MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

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

DEPARTMENT:	Technology and Construction Management
COLLEGE:	Business
SEMESTER/YEAR OF CURRENT REVIEW:	Fall 2018
SEMESTER/YEAR OF NEXT REQUIRED REVIEW:	Summer 2021

DEPARTMENT ADOPTION SIGNATURES:

[signature] 5/16/2018
Department Personnel Committee Chair — Date

[signature] 5/16/2018
Department Head — Date

APPROVAL SIGNATURES:

[signature] 5-18-18
Dean — Date

Chris Gaiey 5-21-18
Provost — Date

THIS PLAN IS IN EFFECT FROM FALL 2018, THROUGH SUMMER 2021.

DEPARTMENT OF TECHNOLOGY AND CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT

GUIDELINES FOR
COMPENSATION,
APPOINTMENT REVIEW,
TENURE,
PROMOTION,
AND
MENTOR PROGRAM

Fall 2018 through Summer 2021
Revised: March 30, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Technology and Construction Management Department Guidelines

1. Introduction

1.1. **Purpose.** The following guidelines elaborate upon the *Faculty Handbook* and the College of Business Guidelines to make them more explicit and assure standardization of these procedures within the Department of Technology and Construction Management.

1.2. **Types of Evaluative Processes.** According to Section 4.6 of the 2014 *Faculty Handbook*, faculty members participate in regularly scheduled performance reviews. These reviews consist of one or more of five separate, but interrelated, evaluative processes:

1.2.1. An annual compensation review (all faculty).

1.2.2. A review of application for annual appointment (for untenured, ranked faculty).

1.2.3. A special assessment of tenure and/or promotion progress during the probationary period (ranked faculty).

1.2.4. A review of application for tenure or promotion (ranked faculty).

1.2.5. A mentoring program (new faculty and others).

2. Review Responsibilities

2.1. **General Guidelines.**

2.1.1. At the times designated by the Personnel Committee, each individual faculty member shall submit the appropriate application and/or review materials for the evaluative process to the appropriate subcommittee.

2.1.2. Each subcommittee will conduct an evaluation of the faculty member, using the application and material submitted, and write a report of the committee's recommendations to the TCM Personnel Committee.

2.1.3. The TCM Personnel Committee shall review the recommendations of the subcommittee, vote on the recommendations, and forward the final vote and subcommittee recommendations to Department head for approval, all as outlined below.

2.1.4. The Department Head shall not be a participant in the voting or deliberations of the TCM Personnel Committee or its subcommittees. Copies of Committee and Department Head recommendations shall be provided to the candidate, who must undersign the Department Head's recommendation before forwarding can occur. Refer to the Faculty Handbook for further details.

2.1.5. Required dates and deadlines shall be in accordance with the Faculty Evaluation Calendar as published by the Provost. [Section 4.6].

2.2. TCM Personnel Committee.

2.2.1. The TCM Personnel Committee is made up of all tenured faculty members in the department. The personnel committee shall designate subcommittees for specific assignments as described in these departmental guidelines. At all times, the TCM Personnel Committee makeup will be in accordance with the Faculty Handbook [Section 4.8.3].

2.2.2. The TCM Personnel Committee has ultimate authority in designating and changing the faculty members assigned to each subcommittee.

2.2.3. The members of the TCM Personnel Committee shall elect a chair in May for the following academic year. The chair is responsible for the autonomy of the committee, security of the candidate's application dossier, and request for additional materials by the committee are detailed in Faculty Handbook Section 4.8.3. The TCM Personnel Committee or its Chair may delegate that responsibility to the chair of the appropriate subcommittee.

2.2.4. The subcommittees of the TCM Personnel Committee shall develop original recommendations, and provide a written report of those recommendations to all tenured faculty for review and approval.

2.2.5. **Voting Guidelines**

2.2.5.1. The vote of all tenured faculty will establish the departmental faculty's recommendation of a personnel action for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, but not compensation. Section 4.8.3 of the Faculty Handbook outlines voting procedures, minority votes, and procedures if a disagreement exists within the committee or between the personnel committee and the Department Head.

2.2.5.2. In situations where a faculty member is applying for both tenure and promotion concurrently, the committee vote on the decision to tenure must precede the vote on the promotion decision since the criteria for promotion are more stringent than those for tenure.

2.2.5.3. All meetings in which a vote for tenure and/or promotion will be taken must be scheduled by the TCM Personnel Committee chairperson and announced at least two weeks prior to the meeting. Meetings should be scheduled so that there are minimal conflicts with any voting faculty's teaching responsibilities. The TCM Personnel Committee chairperson should make every effort to schedule this meeting to accommodate the needs of all faculty members. A faculty member who cannot attend a scheduled meeting for a legitimate reason will be allowed to submit a written proxy vote (not email) to the TCM Personnel Committee chair.

2.2.5.4. A quorum for all votes for faculty tenure and/or promotion decisions will be at least three-fourths (75%) of the eligible faculty voters. The quorum for tenure decisions will be three-fourths (75%) of tenured faculty, and the quorum for promotion will be three-fourths (75%) of all faculty at or above the rank being considered. A favorable vote for tenure requires a majority vote of the department's tenured faculty. A favorable vote for promotion requires a majority vote of the department's tenured faculty who are at or above the rank being considered.

2.2.5.5. Votes for reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be taken by secret ballot.

2.2.5.6. Within subcommittees, a majority vote of the entire committee shall establish the final recommendation of that subcommittee. Neither proxy votes nor email votes are acceptable.

2.2.6. **Review of these Guidelines.**

2.2.6.1. The Technology and Construction Management Department's Personnel Committee will appoint a review subcommittee to conduct a review of the department's "Guidelines for Compensation, Appointment review, Tenure, and Promotion," in early September of each year. In those instances where the "Faculty Handbook," or College Guidelines are changed the subcommittees shall review the appropriates section of the Guidelines to assure continued compliance with College and University guidelines.

2.2.6.2. In addition to the yearly review, in early September of every third year, the subcommittee shall solicit all TCM tenured faculty for suggested modifications, additions, and/or deletions regarding the Department's Guidelines.

2.2.6.3. The following procedure will be followed.

2.2.6.3.1. The appropriate subcommittee will review faculty input and revise the appropriate section of these Guidelines. The revised Guidelines shall be available for TCM Personnel Committee review by mid-September.

2.2.6.3.2. The TCM Personnel Committee shall meet no later than early October to discuss and vote on proposed modifications following the Voting Guidelines in section 2.2.5 (above).

2.2.6.4. The revised Guidelines shall be made available for use by mid-October.

2.3. **TCM Compensation Committee.** The TCM Compensation Committee will consist of a minimum of three tenured department faculty designated by a majority vote of the TCM Personnel Committee. Committee membership shall be created as follows:

2.3.1. Tenured faculty who meet COB scholarly productivity requirements are eligible for election to the committee; selection shall be based on a majority vote of the TCM Personnel Committee.

2.3.2. In the event that less than three faculty members are elected under (2.3.1.), tenured faculty are also eligible; selection shall be based on a majority vote of the TCM Personnel Committee.

2.3.3. In the event that less than three faculty members are elected under (2.3.1.) and (2.3.2.), faculty members from outside the department shall be elected to the committee based on a majority vote of all members of the TCM Personnel Committee.

2.3.4. The TCM Compensation Committee will select a chairperson and a co-chair responsible for receiving appropriate documentation, calling meetings, and forwarding committee recommendations to the Department Head and faculty members. A committee member must excuse himself/herself from the committee during consideration of his/her application. If there are not enough eligible members within the department to staff a committee, the procedures outlined in the College guidelines will be followed.

2.4. **TCM Appointment Review Committee.**

2.4.1. The TCM Appointment Review Committee will consist of a minimum of three tenured department faculty designated by a majority vote of the TCM Personnel Committee in May, for the following academic year. The TCM Appointment Committee will select a chairperson responsible for receiving appropriate documentation, calling meetings, and forwarding committee recommendations to the TCM Personnel Committee.

2.4.2. The TCM Appointment Review Committee will receive and review the applications and supporting materials of both untenured faculty members and non-tenure track faculty members in accordance with the Faculty Handbook, the Provost's office, and the COB Dean's office.

2.5. **TCM Tenure and Promotion Committee(s).** The TCM Tenure and Promotion Committee(s) will consist of a minimum of three tenured department faculty designated by a majority vote of the TCM Personnel Committee. The TCM Tenure and Promotion Committee(s) will select a chairperson responsible for receiving appropriate documentation, calling meetings, and forwarding committee recommendations. In accordance with the Faculty Handbook for promotion, only members of a rank higher than the rank of the person applying for promotion may serve in the decision making process. More than one promotion committee may be designated, depending upon the ranks being considered. No one may serve on the committee considering his/her application. If there are not enough eligible

members within the department to staff a committee, members from outside the Department may be appointed in accordance with the Faculty Handbook.

