

MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

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

DEPARTMENT: IT and Cybersecurity

COLLEGE: College of Business

SEMESTER/YEAR OF CURRENT REVIEW: Fall 2022

SEMESTER/YEAR OF NEXT REQUIRED REVIEW: Fall 2024

DEPARTMENT ADOPTION SIGNATURES:

  
Department Personnel Committee Chair 8/14/2023  
Date

  
Department Head 8/14/2023  
Date

APPROVAL SIGNATURES:

  
Dean 8-14-23  
Date

Ken Brown  
Provost 12/11/2023  
Date

THIS PLAN IS IN EFFECT FROM 2022 , THROUGH 2024 .

DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY  
AND CYBERSECURITY

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS  
MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

**GUIDELINES FOR REAPPOINTMENT,  
PROMOTION, AND TENURE**

**2023**

**DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND CYBERSECURITY  
GUIDELINES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE**

**CONTENTS**

Introduction.....	2
I. Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Regarding Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.....	2
II. Annual Performance Reviews.....	4
III. Process for Annual Tenure Review for Probationary Faculty .....	5
IV. Promotion and Tenure Applications .....	6
V. Promotion and Tenure Process .....	8
VI. Guidelines for External Reviews .....	9
VII. Departmental Guidelines for the Selection of Committees.....	9
VIII. Department Head Recommendations.....	11
IX. Requirements for Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion.....	11
A. Department Philosophy Towards Tenure and Promotion Decisions .....	11
B. Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria for Tenure and Promotion.....	12
1. General Criterion One: Teaching.....	13
2. General Criterion Two: Research.....	13
3. General Criterion Three: Service.....	16
C. Optional Performance Paths to Tenure and Promotion .....	17
D. Specific Criteria for Evaluation.....	18
X. Required Documents for Tenure/Promotion.....	21
XI. Promotion from Instructor to Senior Instructor .....	23
XII. Review of Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.....	23
XIII. Appendix I: Candidate Matrix for Tenure and Promotion .....	25

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 3 and 4 of the 2016 *Faculty Handbook* make departments and faculty responsible for developing application procedures for tenure/promotion and communicating evaluation processes and performance criteria to all departmental faculty (i.e., candidates and committee members). This document, created to satisfy these responsibilities, represents November 2019 revisions to the Information Technology and Cybersecurity (ITC) Department Promotion and Tenure policies, and it reflects the language of the June 10, 2016, *Faculty Handbook*. It rescinds and replaces all prior Department Promotion and Tenure policies and documents with the following exceptions. Assistant professors generally go up under the guidelines that were in effect at the time of appointment, but they have the option of going up under newer guidelines. Associate professors can go up under guidelines in effect within the last seven years. “For instance, a policy in effect in Fall 2012 could be used for a promotion application in Fall of 2019” [3.3.3.].

The following guidelines are based on several resources:

1. The *Faculty Handbook*
2. Guidelines from the Office of the Provost including the *Annual Master Calendar*
3. Guidelines from the College of Business and the Dean

The University confers tenure and promotion, and the *Faculty Handbook* describes the general requirements for all faculty. However, departments are charged with interpreting these general requirements and creating specific criteria and measurements consistent with the context of their individual disciplines.

The guidelines that follow are the Information Technology and Cybersecurity Department’s interpretations of the *Faculty Handbook* requirements within the contexts of the ITC discipline and the College of Business. They are intended to provide explicit guidance and standardized application in the evaluation of faculty. Sincere attempts have been made to eliminate any conflicts with the *Faculty Handbook*, but should any remain, the handbook is controlling and supersedes any language in this document.

All bracketed section numbers in this document refer to the *Faculty Handbook* section from which the language is taken. Although quotation marks are not used, the sections may be either direct quotes from the *Faculty Handbook* or strongly paraphrase its language.

### **I. FACULTY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES REGARDING REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE**

The *Faculty Handbook* outlines the specific roles and responsibilities of departmental faculty for several activities in Faculty Performance Evaluation Processes [4.6.].

#### **A. Faculty Performance Evaluation Processes**

The following are specifically mentioned as activities that are required of each department and are those in which faculty undertake key roles through participation in one or more personnel committees or subcommittees. Procedures regarding each of these are outlined in this document below:

- Yearly Performance Review for All Full-Time Faculty [4.6.6.]
- Annual Review for Probationary Faculty [4.6.3.]

- Tenure and Promotion Review for Probationary Faculty [4.6.4.]
- Optional Pre-Promotion Review for Tenured Faculty [4.6.5.1.]
- Promotion Review from Associate to Full Professor Rank [4.6.5.]
- Promotion for NonTenure-Track Faculty [4.6.5.3.]

## **B. Departmental Committee Structure**

Faculty responsibilities are completed through the workings of the **Department Personnel Committee** and various subcommittees [4.8.3.]. In the Information Technology and Cybersecurity Department, the **Department Personnel Committee** includes all tenured faculty who do not have administrative roles. This committee conducts its work through both a committee of the whole and various subcommittees. These include:

### **The Department Personnel Committee**

Although this committee includes all tenured faculty, the exact membership will vary depending on the level of the rank being considered. This committee is responsible for all promotion and tenure recommendations.

According to the faculty handbook, the number of members should be determined as follows: *Ideally, any committee evaluating a colleague for annual review of appropriate progress toward tenure, required performance reviews, promotion or tenure should have a minimum of five qualified members, but some departments may have insufficiently qualified faculty to meet this expectation. Options include:*

- *Allowing the department to proceed with the evaluation with as few as three qualified faculty from the department.*
- *Supplementing the departmental committee with faculty from other departments (normally from the same college) who, based on rank, would qualify. The additional faculty should never increase the size of the committee to more than five total. These additional faculty are to be selected by the Dean, based on recommendations by the Head and the faculty member.*

***The option (or combination of options) selected should be negotiated with and approved by the Dean.*** [Section 4.8.3.2].

**The Department Personnel Subcommittee** - this subcommittee of three to five tenured faculty is responsible for annual reviews of probationary faculty and making faculty scholar/practitioner status recommendations

**The Department Merit Subcommittee** - this subcommittee is an ad hoc committee of at least three with a maximum of five tenured faculty that conducts yearly performance reviews for all full-time faculty in years when merit funding is available.

**The Department Merit Guidelines Subcommittee** - This is an ad hoc committee of at least three tenured faculty charged with developing merit guidelines for years in which merit funding is available.

**The Department Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Subcommittee** - this ad hoc committee consists of at least three tenured faculty charged with reviewing department promotion and tenure guidelines as required.

It is anticipated that different faculty members will serve in one or more of these subcommittees as needed rather than selecting the same five individuals charged with performing all faculty personnel

responsibilities.

