse populations, or ethical leadership
- Efforts to increase recruitment, accessibility, retention and graduation beyond course assignments
- Completion of specialized training for teaching (e.g., NISL)
- Assessment of teaching (e.g., peer-review of teaching, specialized assessments), including positive outcomes or improvements resulting from those assessments

Excellent Performance—The minimum required to be considered for promotion to Full or Distinguished Full is achieved through leadership in teaching, as evidenced by documentation of:

- Achieving high student evaluations > 4.00 on a 5-pt scale, where 5 is highest); and
- Meeting above expected performance in at least five ways, including, but not limited to those listed above. Additional ways are allowed if similar in significance.

2. Evidence of High-Quality Teaching

Student evaluations are a required artifact that should be included in candidates' portfolios. If not broadly known within the department or program or not sufficiently documented in the vita, candidates may provide specific evidence/documentation for Expected, Above Expected, and Excellent performance. Evidence is not limited to but might include artifacts to substantiate any of the ways above.

B. Scholarship

Scholarship is defined as research, inquiry, and investigation in the fields appropriate to each program within the CLSE department and/or publicly engaged scholarship. The CR and PT Committees evaluate candidates' quantity of research in addition to alignment with the quantitative criteria explained in more detail below.

1. Five Specific Modes of Research

- Discovery: gaining knowledge of or ascertaining the existence of something previously unknown or unrecognized
- Application: using established knowledge to solve significant problems
- Synthesis: bringing knowledge together from disparate sources to produce a whole work that is greater than the sum of its parts
- Criticism: using established values (aesthetic, logical, ethical) to evaluate quality of artifacts (e.g., art, legal decisions, news media, etc.)
- Creation: producing unique forms of expression, generating new interpretations, theory-building, and model-building.

2. Using Scientific Principles for Community Engagement and Publicly Engaged Scholarship

Researchers and graduate programs in social science and education fields typically employ qualitative, quantitative and/or mixed methodologies that help advance and mature a field in relation to other domains and lend credibility for advocacy, prediction and planning, and sound policy making. Faculty in the academy “recognize the importance of scientific principles in the generation of sound public policy,” as a goal of community engagement as a part of the public affairs mission of Missouri State University.

The CLSE department recognizes the value of engaged public research and its central role within the university’s Public Affairs mission. According to the *Faculty Handbook*, public engaged research is subject to critical, academic peer-review and “encompasses different forms of constructing knowledge about, for, and with diverse publics and communities. Through a coherent, purposeful sequence of activities, it contributes to the public good and yields outcomes of public and intellectual value [and] should involve a partnership with the public and/or private sector that enriches knowledge, addresses and helps solve critical societal issues, and contributes to the public good.”

3. Quality of Scholarly Research

In keeping with the mission of the department, the CR and PT Committees evaluate the quality of scholarly research. Evidence of quality rests first upon peer-review, and second upon influence. Peer-review provides a basis for critique, improvement, refinement, and integration within the body of knowledge of a discipline. The CR and PT Committees are part of the peer-review process. Second, quality research may be observed by its influence in a field through dissemination and impact in the form of the distribution of publications, the venue of presentation, citation by other scientists, and adoption by practitioners. To be successful as a researcher, one needs to not only be influenced by but influence other researchers.

A high-quality journal article demonstrates blind peer-review typically by three reviewers, often involving multiple revisions and resubmissions and additional reviewers. It also typically involves influence through a broad distribution or dissemination to established and/or up and coming scholars in a field who are conducting a higher caliber and frequency of scholarship in a domain. Such articles typically achieve multiple citations and affect the ongoing formation of a knowledge through an iterative process. High-quality journals tend to be associated with national associations in a field (or related fields), have established impact factors or other bibliometrics, lower acceptance rates, and are cited frequently within a field. Lower level journals may still provide peer-review and can offer influence potential within a niche audience, which in turn can lead to larger influence over time in a broader context. In addition to looking at individual works of

scholarship, the CR and PT Committees endeavor to review and offer suggestions and/or support for the overall development of the scholar themselves. Faculty are discouraged from involvement with so called predatory open-access, pay to publish, write-only, or deceptive publishing (such as those in Beall's List), which typically will not count towards tenure and promotion.

Books and funded grants represent additional means of peer-reviewed and influential scholarship. Book publishers and grant organizations carry various status levels and influence within a field. Grants likewise have dollar amounts, which again can serve as one proxy for influence and help bridge the silos of the academy with humanity at large. Book chapters and national association presentations provide other forms of quality scholarship that tend to involve less peer-review (often editorial or peer acceptance) or influence, but provide important developmental, creative, and specific application outlets for scholarship that often proceed or move alongside larger or more refined works characterized by greater peer-review and influence.

4. Research Agendas, Research Breadth, and Interdisciplinary Work

A research agenda may provide clear lens through which to consider new ideas, boundaries to make decisions in one's research life, communication of one's work to other scholars through shared language, and the development of one or more specific forms of expertise. Without a research agenda, a faculty member may be a learned person, but not an expert or have a consistent means to articulate and advance a particular field of study. Similarly, without a research agenda, one does not develop the skills, network, and leadership to become a well-respected member of the larger academic community. Therefore, a research agenda is encouraged for depth, expertise, influence, and efficiency, but some degree of breadth and interdisciplinary research is also encouraged for flexibility in mentoring, teaching, and serving the broader community. The research agenda includes purpose, mission, and description of domain of focus and can be fluid as the candidate evolves throughout their career."

5. Authorship Order, Collaboration and Contribution

Sole or first authorship is a status valued in academia because it shows a level of expertise throughout the conceptualization, data gathering, analysis, writing, leading, and refining process that are necessary for high level scholarship. Collaborative work shows the presence of cooperation and internal peer-review that provides the basis for all shared human endeavors. As such both, ideally with some evidence of both, are valued at Missouri State University. When working in collaboration with others, as a first or subsequent author, or even as a sole author with student or community support, candidates are encouraged to be transparent about the relative contributions in the tasks of research completion of the various parties involved.

6. Works in Press

For annual review purposes, manuscripts which have been accepted by an editor and are considered "in press" may be counted in the category in which they would occur if they were fully published and the faculty member in so listing a work is committing themselves to make whatever final steps are necessary (e.g., reviewing a proof, signing a copyright contract, etc.) to assure the work does come to publication. If the faculty member did not complete the work to publication or the publication did not come out as projected, based not upon the contributions of the faculty member but upon the editors or publisher's issues, that work cannot be considered for summative purposes, such as a promotion or tenure. If the committee has every indication that an in press work is

neering publication, then it can be counted, but the committee needs to consider in press works in light of the definition of an Associate Professor, as a rank conveying sustained success in research. For example, a faculty member has obtained a letter from the editor of a national peer-reviewed journal stating that their manuscript has been accepted for publication would qualify as “in press” and therefore be counted as a Category A product upon annual review. However, a faculty member may not count the same work as more than one product in evaluations that are to summarize more than one year’s contributions. For example, in a three-year, tenure, or promotion review, a product may be counted only once even though it may have been counted in two successive years (the first as in press and the second as published). An assistant professor who has all or several of their works in press at the time of review for promotion would not have evidenced the same sustained success as one who had a publication each year.

7. Minimum Levels of Performance for Consideration for Tenure and Promotions

Expected Performance—The Minimum required to be considered for Tenure (since coming to Missouri State University or with credit granted toward tenure when hired) is success in scholarship, as evidenced by:

- A minimum of SIX products from Category C or higher; with
- At least TWO products within the candidate’s articulated research agenda; and
- THREE from Category A or higher, with at least ONE product from Category A+.

Above Expected Performance— The Minimum required to be considered for promotion to Associate (since coming to Missouri State University or with credit granted toward tenure when hired) is success in scholarship, as evidenced by:

- A minimum of SEVEN products from Category C or higher; with:
- At least FOUR products from Category A or higher, including at least TWO products from Category A+; and
- At least FIVE products from Category B or higher, including ONE as sole or first author and ONE that is multi-authored, and at least THREE within the candidate’s articulated research agenda.

Excellent Performance— The minimum required to be considered for promotion to Full (since promotion to Associate) is success in scholarship, as evidenced by:

- A minimum of SEVEN products from Category C or higher; with:
- At least THREE products from Category A+; and
- At least FIVE products from Category B or higher, including TWO as sole or first author and at least THREE within the candidate’s articulated research agenda.

A minimum of FOURTEEN products across the cumulative record, SEVEN from Category A or higher, NINE from Category B or higher (including TWO as sole or first author and TWO that are multi-authored), and at least SIX within the candidate’s articulated research agenda.