3. Annual Performance Review Processes

3.1. **Annual Compensation Review.** Annual compensation reviews for tenure-track, and full-time non-tenure-track faculty will be conducted in accordance with the Faculty Evaluation Calendar published by the Provost's Office. The candidate shall initiate the annual compensation review process, submitting relevant materials to the chair of the TCM Compensation Committee by a date specified by the committee. The TCM Compensation Committee will make their initial recommendation and forward it to the TCM Personnel Committee who will vote on the subcommittee recommendation and then forward the results of the vote on to Department Head, who will then add his/her recommendation and forward both reports to the Dean. The Department Head shall not be a participant in the voting or deliberations of the TCM Compensation Committee. Copies of Department Committee and Department Head recommendations shall be provided to the candidate, who must undersign the Department Head's recommendation before forwarding can occur [Faculty Handbook section 4.8.3].

3.1.1. **Compensation Review Process**

3.1.1.1. **Input.** The candidate's application will be presented to the chair of the TCM Compensation Committee. The TCM Compensation Committee may solicit and consider input from all tenured faculty.

3.1.1.2. **Committee's Evaluation of Teaching, Research, and Service.** For each faculty member evaluated, the committee shall use the "Faculty Compensation Evaluation Guidelines" (Appendix C: Faculty Compensation Evaluation Guidelines) to prepare a narrative review (evaluation of the member), and to provide the numeric ratings of each committee member in all three performance dimensions (teaching, research, service), all in accordance with the policies and procedures of the Provost's Office. In the event one or two members dissent with the committee's narrative review, those members shall complete an individual committee member narrative evaluation to be included in the Committee report.

3.1.1.3. **Distribution of Merit Scores.** The compensation committee will follow the University's Compensation Committee guidelines to assign an approximate distribution.

3.1.2. **Department Head's Evaluation of Teaching, Research, and Service.**

3.1.2.1. The TCM Personnel Committee shall forward all of these assessments and ratings to the Department Head. Additionally, the TCM Personnel Committee shall meet with the Department Head prior to forwarding the applicant's composite ratings to the Dean's office.

3.1.2.2. The Department Head shall provide a narrative review, ratings on the three performance dimensions, and a composite performance rating for each applicant. The composite performance rating shall be based upon a weighted average of the three performance dimensions, as explained below.

3.1.2.3. The Department Head shall have the freedom to negotiate the weighting percentages with both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty members, in accordance with the policies of the Dean's office, the Provost's office, and the Faculty Handbook. Such negotiations occur in the 1st quarter of each calendar year for the following academic year. These weights should reflect the percent of effort a faculty member directs to each dimension.

3.1.3. **Report to the Candidate.** The Department Head should use information provided by the Department Compensation Committee to give extensive formal feedback to the candidate,

including copies of the committee's narrative reviews and the committee's ratings, along with the Department Head's ratings, as required by the Provost's Office. Only anonymous reports will be released to the candidate.

3.1.4. **Supporting Documentation.** The faculty member shall support the application for compensation review with the following documentation and other material as desired:

3.1.4.1. The documents in Appendix D: TCM Annual Evaluation (Merit) Report Forms shall be submitted with the application:

3.1.4.1.1. Part A: Annual Evaluation Summary (less than one page).

3.1.4.1.2. Part B: Rationale for Evaluation of Teaching, Research, and Service (less than 6 pages).

3.1.4.1.3. A current Academic Vita.

3.1.4.1.4. Copies of all teaching evaluation scores and comments.

3.1.4.2. The following documentation shall be available from the faculty member upon request from the committee:

3.1.4.2.1. Evidence of teaching activity including copies of course syllabi, samples of assignments, exams, and/or student projects, "Course Overview and Assessment Document," and other documentation to support teaching effectiveness, copies of significant course or curriculum development activity.

3.1.4.2.2. Evidence of all scholarly activity including copies of all published work, proceedings, paper presentations, monographs, and work under review, along with descriptions of all work in progress.

3.1.4.2.3. Evidence of all service activities.

3.1.4.2.4. Documentation from previous years obtained from applicant files maintained by the department.

3.1.5. **Digital Measures.** Each faculty member shall update their Digital Measures profile by entering all relevant teaching, research and service data for the previous calendar year by January 31 of the current year.

3.2. Annual Appointment Reviews.

3.2.1. Annual reviews and recommendations of reappointment for untenured, ranked faculty and non-tenure track faculty will be conducted in accordance with the Faculty Evaluation Calendar published by the Provost’s Office. The candidate shall initiate the Annual Appointment Review process, submitting relevant materials to the chair of the TCM Appointment Committee at a date specified by the Chair of the TCM Personnel Committee in accordance with the Faculty Evaluation Calendar published by the Provost’s Office.

3.2.2. The TCM Appointment Committee will solicit and consider input from all tenured faculty. The TCM Appointment Committee will meet to consider the reappointment application and establish the reappointment recommendation.

3.2.3. The TCM Appointment Committee will make the initial recommendation, write a formal report, and forward it to the TCM Personnel Committee. The recommendation will include the rationale for the decision and whether it was a consensus decision.

3.2.4. Non-reappointment decisions, reached in accordance to the procedures described in the Faculty Handbook Section 4, and notice of non-reappointment shall be given in writing by the Provost according to standards listed in the Faculty Handbook [Section 3.10].

3.3. Promotion and Tenure Reviews.

3.3.1. Requirements and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure.

3.3.1.1. **Promotion.** The Faculty Handbook, Section 3, discusses Academic Personnel Policies. Specifically, the basis for appointment and eligibility for promotion for non-tenure track faculty positions are as follows: Instructor, Section 3.5.1 and Senior Instructor, Section 3.5.2. The basis for appointment and eligibility for promotion in each tenure track rank are as follows: Assistant professor, section 3.3.1; Associate Professor, Section 3.3.2; Professor, Section 3.3.3; and Distinguished Professor, Section 3.3.4. Note that as of January 1, 2007, the rank of Instructor is not eligible for tenure track [Section 3.5].

3.3.1.2. **Tenure.** A decision to grant tenure must reflect an assessment of high professional competence and performance measured against University standards. 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. Recommendations for tenure are made in accordance with department, college, and University policies and procedures as further detailed in Section 3.7 of the Faculty Handbook.

3.3.1.2.1. Only tenure track faculty are eligible for tenure [Section 3.7.2].

3.3.1.2.2. The locus of tenure is in the University [Section 3.9].

3.3.1.3. This section establishes TCM criteria for promotion and tenure. The performance criteria that define the standards for promotion and tenure are outlined in the table below where performance levels are defined as *Expected = 1, Above Expected = 2 and Excellent = 3:*

Table 1: Technology and Construction Management Department Standards for Tenure and Promotion

Senior Instructor * promotion only	Performance Category: Teaching	Performance Category: Research	Performance Category: Service
Option A	2	N/A	1
Option B	1	N/A	2

Assistant Professor	Performance Category: Teaching	Performance Category: Research	Performance Category: Service
	1	1	1

Associate Professor and/or Tenure	Performance Category: Teaching	Performance Category: Research	Performance Category: Service
Option A	2	2	1
Option B	2	1	2
Option C	1	2	2
Option D	3	1	1
Option E	1	3	1

Full Professor	Performance Category: Teaching	Performance Category: Research	Performance Category: Service
Option A	3	2	2
Option B	2	3	2
Option C	3	3	1
Option D	3	1	3
Option E	1	3	3

3.3.1.4. Table 1 outlined above is presented only to clarify the optional performance paths and suggest the relative weight of evidence of performance required to distinguish professional rank or tenure. It is not intended to prescribe a numeric system for measuring performance levels. A more detailed description of these performance criteria are found in Appendix A: ***Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria for Promotion and Tenure***.

3.3.1.5. Decisions to grant tenure or to promote individual faculty members are inherently and inescapably judgmental. While the criteria offer general guidelines to evaluate candidates, expectations for each individual faculty member may vary based on specific assignments and circumstances. Individuals charged with making evaluations are expected to use their best professional judgment when applying the criteria described in the Faculty Handbook.

3.3.1.6. Non-tenure track academic positions are given term appointments that automatically terminate upon the expiration of the specific term [Section 3.5]. However, Instructors may be promoted to the rank of Senior Instructor in accordance with the Faculty Handbook Section 3.5.2.

3.3.1.7. **Early Promotion and Tenure.** Assistant Professors normally apply for tenure in their sixth year of probationary status at Missouri State. However, individuals with exceptional records of accomplishments may apply for tenure in their fourth or fifth year (adjusted as described in the Faculty Handbook for those faculty hired with credit granted toward tenure). A potential candidate should receive initial guidance from the department head and dean regarding the criteria and expectations for early tenure and early promotion. Early tenure and early promotion are granted only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons.