The names of each subcommittee reflect different task responsibilities and faculty roles, but each subcommittee is composed of members of the “**Department Personnel Committee.**”

## II. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

The *Faculty Handbook* states that performance evaluations shall be conducted annually for all full-time faculty [4.6.6]:

*The Department Head shall seek the written input of the departmental personnel committee on each faculty member and recommend a composite rating to the Dean of the college in which the department is located. However, 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 departmental personnel committee; in those years, the review process shall start with the Department Head. The Dean shall either endorse or modify the recommended rating. In instances where the Dean modifies the rating, the Dean must provide a compelling rationale for the change in writing to the Department Head, to the departmental personnel committee, and to the affected faculty member.*

### A. Merit Procedures and Guidelines in Years with No Merit Component

The Information Technology and Cybersecurity Department faculty have agreed to forgo committee performance reviews in years in which there is no performance-based (merit) component of salary. In these years, the **Department Head** will provide guidelines for submitting yearly performance review materials and will provide evaluations of faculty in a manner consistent with Departmental Merit Guidelines, if available. Performance reviews must be consistent with individual faculty roles and performance criteria described in promotion and tenure documents and COB policies.

### B. Merit Procedures and Guidelines in Years with Merit Component

For years in which a performance-based component of salary is anticipated a **Departmental Merit Guidelines Subcommittee** may be established to develop new merit guidelines. The committee will consist of at least three tenured faculty each of whom must receive a majority of favorable votes from the tenured faculty. The committee will elect a chair and develop recommendations for merit guidelines consistent with departmental tenure/promotion criteria and the role and performance of each faculty member. The committee chair will call a meeting of the department’s tenured faculty to discuss and refine new merit guidelines and gain approval via a majority vote of the tenured faculty.

### C. The Department Merit Subcommittee

For years in which there is a performance-based component of salary available, a departmental personnel committee as defined in the *Faculty Handbook* for purposes of this annual performance review will be established by a vote of the tenured faculty.

For the Information Technology and Cybersecurity Department, this is the **Departmental Personnel Merit Subcommittee**. It will consist of at least three (maximum five) tenured faculty members, each of whom must receive a majority of favorable votes from the tenured faculty.

The **Departmental Merit Subcommittee** will select a chair who convenes the committee's meetings. The **Departmental Merit Subcommittee** will be responsible for writing individual personnel merit recommendations based on the deliberations of the committee. The **Departmental Merit Subcommittee** will rate each faculty member based on established merit criteria and will forward the recommendation and rationale to the **Department Head** and the affected faculty member.

Faculty may appeal performance ratings based on procedures described in the *Faculty Handbook*.

### III. PROCESS FOR ANNUAL TENURE REVIEW FOR PROBATIONARY FACULTY

Annual Reviews are conducted for probationary faculty to assess appropriate progress toward tenure [4.6.3]. These annual tenure reviews for *untenued, ranked faculty* will be conducted according to the *Annual Master Calendar* issued by the Provost. The **faculty member** shall initiate the annual appointment process, submitting relevant materials to the department by the department specified deadline based on the *Annual Master Calendar*. The **Department Head** will make the faculty member's materials available to the **Department Personnel Subcommittee** at a date specified by the **Department Head** and in keeping with the *Annual Master Calendar*.

The **Department Personnel Subcommittee** will evaluate the faculty member's cumulative record as he or she progresses toward tenure and will specify one of three outcomes:

1. Progress toward tenure/promotion is satisfactory
2. Progress toward tenure/promotion is questionable
3. Progress toward tenure/promotion is unsatisfactory

In addition, the committee will provide a detailed written rationale for the rating, including identifying problem areas and making suggestions for improvement.

When new tenure track faculty members are employed, it is assumed they will be reappointed annually through their sixth year; for their seventh year, they must apply for and receive tenure or else receive a terminal contract. A decision to not reappoint will be made only after a candidate's failure to positively respond to performance feedback made following one or more annual reviews in which the candidate was judged to not be making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion.

The **Department Personnel Subcommittee** will make the initial recommendation and forward it to the **Department Head**, who will then add his/her recommendation and forward both to the **Dean**. The **Department Head** shall not be a participant in the voting or deliberations of the **Department Personnel Subcommittee**. Copies of **Department Personnel subcommittee** and **Department Head** recommendations shall be provided to the **candidate**, who must undersign the **Department Head's** recommendation before forwarding can occur.

#### A. Department Personnel Subcommittee Membership

Only tenured faculty may serve on the **Department Personnel Subcommittee**. The **Department Personnel Subcommittee** will consist of a minimum of five tenured department faculty selected by a majority vote of the tenured members of the ITC faculty at the first meeting of the academic year. The **Department Personnel Subcommittee** will select a chairperson responsible for receiving appropriate forms and supporting documentation, calling meetings, and forwarding committee recommendations to the **Department Head** and faculty members.

The final recommendation will be forwarded to the **Department Head**. The **Department Head** will add his or her evaluation and recommendation and forward the evaluations, the accompanying recommendations and the dossier to the **Dean**. The **Dean** will make his or her evaluation and accompanying recommendation in the case of non-renewal and notify the **Provost**.

#### **B. Report to the Candidate**

Copies of **Departmental Personnel Subcommittee**, **Department Head**, and **Dean** evaluations and accompanying recommendations shall be provided to the candidate. Candidates must undersign the evaluations for the purpose of acknowledging their receipt. The **Department Head** should use information provided by the **Departmental Personnel Subcommittee** to give extensive formal feedback to the candidate. Feedback should include an evaluation of each candidate's strengths and weaknesses, recognition of each candidate's progress, a candid discussion of areas of insufficient progress, and the establishment of expectations for the following period.

#### **C. Supporting Documentation**

The faculty member's tenure review packet will include most of the documentation described in Section X. *Binder I is always required* with the exception of External Review Letters. The External Review Letters will be added by the Department Head. Binders II and III are also required.

#### **D. Annual Tenure Review Calendar**

Annual tenure reviews will be conducted consistent with the *Master Calendar* issued by the **Provost's** office and as described in the Faculty Handbook [Sec 4.6.1]. It is each individual faculty member's responsibility to meet deadlines described in the *Master Calendar*. The Master Calendar is available on the Provost's website and is updated annually in a document titled "Calendar for Faculty Evaluation."