Extraordinary Performance— The minimum required to be considered for promotion to Distinguished Full (since promotion to Full) is **an extensive record of scholarship at this or another institution**, as evidenced by:

- A minimum of EIGHTEEN products from Category C or higher, with:
- At least NINE products from Category A+; and
- At least TWELVE products from Category B or higher, including FIVE as sole or first author.

A minimum of THIRTY-TWO products across the cumulative record, SIXTEEN from Category A or higher, TWENTY from Category B or higher (including SEVEN as sole or first author and FOUR that are multi-authored), and at least FOURTEEN within the candidate's articulated research agenda.

In addition, the candidate must have **original work refereed by credible sources in leading publications/venues at the international/national level** including:

- Scholarly/research articles published in international/national peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media
- Author or editor of scholarly book(s).
- External grant(s) that have been funded (typically >\$50,000)

Candidates must also document scholarship quality which includes a collection (two or more) of the following:

- Awards and distinctions
- Bibliometrics of influence, such as:
 - Published journal or book publisher rankings
 - Acceptance rates
 - Impact factors
 - Citation indexes
- Critical reviews of the candidate's work by other expert scholars
- Evidence of leadership roles in national/international organizations relative to the area of candidates' expertise or pursuant to their accomplishments

8. Categories of Scholarly Work

CATEGORY "A+" works are high-quality scholarly products and have had an impact on the discipline. The candidate documents the significance of their contribution if not sole authored.

- Scholarly/research articles published in international/national peer-reviewed journals
- External grants that have been funded (typically >\$50,000)
- Author or editor of scholarly books with publishers that employ peer-review, not self-publishing

CATEGORY "A" works represent substantial scholarly contribution. The candidate documents the significance of their contribution if not sole authored.

- External grant applications that have not been funded that show significant candidate effort (typically >\$50,000) (Substantially similar grant applications will only be considered as one product.)
- Author or editor of full-length book chapters, monographs, encyclopedia entries, or anthologies

CATEGORY "B+" works represent the potential for higher level scholarship and/or have influence without substantial enduring impact on their own. The candidate documents the significance of their contribution if not sole authored.

- Scholarly peer-reviewed conference presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s) at international or national conferences

- External grants that have been funded (typically >\$10,000)
- Books or book chapters that did not employ peer-review
- National or international awards for research

CATEGORY “B” works represent an academic work with either a full length scope and a lesser degree of peer-review and/or substantial influence with less substantial evidence of a product. The candidate documents the significance of their contribution if not sole authored.

- Scholarly/research articles published in regional or state peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media
- Scholarly peer-reviewed conference presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s) at regional or state conferences
- Articles published in major national discipline-based, print-based or electronic media that are not peer-reviewed
- External grant applications that have not been funded that show significant candidate effort (typically >\$10,000) (Substantially similar grant applications will only be considered as one product.)
- Faculty or student research mentored by faculty members published in state/regional peer-reviewed venues
- Authoring university accreditation or other university self-studies that require substantial faculty effort
- Primary author, editor, project manager or production specialist of published major educational curriculum material including electronic media

CATEGORY “C” works represent the potential for future peer-reviewed, influential scholarship.

- Local/university grants or research contracts that have been funded (typically <\$10,000)
- State and local peer-reviewed conference presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s)
- Submissions for publication under peer-review and/or revision after peer-review that have not been accepted for publication and not been counted in previous years
- Scholarly, creative work(s), publications, and/or electronic presentation(s) other than electronic media as described above
- Manuscripts under preparation
- Student/faculty collaborative research project(s) outside course assignments
- Local honors or awards for research
- Approved IRB applications for research not counted as other product
- Other, as judged by faculty

9. Balancing Quantity and Quality Within Categories

The above guidelines are meant to convey the minimum levels necessary if all works were high-quality within their designated category. If works are of lower quality, then a higher quantity of work through success in more modest works is necessary. Likewise, the committee may consider abundant quantity at the next level lower as potentially satisfying a higher level when it is clear the faculty member is highly engaged and striving for research productivity and development.

10. Evidence of High-Quality Scholarship/Research

Works counting in Categories A+ or A must have an artifact, and the level of contribution explained if not sole authored. If not broadly known within the department or program or not sufficiently documented in the vita, candidates may provide specific further evidence/

documentation for any of the categories of scholarship. Evidence is not limited to, but might include the following types of artifacts:

- Published pdfs, proofs, or links to written scholarly works or descriptions of works online
- Conference programs for presentations
- Manuscripts for works under review, revisions, or preparation
- Grant or contract award letters or reports generated from grants or contracts
- Evidence of scholarly footprint from EBSCO, Research Gate Google Scholar, or other sources on the quality of journal or publisher

C. **Service**

Service includes university (program, department, college, university-wide) and non-university related professional service such as consulting and advocating with community agency and state offices, participation in professional association leadership, or being an editorial reviewer or editor. This category also includes unpaid service to the community. University service includes department, college and university committee work; duties of departmental administrative appointments; and membership on special committees and bodies such as the Graduate Council, the Faculty Senate, or the Institutional Review Board. University Service also includes the advisement of student organizations.

As per the *Faculty Handbook*, University Citizenship is of paramount importance. Any faculty member, in order to succeed in the area of service at Missouri State University, must succeed in University Citizenship. Success in Professional Service and/or Public Service and Consultation is required for tenure and for promotion to Associate Professor. Sustained success in one or more areas is required for promotion to Full Professor. Attained success in service is indicated by active participation; sustained success is defined as active participation in three or more years of a service area (Professional Service, Public Service, and Professional Consultation).

Demonstrated success, synonymous with attained success, is defined as participating in service process (e.g., attending committee meetings), evidencing contributions (e.g., specifying what was value added to their participation as opposed to anyone's participation), and having tangible outcomes (e.g., products, incremental progress, solutions emerging from the committee) that show service is not just listed but was successful. For university service, the expectation is for two or more defined activities per year, such as service on two or more committees, or equivalent. An example equivalent activity is regular participation in recruitment activities or advising a student organization. Attained service goes beyond basic participation at the programmatic or department level expected of all faculty, such as assisting with interviews, comprehensive exams, department meetings, or other regular duties necessary for the functioning of a program or department. Attained, or demonstrated success generally refers to an expectation of two committees (or equivalent) per year in addition to four domains in university and two activities per year in one domain outside the university. Committee equivalents include activities such as student organization advising (typically at the university level) or three or more recruitment events in an evaluation year. Other equivalencies may be suggested by the candidate.

Sustained success is defined as maintaining service success in one or more domains across a period of 3 or more years, typically accompanied by leadership and/or documented, enduring accomplishments. This does not necessarily mean service on one committee for 3 years or as a student advisor for 3 years, but does involve evidence of an ongoing strand of contribution, such as within curricular processes, mentoring, consistent reviewing activities within a sub-field or an enduring contribution to university-community partnerships or diversity-related activities.

1. **Minimum Levels of Performance for Consideration for Tenure and Promotions**

Expected Performance—The minimum required to be considered for Tenure includes:

- Demonstrated success in University Citizenship as evidenced by contributing fairly to the task of shared governance at three or more levels (program, department, college, or university) with an average at or above two committees or equivalent per year, and
- Attained success in one or more additional areas, i.e., Professional Service, Public Service and Consultation.

Above Expected Performance—The minimum required to be considered for promotion to Associate extends beyond expected performance to include:

- Demonstrated success in University Citizenship as evidenced by contributing fairly to the task of shared governance at all levels (program, department, college, or university) with with typically two to three committees or equivalent per year, and
- Attained success in one or more areas, i.e., Professional Service, Public Service and Consultation.

Excellent Performance—The minimum required to be considered for promotion to Full or Distinguished Full] extends beyond expected performance to include:

- Demonstrated success in University Citizenship as evidenced by contributing fairly to the task of shared governance at all levels (program, department, college, or university) with with typically three to four committees or equivalent per year,
- Recognition as a leader with a both a sustained and broad cumulative record in service to the university, and
- **Sustained** success in one or more areas outside the university, i.e., Professional Service, Public Service and Consultation.