3.3.1.7.1.1. **Early Promotion.** In order to receive a favorable recommendation for early promotion to associate professor or full professor, a candidate must achieve a record of distinction in all three areas of evaluation that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements established in the department and college policies. Candidates for early promotion to associate professor are normally also candidates for early tenure. In rare instances, the university may decide that a candidate's achievements merit promotion to the rank of associate professor without a concomitant awarding of tenure. This decision represents the belief that a

candidate has produced a body of work sufficient for promotion, but has not yet fully demonstrated the sustained record upon which tenure is based.

3.3.1.7.1.2. **Early Tenure.** Early tenure may be granted in rare cases when a candidate demonstrates a record of distinction in all three areas and superior accomplishments significantly beyond what is expected for tenure on the standard six-year timeline. The candidate's record must establish compelling evidence of distinction in all areas and must inspire confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue.

3.3.2. **Pre-Tenure/Pre-Promotion and Pre-Promotion Reviews.** Pre-Tenure/Pre-Promotion Review and Pre-Promotion Review are discussed in Sections 4.6.1 and 4.6.3.1, respectively, of the Faculty Handbook. These reviews will constitute that year's regular performance review for the faculty member. Documentation follows the flow chart in the Faculty Handbook.

3.3.3. **Tenure/Promotion and Promotion Reviews.** The tenure/promotion and promotion reviews are discussed at length in sections 4.6.2 and 4.6.3 of the Faculty Handbook, and follows the procedure outlined therein.

3.3.3.1. **External Reviews for Tenure/Promotion and Promotion Reviews.** It is expected that, in the case of tenure track actions, external reviews will be solicited from three comparable institutions by the department head to aid each tenure/promotion or promotion decision. External reviewers will be identified collaboratively by the faculty member and the Department Head working with the personnel committee and in consultation with the College Dean. The Department Head is responsible for obtaining a sufficient number of reviews. The external review process will be in accordance with the Faculty Handbook and the Faculty Evaluation Calendar published by the Provost's Office.

3.4. **Supporting Documentation for Appointment, Tenure and Promotion.** Applicants shall submit supporting documentation on or before the date set by the personnel committee. Supporting documentation is submitted to the Chair of the appropriate subcommittee. Although additional objective evidence may be requested by the committee, the following represents the minimum level of documentation to be submitted:

3.4.1. Formal cover letter of application and request for review by subcommittee.

3.4.2. Vita.

3.4.3. Performance summary including but not limited to:

3.4.3.1. Philosophy of teaching,

3.4.3.2. Major accomplishments,

3.4.3.3. Brief summary of teaching, research and service.

3.4.4. Section 1: Assessment

3.4.4.1. Evaluation reports covering the last six years or since last appointment/hire from:

3.4.4.1.1. Department head,

3.4.4.1.2. Committees,

3.4.4.1.3. Subcommittees.

3.4.4.1.4. Note: compensation reports shall not to be used.

3.4.5. Section 2: Teaching

3.4.5.1. General summary of teaching performance.

3.4.5.2. Chronological summary of classes taught, including teaching evaluations and significant improvements implemented.

3.4.5.3. Supporting objective evidence including but not limited to:

3.4.5.3.1. Copies of all teaching evaluations including all student comments during evaluation period,

3.4.5.3.2. Faculty's Course Overview and Evaluations for each course taught,

3.4.5.3.3. Samples of course syllabus, major assignments, teaching aids.

3.4.5.4. Other items as appropriate.

3.4.5.4.1. Evidence of promoting appreciation for diversity.

3.4.5.4.2. Documentation of teaching awards or honors.

3.4.5.4.3. Etc.

3.4.5.5. Reporting in teaching should include only service at MSU.

3.4.6. Section 3: Research:

3.4.6.1. General summary of research performance.

3.4.6.2. Chronological summary of scholarly activity organized into four categories:

3.4.6.2.1. Refereed journal articles (letter of acceptance if accepted but not published),

3.4.6.2.2. Conference proceedings,

3.4.6.2.3. Grants.

3.4.6.2.4. Miscellaneous, including but not limited to:

3.4.6.2.4.1. Contributions to text books,

3.4.6.2.4.2. Presentations,

3.4.6.2.4.3. Participation as a reviewer.

3.4.6.3. Supporting objective evidence should include:

3.4.6.3.1. Copies of all journal publications (accepted and submitted) covering the last six years.

3.4.6.3.2. Grants, including:

3.4.6.3.2.1. Copies of grant award letters,

3.4.6.3.2.2. Summary reports for completed projects,

3.4.6.3.2.3. In- progress reports,

3.4.6.3.2.4. Submitted grant application still eligible for funding.

3.4.6.3.3. Samples of other scholarly activity.

3.4.6.4. Reporting in research may include lifetime accomplishments.

3.4.6.5. Other objective evidence as appropriate.

3.4.7. Section 4: Service

3.4.7.1. General overview summary of service activity.

3.4.7.2. Chronological overview of service both within the University and the community during the last six years or since date of last appointment.

3.4.7.3. Supporting objective evidence may include:

3.4.7.3.1. Letters of appointment,

3.4.7.3.2. Letters of appreciation,

3.4.7.3.3. Awards,

3.4.7.3.4. Recognitions,

3.4.7.3.5. Other objective evidence as appropriate.

4. Mentor Program

4.1. Introduction.

4.1.1. The Technology and Construction Management Department's mission to achieve and sustain excellence in its academic programs adheres to the philosophy of university collegiality, teamwork, and professionalism. The Department's Mentor Program is designed to assist the department head and departmental faculty in their individual and collective pursuits in achieving the missions of the university, college and department.

4.1.2. The primary goal of the Mentor Program is to optimize the individual and collective performances of Technology and Construction Management faculty by promoting a collegial and collaborative relationship between faculty members. An important feature of the Technology and Construction Management Department's Mentor Program is its correlation to the department's reappointment, promotion, and tenure guidelines.

4.1.3. Most specifically, the Mentor Program (MP) is designed to mentor three categories of faculty members: 1) newly hired faculty, 2) faculty members with performance below "expected" or "competent" in one or more of the three areas of teaching, research, and service, and 3) faculty who request mentoring.

4.1.4. The overall purpose of the Technology and Construction Management Department's Mentor Program is to assist Technology and Construction Management faculty in optimizing their respective and collective performances. The mentoring process is, therefore, a critical part of the department's commitment to continuous improvement.

4.1.5. In addition to the Mentor Program, it is expected that each faculty member in the department, regardless whether they are non-tenured or tenured faculty, will function as a mentor to any faculty member who requests advice, assistance, or collaboration in any one of the three areas of teaching, research, and/or service, thus increasing teamwork within the department.

4.2. **Duration of Mentoring Program.** The faculty member's mentor(s) and the department head shall be responsible to set the duration of the Mentor Program for each faculty member. For newly hired faculty and for faculty with performance below expected, the duration shall be at least 2 years.

4.3. **Selection of Mentors.** Individual faculty members who serve as a mentor are required to meet the following:

4.3.1. The mentor shall be elected by a majority vote of the TCM Personnel Committee from the tenured faculty in the department or from within the college.

4.3.2. The mentors should be tenured-faculty recognized as having achieved or exceeded expected performance in all three areas of teaching, research, and service.

4.4. Newly Hired Faculty.

4.4.1. Preferably before classes begin, but no later than the third week of the faculty member's first semester, new faculty members should meet separately with the department head, and with their respective mentor(s).

4.4.2. The purpose of these meetings is as follows

4.4.2.1. To establish a collegiality between the new faculty member and departmental faculty,

4.4.2.2. To review the Faculty Handbook,

4.4.2.3. To discuss campus resources that enhance teaching, research, and service, including possible awards and grants,

4.4.2.4. To discuss portfolio construction,

4.4.2.5. To list social and other networking events within the department, college, and university, and in the community-at-large,

4.4.2.6. To outline College and Departmental procedures and policies, and

4.4.2.7. To delineate the University's, College's, and Department's compensation, appointment review, promotion, and tenure policies.

4.4.3. The newly hired faculty member's responsibilities include the following:

4.4.3.1. To meet with the mentor(s) assigned to the newly hired faculty member.

4.4.3.2. To meet with the department head.

4.4.3.3. To develop a plan that

4.4.3.3.1. Outlines the individual's annual goals, including measurable actions for achieving those goals, in the three areas of teaching, research, and service; and

4.4.3.3.2. Establishes milestones to monitor progress in achieving the goals.

4.4.3.4. To meet and submit the final plan in a joint meeting with the mentor(s) and department head, no later than nine weeks following the first meeting.

4.4.4. There shall be at least one meeting per semester between the mentor(s) and the newly hired faculty member throughout the duration of the mentoring program. The newly hired faculty member shall record the minutes of this meeting that shall be signed and agree to by both the mentor(s) and the newly hired faculty member.

4.5. Faculty with Performance Below Expected or Below Competent.

4.5.1. The Mentor Program is also designed to assist faculty members whose performance has been determined to be below "expected" or "competent" in one or more of the following areas: teaching, research, and service activities.