### **IV. PROMOTION AND TENURE APPLICATIONS**

The Faculty Handbook, Section 3.7.2., states the following regarding tenure:

*Only members of the ranked faculty are eligible for tenure. The choices that the University makes in granting tenure are crucial to its endeavors toward academic excellence. A decision to grant tenure must reflect an assessment of high professional competence and performance measured against University standards. Recommendations for tenure are made in accordance with Department, College, and University policies and procedures. The expectations for each individual are dependent upon the particular assignment. It is the responsibility of the applicant for tenure to provide sufficient relevant documentation as evidence in support of his or her teaching, research, and service activities.*

*Tenure is based on a thorough evaluation of the candidate's total contribution to the University. While specific responsibilities of faculty members may vary because of special assignments or because of the particular mission of an academic unit, all evaluations for tenure shall address the manner in which each candidate has performed in teaching, research, and service. Basic competence in itself is not sufficient to justify granting tenure, for such competence is a prerequisite for the initial appointment. The decision to grant tenure is inherently and inescapably judgmental and is a deliberate action indicating the person has been selected as a member of the permanent faculty because of demonstrated high-quality performance and relative merit.*



*Tenure will be granted only to faculty members who apply for tenure and are approved through normal procedures (Refer to Section 4). All initial appointment letters for individuals hired in tenure-track faculty positions will specify the last semester during which this tenure application can be made. If a tenure application is not made by a faculty member by this specified time, the individual forfeits all expectations to tenure as specified in this Faculty Handbook. De facto tenure will not occur. Tenure-track faculty who have not been granted tenure by the end of their seventh year of employment at Missouri State University shall not be further employed by Missouri State University in a tenure-track position.*

#### **A. Key points from the *Faculty Handbook***

Members of The Department Personnel Committee and candidates for promotion and tenure should keep in mind the following points taken from the **Faculty Handbook**:

- Each decision is individual and is based on a faculty member's specific assignment in conjunction with performance standards identified by the University, the College, and the Department.
- The responsibility for meeting deadlines for applications and providing required documentation lies entirely with the individual faculty member, and tenure will not be granted to faculty who fail to apply by the specified time or who fail to include all required documentation.
- Meeting minimum standards may be insufficient for purposes of promotion and tenure. The decision to grant tenure and promotion is inherently judgmental. The committee has both an obligation and the professional ability to apply its collective judgment to each individual tenure and promotion decision. The candidate has an equal obligation to demonstrate his or her relative merit beyond that of basic competence.
- No faculty member will be offered tenure upon hire unless (1) the candidate's credentials satisfy the department's standards for tenure and promotion, and (2) a majority of the tenured departmental faculty at or above the candidate's rank vote to approve the tenure offer [3.8.2.].

#### **B. Promotion and Tenure as a Joint Decision**

In the Information Technology and Cybersecurity Department non-tenured assistant professors must apply for tenure and promotion to associate professor concurrently. The same performance criteria are used both to award tenure and to award promotion. In no case will a faculty member be awarded tenure unless he or she is also awarded promotion to associate professor.

## V. PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS

In most cases, a probationary faculty member must apply for tenure/promotion no later than the sixth year of employment (except when the tenure clock has been temporarily stopped) to remain employed beyond the seventh year. In cases where the faculty member has negotiated for a shorter probationary period, the final application year will be stated in the faculty member's letter of employment. Candidates denied tenure in the final application year are not permitted to reapply. The tenure clock begins in August of the first year of employment [4.6.4.1.].

The **faculty member** shall initiate the annual appointment process, submitting relevant materials to the department by the department specified deadline based on the *Annual Master Calendar*. The process for applications for tenure/promotion follow the *Annual Master Calendar* established annually by the Provost and include the following steps [4.6.3.]:

1. The faculty member prepares and submits a complete dossier to the **Department Head**, who forwards it to chair of the **Departmental Personnel Committee** in early October (see Section X for a description of the required documents).
2. The **Departmental Personnel Committee** reviews the dossier and writes a recommendation normally by late October or early November. The candidate receives a copy and signs the original **Departmental Personnel Committee's** recommendation.
3. The **Departmental Personnel Committee's** recommendation and dossier are forwarded to the **Department Head**, who reviews the materials and writes a recommendation normally by late November. The candidate receives a copy and signs the original **Departmental Head's** recommendation.
4. The **Departmental Personnel Committee** and the **Departmental Head's** recommendations and dossier are forwarded to the **Dean**, who reviews the materials and writes a recommendation, normally by mid-to-late December. The candidate receives a copy and signs the original **Dean's** recommendation.
5. By the end of each year, the **Dean** completes a recommendation and sends all rationales and a current applicant vita to the **Provost**, who makes a final recommendation.

At each stage of evaluation (**Department Personnel Committee, Department Head, College Dean, Provost**) the candidate will be given a copy of the recommendation and the written rationale for the recommendation. At each subsequent stage, a copy of the recommendation and a probative rationale will also be furnished to the **Departmental Personnel Committee** for its information and records [4.6.3.].

Recommendations and rationales (along with the information required in Binder I, described in Section X) will be forwarded to the next stage for evaluation. Supporting materials will be forwarded as far as the **Dean's** office; they will only be forwarded beyond the **Dean's** office at the request of the Provost. The candidate may choose to withdraw the application from consideration at any stage of the process [4.6.3.].

Through the entire process, confidentiality of information must be maintained. Faculty members at every level of decision making must assume personal responsibility to ensure that confidentiality is not violated [4.6.3.].

## VI. GUIDELINES FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWS

The **Department Head** must solicit **external reviews** to aid in each tenure and promotion candidates [4.8.2.2].

### A. Rules for Selecting Reviewers

In the spring of the year before the application is due in the fall, external reviewers will be identified:

1. Reviewers are to be at a rank higher than the applicant and to be at schools considered to be peer or aspirant institutions.
2. Reviewers should also not be previous coauthors or personal friends of the candidates or have any relationship that might create a conflict of interest.

### B. Procedures for Reviews

1. The candidate and **Department Head** will agree on a list of four external reviewers. If the parties cannot agree, each will select two.
2. The **Departmental Personnel Committee** will be asked to approve the list, and should do so unless a compelling reason exists to reject one or more reviewers.
3. The list of reviewers will be submitted to the **Dean** for certification of the process.

The **Department Head** is responsible for obtaining external reviews. He or she will contact selected reviewers early in the process to ask for willingness to provide reviews. A packet will be sent to the reviewer containing the following: Current Vita; Departmental criteria for tenure and/or promotion; Information on the number of hours taught and other relevant details of the faculty members' assignments in each academic year in question; Samples of research selected by the candidate. Packets will be sent in late spring or summer to facilitate receipt by October 1.

The external reviews will then become part of the candidate's tenure and/or promotion packet and the **Departmental Personnel Committee** can use them in their deliberations as deemed appropriate.

## VII. DEPARTMENTAL GUIDELINES FOR THE SELECTION OF COMMITTEE(S)

### A. Formation of Department Personnel Committees

Only *tenured faculty* may serve on tenure/promotion/reappointment committees [4.8.3]. For tenure, the **Departmental Personnel Committee** will consist of all full-time tenured faculty. For promotion, the **Departmental Personnel Committee** will consist of all full-time faculty members of a rank higher than the rank of the person applying for promotion. When an applicant is being considered for promotion, only those tenured faculty who hold a rank equal to or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered shall participate in the decision-making process. More than one promotion committee may be appointed, depending upon the ranks being considered, so that the broadest degree of departmental participation can be involved in recommendations. No one may serve on the committee considering his/her application. In no instance can a majority of committee members come from outside the department so long as there are at least two departmental faculty eligible to serve on the committee.