Service Area	Examples of Service Activities
<p>1. University Citizenship: serving the University organization and contributing fairly to the task of shared-governance by taking a turn and serving on various service activities, by volunteering, or being appointed to serve.</p>	<p>-Program service (e.g., participation on curriculum revision committee; chair or member of program advisory board; chair or member of accreditation committee; academic adviser at undergraduate or graduate level; faculty search chair committee member; thesis chair or thesis committee member, program coordination duties beyond teaching, recruitment activities);</p> <p>-Departmental service (e.g., departmental policy revision committee; space utilization committee; faculty search committee member; department Library representative, recruitment activities);</p> <p>-College service (e.g., member of Dean’s faculty advisory committee; chair or member of COE Graduate Program Committee; member of CAEP accreditation committee; faculty, administrator, or staff search committee member)</p> <p>-University service (e.g., chair or member of University committees such as Graduate Council, Library Advisory Committee, University Assessment Committee; administrator or staff search committee member)</p> <p>-Additional service activities (e.g., task force chair or committee member; providing professional development activities; participating in campus discussions, and expanding opportunities for shaping the learning environment); or other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.</p>
<p>2. Professional Service: contributing to professional organizations within the</p>	<p>-Chairing or serving as a board member or officer of a professional organization at the local, state, national, and/or international levels;</p> <p>-Serving as an editor or member of an editorial board of a professional journal at the state, national, and/or international levels;</p>

Service Area	Examples of Service Activities
faculty member's field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Serving as a reviewer or guest reviewer for a professional journal at the state, national, and/or international levels; -Sponsoring an active student organization; -Providing mentoring or advising to individuals who are not current students; -Providing opportunities for student experiences outside the expectations of teaching - Engaging in development/renewal (e.g., appropriate professional meetings, conventions, workshops, seminars) - Engaging in service and advocacy (e.g., program presentations, workshops, consultations, speeches, direct service) - Other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.
3. Public Service and Consultation: serving community, state, national or international public constituents with expertise or advocacy consistent with the goals of public affairs mission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Writing op-eds or other articles in newspapers or other print media or on television or radio, etc. -Providing presentations to support individuals and groups of individuals in local communities, states, the nation, and other countries -Volunteering for local, community, state, national, and international organizations -Advocating with vulnerable populations, consistent with the professional discipline or the public affairs mission. -Providing professional expertise to business, industry, schools, community organizations, and colleagues in other university programs through collaborative projects, presentations, or specific consultations -Providing consultation services to external constituents within the faculty member's professional expertise - Other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.

2. Evidence of High-Quality Service

If not broadly known within the department or program or not sufficiently documented in the vita, candidates may provide specific further evidence/ documentation for Expected, Above Expected, and Excellent performance. Evidence is not limited to but might include:

- Professional association, non-profit, or public documents showing leadership or contribution in service
- University documents showing tangible outcomes of service if demonstrating leadership or contribution

D. Understanding the Role of Final Cumulative (Summative), Annual Cumulative (Formative), and Annual Performance (Annual) Reviews

All faculty members receive an annual performance review (annual review) along the five categories of unsatisfactory, progressing, expected, above expected, or excellent. For pre-tenure faculty, these come from both the PT committee and the Department Head. For all other full-time faculty, the review comes only from the Department Head, unless merit pay is operative, in which case a CC committee provides an annual performance review for each faculty member, including the pre-tenure faculty. Criteria tables for these annual reviews are provided on page 35. For pre-tenure faculty, the PT Committee also provides a cumulative annual review for formative purposes. Benchmarks for these cumulative reviews are provided below. At that time the PT

Committee also votes on reappointment for each faculty member. The PT Committee may not vote reappointment for any faculty member receiving a majority of votes for unsatisfactory in 2 or more categories, but may vote for reappointment with any other majority vote outcomes. The final cumulative review for summative purposes to determine the tenure and promotion decision occurs only at the final review, which will include consideration of feedback from external reviewers.

E. Cumulative Review Expectations for Satisfactory Ratings for Pre-Tenure Faculty

The guidelines offer minimums for satisfactory ratings and assumes high-quality. Lower quality work should be accompanied by higher quantity, following the guidelines on quality and how to substitute quantity for quality. A questionable rating is warranted when a candidate is close to meeting the minimums. An unsatisfactory rating is warranted when a candidate is not near the minimums. Years granted toward tenure and/or promotion will count at the beginning, meaning that someone entering with two years granted will have their first review in “Year 3” and would be subject to the Year 3 guidelines for satisfactory rating, which may include scholarly products in the previous two years if intended by letter of hire. The following serves as a guide for candidates and the faculty who evaluate them on expected progress toward tenure and promotion to associate professor.

Year 1 review (after first semester) (Minimum Annual Review of Progressing)

- Teaching: Teaching evaluations 3.5 or higher. 1 or more ways
- Service: Service on 1 committee or equivalent, 1 activity outside university
- Research: 2 or more at C or higher, articulated research agenda with 1+ in agenda

Year 1.5 review (after second semester in fall per AAUP) (Minimum Annual Review of Progressing)

- Teaching evaluations 3.5 or higher, 2 or more ways
- Service on 2 committees or equivalent each year, 2 activities outside university each year (2 levels of university citizenship)
- Research: 3 or more at C or higher, 1 or more at B or higher, articulated research agenda with 2+ in agenda

Year 2 review (after third semester) (Minimum Annual Review of Progressing and Above Expected or two years of Expected)

- Teaching evaluations 3.75 or higher. 2 or more ways
- Service (see Year 1.5 review) (2 levels of university citizenship)
- Research: 4 or more at C or higher, 3 or more at B or higher, 2 or more at B+ or higher, 1 or more at A or higher, articulated research agenda with 2+ in agenda

Year 3 review (Minimum Annual Review of Progressing, Above Expected, and Excellent, or Expected, Expected, and Excellent)

- Teaching evaluations 4.0 or higher. 3 or more ways
- Service (see Year 1.5 review) (3 levels of university citizenship)
- Research: 5 or more at C or higher, 3 or more at B or higher, 2 or more at B+ or higher, 1 or more at A+, articulated research agenda with 3+ in agenda

Year 4 review (Minimum Annual Review of Expected, Expected, and Excellent in three of 4 separate years)

- Teaching evaluations 4.0 or higher. 4 or more ways
- Service (see Year 1.5 review) (4 levels of university citizenship)

- Research: 6 or more at C or higher, 4 or more at B or higher, 3 or more at B+ or higher, 2 or more at A or better, 1 or more at A+ or better, articulated research agenda with 3+ in agenda

Year 5 review (Minimum Annual Review of Expected, Above Expected and Excellent in three separate years)

- Teaching evaluations 4.0 or higher. 5 or more ways
- Service (see Year 1.5 review) (4 levels of university citizenship)
- Research: 7 or more at C or higher, 5 or more at B or higher, 4 or more at B+ or higher, 3 or more at A or better, 2 or more at A+ or better, articulated research agenda with 3+ in agenda

V. NON-TENURE-TRACK ACADEMIC POSITIONS

[As per the *Faculty Handbook*] Persons who hold non-tenure-track positions are given term appointments which automatically terminate upon the expiration of the specified term. Non-tenure track appointments may be given annual or multi-year contracts as determined by the program/department with approval of the Dean and the Provost. No notice of non-reappointment is given, and reemployment of the employee after the conclusion of the contractual term is solely within the discretion of the University. Non-tenure track faculty members are not eligible for tenure, educational leave, or sabbatical leave. With the exception of visiting Professors, time spent in a non-tenure track position does not count towards tenure eligibility if the individual later applies for and is appointed to a tenure-track faculty position. Non-tenure track faculty must be qualified by academic or practical experiences appropriate for the responsibilities assigned. A Master's degree or higher is preferred. All non-tenure track academic positions have the same right to academic freedom accorded tenure-track faculty.

Instructor

As per the *Faculty Handbook*, an Instructor is normally appointed to teach full-time and to provide appropriate service and may participate in research or creative activities. An Instructor may be appointed to an annual or to a multi-year term of up to five years. Contingent upon satisfactory performance reviews, educational needs and continued funding, the Instructor appointment is renewable without constraint of term limits. Instructors shall have earned a terminal degree or possess the degree required for teaching in specific disciplines, have potential or demonstrated teaching ability, and a willingness to serve the academic unit, college, and University. If an Instructor applies for and is appointed to a tenure-track position, the time spent as Instructor at Missouri State University will not count toward the probationary period for tenure and promotion. Instructors on 9-month contracts will receive salary compensation and benefits for 12 months.

[from COE Task Force, 2015] Section 3.5.1 (p. 22) of the Faculty Handbook provides the University's definition of Instructor. The primary responsibility of an instructor in the College of Education is to teach, which typically involves teaching classes, including any activity described as teaching in departmental, college, or university guidelines. Secondly an instructor provides service that is negotiated with the Department Head or specified in the departmental criteria. Service may include university citizenship or professional and community service relevant to an instructor's discipline or assignment. Typically, programmatic or departmental service is encouraged or expected. An instructor may conduct or participate in research or scholarly activity as part of their load, as negotiated with the Department Head or as specified in the departmental criteria. However, the primary focus for an instructor remains on teaching and includes service as described above. An instructor who is a full-time faculty member may be promotable to senior instructor with further development and contributions as defined in departmental criteria. An instructor at Greenwood Lab School is eligible for tenure within Greenwood (as explained in section 3.3 of the Faculty Handbook) with eligibility requirements for promotion currently being developed.