4.5.2. The department head and the Personnel Committee shall monitor the performance of the departmental faculty and ascertain whether a faculty member's performance warrants that the faculty be referred to the Mentor Program.

4.5.3. The faculty member's responsibility in the MP include the following:

4.5.3.1. To meet with the mentor(s) assigned to that faculty member no later than three weeks after the department head notified him or her of being referred to the Mentor Program. [This meeting is to be set by that faculty member's mentor(s) in consultation with faculty member.] The purpose of this meeting is to delineate the Technology and Construction Management Department's reappointment and promotion policies that relate to the faculty member's circumstances.

4.5.3.2. To develop a plan that

4.5.3.2.1. Outlines the individual's annual goals, including measurable actions for achieving those goals, in the three areas of teaching, research, and service; and

4.5.3.2.2. Established milestones to monitor progress in achieving the goals.

4.5.3.3. To meet and submit the final plan in a joint meeting with the mentor(s) and department head, no later than nine weeks following the first meeting.

4.5.4. There shall be at least one meeting per semester between the mentor(s) and the faculty member throughout the duration of the mentoring program. The faculty member shall record the minutes of this meeting that shall be signed and agreed to by both the mentor(s) and the newly hired faculty member.

4.6. **Faculty Member Requesting Assistance.** Any faculty member in the Technology and Construction Management Department may request assistance from departmental mentors. Under these circumstances, the faculty/mentor relationship is one to be established by the nature of the request.

4.7. **Responsibilities of the Mentor(s).** The responsibilities of the mentor(s) include the following:

4.7.1. To meet with the faculty member to delineate policies and procedures.

4.7.2. To assist, review, and advise the faculty member in developing an action plan designed to meet or exceed expected and/or competent performance in teaching, research, and service.

4.7.3. To monitor the faculty member's progress in achieving his or her plan, including, but not limited to, establishing collegiality with the faculty member, visiting the faculty member's classroom (use form in Appendix E: TCM Peer Evaluation of Teaching), evaluating the faculty member's teaching, requesting additional meetings with the faculty member, conducting informal visits or "chats" with the faculty member, etc.

4.7.4. At the option of the mentor, the following feedback may be given:

4.7.4.1. A report of planned meeting dates, actual meeting dates, and minutes of the meetings to the department head and the faculty member, or to the faculty member only.

4.7.4.2. A progress report, at the end of each academic year, to the department head and the faculty member, or to the faculty member only.

4.7.4.3. Any other written or oral feedback to the department head and the faculty member, or to the faculty member only.

4.8. **Responsibilities of the Department Head.** The department head's responsibility in the mentoring process includes the following:

4.8.1. To meet with the faculty member to delineate policies and procedures.

4.8.2. To assist, review, and counsel the faculty member in developing an action plan that is designed to meet or exceed expected performance (and competent performance) in teaching, research, and service.

4.8.3. To monitor the faculty member's progress in achieving his or her plan.

4.8.4. To formally acknowledge, within two weeks of its reception, receipt of the faculty member's submitted plan, and, at the option of the department head, to provide written or oral feedback to the candidate.

4.9. **Changing Mentors.** In cases of changing commitments, incompatibility, or where the relationship is not mutually fulfilling, either the faculty member or the mentor should seek confidential advice from the department head or the chairman of the Personnel Committee. Changes can be made without prejudice or fault. In any case, faculty members are encouraged to seek out additional mentors as the need arises.

Appendix A: Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

The following sections describe three dimensions of faculty performance - teaching, research, and service - used by the Technology and Construction Management Department to evaluate candidates for promotion and tenure decisions. Each dimension is defined, types of measures are described, and criteria for different levels of performance are suggested.

I. Rating Factor Criterion: Teaching

Teaching is among the most important faculty responsibilities in any institution of higher education. According to the 1996 *Faculty Roles and Rewards* document, "Enhancing the learning process is a primary function of the faculty and everything else pertains to or extends from this activity [Section II.A]." Thus, no serious consideration will be given to promotion or tenure unless a candidate can demonstrate effective teaching.

The January 1998 presentation of the report by the *Missouri State University Committee on Teaching Effectiveness* to the Faculty Senate outlines a useful approach to defining teaching effectiveness. This report recognizes that teaching evaluation is a multidimensional activity. This suggests that no single measure is adequate to assess the total domain of teaching effectiveness. Instead, different measures should be used to assess different dimensions of teaching. Thus, in the evaluation of a candidate, the Departmental Committee should consider multiple measures of teaching effectiveness, and the validity of each specific measure for assessing the dimension of teaching effectiveness it presumes to measure.

A. **Measures of Teaching Effectiveness**

1) **Self-Evaluation:** An essential measure of teaching effectiveness is the individual faculty member's critical review of his or her own teaching approaches and philosophies and self-review of teaching tools and techniques. This measure of teaching effectiveness can be useful for assessing organization and preparation, teaching objectives, course content and rigor, and subject knowledge. Additionally, this measure can be used to evaluate course development activities, active attempts to improve teaching, and efforts to incorporate new instructional technology into the class. This method should not be used to assess dimensions such as presentation skills or attitude measures. Examples of possible measures might include some of the following, or other related measures:
   a) Statements of teaching philosophy.
   b) Course materials including syllabi, exams, and handouts.
   c) Evidence of course development.
   d) Student work samples.
   e) Activities to improve teaching effectiveness (seminars, workshops, etc...)

2) **Peer Evaluation:** An essential measure of teaching performance is review by faculty colleagues. Peer review should include review of course materials and other documents described above in "self-evaluation" to establish the appropriateness of course content and methods, course rigor, and organization skills. Peer review can also be used to assess subject matter knowledge and, if class observation is used, presentation and communication skills. Examples of possible measures might include some of the following, or other related measures:
   a) Critical review of course materials and philosophy statements.
   b) Class visits and observation
   c) Assessment of professional development activities to assess subject knowledge.

3) **Reaction Measures:** Reaction measures regarding individual faculty performance are important measures of teaching effectiveness. Reaction measures should be used to evaluate the presentation skills of the faculty member including the ability to present clear course objectives, the ability to present material effectively, and efforts to motivate and involve students. Reaction measures may also be used to assess perceptions of a faculty member's willingness to treat students fairly, and to treat students with respect and dignity. Finally, reaction measures can be used to assess faculty willingness to assist and encourage students, and to provide them reasonable access and timely feedback. Reaction measures should not be used to assess course rigor, faculty member subject knowledge, or course content. The committee should exercise caution in the interpretation of formal student evaluation instruments, recognizing both the influence of the context of the evaluation process, and the limits of practical and statistical significance in the numerical outcomes. Rather more emphasis should be given to specific items on an instrument than on total average scores. In addition, evaluations of scores should be criterion referenced rather than norm referenced. Examples of reaction measures could include some of the following, or other related measures:
   a) Ratings on items and dimensions of formal student evaluation forms.
   b) Student, alumni, and/or employer feedback or comments.
   c) Student interviews or focus groups.

4) **Outcome Measures:** Outcome measures represent additional indices of the effectiveness of one's teaching. Specifically, outcome measures assess learning. The committee should consider, however, that outcome measures are subject to numerous threats to internal validity not present with other measures of teaching effectiveness. Therefore, outcome measures should be used judiciously. Outcome measures such as grade distributions and performance on standardized final exams may be used in context to assess knowledge acquisition and course rigor. Other measures such as scores on standardized tests are subject to contamination (forces outside the individual faculty member's control), and while useful to assess academic programs, should be used with caution as indicators of individual teaching effectiveness. Examples of outcome measures might include some of the following, or similar measures:
   a) Course final grade distributions.
   b) Scores on departmental or standardized final exams.
   c) Pretest-posttest results.
   d) Performance on standardized exams.

B. Descriptions of Criterion Levels for Teaching

The definitions of three different levels of teaching effectiveness follow. These will serve as a basis for establishing criteria for tenure and promotion when incorporated with the research and service categories. However, establishing specific, objective, and measurable criteria for teaching performance is probably neither possible nor desirable. Instead, the committee must use careful, considered, professional judgment in

deciding the appropriateness of rating a candidate at a specific level. 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.

1) **Expected Performance**

All candidates must perform at an expected level in each of the following dimensions as described in order to merit a rating of "expected" in teaching effectiveness:

a) Course rigor and content: The faculty member must provide evidence of adequate course rigor and content based on self evaluations, peer evaluations of course materials, and/or outcome measures.

b) Subject knowledge: The faculty member must demonstrate command of the subject matter and strong knowledge of discipline based on self and peer evaluations of course materials.

c) Presentation, organization, and preparation skills: The faculty member must provide evidence of adequate presentation, organization, and preparation skills based on reaction measures, self evaluations, and/or peer evaluations.

d) Course development: The faculty member must demonstrate adequate ongoing efforts in course development activities and/or developing and implementing new instructional technologies as based on self and peer evaluations.

e) Appropriate conduct toward students: The faculty member must be able to demonstrate appropriate conduct toward students. This includes an attitude of respect for students, availability and willingness to assist students, and fairness in the application of policies. This also includes efforts to motivate students and encourage questions, and provide adequate and timely feedback regarding assignments and exams. This dimension should utilize reaction measures complimented by self and peer evaluations.

f) Other evidence to demonstrate "expected" teaching including:
   (i) Expected student advising.
   (ii) Nominations for teaching awards
   (iii) Assisting students with internships or employment opportunities.
   (iv) Other related activities.