Each committee will select a **Chair** who will be responsible for receiving appropriate forms and supporting documentation, calling meetings, and forwarding committee recommendations to the

**Department Head** and faculty members. The candidate's application will be presented to the **Chairperson** of the **Departmental Personnel Committee**, who will undertake the security of the application dossier. The **Departmental Personnel Committee** will meet, confer, and vote to establish the Information Technology and Cybersecurity Department faculty recommendation. If there is a split vote among tenured faculty, the minority may file a report, signed by each member of the minority, which will be forwarded with the majority decision. The recommendation will include the rationale for the decision and whether it was a consensus decision [4.8.3.].

## **B. Departmental Personnel Committee Meeting and Voting Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Decisions**

**Departmental Personnel Committee** meetings regarding promotion and tenure decisions are among the most important decisions faculty members must make. While every effort will be made to accommodate individual schedules, faculty members need to recognize the importance of these meetings and that attendance and participation in them is required as part of their role as a university faculty member. As these meetings are very infrequent, yet very important, voting committee members are asked to schedule family and personal activities to avoid conflicts with committee meetings. Meetings and procedures must follow these rules:

### **Guidelines for Meetings**

1. Any meeting in which a formal vote will be taken must be scheduled by the committee chairperson and announced *at least two weeks* prior to the meeting (this can be waived by consensus of the committee). No proxies are allowed, and a quorum of seventy-five percent of the members of eligible faculty must be present for the vote.
2. Faculty members must, to every possible extent, adjust personal schedules to accommodate promotion and tenure meetings.
3. If it is not possible to schedule meetings during the normal workday or workweek, meetings can be scheduled outside this time and distance technology can be used to facilitate the meetings.

### **Guidelines for Voting**

1. Standards for tenure and promotion are identical for candidates whose initial appointment is as an assistant professor. There will be only one vote, and it will cast for tenure *and* promotion (no separate vote for tenure and then promotion).
2. Promotion guidelines for untenured faculty applying for promotion will be identical to the promotion guidelines of the rank for which the candidate is applying.
3. Voting will proceed as follows:
  - a. Voting will be by secret ballot (can be waived by consensus).
  - b. An initial ballot for tenure will be cast first and will include evaluations in each dimension of teaching, intellectual contributions (research), and service. The evaluations will use the standards as described in the section entitled "Optimal Performance Paths to Tenure and Promotion" (where a rating of 0 is below average, 1 average, 2 above

average, and 3 outstanding). Each area will be evaluated by each member of the committee.

- c. Once all ballots are submitted, votes will be counted, and a decision by the committee will be made based on the votes and Table IX.C.1.

The committee chair will provide the exact overall vote for promotion and/or tenure to the **Department Head**.

## VIII. DEPARTMENT HEAD RECOMMENDATIONS

The **Departmental Personnel Committee** recommendation will be forwarded to the **Department Head**. The **Department Head** shall not be a participant in the voting or deliberations of the department committee. The **Department Head** will make an independent evaluation and recommendation.

The **Department Head** will review the recommendations of the **Departmental Personnel Committee** as well as the material submitted for each faculty member and make a recommendation to be forwarded to the **Dean** of the college. The **Department Head** shall state in writing to the faculty member and to the **Department Personnel Committee** his/her recommendation. In instances of disagreement between the **Department Head** and the **Department Personnel Committee**, there shall be a good faith effort to resolve these differences. If a resolution is not possible, the **Department Head** must offer in writing compelling reasons for disagreeing with the **Department Personnel Committee's** recommendation before advancing his or her recommendation to the Dean [4.8.3.].

## IX. REQUIREMENTS FOR APPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

Descriptions of rank and requirements for appointment and eligibility for promotion and tenure are described in the *Faculty Handbook* Section 3.3 for tenure track faculty and in Section 3.5 for non-tenure track faculty. All candidates are responsible for knowing the relevant sections of the *Faculty Handbook* as it applies to their unique status and candidacy, particularly to one's eligibility status.

The Information Technology and Cybersecurity Department has no guidelines separate from the *Faculty Handbook* guidelines that address eligibility for tenure and promotion in terms of meeting specific degree and experience requirements. The language of the *Faculty Handbook* is controlling in these criteria. These guidelines supplement the eligibility requirements with a set of performance dimensions and standards spelled out in **Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria for Tenure and Promotion** (Section B) below.

### A. Department Philosophy Towards Tenure and Promotion Decisions

The development and application of these tenure and promotion criteria reflect a shared philosophy deeply held by the Information Technology and Cybersecurity Department. That philosophy includes the following:

1. *Tenure and promotion decisions are not programmed decisions that can be reduced to the application of rating scales, point systems, and weighting schemes, that provide an illusion of objectivity where none exists. Instead, these decisions are inherently judgmental [Faculty Handbook at Sec. 3.7.2.] and the role of faculty is to exercise professional judgment in evaluating candidates.*
2. When an individual is appointed to a position in the Information Technology and Cybersecurity

Department, we expect that individual to succeed, and it is our responsibility to do everything we can as peers and mentors to develop and nurture new faculty.

3. We have a responsibility to inform candidates about what is expected of them by communicating all relevant dimensions of performance, standards for dimensions, and providing regular and detailed performance feedback.
4. We have a responsibility not only to be fair and impartial in our application of these relevant criteria, but also to realize that individuals perform varying roles and contribute in different ways, and that each promotion and tenure decision is unique and must be made with sensitivity to individual dimensionality and the specific role and context within which each individual must perform.

## **B. Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria for Tenure and Promotion**

The *Faculty Handbook*, section 4.1, states the following:

*Faculty members with standard appointments ... are evaluated in three categories of performance: teaching, research, and service.*

The sections below describe three general criterion measures of faculty performance - Teaching, Research (intellectual contributions), and Service - used by the Information Technology and Cybersecurity Department to evaluate faculty with standard appointments for purposes of promotion and tenure. Each criterion is defined, performance dimensions are described, and standards and examples of measures are offered.

In addition to these dimensions of performance, each candidate must meet standards of ethical behavior and collegiality described in the *Faculty Handbook* and required of the profession. While not specifically addressed in performance criteria, serious breaches of professional ethical standards and/or inappropriate conduct towards others, including conduct inconsistent with notions of collegiality as provided in Section 1.1.3.4 of the *Faculty Handbook*, may provide grounds for denying tenure/promotion.

Documentation requirements for tenure and promotion dossiers are outlined in Section X.

## **B.1 General criterion one: teaching**

The *Faculty Handbook* clearly states that “Teaching is among the most important faculty responsibilities of any institution of higher learning [4.2.1.2.]” and, therefore, teaching effectiveness is required in order to earn tenure and promotion. The handbook describes two categories of activities that constitute effective teaching: Essential Elements, which are required for tenure and promotion, and Additional Areas, which are not required but which may be considered in the tenure and promotion decision.