Senior Instructor

As per the *Faculty Handbook*, an Instructor who has demonstrated excellence in teaching and service at Missouri State University for at least five years (not necessarily consecutive) 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. A Senior Instructor shall be appointed to a specific term not to exceed five years and may be reappointed to one or more additional terms, contingent upon satisfactory performance reviews, educational needs and continued funding. If a Senior Instructor applies for and is appointed to a tenure-track faculty position, the time spent as Senior Instructor at Missouri State University will not count toward the probationary period for tenure and promotion. Senior Instructors on 9-month appointments will receive benefits for 12-months.

Clinical Faculty

As per the *Faculty Handbook*, Clinical Faculty are members of the faculty whose primary responsibilities are clinical education and service. Clinical Faculty may participate in research and other scholarly or creative activities. Clinical Faculty must be qualified as defined by professional/discipline standards, have practical experience appropriate for the responsibilities assigned and must maintain appropriate professional credentials. Appointment is to the rank of Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, or Clinical Professor. Departments desiring to appoint Clinical Faculty shall develop appropriate appointment, promotion and performance review criteria for each rank, which must be approved by the Dean of the College and the Provost. Clinical Faculty may be appointed to a specific term not to exceed five years and may be reappointed to one or more additional terms, contingent upon satisfactory performance reviews, educational needs of the department, and continued funding. Clinical Faculty are not eligible for tenure but have the same right to academic freedom accorded tenure track faculty. A Clinical Faculty member wishing to move to a tenure-track regular faculty position must apply for a vacant position for which recruitment has been authorized. If a Clinical Faculty member applies for and is appointed to a tenure-track faculty position, the time spent as a Clinical Faculty member at Missouri State University will not count toward the probationary period for tenure and promotion. Clinical Faculty members may be appointed to 9-month or 12-month contracts. Clinical Faculty on 9-month contracts will receive salary compensation and benefits for 12 months.

[from COE Task Force, 2015] Section 3.5.11 of the Faculty Handbook provides the University's definition of Clinical Faculty. The primary responsibilities of a clinical faculty member in the College of Education are both clinical education and service. Clinical education encompasses applied educational experiences, including the supervision of field placement such as student teaching, practica, internship, or other direct involvement in the application of learning within an applied setting such as a school, clinic, hospital, non-profit agency, or other similar venue. Primary means that not less than 50% of the load of a clinical faculty member must involve this type of education. Likewise, a clinical faculty member must conduct service in an applied capacity. This service must be beyond the teaching responsibilities (e.g., beyond teaching classes or beyond supervising teachers, counselors, family life or child life specialists, administrators, diagnosticians, or others that comprise the teaching load) and must involve an agency or organization beyond the university classroom (e.g., school, clinic, hospital, non-profit agency, professional organization). Crucial to clinical faculty is their expertise in the applied setting in which they are providing educational and service functions, including experience, licensure, certification, or other credentialing as appropriate. Clinical faculty conduct or participate in research and have educational attainment and leadership responsibilities consistent with their rank, preferably involving the applied field for which they are employed. Clinical faculty may be at the rank of clinical instructor, clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, or clinical professor, and they are eligible for promotion according to departmental guidelines, but not for tenure.

VI. GUIDELINES FOR CLINICAL FACULTY APPOINTMENT, RENEWAL OF CONTRACT (REAPPOINTMENT) AND PROMOTION

A. Evaluation of Faculty with Clinical Appointments (*Faculty Handbook*, 2018)

The University recognizes the need to evaluate faculty members with specialized assignments according to the requirements of their appointment letters. Clinical faculty should be so designated in appointment letters. Clinical faculty are vital to the success of certain programs in professional fields. Their primary purpose is to provide an authentic applied learning environment for students in these disciplines while maintaining their own applied expertise. Clinical faculty translate new knowledge in their discipline into clinical practice and clinical practice into new knowledge. Clinical faculty members have the same service requirements as those with standard appointments. Areas of performance evaluation for renewal of contract are clinical education and service and evaluation for promotion specific to clinical faculty are clinical education and service.

B. CLSE Criteria for Promotion to Senior Instructor

Instructors are eligible to apply for appointment to Senior Instructor in the fall semester of their 5th year of employment with the university (years of employment need not be consecutive). Number of years is not an entitlement for this promotion, and judgments will be made at all levels based on the standards for excellence in teaching as measured by departmental criteria developed in accord with the *Faculty Handbook* (2013) and university criteria. The expectation for promotion at this rank is based on a 12-hour teaching load or its equivalence per semester and at least five years of full-time teaching experience at the university (years of teaching need not be consecutive).

The criteria for reviewing applications for promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor must include these general elements and evidence for each.

1. Evidence of student success on learning outcomes

- Department head's evaluations of applicant's teaching capability and performance
- Student evaluations, both quantitative and qualitative
- Pre- post evaluations to demonstrate an increase in knowledge and skills taught in the specific content area
- Explanation of learning outcomes assignments or portfolios that are connected to course goals
- Peer-reviews documenting student learning outcomes.

2. Demonstration of the use of effective modalities, e.g., experiential learning, collaborative learning, service-learning

- Hands on practice and feedback
- Peer group work and collaborative presentations
- Self- and peer-analysis of writing-intensive projects
- Involvement in research
- Integration of course concepts applied to community service and community interaction
- Use of instructional technologies to present concepts, interact, or provide highly relevant or engaging material and facilitate class discussions in a flipped model.

3. Leadership in teaching

- Demonstrate leadership in andragogy, pedagogy and curriculum development
- Mentoring students in research, field placement, or other high impact learning experiences
- Manage or coordinate teaching or student-related grants

- Coordinate academic programs
 - Other factors in the area of service/teaching, e.g., evidence of advising to student organizations, organizing relevant community or university student events.
- 4. Contribution to course and curriculum development**
- Development of new courses or major revisions to existing courses
 - Launching or making tangible improvements in the use of instructional technology to better meet course goals
- 5. University, Professional, and Public Service**
- Service with program, department, college, or university committees or initiatives.
 - Professional Service in discipline relevant, professional and/or teaching organizations
 - Public service: University-community engagement, alumni relations, professional networking for MSU

C. Application Process

Instructors seeking to apply to Senior Instructor position shall be provided with opportunities for evaluation in the application process in developing the teaching portfolio and appropriate artifacts. Evaluation shall be available to Instructors during the second semester of their second, third, fourth, and fifth year. The evaluation may be provided by the PT Committee, approved mentors, and/or the Department Head. The teaching portfolio, including an artifacts binder, will be submitted to the DPC for review in accordance with the dates specified in the tenure and promotion calendar (typically early October). The DPC will submit recommendations to the Department Head in accordance with the timelines specified in the Tenure and Promotion Calendar. The Department Head will review all relevant information and make a recommendation to the Dean, who will also conduct a review and forward recommendations to the Provost. The Provost will notify the candidate of approval or non-approval of the appointment to Senior Instructor in writing, with copies to the Department Head and Dean. The Academic department will be responsible for initiating the personnel action forms designating the change of appointment and incremental salary increase.

D. Dossier Requirements for Application to Senior Instructor

Please refer to the Provost's Website for procedures at time of application. This dossier must be submitted by the due date to the Department Head and cannot be changed once it is submitted, except for additions to the curriculum vita with the approval of the relevant faculty committee prior to the committee's completion of recommendation, with supporting documentation if requested from the faculty committee. The dossier includes the Provost's binder, with all of its included materials, plus a second collection of materials in digital form (i.e., Blackboard portfolio) or hard copy (i.e., CLSE binders), which includes:

- A profile consisting of candidate's current curriculum vitae and a personal summary statement between 2-5 pages describing the faculty member's research agenda and teaching and service philosophies
- Annual teaching, research/scholarship, and service narratives that include accomplishments, goals, plans, and how feedback from previous years was addressed
- A table summarizing all course evaluation averages by semester
- Matrices for teaching, scholarship/research, and service, which includes the location of relevant evidence
- Evidence/documentation related to teaching, scholarship/research, and service, particularly when not clearly known throughout the program or department

- Summary tables with all past annual and cumulative evaluation ratings of the faculty member by the DPC, Department Head, and Dean (see example below)

Year	Reviewer	Date	Overall Assessment	Teaching	Research	Service
2018	CLSE DPC Committee	2/27/2019	Satisfactory	Satisfactory: Excellent (5)	Satisfactory: Above Expected (4)	Satisfactory: Expected (3)
2018	Department Head	3/1/2019	Satisfactory	Satisfactory: Excellent (5)	Satisfactory: Above Expected (4)	Satisfactory: Expected (3)
2018	Dean	3/5/2019	Satisfactory	Satisfactory: Excellent (5)	Satisfactory: Above Expected (4)	Satisfactory: Expected (3)

- Faculty members being considered for tenure should include all reappointment letters; faculty members being considered for promotion should include all letters of evaluation since their last promotion.
- External review letters (Additional guidelines for external reviewers can be found on the Provost's website.)
- Departmental guidelines to be used for evaluation, which should be those provided to the faculty member at the time of hire for tenure and initial promotion or newer; those within the last five years or newer for additional appointments.
- In exceptional circumstances, the above documents may be supplemented by other sources of evaluative information offered by the faculty member or requested by the CR or PT Committee.
- Evidence of student success, use of effective modalities, course or curricular development, leadership in teaching and service.