2) **Above Expected Performance**

The following dimensions of teaching performance must be considered to establish a rating of "above expected" in teaching effectiveness. To merit an "above expected" rating, the faculty member should be able to demonstrate strong performance in the majority of the following dimensions, and expected levels in all:

a) Course rigor and content: The faculty member must provide evidence of high levels of course rigor and strong content based on self-evaluations, peer evaluations of course materials, and/or outcome measures.
b) Subject knowledge: The faculty member must demonstrate command of the subject matter and knowledge of the discipline based on self and peer evaluations of course materials.

c) Presentation, organization, and preparation skills: The faculty member must provide evidence of good presentation, organization, and preparation skills based on reaction measures, self-evaluations and/or peer evaluations.

d) Course development: The faculty member must demonstrate continuous and energetic efforts in course development activities and/or developing and implementing new instructional technologies as based on self and peer evaluations.

e) Appropriate conduct toward students: The faculty member must be able to demonstrate appropriate conduct toward students. This includes an attitude of respect for students, availability and willingness to assist students, and fairness in the application of policies. This also includes efforts to motivate students and encourage questions, and provide adequate and timely feedback regarding assignments and exams. This dimension should utilize reaction measures complimented by self and peer evaluations.

f) Other evidence should be presented by the faculty member to demonstrate "above expected" teaching including:
   (i) Being the recipient of a teaching award or awards.
   (ii) Outstanding student advising and/or thesis advising.
   (iii) Assisting students with internships or employment opportunities.
   (iv) Other related activities.

3) **Excellent Performance**

The following dimensions of teaching performance must be considered to establish a rating of "excellent" in teaching effectiveness. The faculty member should use a combination of the measures described above to demonstrate strong levels of performance in all dimensions:

a) Course rigor and content: The faculty member must provide evidence of high levels of course rigor and strong content based on self-evaluations, peer evaluations of course materials, and/or outcome measures.

b) Subject knowledge: The faculty member must demonstrate command of the subject matter and strong knowledge of discipline based on self and peer evaluations of course materials.

c) Presentation, organization, and preparation skills: The faculty member must provide evidence of good presentation, organization, and preparation skills based on reaction measures, self-evaluations, and/or peer evaluations.

d) Course development: The faculty member must demonstrate continuous and energetic efforts in course development activities and/or developing and implementing new instructional technologies as based on self and peer evaluations.

e) Appropriate conduct toward students: The faculty member must be able to demonstrate appropriate conduct toward students. This includes an attitude of respect for students, availability and willingness to assist students, and fairness in the application of policies. This also includes efforts to motivate students and encourage questions, and provide adequate and timely feedback regarding assignments and exams. This dimension should utilize reaction measures complimented by self and peer evaluations.

f) Other evidence may be presented by the faculty member to demonstrate "excellent" teaching including:
   (i) Being the recipient of a teaching award or awards.
   (ii) Outstanding student advising and/or thesis advising.
   (iii) Assisting students with internships or employment opportunities.
   (iv) Involving students in research activities.
   (v) Other related activities.

II. Rating Factor Criterion: Research

The Faculty Handbook states that 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, research productivity should be considered in tenure and promotion decisions . The Faculty Handbook provides taxonomy of scholarship/research that forms the basis for the Department of Technology and Construction Management's criteria for promotion and tenure [Section 3.3.3].

A. Types of Research

The following provides examples of different types of activities that fall under each of three research categories. The list is not meant to be either exclusive or exhaustive. The departmental committee must exercise considered professional judgment, both when deciding whether a faculty member's contribution fits a specific category, and on evaluating the significance of the contribution.

1) **Scholarship of Discovery:** Recognized as an essential element of the mission of the University, College, and the Department, scholarship of discovery is highly valued for both tenure and promotion. Evidence of scholarship of discovery is not required for tenure and promotion, but does provide strong evidence of research quality. Examples include:
   a) Original research findings published in scholarly journals.
   b) Scholarly books or monographs that advance understanding.
   c) Successful external grant applications for research.
   d) Presentation of original research findings at national or international, peer-reviewed professional meetings.

2) **Integrative and Applied Research**: Recognized as essential elements of the mission of the University, College, and the Department, integrative and applied research is required for tenure and promotion. Examples include:
   a) Published professional or applied research journal articles:
   b) Presentation of integrative or applied research at national, peer-reviewed meetings (paper or case presentations).
   c) Published textbook summarizing existing research.
   d) Published literature reviews or position papers.
   e) Published critical reviews of scholarly projects.
   f) Successful external grant applications for applied research.

3) **Professional Development and Other Research**: Recognized as essential elements of the mission of the University, College, and the Department. This category includes activities designed to maintain professional competence in one's field. All members of the department *must* engage in this form of activity for tenure and promotion, but it alone *is not sufficient* for tenure and/or promotion. Examples include:
   a) Staying abreast of current literature of the field.
   b) Contributions in others' published work such as textbooks chapters, readings books, case books, and other ancillary materials.
   c) Book/article reviews.
   d) Editorial responsibilities: professional publications, proceedings, and other discipline-related media.
   e) Editorial/manuscript reviewer for professional publications, textbook publishers, professional conferences.
   f) Discussant/attendance at international, national, regional, and local conference.

B. Descriptions of Criterion Levels for Research Productivity

The definitions of three different levels of research productivity follow: These will serve as a basis for establishing specific criteria for tenure and promotion when incorporated with teaching and service categories.

1) Expected Performance

The following two criteria should be satisfied:

a) The normal minimum expectation is an average of one peer-reviewed publication involving original, applied or integrative research, and/or scholarly book per year in rank. Some guidelines include the following:

   (i) Meeting minimum productivity requirements does not guarantee an "expected" rating. The committee must evaluate the faculty member's contribution to ensure that it meets an acceptable level of quality. Original empirical research is not required, but evidence of integrative and applied research must be demonstrated.

   (ii) The normal minimum productivity requirement applies to the applicant's last full year of service. As an example, an assistant professor progressing normally and applying for tenure in his or her fifth year of service would normally be expected to have a minimum of four peer-reviewed publications.

(iii) Faculty members with three peer-reviewed publications in a five year period may be considered to be at the expected level of performance only if the contributions are judged to be of substantial quality, if the faculty member is a major contributor to the publications, if the publications are in the faculty member's field of expertise, and if the faculty member presents additional supporting evidence of scholarly activity such as paper presentations, proceedings, working papers, published cases, or works under review.

(iv) A faculty member with fewer than three peer-reviewed publications in a five year period will not be considered to be at the expected level of performance.

(v) In general, contributions unconditionally accepted by, or published in, peer reviewed outlets, or scholarly books published or in press meet this criterion.

(vi) The strength of the contribution must also be considered in the evaluation of research quality in that there should be evidence of an individual faculty member's contributions through single or first authorship status in at least some of the contributions.

(vii) Truly interdisciplinary efforts are encouraged where the faculty member can bring his/her expertise to bear with professional peers on difficult or unusual problems or to facilitate the creative redefinition of issues. Publications out of one's field that do not meet this criterion will be considered, but some research activity in one's own field must be in evidence.

(viii) An amount of research activity above the minimum productivity requirements must be considered as additional evidence of performing at the expected level.

b) Other evidence of either integrative or applied research as described above such as successful grant applications, presentations at professional meetings, proceedings publications, works under review, textbook writing, etc., should be considered as evidence of meeting the expected level of performance, particularly where a faculty member has met only the minimum requirements for peer-reviewed publishing described above. Evidence of being continuously and actively engaged in professional development through attendance at professional meetings and conferences, through active involvement in professional organizations, or other significant personal development activities, is required.

2) **Above Expected Performance**

The following three criteria should be satisfied:

a) The normal minimum expectation is an average of one peer-reviewed publication involving original research, applied or integrative research, and/or scholarly book per year in rank. The quality of the contributions should reflect a significant contribution to one's discipline. Some guidelines include:

(i) All publications must be evaluated on the basis of the reputation of the journal, or through book reviews, citation indexes, or any other evidence of the quality of the contribution. While the publication of original research (scholarship of discovery) is indicative of this level of performance, it is not required for this criterion. Evidence of applied or integrative

research is required, but may be of lesser quality than that required by the "excellent" level.