The essential elements of teaching effectiveness required for tenure and promotion are the following: Knowledge, Teaching Strategies, and Evaluation and Response to Feedback. Additional Areas that may be evaluated and considered are Accessibility and Diversity. Section 4.2.1 of the handbook acknowledges that teaching is a multidimensional activity and as such, this implies multiple measures should be used to assess teaching effectiveness. The candidate should refer to Table IX.C.1 section D.

The following must be kept in mind by the committee when evaluating a candidate’s application for tenure and promotion:

- Due to numerous threats to internal validity and forces outside the individual faculty member’s control, outcome measures (grade distributions, scores on standardized tests, etc.) should be considered in context and used judiciously. Neither COB nor departmental program assessment results are to be submitted as evidence of teaching effectiveness.
- Caution should be exercised when interpreting the results of formal student evaluation instruments and should account for no more than 25% of the final assessment of faculty performance on the Essential Elements. While students are appropriate evaluators of classroom delivery, some teaching strategies, and appropriate conduct toward students, students are inappropriate evaluators of course knowledge and many other dimensions for which faculty peers are more informed evaluators.
- Due to the limits of practical and statistical significance in the numerical outcomes, more emphasis should be given to specific items on an evaluation instrument than on total average scores, and evaluation of scores should be the criterion rather than norm referenced.
- Peer and/or supervisor observation and review of classroom teaching that indicates evidence of skill in classroom delivery.

The *Faculty Handbook* further acknowledges that teaching should not be considered in isolation but that it is “affected by overall workload, level of course, experience in teaching a particular course, number of students, use of new modalities or approaches, and nature of course (general education, requirement for major, etc.)” Therefore, these issues should be considered when evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure. The committee must use careful, considered, professional judgment in evaluating a candidate. The committee must consider the entire context of the teaching environment, the various dimensions of teaching performance, and the totality of the evidence presented by the candidate.

## **B.2 General criterion two: intellectual contributions (research)**

The Information Technology and Cybersecurity Department’s performance dimensions and standards for research are guided by two major sources: the *Faculty Handbook* and the AACSB’s *2016 Business Accreditation Standards*. The *Faculty Handbook* states that the process of research (scholarly productivity) is an integral and indispensable part of the university’s basic function to create, preserve, and transmit knowledge and otherwise facilitate student learning. Thus, research is considered to be an essential faculty role responsible for maintaining the individual faculty member’s competence, contributing to the education of students, and advancing the interests of one’s profession and the needs of society. Therefore, intellectual contributions or research productivity should be considered in tenure and promotion decisions [Section 4.2.2].

The *Faculty Handbook* defines research, “as the production and formal communication of creative scholarly work...To qualify as Research activities must produce outcomes that are disseminated and subjected to critical peer review or evaluation by the scholarly community, and those outcomes should

serve the growth of knowledge in a field or be of significant practical use. [4.2.2.1]”

The AACSB’s *2016 Business Accreditation Standards*, Standard 15, requires *...significant academic and professional engagement that sustains the intellectual capital necessary to support high-quality outcomes consistent with the school’s mission and strategies*. This document defines and describes a taxonomy of sustained engagement activities: (1) Scholarly Academics, (2) Practice Academics, (3) Scholarly Practitioners, and (4) Instructional Practitioners. In general, tenure track candidates must satisfy the requirements for academic engagement as Scholarly and/or Practice Academics. Clinical track candidates and candidates for Senior Instructor must satisfy standards for professional productivity as Scholarly and/or Instructional Practitioners as described below.

The *Faculty Handbook* [Section 4.2.2] provides a taxonomy of scholarship/research that is substantially similar to that described in the AACSB’s *2016 Business Accreditation Standards*, Standard 2 describing intellectual contributions consistent with the mission. For this reason, the Information Technology and Cybersecurity Department incorporates elements of the AACSB’s taxonomy into the Department of Information Technology and Cybersecurity’s criteria for promotion and tenure.

### **DESCRIPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS (RESEARCH)**

Research is generally only required of tenure-track faculty members. Scholarly engagement is not required for promotions related to clinical faculty or instructors. However, should these faculty members engage in scholarly activities, such activities may be used to help satisfy requirements for teaching, service, or professional productivity as appropriate.

The Faculty Handbook [4.2.2.2] provides four goals and criteria for evaluating research. *“Item 1 below is of paramount importance on this list, and any faculty member who, in order to succeed in the area of Research at Missouri State University and attain tenure and promotions, must succeed in item 1. Although items 2, 3, and 4 are not individually prescriptive, they are inclusive of Research and may be considered. Success in one or more of these areas (2-4) is required to attain tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. Sustained success in one or more of these areas is required for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor.”*

The ITC department values and stresses research. The minimum requirement for tenure and promotion to **Associate Professor** and **Full Professor** is spelled out in Section D. Latitude should be granted when evaluating ITC research since ITC is a broad, multidisciplinary field with many application areas. The candidate should refer to Table IX.C.1 section D for different pathways for promotion. *In all cases, promotion depends on a consistent publication record, defined as maintaining scholarly academic status (see College of Business Policy Manual).*

### **B.3 General criterion three: service**

The *Faculty Handbook* states that service serves to support the academic tradition of shared governance, to support professional and organizational needs of the disciplines, and to bring the products of University work to the public for its benefit [4.2.3.1]. Each faculty member is required to engage in service as one of the requirements for reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

### **DIMENSIONS OF SERVICE**

The *Faculty Handbook* [Section 4.2.3.2] provides a taxonomy of service activity that forms the basis for the Department of ITC’s criteria for promotion and tenure. Service activities include (1) University Citizenship, (2) Professional Service, (3) Public Service, and (4) Professional Consultation. Specifically,



*“...Item 1 below is of paramount importance on this list, and any faculty member, in order to succeed in the area of Service at Missouri State University and attain tenure and promotions, must succeed in item 1. Although items, 2, 3, and 4 are not individually prescriptive, they are inclusive of Service and may be considered. Success in one or more of these areas (2-4) is required to attain tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. Sustained success and documented leadership in one or more areas are required for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor.”*

## **DESCRIPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR SERVICE**

The faculty of the Information Technology and Cybersecurity Department acknowledge that early in a faculty member’s career, the primary emphasis should be developing their research and teaching, but over time participation in service activities will increase. The candidate should refer to Table IX.C.1 section D.

Committees should expect candidates to engage in limited service activities early in the appointment, but the candidate should show increased citizenship behavior and activities as time progresses, including some evidence of leadership in the later years of the appointment. Service obligations increase as the faculty member becomes more experienced. Faculty applying for promotion to Full status should have continued to participate in campus events and to serve on departmental, college, university, and professional committees.

**C. Optional Performance Paths to Tenure and Promotion**

The standards for tenure and promotion outlined above do not prescribe a numeric system for measuring performance levels. Table IX.C.1 below presents the various performance paths to tenure and/or promotion and suggests the relative weight of evidence of performance that should be required to distinguish professorial ranks and tenure. The following specific evaluation criteria are a summary of the detailed explanation of the three areas of teaching, research, and service and communicate performance standards at each performance level included below.