E. Clinical Faculty Original Appointment/Promotion, Annual Evaluations, Renewal of Contract

1. Criteria for Original Appointment and/or Promotion (COE Guidelines, 2013)

Faculty may be initially appointed to the rank of Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, or Clinical Professor. Minimal qualifications for initial appointment to each rank are provided in the table below.

CLINICAL FACULTY APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION CRITERIA PER CLINICAL RANK				
Appointment & Promotion Criteria per Clinical Rank	Clinical Instructor	Clinical Assistant Professor	Clinical Associate Professor	Clinical Full Professor
Minimum Degree	Master's	Master's plus 6 graduate credit hours	Master's plus 12 graduate credit hours	Doctoral Degree
Licensure or certification	Faculty must be qualified as defined by professional or discipline standards, have practical	Same as Clinical Instructor	Same as Clinical Instructor	Same as Clinical Instructor

CLINICAL FACULTY APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION CRITERIA PER CLINICAL RANK				
	experience appropriate for the responsibilities assigned and must maintain appropriate professional credentials.			
Specific type & quantity of experience	Min-5 years	7 years	9 years	10 plus years
Experience supervising students or others	0-3 yrs experience	3-6 yrs experience	6-9 yrs experience	10 plus yrs experience
Scholarly Work (For initial appointment or promotion to higher ranks)	Remaining current in reading of relevant research	Minimum of one Category A publication or one national, peer-reviewed presentation in appropriate field; OR One externally funded grant of \$2500 minimum	Minimum of two Category A scholarly activities	Minimum of three Category A scholarly activities
Professional Development	Remaining current in outside reading for course assignment	Minimum of 3 professional development activities	Minimum of 4 professional development activities	5+ professional development activities
Teaching	Meeting all <i>Faculty Handbook</i> teaching responsibility criteria; Providing evidence of effective teaching; Average student evaluation ratings (on a 5-pt. scale; 3.01-3.5 where 5 is the highest).	Exceeding expected performance in at least three ways, including, but not limited to: Achieving high student evaluations (on a 5-pt scale; >3.51 where 5 is highest); Evidencing engagement in the scholarship of teaching; Course development activity (e.g., alignment with standards/competencies or updating materials); Curriculum development activity; Support of student research efforts;	Exceeding expected performance in at least three ways, including, but not limited to: Achieving high student evaluations (on a 5-pt scale; >3.51 where 5 is highest); Evidencing engagement in the scholarship of teaching; Course development activity (e.g., alignment with standards/competencies or updating materials); Curriculum development activity; Support of student research efforts;	Exceeding expected performance in at least three ways, including, but not limited to: Achieving high student evaluations (on a 5-pt scale; >4.00 where 5 is highest); Evidencing engagement in the scholarship of teaching; Course development activity (e.g., alignment with standards/competencies or updating materials); Curriculum development activity; Support of student research efforts;

CLINICAL FACULTY APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION CRITERIA PER CLINICAL RANK				
		Effective student advisement; Coordination of academic program; Contribution to the public affairs mission; Innovative use of instructional technology; Development of internet courses; Curriculum/instructional efforts related to accreditation; Completion of specialized training for teaching; or Assessment of teaching (e.g., peer-review of teaching, specialized assessments)	Effective student advisement; Coordination of academic program; Contribution to the public affairs mission; Innovative use of instructional technology; Development of internet courses; Curriculum/instructional efforts related to accreditation; Completion of specialized training for teaching; or Assessment of teaching (e.g., peer-review of teaching, specialized assessments)	Effective student advisement; Coordination of academic program; Contribution to the public affairs mission; Innovative use of instructional technology; Development of internet courses; Curriculum/instructional efforts related to accreditation; Completion of specialized training for teaching; or Assessment of teaching (e.g., peer-review of teaching, specialized assessments)
Service	Participates in Program & Department Activities	Documentation of Program, Department and College Service	Documentation of Program, Department, College and University Service	Documentation of Program, Department College, and University Service; PLUS Service to the Profession/Discipline

F. Annual Evaluations of Clinical Faculty

All clinical faculty members are reviewed annually by the Department Head at the date specified in the Provost's Calendar for Faculty Evaluation. Clinical faculty are evaluated in clinical education (teaching) and service, and the annual review will include a discussion of (a) the results of prior performance and (b) objectives for forthcoming performance. When appropriate or requested by the clinical faculty member, discussion at annual evaluations also can address progress toward promotion to the subsequent rank. The annual review will address completion of goals established during prior review.

G. Evaluation for Renewal of Contract

The duration of contracts for clinical faculty members varies depending on level of initial appointment and time in service. The Department Head conducts evaluations for *renewal of contract*, which should be based on the performance of clinical faculty members as reflected in their annual reviews. Renewal of contract is contingent upon positive annual evaluations from the Department Head. Faculty must be notified of non-renewal decisions no later than the date provided on the Provost's website.

H. Promotion Application Process

The professional performance portfolio and artifacts binder will be submitted to the Department Head to be given to the DPC for review in accordance with the dates specified in the tenure and promotion calendar (typically early October). The DPC will submit recommendations to the Department Head in accordance with the timelines specified in the Tenure and Promotion Calendar. The Department Head will review all relevant information and make a recommendation to the Dean, who will also conduct a review and forward recommendations to the Provost. The Provost will notify the candidate of approval or non-approval of the appointment to Senior Instructor in writing, with copies to the Department Head and Dean. The Academic department will be responsible for initiating the personnel action forms designating the change of appointment and incremental salary increase. Clinical Instructors seeking to apply to Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, or Clinical Full Professor shall be provided with opportunities for evaluation in the application process in developing the teaching portfolio and appropriate artifacts. Evaluation shall be available to Instructors during the second semester of their second, third, fourth, and fifth year. The evaluation may be provided by the PT Committee, approved mentors, and/or the Department Head.

I. Dossier Requirements for Application to Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, or Clinical Full Professor

Please refer to the Provost's Website for procedures at time of application. This dossier must be submitted by the due date to the Department Head and cannot be changed once it is submitted, except for additions to the curriculum vita with the approval of the relevant faculty committee prior to the committee's completion of recommendation, with supporting documentation if requested from the faculty committee. The dossier includes the Provost's binder, with all of its included materials, plus a second collection of materials in digital form (i.e., Blackboard portfolio) or hard copy (i.e., CLSE binders), which includes:

- A profile consisting of candidate's current curriculum vitae and a personal summary statement between 2-5 pages describing the faculty member's research agenda and teaching and service philosophies
- Annual teaching, research/scholarship, and service narratives that include accomplishments, goals, plans, and how feedback from previous years was addressed
- A table summarizing all course evaluation averages by semester
- Matrices for teaching, scholarship/research, and service, which includes the location of relevant evidence
- Evidence/documentation related to teaching, scholarship/research, and service, particularly when not clearly known throughout the program or department
- Summary tables with all past annual and cumulative evaluation ratings of the faculty member by the DPC, Department Head, and Dean (see example below)

SUMMARY OF PROMOTION AND TENURE QUALIFICATION

This document reflects the MINIMUM requirements for a faculty member to be eligible for consideration for tenure and/or promotion. As such, it does not provide a guarantee that a faculty member will be granted tenure and/or promotion as that decision is based on an overall evaluation of the time period being considered and the presentation of sufficient evidence. The expectations outlined in this document need to be considered in light of individual workload assignments negotiated between the faculty member and the Department Head which may require modified expectations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Furthermore, in some cases activities may be counted in multiple areas, such as when a faculty member engages in the scholarship of teaching.

VII. FACULTY WORKLOAD FOR TEACHING (Approved by CLSE Faculty April 15, 2010, except where updated)

This policy guides all the Counseling, Leadership, and Special Education (CLSE) programs as the Department Heads assigns faculty time for teaching. The CLSE Policy is supplemental to the COE policy, which is a supplemental to the University Faculty Workload Policy, and neither replaces nor supersedes the COE or University policies.