(ii) The normal minimum productivity requirement applies to the applicant's last full year of service. As an example, an associate professor applying for promotion in his or her tenth year of service would normally be expected to have a minimum of nine peer-reviewed publications and/or scholarly books.

(iii) The strength of the individual contribution should also be considered in that there should be some evidence of an individual faculty member's contributions through single and first authorship status in some of the publications.

(iv) Truly interdisciplinary efforts are encouraged where the faculty member can bring his/her expertise to bear with professional peers on difficult or unusual problems or to facilitate the creative redefinition of issues. Publications out of one's field that do not meet this criterion may be considered, but evidence of "above expected" performance requires substantial activity in one's own field.

(v) An amount of research activity above the minimum productivity requirements must be considered. Productivity above minimal requirements may be one indication of performance above the "expected" level of performance.

b) Other evidence of original, integrative, or applied research such as successful grant applications, presentations at professional meetings, textbook writing, etc., should be considered. Evidence of being continuously and actively engaged in professional development through attendance at professional meetings and conferences, through active involvement in professional organizations, or other significant personal development activities, is required.

c) Some evidence that faculty member serves as a resource person with regard to research activities of others should be considered. The faculty member should serve as a conduit of essential information through attending and participating in professional activities, through reviewing and critiquing recent work, or through serving as a consultant to groups outside the university.

3) **Excellent Performance**

The following three criteria should be satisfied:

a) The normal minimum expectation is an average of one peer-reviewed publication involving original research, applied or integrative research, and/or scholarly book per year in rank. A record of continuous scholarly activity is required for all levels of performance. However, the distinction between a rating of "excellent" and a lower rating requires evaluating both the overall quality of the faculty member's contributions and his or her level of activity. Some guidelines include the following:

(i) All publications must be evaluated on the basis of the (1) reputation of the journal or publishing outlet, (2) reviews of the article, book, or other contribution, (3) evidence of recognition provided by citation indices, or (4) any other evidence of the quality of the contribution. While scholarship of discovery is not required to place someone at this level,

it would be considered strong support of high quality. In the absence of scholarship of discovery, strong evidence of a body of integrative and applied research is required.

(ii) The normal minimum productivity requirement applies to the applicant's last full year of service. As an example, an associate professor applying for promotion in his or her tenth year of service would normally be expected to have a minimum of nine peer-reviewed publications and/or scholarly books.

(iii) Significant evidence of the faculty member's individual contribution on the basis of authorship must be considered. In general, single and first authorship will be given considerable weight as evidence of one's individual contribution. Contributions with multiple authorship may be considered, but should be given lesser weight.

(iv) Truly interdisciplinary efforts are encouraged where the faculty member can bring his/her expertise to bear with professional peers on difficult or unusual problems, or to facilitate the creative redefinition of issues. However, an abundance of publications out of one's field should generally not be evidence of "excellent" performance unless they meet this criterion. Multiple authored, out-of-field publications generally should not be considered evidence of "excellent" research performance.

(v) An amount of research activity above the minimum productivity requirements must be considered. The volume of activity may not compensate for lack of quality, but will provide additional evidence of "excellent" performance.

b) Other significant evidence of original, integrative, or applied research such as successful grant applications, presentations at national or international professional meetings, textbook writing, etc., should be considered. Evidence of being continuously and actively engaged in professional development through attendance at professional meetings and conferences, through active involvement in professional organizations, or other significant personal development activities, is required.

c) Strong evidence that faculty member serves as a resource person with regard to scholarship and research activities of others is required. The faculty member will serve as a conduit of essential information through attending and participating in professional activities, through reviewing and critiquing recent work, or through serving as a consultant to groups outside the university.

III. Rating Factor Criterion: Service

In the Faculty Handbook, each faculty member is expected to make professional contributions through service to the Department, the College, the University, the regional community, and to his or her discipline as one of the requirements for reappointment, promotion and tenure. The Faculty Handbook provides taxonomy of service activity that forms the basis for the Department of Technology and Construction Management's criteria for promotion and tenure [Section 4.2.3.2].

A. Types of Service

The following describes service activities that fall under two categories of service: Service as Scholarship, and Service as Citizenship. The examples that follow are not meant to be either exclusive or exhaustive. The

departmental committee must exercise considered professional judgment, both when deciding whether a faculty member's contribution fits a specific category, and in evaluating the significance of the contribution.

1) **Service as Scholarship**: The first dimension of service describes service in terms of scholarship. To be considered scholarship, service activities must be tied to the special knowledge the performer of the activities has acquired. These activities require rigor and accountability, and are highly valuable for promotion and tenure decisions. Thus, the significance of the results of that service should be amenable to evaluation. Service activities should contribute to knowledge, aid learning, and/or help to solve problems within or outside of the university. As a part of an evaluation process, documentation of these endeavors and their fitness within the definition of service as a form of scholarship should be expected. Evaluation should take into account the nature or type of service activity, the duration and impact of the service activity, and the significance of the contribution played by the faculty member. Examples include:

    a) Holding an elected office or other position of leadership in professional organizations.

    b) Editing a national, regional and/or local professional journal.

    c) Consulting activities where it can be shown to benefit the faculty member's effectiveness in teaching and research.

    d) Serving as an invited speaker, holding board membership or other positions of leadership, providing and developing training for community organizations outside the university.

    e) Receiving major external recognition for service activities.

    f) Teaching courses or seminars through the Continuing Education Program, Center for Business Research and Development, intersession courses or any other University sponsored seminar.

    g) Assisting other faculty members with computer tasks or technology training, assisting faculty in understanding new developments related to that professor's field, guest lecturing in other classes.

2) **Service as Citizenship**: The second dimension of service can more properly be referred to as "citizenship." Citizenship activities relate to active participation in the shared governance structure of the Department, the College, and the University, as well as meritorious social and civic actions faculty as individuals may perform. Service, under this definition, is in keeping with the concept of citizenship, doing those charitable and necessary deeds required of a good citizen in both the organization and in society. Although worthy of recognition, citizenship activities do not constitute "scholarship" with its attendant use of professional training and specialized abilities. Examples include:

    a) Developing and implementing University/College/Department policy through active participation in the collegial decision-making process such as committees and other mechanisms for shared governance.

    b) Participating at professional meetings in the capacity of moderator, track chairperson, discussant, speaker, or reactor.

c) Advising a student professional organization.

d) Involvement in special projects for the department, college, or university, or profession, or community; work on innovative solutions to community or university problems.

e) Leadership or participation in community organizations.

B. Descriptions of Criterion Levels for Service

The definitions of three different levels of service follow: These will serve as a basis for establishing specific criteria for tenure and promotion when incorporated with teaching and research categories. Faculty do not have to perform all of the example activities described for a particular criterion level to be eligible for a rating at that level. The committee should consider the nature or type of each service activity, and the impact of the service activity on the Department, College, or University, and on one's profession. The committee should also consider the time involved and the significance of the contribution made by the faculty member. The evaluation will be based on documentation providing justification for the activity to be included at the requested levels.

1) Expected Performance

To be considered as "expected" there should be evidence of contributions from the following areas. The higher the level of visibility and prestige and the more significant the activities and accomplishments the more substantive the activity will be judged. The quantity, quality, and time\effort of activities can all be emphasized. There should be multiple activities with at least one activity from each of the two main categories being included, and evidence of service involvement. The particular blend of activities from the following categories will vary greatly from one candidate to another. The combination must include activities both internal and external to the University. Other activities not specifically mentioned in the "Guidelines" can also be considered provided they meet the spirit of the types of contributions considered by the University as "service".

To qualify for a rating of "expected", candidates must meet the following criteria:

a) **Service of Scholarship**– contributions in this area as evidenced by some combination of the criteria mentioned in the previous section. Roles such as offices or participation in professional organizations shall be judged according to such factors as visibility, prestige, activities and accomplishments involved. Also included would be participation in campus or community activities or projects <u>that involved the use of one's professional expertise</u>. This could be in the role of committee membership, consultant, invited speaker, conducting "nontraditional" courses or seminars through the University or professional organizations, etc. These activities shall be judged according to their level of visibility, activities and accomplishments involved, and contribution to the University or community.

b) **Service of Citizenship** – contributions in this area as evidenced by some combination of the criteria mentioned in the previous "Types of Service" section. Roles would include membership or participation in community organizations and membership in campus committees that <u>do not necessarily involve the use of one's professional expertise</u>. These could include activities of self-governance and special projects or "problem-solving" types of groups. Advising student organizations, serving as track chair, moderator, reactant etc. at professional meetings are also

involved. Assisting colleagues with professional issues and problems could also be considered. Attendance and participation in departmental and college meetings is also expected.