The options and evaluation criteria presented below for ITC faculty give additional specificity to University and COB guidelines for faculty evaluation. **The criteria (Section D) are not intended to be all-inclusive. Further, while extraordinary volume listed in one level may justify advancement to the next higher level, the achievement of a single item at any level does not necessarily justify a rating at that level.**

**Table IX.C.1: ITC STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION**

TENURE OR PROMOTION TO RANK		PERFORMANCE CATEGORY			TOTAL POINTS
		TEACHING	RESEARCH	SERVICE	
<b>ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND TENURE</b>	OPTION A	2	2	1	5
	B	2	1	2	5
	C	1	2	2	5
	D	3	1	1	5
	E	1	3	1	5
<b>PROFESSOR</b>	OPTION A	3	2	2	7
	B	2	3	2	7
	C	3	3	1	7
	D	3	1	3	7
	E	1	3	3	7

POINTS: BELOW AVERAGE = 0\* AVERAGE = 1 ABOVE AVERAGE =2 OUTSTANDING = 3

\*A rating of BELOW AVERAGE (0) represents Unsatisfactory performance is not acceptable for any performance dimension. A faculty member will not be granted tenure and/or promotion with a BELOW AVERAGE (0) rating in any dimension.

## D. Specific Criteria for Evaluation

The evaluation criteria presented below for ITC faculty give additional specificity to the University and COB guidelines for faculty evaluation. The criteria listed are not intended to be all-inclusive, nor are they intended to communicate that an individual should have accomplished all items listed to be categorized in that level. Further, while extraordinary volume of materials in one level may justify advancement to the next higher level, the achievement of a single item at any level does not necessarily justify a rating at that level. Individuals charged with making evaluations (administrators or faculty committees) are expected to use good judgment in categorizing faculty performance. *The ratings are not accumulative but calculated per review period of each successive rank.*

### Teaching<sup>1</sup>

#### Level 3 – Outstanding

In addition, the candidate will have demonstrated outstanding teaching by very high student evaluations and peer evaluations of teaching materials presented by the candidate, as well as by two of the following:

- Honors or recognition for teaching materials
- Publications of well-reviewed textbook, cases, or other teaching materials
- Significant work in program development
- Recipient of teaching grant

#### Level 2 – Above Average

The candidate at this level will have demonstrated above-average teaching by high student evaluations and peer evaluations of teaching materials presented by the candidate, as well as at least two of the following:

- Revision of an established course (including different modalities of the same course)
- Preparation of new courses
- Development of new course material for other faculty use
- Involvement in seminars, workshops, and conventions as a learner

#### Level 1 – Average

Candidates whose performance is this level will have demonstrated expected teaching by:

- Good student evaluations
- Good peer evaluations of teaching materials
- Performing as expected in all seated and online classes (e.g., regularly attends all seated classes)
- Working well with colleagues in multiple section courses

#### Level 0 – Below Average

Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated a teaching performance below the minimum expected. Some evidence of poor teaching includes:

- Consistently poor student evaluations
- Poor peer evaluations of teaching materials
- Lack of or poorly prepared teaching materials
- Unwillingness to accept varied teaching assignments
- Poor attendance for seated classes or poor communication with online students

---

<sup>1</sup> For criteria purposes, textbooks, cases, and pedagogical material may be either under Teaching or Scholarly Activity depending upon the situation, but not under both.

## Research and Scholarly Activity<sup>2</sup>

### Level 3 – Outstanding

Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated exceptional professional activity by earning five peer-reviewed publications wherein they have authored at least one publication as first author or have at least six peer-reviewed publications. In addition, the individual should display research excellence through other activities, such as (but not exclusively):

- Publication of scholarly book or monograph by a reputable, peer-reviewed university or commercial press
- Sole authored publication in reputable journal
- Publication of an article in major or high impact factor peer-reviewed journal
- Editor of scholarly book
- Recipient of major grant ( $\geq 10K$ ) from an off-campus agency or foundation
- Invitation for a keynote address
- Recipient of a best paper award

### Level 2 – Above Average

Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated above average professional activity by earning (i) at least five peer-reviewed publications wherein they have authored at least one publication as the first author, or (ii) at least six peer-reviewed publications plus two additional indicators of scholarly activity, such as:

- Publication of article(s) in lesser (e.g., deemed less than international, national and regional peer-reviewed) journals
- Publication in professional/trade magazine
- Author of a chapter in a scholarly book
- Submission of application for an outside research grant
- Reviewer of articles for peer-reviewed journal
- Recipient of an MSU or off-campus grant less than 10K
- Presentation of invited talk at national or international professional conference
- Presentation of paper at a regional, national, or international professional conference with proceedings
- Publication or presentation at regional or national professional conference with students

### Level 1 – Average

Individual whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated expected research and scholarly activity by earning at least six peer-reviewed publications plus at least three additional indicators of scholarly activity, such as:

- Presentation at a regional, national, or international professional conference without proceedings
- Presentation at local professional conference or on-campus conference
- Publication of a non-peer reviewed paper
- Publication of a minor paper in a regional publication
- Publication of book review

<sup>2</sup> For criteria purposes, textbooks, cases, and pedagogical material may be either under Teaching or Scholarly Activity depending upon the situation, but not under both

### Level 0 – Below Average

Individuals with below average performance will have less than six peer-reviewed publications. Other characteristics indicative of poor research and scholarly performance include:

- Insufficient evidence of an effort to remain current in the field
- Insufficient attendance at professional meetings

### **Service**

### Level 3 – Outstanding

It is presumed that the candidate has already established level 1 competencies. Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated exceptional service activities by at least two of the following:

- Leading a significant curriculum development
- Serving as editor of a national journal
- Mentoring students towards conference presentations or journal publications
- Obtaining funding for faculty and student research activities and resources (e.g., grants and gifts)
- Organizing a track or workshop at a professional meeting or academic conference
- Serving as an officer of a regional or national student competition
- Serving as major officer in a national professional organization
- Serving as chair of major university committee, college council or college committee
- Recognition for service activities
- Substantial service as an outside expert to organizations serving the community
- Appearance or mention in national or international media as an expert
- Organizer of a conference or workshop
- Developing and maintaining a departmental lab
- Demonstration of major uncompensated leadership role on campus
- Providing substantial leadership for major departmental programs
- Substantial service on a university or college committee
- Serving as mentors of students in regional or national organizations and/or competitions
- Significant participation in local service activities (e.g., service organizations, charities, etc.)