A. Faculty Roles and Corresponding Standard Workload (From the COE Workload Policy, April 8, 2008)

1. Instructors

Instructors with neither research nor service requirements will be assigned 15 hours teaching each semester.

Instructors with no research but some service requirements may be assigned 12 hours teaching each semester, as deemed appropriate by the Department Head and college dean.

If instructors choose to engage in research or service activities beyond an equivalent of 3 hours assigned time, they may do so but with no additional reassigned time beyond 3 hours, maintaining a teaching assignment of 12 hours.

Note. The CLSE faculty contend that the level, type, and size of classes, as well as TLE of various activities, justify additional consideration when determining workload for instructors.

2. Tenure-Track Ranked Faculty

All ranked faculty (tenured and untenured) will be assigned 9 hours teaching provided the faculty member documents an established research agenda. Three hours will be assigned for research. Service is an expectation that will not result in reassigned time except for special or extenuating circumstances, as detailed in this document.

All ranked faculty with tenure who cannot document an established research agenda [or choose not to] will be assigned 12 hours teaching with service expectations and some documented scholarly activity.

3. Newly Hired Faculty

Newly hired tenure track faculty will be assigned 6 hours equated teaching during their first two semesters, excluding summer provided the faculty member provides a research plan. Beginning in the third semester of employment, the faculty member will be assigned 9 equated hours of teaching with the same opportunity for reassigned time and /or overload compensation as other ranked faculty, per this workload policy.

4. Probationary Faculty

Probationary faculty (those who have not yet achieved tenure) are allowed to continue on a 9 equated hour load per semester until they achieve tenure. After achieving tenure, they will need to provide documented outcomes (Compensation 101, Office of the Provost) to continue on a 9 equated hour load.

5. Standard Workload – MSU policy

Per the university faculty workload policy, “standard workload” is 24 equated hours across an academic year with the exception of instructors without a service component. The conceptual framework for this standard workload is a total workload of 30 equated hours with six equated hours being allocated for maintaining currency in one’s field, advising duties, and normal department, college, and University service activities. The departmentally-approved activities of each faculty member will often vary, and in many cases the standard workloads for individual faculty members will also vary. Research-

active faculty members are typically granted a three-hour reassignment per semester to promote scholarly endeavors at the University, resulting in an equated 18-hour instructional workload for an academic year. Research and other agreed upon activities are negotiated between the Department Head and the faculty member, with the approval of the College Dean.

6. Overload – MSU policy

Per the university faculty workload policy, a faculty member is experiencing an overload when their workload exceeds 25 equated hours per academic year.

B. Definitions and Policies Regarding “Research Active” Status (Adopted by COE Faculty Advisory Council April 1, 2015 (the URL was: <https://education.missouristate.edu/research-active.htm> as of April 2019)

[NOTE: This definition applies to the designation of release time for research in regard to workload and teaching considerations. It is not related to criteria for Tenure/Promotion and would not meet the standards for either.]

While recognizing disciplinary differences within the university, the expectation that a faculty member is eligible to receive 3 hours of reassigned time for research is based on that person demonstrating an ongoing research agenda in the annual review and successful publication of a KPI-recognized research product within a 3-year time period. If a KPI-recognized research product is not published (or completed in the case of presentations) after a 2-year period, faculty will receive a warning that if no product is forthcoming for one more year, they will not receive reassigned time for research purposes. Tenure-track faculty designated as non-research active would then be required to teach 12 hours per semester; nontenure-track faculty would be required to teach 15 hours per semester.

For the purposes of reassigned time for research, an ongoing research agenda would be demonstrated through:

- Annual evidence of research agenda, and
- One KPI-recognized product within the previous 3–year period.

1. Annual Evidence of Research Agenda

Annual evidence of a research agenda will be presented at the time of annual review, via documentation posted on Blackboard or other CLSE digital template. Examples of annual evidence would include, but not be limited to:

- a) Presenting research at 1 national/international disciplinary conference in a 12-month period;
- b) Mentoring and co-presentation of a minimum of 2 student research-based peer-reviewed presentations at national/international conference(s) within a 12-month period;
- c) Documentation of publications in-progress or submitted for review within a 12-month period, including but not limited to:
 - Letters indicating journal articles have been submitted and are currently under review,
 - Drafts of books/book chapters with new content developed during the 12-month period under review,
 - Notices of accepted/conducted research presentation(s) at national/international conference(s) within the 12-month period under review;
 - Documentation of submitted grant application as principal investigator of a national/international competitive research grant of \$30,000 or more;

d) Publication of one KPI-recognized product within the 12-month period under review.

2. KPI-Recognized Research Product

In addition to annual documentation of an active research agenda, [research active] faculty members must provide documentation of a completed KPI-recognized research project/product within a 3-year period. Examples of documentation of a completed KPI-recognized research project/product would include, but not be limited to:

- a) Publication of 1 peer-reviewed journal article involving dissemination of research conducted by the faculty member;
- b) Publication of 1 peer-reviewed book;
- c) Publication of 1 peer-reviewed book chapter;
- d) Principal investigator of a national/international competitive research grant of \$30,000 or more, approved for funding;
- e) Juried exhibits or performances.

3. Approval/Denial of Research-Active Status

Faculty research active status will be reviewed annually, using documentation from a 2-year time period. Members will retain “research-active status” and appropriate 3-hour release time from teaching if:

- a) annual evidence of research active status is provided, and
- b) one KPI-recognized product is published/completed within that 2-year time frame.

If a faculty member does not provide annual evidence of active research (as described above), he or she will not receive three hours reassigned time for research. Further, if a faculty member does not publish a KPI-recognized product (or completed in the case of some projects) after a 2-year time period, he or she will receive a warning that if no product is forthcoming for one more year, he or she will not receive reassigned time and will teach 12 hours per semester (if tenure-track faculty) or 15 hours per semester (if nontenure-track faculty).

C. Reassigned Time and Summer Compensation Activities

Faculty are eligible to receive reassigned time during the academic year, and compensation during the summer, for various qualifying activities, including:

- Grant writing and/or grant development
- PI, Director, Evaluator, or some other approved role on a grant-funded project
- Program Coordinator or Director
- Accreditation work beyond that which is common or ordinary as a component of teaching, research, or service
- Supervision of student teachers
- Advisement and student portfolio work in tandem that are not commonly or ordinarily assigned as a component of teaching
- Faculty Fellow
- Special projects coordinator as assigned by the Department Head or dean
- Special research initiatives specific to the department or college
- Sabbaticals [Note: All faculty on sabbatical will be reviewed as 100% research with no teaching nor service requirements during the sabbatical leave time.]
- Working with graduate students on research projects, papers, reports, seminars, theses

[MSU Policy active as of April 2019: http://www.missouristate.edu/policy/op3_33_workload.htm]. 5.8. Summer Session. The summer session plays a significant role in providing opportunities for students. Faculty members who teach during the summer sessions will receive pay in addition to their regular annual salaries as determined by the Board of Governors. Compensation will be based on a rate of at least two and one-half percent of base salary per teaching load equivalent. For courses that do not meet the minimum enrollment guidelines, the administrator and faculty member may negotiate for a salary rate that is less than two and one-half percent of base salary per teaching load equivalent. Subject to a holdback of ten percent of the personnel services budget for the summer to cover unforeseen student demand for courses in specific areas, summer faculty appointments will be confirmed as soon as possible after the summer budget is final and allocation has been made by the colleges to the departments. While there is no specific date by which summer appointments will be confirmed, it will be at the earliest possible date. Faculty members (except those whose contracts already include summer sessions) are placed on the summer session payroll and will receive their summer salary at the end of June and/or at the end of July, depending on the session that is taught. If circumstances require that an appointment to teach during the summer is made after the last week in May, the entire compensation will be included in the July paycheck.

Teaching Load Equivalency (TLE) Guide

The following is to be considered a guide for faculty members to use when negotiating with the Department Head for reassigned time or summer compensation based on teaching-related activities. Such activities typically generate credit hours but not in a classroom setting. [Faculty can also advocate for reassigned time for items not included in the following guide, but included in the comprehensive list of eligible activities.]