2) **Above Expected Performance**

To be considered as "above expected" there should be evidence that all the criteria for the "expected" level are met and then exceeded by additional contributions from the following areas. The higher the level of visibility and prestige and the more significant the activities and accomplishments the more substantive the activity will be judged. The quantity, quality, and time\effort of activities can all be emphasized. There should be numerous activities, some activity from each of the two main categories, and evidence of above expected involvement, although the particular blend of activities from the following categories will vary greatly from one candidate to another. The combination must include activities both internal and external to the University. Minimum criteria required for the "expected" level must be met along with the criteria in the "above expected" category. Other activities not specifically mentioned in the "Guidelines" can also be considered provided they meet the spirit of the types of contributions considered by the University as "service".

To qualify for a rating of "above expected", candidates must meet the following criteria:

a) **Service of Scholarship**– above average contributions in this area as evidenced by some combination of the criteria mentioned in the previous section. Roles such as editorships, offices in professional organizations, professional service awards, etc. shall be judged according to such factors as visibility, prestige, activities and accomplishments involved. Also included would be participation and/or leadership in campus or community activities or projects that involved the use of one's professional expertise. This could be in the role of committee chair or membership, consultant, invited speaker, conducting "nontraditional" courses or seminars through the University or professional organizations, etc. Awards for such activities should be considered. These activities shall be judged according to their level of visibility, activities and accomplishments involved, and contribution to the University or community.

b) **Service of Citizenship**– above average contributions in this area as evidenced by some combination of the criteria mentioned in the previous section. Roles would include leadership and/or membership in community organizations and leadership/membership in campus committees that do not necessarily involve the use of one's professional expertise. These could include activities of self-governance and special projects or "problem-solving" types of groups. Advising student organizations, serving as track chair, moderator, reactant etc. at professional meetings are also involved. Assisting colleagues with professional issues and problems could also be considered.

3) **Excellent Performance**

To be considered as "excellent" there should be evidence of substantial contributions that include both of the following areas. The higher the level of visibility and prestige and the more significant the activities and accomplishments the more substantive the activity will be judged. The quantity, quality, and time\effort of activities can all be emphasized. There should be numerous activities, multiple examples from each of the two main categories, and evidence of some leadership involved although the particular blend of activities from the following categories will vary greatly from one candidate to another. The combination must include activities both internal and external to the University. Minimum criteria required for the "expected" and "above expected" levels must be met along with the

criteria in the "excellent" category. Other activities not specifically mentioned in the "Guidelines" can also be considered provided they meet the spirit of the types of contributions considered by the University as "service".

To qualify for a rating of "excellent", candidates must meet the following criteria:

a) **Service of Scholarship**– "significant" contributions in this area as evidenced by some combination of the criteria mentioned in the previous section. Roles such as editorships, offices in professional organizations, professional service awards, etc. shall be judged according to such factors as visibility, prestige, activities and accomplishments involved. Also included would be participation and/or leadership in campus or community activities or projects that involved the use of one's professional expertise. This could be in the role of board member, committee chair or membership, consultant, invited speaker, conducting "nontraditional" courses or seminars through the University or professional organizations, etc. Awards for such activities should be considered. These activities shall be judged according to their level of visibility, activities and accomplishments involved, and contribution to the University or community.

b) **Service of Citizenship**– "significant" contributions in this area as evidenced by some combination of the criteria mentioned in the previous section. Roles would include leadership and/or membership in community organizations and leadership/membership in campus committees that do not necessarily involve the use of one's professional expertise. These could include activities of self-governance and special projects or "problem-solving" types of groups. Advising student organizations, serving as track chair, moderator, reactant etc. at professional meetings are also involved. Assisting colleagues with professional issues and problems could also be considered.

Appendix B: Promotion and Tenure Matrix Form

Teaching:

Candidate: _____ Application for Tenure (circle one): Yes No

Application Date: _____ Promotion to: _____

Department of Technology and Construction Management Teaching Standards

Performance Dimension	Standard	Description of Performance Relative to Standard	Location of Supporting Documents
A. Course Rigor and Content	The faculty member must provide evidence of adequate course rigor and content based on self-evaluations, peer evaluations of course materials, and/or outcome measures.		
B. Subject knowledge	The faculty member must demonstrate command of the subject matter and strong knowledge of discipline based on self and peer evaluations of course materials.		
C. Presentation, organization, and preparation skills	The faculty member must provide evidence of adequate presentation, organization, and preparation skills based on reaction measures, self-evaluations, and/or peer evaluations.		
D. Course development	The faculty member must demonstrate adequate ongoing efforts in course development activities and/or developing and implementing new instructional technologies as based on self and peer evaluations.		
E. Appropriate conduct toward students	The faculty member must be able to demonstrate appropriate conduct toward students. This includes an attitude of respect for students, availability and willingness to assist students, and fairness in the application of policies. This also includes efforts to motivate students and encourage questions, and provide adequate and timely feedback regarding assignments and exams. This dimension should utilize reaction measures complimented by self and peer evaluations.		
F. Other evidence to demonstrate "expected" teaching	(i) Expected student advising. (ii) Nominations for teaching awards. (iii) Assisting students with internships or employment opportunities. (iv) Other related activities		

1. To merit an "above expected" rating, the faculty member should be able to demonstrate strong performance in the majority of the dimensions, and expected levels in all.

2. To establish a rating of "excellent" in teaching effectiveness, the faculty member should use a combination of the measures described above to demonstrate strong levels of performance in all dimensions.

3. Other evidence should be presented by the faculty member to demonstrate "above expected or excellent" teaching including:

(i) Being the recipient of a teaching award or awards.

(ii) Outstanding student advising and/or thesis advising.

(iii) Assisting students with internships or employment opportunities.

(iv) Involving students in research activities.

(v) Other related activities

Research:

Candidate: _____ Application for Tenure (circle one): Yes No

Application Date: _____ Promotion to: _____

Department of Technology and Construction Management Teaching Standards

Performance Dimension	Standard	Description of Performance Relative to Standard	Location of Supporting Documents
A. Minimum Expectations	The normal minimum expectation is an average of one peer-reviewed publication involving original, applied or integrative research, and/or scholarly book per year in rank.		
B. Scholarly Engagement: Applied or Integration/Application Research	Other evidence of either integrative or applied research as described in the TCM Departmental Guidelines such as successful grant applications, presentations at professional meetings, proceedings publications, works under review, textbook writing, etc., should be considered as evidence of meeting the expected level of performance, particularly where a faculty member has met only the minimum requirements for peer-reviewed publishing described above. Evidence of being continuously and actively engaged in professional development through attendance at professional meetings and conferences, through active involvement in professional organizations, or other significant personal development activities, is required.		

1. To merit an **"above expected"** rating, the quality of the contributions should reflect a significant contribution to one's discipline. Some evidence that the faculty member serves as a resource person with regard to research activities of others should be considered. The faculty member should serve as a conduit of essential information through attending and participating in professional activities, through reviewing and critiquing recent work, or through serving as a consultant to groups outside the university.

2. To establish a rating of "excellent", a record of continuous scholarly activity is required for all levels of performance. However, the distinction between a rating of "excellent" and a lower rating requires evaluating both the overall quality of the faculty member's contributions and his or her level of activity. Strong evidence that the faculty member serves as a resource person with regard to scholarship and research activities of others is required. The faculty member will serve as a conduit of essential information through attending and participating in professional activities, through reviewing and critiquing recent work, or through serving as a consultant to groups outside the university.

Service:

Candidate: _____ Application for Tenure (circle one): Yes No

Application Date: _____ Promotion to: _____

Department of Technology and Construction Management Teaching Standards

Performance Dimension	Standard	Description of Performance Relative to Standard	Location of Supporting Documents
A. Service of Scholarship	Contributions in this area as evidenced by some combination of the criteria mentioned in the "Types of Service" section of the TCM Departmental Guidelines. Roles such as offices or participation in professional organizations shall be judged according to such factors as visibility, prestige, activities and accomplishments involved. Also included would be participation in campus or community activities or projects that involved the use of one's professional expertise. This could be in the role of committee membership, consultant, invited speaker, conducting "nontraditional" courses or seminars through the University or professional organizations, etc. These activities shall be judged according to their level of visibility, activities and accomplishments involved, and contribution to the University or community.		
B. Service of Citizenship	Contributions in this area as evidenced by some combination of the criteria mentioned in the "Types of Service" section of the TCM Departmental Guidelines. Roles would include membership or participation in community organizations and membership in campus committees that do not necessarily involve the use of one's professional expertise. These could include activities of self-governance and special projects or "problem-solving" types of groups. Advising student organizations, serving as track chair, moderator, reactant etc. at professional meetings are also involved. Assisting colleagues with professional issues and problems could also be considered. Attendance and participation in departmental and college meetings is also expected.		

1. To merit an "above expected" rating, there should be evidence that all the criteria for the "expected" level are met and then exceeded by additional contributions from the two main categories. The higher the level of visibility and prestige and the more significant the activities and accomplishments the more substantive the activity will be judged. The quantity, quality, and time\effort of activities can all be emphasized. There should be numerous activities, some activity from each of the two main categories, and evidence of above expected involvement, although the particular blend of activities from the two categories will vary greatly from one candidate to another. The combination must include activities both internal and external to the University. Minimum criteria required for the "expected" level must be met along with the criteria in the "above expected" category. Other activities not specifically mentioned in the "Guidelines" can also be considered provided they meet the spirit of the types of contributions considered by the University as "service".