### Level 2 – Above Average

It is presumed that the candidate has already established level 1 competencies. Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated above-average service activities by at least two of the following:

- Serving as an active associate editor of a national or international journal
- Serving on search committee
- Forming research and study groups with students or faculty
- General tutoring services beyond the classroom
- Co-teaching a class across colleges
- Serving as mentors of students in regional or national organizations and/or competitions
- Serving as an officer of a professional conference
- Substantial manuscript reviewer for professional meetings, workshops, conferences, journals, or book publishers
- Speaking to business and/or educational organizations
- Coordinator of an academic area
- Seminars or courses given to the internal or external community (e.g., non-credit courses and

- intersession courses, courses offered at the library, etc.)
- Major contribution to an uncompensated university/college/department through special administrative assignment
- Teaching overload
- Participation in local service activities (e.g., service organizations, charities, etc.)

#### Level 1 – Average

- Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated expected service activities by service on departmental and college committees and participation in departmental programs. Moreover, it is expected that faculty will serve at least once as a reviewer for professional meetings, workshops, conferences, journals, or other manuscripts.

#### Level 0 – Below Average

Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated below expected service activities by:

- Failure or refusal to serve on departmental, college, and university committees
- Poor performance in service activities (e.g., failure to attend committee meetings, lack of attention to responsibilities, etc.)

### **X. REQUIRED DOCUMENTS FOR TENURE/PROMOTION**

The candidate's evidentiary documentation in support of their application should be organized into three binders. An ordered and descriptive checklist is provided below for each binder. The contents of the presentation, including the order of items, in *Binder I* is required by the **Provost**, the **Dean**, and the **Department Personnel Committee**, and Binder I is the only binder that goes to the **Provost**. It is **REQUIRED** that each faculty member follow the *Binder I* guidelines for required documents **EXACTLY**. The Provost's office will provide the binder and tabs. The contents of Binder II and Binder III are required by the **Department Personnel Committee**.

#### **Tab Ordered Checklist for Binder I**

**Original Application Form** – This form is to be placed in front of Tab 1 at the front of the binder.

- 1. Personal Summary Statement** – The candidate's description of who he or she is and his or her teaching, research, and service philosophies. It should describe what is important to the faculty member and how he or she assesses his or her roles, responsibilities, accomplishments, and objectives. Typically, the summary should not exceed six (6) pages.
- 2: Current Vita** – An accurate, complete, and up-to-date academic vita *in which the research section is identical to the Table of Contents in the faculty member's Binder II – Research Supplementary Materials Binder*.
- 3-5: The Annual Tenure and Promotion Review for Probationary Employees Reports** – A copy of the annual tenure and promotion progress reports from the **Department Personnel**
- 6: External Review Letters (see Section VI)** – Inserted by the **Department Head**.
- 7. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines** – A copy of *Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines* the faculty member is going up under.

**8. Candidate Matrix for Tenure and Promotion.** Each candidate must show in the *Candidate Matrix for Tenure and Promotion* (Appendix 1) the qualifications that the candidate has fulfilled for Tenure and Promotion.

**Tab Ordered Checklist for Binder II – Research Supplementary Materials**

1. **Table of Contents: A Numbered List of All Work** – Each item must be numbered and grouped according to type of research.
2. **Copies of All Works** – Include copies of **all** listed papers in the order of the Table of Contents. Separate each paper with tabs. Papers accepted for publication or those in press must include acceptance letters
3. **Table of Indicators of Contribution and Quality** – Table which contains the following information (in column order): Complete Citation (indicating authorship order and containing comments regarding contribution if not consistent with authorship order appearance), Journal Rankings/Acceptance Rates, Journal Impact Factor, Citation Count, and Other Indicators of Quality. At least one indicator of quality must be listed for each publication.

**Tab Ordered Checklist for Binder III – Teaching and Service Supplementary Documentation**

1. **Teaching Statements** – A self-evaluation summarizing the candidate’s teaching philosophy and activity and that addresses the degree to which standards described in Teaching
2. **Course Documents**
  - Copies of the most recent course syllabi for each course taught
  - Samples of assignments, exams
  - Samples of student projects
  - Other documentation to support teaching effectiveness
3. **Student Feedback**
  - Summary table of all teaching evaluation results including ratings on items and dimensions of formal student evaluation forms
  - Copies of samples of student’s comments from all semesters during the period of review
4. **Other Documentation Measures**
  - Summary report of the grade distributions for all classes taught
  - Scores on departmental or standardized final exams (if applicable).
  - Pretest-posttest results (if applicable).
  - Performance on standardized exams.
5. **Service Statement** – A self-evaluation summarizing the candidate’s service activity addressing the degree to which the standards described in Service have been met and the faculty member’s contribution.

**d. Supporting Service Documentation (as submitted on Faculty Success)**

## **XI. PROMOTION POLICIES FROM INSTRUCTOR TO SENIOR INSTRUCTOR**

### **Appointment to Instructor**

An instructor is appointed to teach full-time and provide appropriate service. Contingent on satisfactory performance and department needs an instructor's appointment can be renewed without limits. Instructors may apply for tenure-track positions for which they are qualified but service as an instructor will not count towards the service requirement for promotion and tenure [3.5.1.].

### **Eligibility for Promotion to Senior Instructor**

Instructors who have at least five years of service and meet performance criteria outlined in this document may apply for and be promoted to Senior Instructor. The appointment will be to a specific term not to exceed five years [3.5.2.].

### **Promotion Process**

The process for promotion for instructors within the Information Technology and Cybersecurity Department will be identical to processes currently in place for tenured faculty and described above.

## **XII. REVIEW OF PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

At the request of the **Department Head** the Information Technology and Cybersecurity Department's **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Subcommittee** will conduct a review of the department's **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**. The process will occur as follows:

1. At the request of the **Department Head** and at the initial department meeting of each academic year in August or early September, the **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Subcommittee** will be formed by a vote of the tenured faculty. The committee will consist of at least three tenured members of the department faculty. The chair of the **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Subcommittee** shall solicit all tenured faculty members for suggested modifications, additions, and/or deletions regarding the department's **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**.
2. The **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Subcommittee** shall meet during the fall semester to consider modifications suggested by faculty. The **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Subcommittee** will circulate proposed modifications, if any, to all tenured faculty members.
3. The chair of the **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Subcommittee** will call for a vote of all tenured faculty to discuss and vote on proposed modifications.
4. The proposed modifications will be considered adopted into the **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines** *only* if a *majority* of all tenured Information Technology and Cybersecurity Department faculty vote to adopt the proposed modifications (Note: this is a majority of all active tenured faculty in the department).
5. The modifications to the **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines** will be submitted to the **Department Head** for subsequent administrative approval.