- **Program Coordinators.** Faculty members who coordinate an academic program shall receive a workload adjustment or compensation for those activities. The amount of adjustment/compensation will vary depending upon the work required for the coordination of each program. Factors to consider when determining appropriate compensation/adjustment are the level of program marketing, student recruitment, student advisement, internship coordination, clinic coordination, and adjunct faculty coordination required for effective program operation. Typically, program coordinators are to receive:
 - Program Coordination = 3 hours of reassigned time (fall and spring)
 - Program Coordination = 2-3 hours of compensation (summer)
- **Off-Site Intern Supervision.** Each EAD Masters/Specialist student registers for one credit hour of off-site internship. Faculty supervisors receive one equated hour of credit for supervising four interns. (.25 per student, per one hour of off-site internship).
 - Four (4) off-site interns = 1 hour of reassigned time (fall and spring)
 - Four (4) off-site interns = 1 hour of compensation (summer)
- **On-Site Intern Supervision.** Each EAD Masters/Specialist student registers for two credit hours of on-site internship. Faculty supervisors receive one equated hour of credit for supervising 2 interns. (.25 per student, per hour of on-site internship).
 - Two (2) on-site interns = 1 hour of reassigned time (fall and spring)
 - Two (2) on-site interns = 1 hour of compensation (summer)
- **On-Site Counseling Intern Supervision.** Each counseling intern at the Center City Clinic (or other affiliated approved site) registers for the internship course as

well as receiving one-hour weekly face-to-face supervision, tape and case note review, and clinical oversight from a licensed supervisor. Faculty supervisors receive one (1) equated hour for supervising one (1) intern (fall/spring) and .75 hour compensation for summer supervision (4 interns = 3 equated hours).

- One (1) intern = 1 hour of reassigned time (fall and spring)
- Four (4) interns = 3 hours of compensation (summer)
- **Student Affairs Practicum.** Students in the Student Affairs master's program each complete 6 hours of practicum. The workload equivalency for faculty supervisors is .25 per hour per student (.75 for each student for 3 hours of practicum).
- Eight (8) practicum students = 3 hours of reassigned time/compensation.
- **Counseling Practicum.** Counseling students register for 3 credits of practicum, however, students meet together and work separately with clients during live-supervised lab for a course equivalency of six hours. Furthermore, CACREP Standard I. Q. requires that a maximum load of six (6) practicum students be registered in one three-hour (3) course. Any students beyond six (6) should count as .5 equated hours per student enrolled in the three-hour practicum course.
- **Field Study Research.** Each EAD specialist student completes three hours of research while doing their field study research. Per the university Faculty Workload Policy (2000) it is recommended that thesis advisors (similar to field study advisors) receive .75 equated hours for 3 credit hours of student thesis. This would correspond to four students, 3 credit hours each, resulting in a 3 equated hour workload adjustment.
- Four (4) Field Study Students = 3 hours of reassigned time (fall/spring) [cannot be repeated for multiple semesters for same students]
- Four (4) Field Study Students = 3 hours of compensation (summer) [cannot be repeated for multiple semesters for same students]
- **Thesis Supervision.** Per the university Faculty Workload Policy (2000) it is recommended that thesis advisors receive .75 equated hours for 3 credit hours of student thesis. This would correspond to four students, 3 credit hours each, resulting in a 3 equated hour workload adjustment.
- Four Students Supervised for Three Hours of Thesis Each = 3 hours of reassigned time (fall/spring) [cannot be repeated for multiple semesters for same students without registering for additional credit hours]
- Four Students Supervised for Three Hours of Thesis Each = 3 hours of compensation (summer) [cannot be repeated for multiple semesters for same students without registering for additional credit hours]
- **Dissertation Advisement.** University of Missouri policy recommends one (1) hour of reassigned time for advisement of two (2) students working on their dissertations. This would correspond to .25 equated hours per dissertation credit hour (students register for 2 credits during each regular semester, 1 credit during summer).
- Two (2) dissertation advisees = 1 hour of reassigned time (fall and spring)
- Four (4) dissertation advisees = 1 hour of compensation (summer)

- **Student Research Committee Membership.** Faculty who serve on student research committees (for theses, field studies, and dissertations) are eligible to accrue reassigned time for such activity. The responsibility of committee member is approximately one-fifth that of an advisor (If used here it cannot also be counted as service).
 - Ten (10) student research committees = 1 hour of reassigned time (fall and spring)
 - **Independent Study.** Faculty who supervise students on independent study projects approved by the Department Head are eligible to receive reassigned time for such activity.
 - Nine (9) independent study courses = 3 hours or reassigned time (fall or spring).
 - Three (3) independent study courses = 1 hour compensation (summer).
1. **Banking of Hours.** Faculty members who do not “earn” enough additional equated hours during one semester for reassignment from a 3-hour course can “bank” the hours earned and later negotiate for a load reduction.

VIII. CLSE Annual Evaluation and Compensation Guidelines

All faculty members are required to maintain a current record of accomplishments and activity using Blackboard or other CLSE digital template. From Blackboard or other CLSE digital template, annual reports will be generated every year in January and then evaluated. Individual faculty members provide a narrative summary (in the annual activity report within Blackboard or other CLSE digital template) of their activities in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. The narrative summary includes a vision for the faculty member’s purpose and motivation as part of their research agenda, which could include but does not have to include links with teaching and service. During January of each year, the CLSE CC will utilize department evaluation criteria (see below) to conduct reviews of annual reports and will prepare narrative assessments of each faculty member. In addition, each member of the CLSE CC will assign a numerical rating on each of the three performance dimensions for each faculty member being reviewed. The CLSE CC shall rate each faculty member on each criterion according to the following five categories: Unsatisfactory, Progressing, Expected, Above Expected, and Excellent. The Unsatisfactory level of evaluation is characterized by an absence of evidence, whereas the Progressing level is characterized by inconsistent or minimal evidence.

The written report from the CLSE CC shall contain a summary of the evaluation in each of the criterion performance areas (Teaching, Scholarship, Service), in accord with departmental expectations and university guidelines. The report shall be signed by the evaluators. It shall be shared with the faculty member being evaluated, and signed indicating his/her understanding of its contents.

The CLSE CC’s narrative evaluations and performance rankings will be forwarded to the Department Head. The Department Head will review the faculty annual activity reports, the narrative assessments from the CLSE CC and ratings provided by the CLSE CC. The Department Head will meet with the CLSE CC to discuss the assessments and ratings. The Department Head will then prepare a composite performance rating that takes into account the percentage weights for each of the three categories of teaching, scholarship, and service agreed upon previously by the faculty member and the Department Head, consistent with applicable college criteria within the time specified in the compensation calendar.

Information provided to the faculty member by the Department Head on or before the date specified on the compensation calendar:

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

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

Information provided to the faculty member by the dean on or before the date specified on the compensation calendar:

1. His/her final composite rating.
2. A brief written rationale explaining any differences in ratings between the dean's composite rating and the Department Head's composite rating, with a copy to the Department Head.

As per the *Faculty Handbook*, in years when there will be no performance-based component to salary adjustments, the full-time faculty of a department may, by majority vote, opt to forgo a review by the DPC; in those years, the review process shall start with the Department Head.

IX. TENURE-TRACK/TENURED FACULTY EVALUATION RUBRICS

A. Faculty Evaluation Rubric for Teaching

Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric below. Please refer to the Minimum Levels of Performance for Consideration for Tenure and Promotions section under Teaching for examples of Above Expected Performance (section IV, A, 1).

Unsatisfactory (1)	Progressing (2)	Expected (3)	Above Expected (4)	Excellent (5)
Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in their teaching or persistent evidence of low quality teaching.	Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in their teaching.	Meeting all <i>Faculty Handbook</i> teaching responsibility criteria; Providing evidence of effective teaching; Average student evaluation ratings (on a 5-pt. scale; 3.01-3.5 where 5 is the highest) and at least three of the ways noted in the Above Expected criteria.	Exceeding expected performance is achieved by high student evaluations (on a 5-pt scale; >3.51 where 5 is highest); and at least four of the ways noted in the Above Expected criteria.	Excellent performance is achieved by: High student evaluations (on a 5 pt. scale, >4.00 where 5 is the highest); And at least five of the ways listed in the Above Expected criteria.

B. Faculty Evaluation Rubric for Research/Scholarship

Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric below. Please refer to the Minimum Levels of Performance for Consideration for Tenure and Promotions section under Scholarship for categories of scholarly work (section IV, B, 8).

Unsatisfactory (1)	Progressing (2)	Expected (3)	Above Expected (4)	Excellent (5)
Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in scholarship.	Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in scholarship.	At least one scholarship product from Category B or higher, or at least three products from C, including one that could viably result in an A or higher.	At least one scholarly product from Category A and two products B or higher.	At least one scholarly product from A+ or two scholarship products from Category A AND one additional scholarship product from B or higher.

C. Faculty Evaluation Rubric for Service

Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric below. Please refer to the Minimum Levels of Performance for Consideration for Tenure and Promotions section under Service for examples of service activities (section IV, C, 1).

Unsatisfactory (1)	Progressing (2)	Expected (3)	Above Expected (4)	Excellent (5)
<p>Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in service.</p>	<p>Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in service. Participation in 1 committee or equivalent OR, lack of attained success in Professional Service or Public Service and Consultation.</p>	<p>Demonstrated success in: -University Citizenship as evidenced by contributing fairly to the task of shared governance at two or more levels (program, department, college, or university) with at least two committee participation or equivalent, - and attained success in one additional areas, i.e., in Professional Service or Public Service and Consultation.</p>	<p>Demonstrated success in: -University Citizenship as evidenced by contributing fairly to the task of shared governance at three or more levels (program, department, college, or university) with at least three committee participation or equivalent,, -and attained success in one or more areas, i.e., in Professional Service or Public Service and Consultation.</p>	<p>Demonstrated success in: -University Citizenship as evidenced by contributing fairly to the task of shared governance at three or more levels (program, department, college, or university) with at least four committee participation or equivalent;; -leadership roles in service to the university; -and sustained success in one or more areas, in Professional Service or Public Service and Consultation.</p>

X. NON-TENURED FACULTY EVALUATION RUBRICS

A. Non-Tenured -Faculty Evaluation Rubric for Teaching

Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric below. Please refer to the Minimum Levels of Performance for Consideration for Tenure and Promotions section under Teaching for examples of Above Expected Performance (section IV, A, 1).

Unsatisfactory (1)	Progressing (2)	Expected (3)	Above Expected (4)	Excellent (5)
Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in their teaching or persistent evidence of low quality teaching.	Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in their teaching.	Meeting all <i>Faculty Handbook</i> teaching responsibility criteria; Providing evidence of effective teaching; Average student evaluation ratings (on a 5-pt. scale; 3.01-3.5 where 5 is the highest).	Exceeding expected performance is achieved by: High student evaluations (on a 5-pt scale; >3.51 where 5 is highest); and at least three of the ways listed in the Above Expected criteria.	Excellent performance is achieved by: High student evaluations (on a 5 pt. scale, >4.00 where 5 is the highest); and at least five of the ways listed in the Above Expected criteria.

B. Non-Tenured-Faculty Evaluation Rubric for Research/Scholarship

Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric below. Please refer to the Minimum Levels of Performance for Consideration for Tenure and Promotions section under Scholarship for categories of scholarly work (section IV, B, 8).

Unsatisfactory (1)	Progressing (2)	Expected (3)	Above Expected (4)	Excellent (5)
Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in scholarship.	Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in scholarship.	Participation in research/scholarly activity.	At least one scholarship product from Category A or B or C.	At least one scholarship product from Category A or B.

C. Non-Tenured Faculty Evaluation Rubric for Service

Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric below. Please refer to the Minimum Levels of Performance for Consideration for Tenure and Promotions section under Service for examples of service activities (section IV, C, 1).

Unsatisfactory (1)	Progressing (2)	Expected (3)	Above Expected (4)	Excellent (5)
Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in service.	Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in service in university OR Professional Service, Public Service and Consultation	Demonstrated success in: -University Citizenship as evidenced by contributing fairly to the task of shared governance at one or more levels (program, department, college, or university) with at least one committee participation or equivalent, - and attained success in one additional areas, i.e., Professional Service, Public Service, and Consultation.	Demonstrated success in: -University Citizenship as evidenced by contributing fairly to the task of shared governance at two or more levels (program, department, college, or university) with at least two committee participation or equivalent, -and attained success in one or more areas, i.e., Professional Service, Public Service and Consultation.	Demonstrated success in: -University Citizenship as evidenced by contributing fairly to the task of shared governance at three or more levels (program, department, college, or university); -leadership roles in service to the university with at least three committee participation or equivalent; -and sustained success in one or more areas, i.e., Professional Service, Public Service and Consultation.

XI. Appeals of Annual Evaluation Ratings

Only a faculty member's final composite performance rating may be appealed. 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 as specified in the compensation calendar.

A faculty member who is dissatisfied with his/her final composite performance rating should first request a meeting with the Department Head to discuss the processes and underlying rationales by which the performance rating was determined. After the 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, stating the reasons for questioning the rating. At the request of the faculty member, the appeal, along with the Department Head response and other supporting materials, is forwarded to the dean.

The dean transmits the appeal to the College Personnel Committee (or the College Compensation Committee, if one exists as a separate subcommittee of the Personnel Committee) for consideration. The College Personnel Committee (or Compensation Subcommittee) will consider the appeal. The committee's review should make use of the department performance criteria, the narrative and ratings from the DPC and the Department Head, the Department Head's annual report of accomplishments, and summary descriptive measures (mean, median, mean, etc.) of the ratings of department faculty. If necessary, additional information may be requested by the committee in the process of their deliberations. The college committee will provide a written summary to the dean on the recommended disposition of the appeal.

If the dean makes a decision on the appeal that is different than that recommended by the college committee, the dean must provide a written rationale for that decision. The faculty member may continue to 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 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 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 that they have been discriminated against for any reason not related to job performance may consult with the Office for Equity and Diversity.

XII. Performance Parameters for Compensation System

In accord with University compensation guidelines, the faculty members of the Department of Counseling, Leadership, and Special Education have identified the following evaluation weights across three criterion areas (Teaching, Scholarship, Service) for decisions regarding, faculty promotion, tenure status, retention, and compensation.

These parameters do not refer directly to workload or time/effort/percentages, but rather to the weighting of performance dimensions for determining performance ratings; however, as individual faculty parameters are determined by Department Heads through a process of consultation with faculty, the percentage weights chosen should reflect the roles of individual faculty in fulfilling departmental needs and should also be consistent with any college-specific parameters that have been adopted. Grant activity will be counted in the performance dimension in which the grant/contract work is most applicable—Teaching, Research, or Service. Performance parameters or “weights” should, as much as possible, reflect faculty assignments. Individuals who are assigned higher teaching loads should have more of their evaluation influenced by the quality of their teaching. Likewise, individuals who are provided with release time for research should be expected to produce more research, both in terms of quality and quantity.

Generally speaking, faculty assignment should reflect the effort that a department is expecting from faculty in each area. Evaluations focus on the outcome of those efforts – the learning that occurs or the research or service produced. Faculty assignments and performance parameters should be negotiated between the Department Head and the faculty member at the same time.

I. Tenured Faculty -- 9-hour TLE

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

II. Tenured Faculty -- 12-hour TLE

Minimum Weight	Performance Dimension (Role)	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 Dimension (Role)	Maximum Weight
45%	Teaching/Advising	60%
35%	Research/scholarship/creative activities	50%
5%	Service	15%

IV. Non Tenure-Track Faculty

Minimum Weight	Performance Dimension (Role)	Maximum Weight
80%	Teaching/Advising	90%
0%	Research/scholarship/creative activities	10%
10%	Service	20%

For purposes of planning and assessment, teaching one 3-credit course is typically viewed as the equivalent of 20% weight, as appropriate to the situation. Therefore, 3 courses would generally amount to 60% weight for teaching, etc. Other equivalencies are based on the college faculty workload policies.

For faculty with reassigned time the above percentages are negotiable, as approved by the Department Head. Probationary faculty may use the Tenured Faculty tables above, as appropriate to their specific faculty load and faculty goals. Faculty who receive funding for teaching, research, or service projects are to be provided with opportunities to adjust their performance weights to reflect whatever area of activity in which funding occurs. The exact weight of such activities should be negotiated between the faculty member and the Department Head. The weight assigned must be approved by the dean. The form on the following page is utilized to negotiate and document annual workload percentages.

Workload Percentages for _____ (year)

Name of Faculty Member: _____

Per CLSE Guidelines (Fall 2019-Spring 2022)

Tenured Faculty -- 9-hour TLE

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

II. Tenured Faculty -- 12-hour TLE

Minimum Weight	Performance Dimension (Role)	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 Dimension (Role)	Maximum Weight
45%	Teaching/Advising	60%
35%	Research/scholarship/creative activities	50%
5%	Service	15%

Which range is applicable?

_____ Tenured—9 hour TLE

_____ Tenured—12 hour TLE

_____ Probationary

Research Active?

_____ Yes

_____ No

Performance Dimension (Role)	Chosen Weight
Teaching/Advising/Program Director/Accreditation Activity	_____ %
Research/scholarship/creative activities	_____ %
Service	_____ %

_____ (Faculty Member Signature) _____ (Date)

_____ (Department Head Signature) _____ (Date)

Acknowledgment Page for New Hires

I acknowledge receipt of these CLSE departmental guidelines at the time of my hire at Missouri State University. I understand that these guidelines will be used to determine my tenure and promotion.

_____ (Faculty Member Signature) _____
(Date)

_____ (CLSE Department Head Signature) _____
(Date)