Appendix I

**Candidate Matrix for Tenure and Promotion**

**Candidate:**  
**Tenure Application:**  
**Promotion To:**  
**Department:**

**Note: Levels 1-3 define the performance pathways for promotion and tenure outlined in Table IX.C.1 (see page 17).**

<b>RESEARCH</b>		
<b>Departmental Criteria</b>	<b>How I Meet Departmental Criteria</b>	<b>Location of Artifact/Notes</b>
<p><b>See Section IX of the Guidelines for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.</b></p> <p><u>Level 3 – Outstanding</u>                      Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated exceptional professional activity by earning five peer-reviewed publications wherein they have authored at least one publication as first author or have at least six peer-reviewed publications. In addition, the individual should display research excellence through other activities, such as (but not exclusively):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publication of scholarly book or monograph by a reputable, peer-reviewed university or commercial press</li> <li>• Sole authored publication in reputable journal</li> <li>• Publication of an article in major or high impact factor peer-reviewed journal</li> <li>• Editor of scholarly book</li> <li>• Recipient of major grant (≥10K) from an off-campus agency or foundation</li> <li>• Invitation for a keynote address</li> <li>• Recipient of a best paper award</li> </ul> <p><u>Level 2 – Above Average</u>                      Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated above average professional activity by earning (i) at least five peer-reviewed publications wherein they have authored at least one publication as the first author, or (ii) at least six peer-reviewed publications plus two additional indicators of scholarly activity, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publication of article(s) in lesser (e.g., deemed less than international, national and regional peer-reviewed) journals</li> <li>• Publication in professional/trade magazine</li> <li>• Author of a chapter in a scholarly book</li> <li>• Submission of application for an outside research grant</li> <li>• Reviewer of articles for peer-reviewed journal</li> <li>• Recipient of an MSU or off-campus grant less than 10K</li> <li>• Presentation of invited talk at national or international professional conference</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation of paper at a regional, national, or international professional conference with proceedings</li> <li>• Publication or presentation at regional or national professional conference with students</li> </ul> <p><u>Level 1 – Average</u> Individual whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated expected research and scholarly activity by earning at least six peer-reviewed publications plus at least three additional indicators of scholarly activity, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation at a regional, national, or international professional conference without proceedings</li> <li>• Presentation at local professional conference or on-campus conference</li> <li>• Publication of a non-peer reviewed paper</li> <li>• Publication of a minor paper in a regional publication</li> <li>• Publication of book review</li> </ul> <p><u>Level 0 – Below Average</u> Individuals with below average performance will have less than six peer-reviewed publications. Other characteristics indicative of poor research and scholarly performance include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient evidence of an effort to remain current in the field</li> <li>• Insufficient attendance at professional meetings</li> </ul>		
--	--	--

**TEACHING**

Departmental Criteria	How I Meet Departmental Criteria	Location of Artifact/Notes
<p><b>See Section IX of the Guidelines for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.</b></p> <p><u>Level 3</u> – Outstanding            In addition, the candidate will have demonstrated outstanding teaching by very high student evaluations and peer evaluations of teaching materials presented by the candidate, as well as by two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Honors or recognition for teaching materials</li> <li>• Publications of well-reviewed textbook, cases, or other teaching materials</li> <li>• Significant work in program development</li> <li>• Recipient of teaching grant</li> </ul> <p><u>Level 2</u> – Above Average            The candidate at this level will have demonstrated above-average teaching by high student evaluations and peer evaluations of teaching materials presented by the candidate, as well as at least two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revision of an established course (including different modalities of the same course)</li> <li>• Preparation of new courses</li> <li>• Development of new course material for other faculty use</li> <li>• Involvement in seminars, workshops, and conventions as a learner</li> </ul> <p><u>Level 1</u> – Average            Candidates whose performance is this level will have demonstrated expected teaching by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good student evaluations</li> <li>• Good peer evaluations of teaching materials</li> <li>• Performing as expected in all seated and online classes (e.g., regularly attends all seated classes)</li> <li>• Working well with colleagues in multiple section courses</li> </ul> <p><u>Level 0</u> – Below Average            Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated a teaching performance below the minimum expected. Some evidence of poor teaching includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistently poor student evaluations</li> <li>• Poor peer evaluations of teaching materials</li> <li>• Lack of or poorly prepared teaching materials</li> <li>• Unwillingness to accept varied teaching assignments</li> </ul> <p>Poor attendance for seated classes or poor communication with online students</p>		

<b>SERVICE</b>		
<b>Departmental Criteria</b>	<b>How I Meet Departmental Criteria</b>	<b>Location of Artifact/Notes</b>
<p><b>See Section IX of the Guidelines for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.</b></p> <p><u>Level 3 – Outstanding</u>            It is presumed that the candidate has already established level 1 competencies. Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated exceptional service activities by at least two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leading a significant curriculum development</li> <li>• Serving as editor of a national journal</li> <li>• Mentoring students towards conference presentations or journal publications</li> <li>• Obtaining funding for faculty and student research activities and resources (e.g., grants and gifts)</li> <li>• Organizing a track or workshop at a professional meeting or academic conference</li> <li>• Serving as an officer of a regional or national student competition</li> <li>• Serving as major officer in a national professional organization</li> <li>• Serving as chair of major university committee, college council or college committee</li> <li>• Recognition for service activities</li> <li>• Substantial service as an outside expert to organizations serving the community</li> <li>• Appearance or mention in national or international media as an expert</li> <li>• Organizer of a conference or workshop</li> <li>• Developing and maintaining a departmental lab</li> <li>• Demonstration of major uncompensated leadership role on campus</li> <li>• Providing substantial leadership for major departmental programs</li> <li>• Substantial service on a university or college committee</li> <li>• Serving as mentors of students in regional or national organizations and/or competitions</li> <li>• Significant participation in local service activities (e.g., service organizations, charities, etc.)</li> </ul> <p><u>Level 2 – Above Average</u>            It is presumed that the candidate has already established level 1 competencies. Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated above-average service activities by at least two of the following:</p>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serving as an active associate editor of a national or international journal</li> <li>• Serving on search committee</li> <li>• Forming research and study groups with students or faculty</li> <li>• General tutoring services beyond the classroom</li> <li>• Co-teaching a class across colleges</li> <li>• Serving as mentors of students in regional or national organizations and/or competitions</li> <li>• Serving as an officer of a professional conference</li> <li>• Substantial manuscript reviewer for professional meetings, workshops, conferences, journals, or book publishers</li> <li>• Speaking to business and/or educational organizations</li> <li>• Coordinator of an academic area</li> <li>• Seminars or courses given to the internal or external community (e.g., non-credit courses and intersession courses, courses offered at the library, etc.)</li> <li>• Major contribution to an uncompensated university/college/department through special administrative assignment</li> <li>• Teaching overload</li> <li>• Participation in local activities (e.g., service organizations, charities, etc.)</li> </ul> <p><u>Level 1</u> – Average</p> <p>Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated expected service activities by service on departmental and college committees and participation in departmental programs. Moreover, it is expected that faculty will serve at least once as a reviewer for professional meetings, workshops, conferences, journals, or other manuscripts.</p> <p><u>Level 0</u> – Below Average</p> <p>Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated below expected service activities by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure or refusal to serve on departmental, college, and university committees</li> <li>• Poor performance in service activities (e.g., failure to attend committee meetings, lack of attention to responsibilities, etc.)</li> </ul>		
---	--	--