2. To establish a rating of "excellent", there should be evidence of substantial contributions that include both of the two main categories. The higher the level of visibility and prestige and the more significant the activities and accomplishments the more substantive the activity will be judged. The quantity, quality, and time\effort of activities can all be emphasized. There should be numerous activities, multiple examples from each of the two main categories, and evidence of some leadership involved although the particular blend of activities from the two categories will vary greatly from one candidate to another. The combination must include activities both internal and external to the University. Minimum criteria required for the "expected" and "above expected" levels must be met along with the criteria in the "excellent" category. Other activities not specifically mentioned in the "Guidelines" can also be considered provided they meet the spirit of the types of contributions considered by the University as "service".

Appendix C: Faculty Compensation Evaluation Guidelines

Following are the Department of Technology and Construction Management's Faculty Compensation Evaluation Guidelines to be used annually as a basis for rating the performance of individual departmental faculty members. The resulting performance ratings from all departments will then be used by COB to determining annual compensation increases for all COB faculty members. Note that the performance ratings also provide an indication of progress by faculty; however, distinctly different guidelines exist for reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions. Therefore, be it understood that performance evaluated as competent for compensation purposes may not be sufficient for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The reappointment, tenure, and promotion guidelines only will be the basis for determining reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion.

The guidelines found in this document pertain to two classes of faculty, tenure-track faculty and full-time non-tenure-track lecturers. Primary consideration is given to tenure track faculty, but where expectations differ for non-tenure track lecturers such differences are noted.

Considerations for New Faculty

In accordance with the Provost's Compensation Committee recommendations, new faculty whose positions begin in August, may select one of the two options below related to salary increases for the next contract year:

Option 1. To participate in departmental and college approved compensation system. In doing so, new faculty may hope to enjoy whatever rating is assigned based on the teaching, research, and service accomplished since the beginning of their contract period in August. There will be no automatic assignment of a rating.

Option 2. To receive the average of the percent raise in each new faculty member's quartile provided the new faculty member is determined to be making satisfactory progress as determined through the annual tenure review process.

Faculty Duties and Responsibilities

A faculty member’s first responsibility is to *student learning*. Thus, each faculty member is obligated to help create at the University, in the College, and in the Department/School, beyond the class, an atmosphere of inquisitiveness and professional and community concern. The University, as noted in Section 1.3 of the current Faculty Handbook, and the College, as recorded in the COB Vision, Mission, and Value Statements, expect faculty members to employ a balanced approach toward carrying out their responsibilities. The University affords much latitude to faculty members in how they structure that balanced approach. COBA understands and supports the University’s purposes. However, COB has its own goals and objectives that include maintaining AACSB accreditation. Consequently, this document is influenced by COB’s unique goals.

The previous paragraph refers to tenured or tenure-track faculty. Expectations differ for non-tenure-track faculty, primarily in areas of research where expectations are limited or are none. Expectations for teaching competence do not differ from those of tenured or tenure-track faculty. In addition, full-time Instructors should expect to perform service. The remainder of this document provides specific guidance as to what may constitute meritorious performance by COB faculty.

Teaching Productivity and Performance Evaluation

An annual evaluation of teaching performance shall be based on 4 dimension groups: A) instructional delivery, B) instructional design, C) content expertise, and D) course management. These 4 dimension groups and the suggested assessment techniques are defined under the heading of "Teaching Dimension Group Definitions and Assessment Techniques." Many factors contribute to successful teaching in each of these dimensions. This document lists specific factors which are deemed necessary for competent teaching as well as additional factors and activities which may signify performance above competent. Other factors and activities which are not specifically mentioned can be considered in the evaluation of teaching if they achieve student learning and meet the spirit of teaching in the Technology and Construction Management Department.

Determination of Teaching Performance Levels

Faculty will be ranked in one of five levels which correspond to the rating scales recommended by the President's Compensation committee. Level 5 (Exceptional) is the highest level achievable by a faculty member, while level 1 (Unsatisfactory) is the lowest level.

Level 1: Unsatisfactory. Performance is below Competent for two years in a row. Improvement Plan is established and immediate improvement is required.

Level 2: Development Needed. Performance has fallen below Competent. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and improvement is required.

Level 3: Competent. All Minimum Factors for Competency in Groups A, B, C, and D are met.

Level 4: Commendable: Performance frequently and to an easily identified extent exceeds Competent levels. Factors for consideration at this level are presented in more than one Group (A, B, C, and D).

Level 5: Exceptional: Performance consistently and to a significant extent exceeds Competent levels. Multiple factors for consideration at this level are present in most Groups (A, B, C, and D).

Note: All Minimum Factors for Competency in Groups A, B, C, & D must be met before additional factors will be considered at any level.

Support of each teaching level must be established or augmented by information submitted in addition to student evaluations in over half of the claims.

Faculty must include teaching evaluations and comments as a part of their teaching compensation packet.

Definitions of Group Dimensions are defined below under the heading of "Teaching Dimension Group Definitions and Assessment Techniques."

Teaching Productivity Outcomes: Minimum Factors for Competency

Dimension A: Instructional Delivery

A. *Students understand course objectives.
B. *Is well prepared to teach class.
C. *Generally keeps to the subject matter as noted in syllabi and assignment schedules; deviations are generally attempts to make a point regarding the subject matter.
D. *Works well with students who seek help outside class.
E. *Shows enthusiasm and/or professional interest in the subject.

Dimension B: Instructional Design

F. Courses taught were generally well-organized.
G. Course content follows objectives established or approved by the Department.
H. Course material followed an understandable sequence.
I. Courses covered material indicated at beginning of semester.
J. Examinations followed the content of the course coverage.
K. Faculty accepted fair share of new preparations or difficult teaching assignments, including, but not limited to, laboratory classes, high student-volume classes, evening classes, Internet courses, and graduate level classes

Dimension C: Content Expertise

L. Possessed a requisite, basic knowledge of the subject matter taught in the course.

Dimension D: Course Management

M. Provided a course syllabus that adheres to the requirements for syllabi and course policy statements.
N. *Meet classes regularly.
O. *Meet classes generally on time.
P. Scheduled and kept required office hours.
Q. Complied in a timely manner with reporting requirements and other reasonable requests regarding teaching-related data.
R. Final examinations (or other meaningful course termination activities) were given at the time and place established or approved by the University.

Note: Those factors indicated with an asterisk ("*") may be answered or addressed using student evaluation scores, as follows:

a. An average score of 3.5 from all classes for an individual student evaluation question is considered competent for that one factor, as defined in the " Correlation Table: Faculty Productivity Factors versus Student Evaluation Instrument Questions."
b. An average composite score of 3.75 from all classes and all questions for all student evaluations is considered competent for all factors with an asterisk ("*").

Teaching Productivity Outcomes: Additional Factors

Dimension Group A: Instructional Delivery

1. Students learned the material covered in the course.
2. Students developed skills appropriate for the course level but which are not a part of the course material.
3. Directs independent readings or independent student research projects.
4. Improved course or course delivery using knowledge gained from attending formal training, documenting class activities, or regular student feedback.
5. Receives honors, awards or recognition for teaching effectiveness.
6. Makes effective use of instructional technology and class time.

Dimension Group B: Instructional Design

7. Establishes and enforces high standards of achievement for students and delivers a generally rigorous course appropriate for the level.
8. Works with other colleagues to assure course curriculum unique to that course and follows degree sequence or material is appropriate in multiple-section classes.
9. Develops new material or innovative teaching techniques.
10. Pursues new or updated course equipment, including outside grants.
11. Students are required to perform written and/or oral communication at an appropriate level.
12. Students are required or encouraged to work in groups at an appropriate level.
13. Course helps develop students' abilities to think critically and perform other higher cognitive skills at an appropriate level.
14. Course reflects standards and knowledge of professional organizations in discipline or includes difficult and/or newly developed issues that are generally not addressed in the assigned textbook
15. Faculty accepts more than fair share of new preparations or difficult teaching assignments, including, but not limited to, laboratory classes, high student-volume classes, evening classes, Internet courses, and graduate level classes.
16. Course includes a service-learning, public affairs component or includes emphasis of the relationship of the course to public affairs.
17. Attends meetings, seminars or conferences or takes courses to improve course design skills.

Dimension Group C: Content Expertise

18. Possesses in-depth knowledge of the subject matter taught in the courses.
19. Attends meetings, seminars or conferences or takes courses that address difficult or newly developing issues appropriate for inclusion into course content; faculty may participate in internship activities which increase their knowledge of current industry practices.
20. Obtains and maintains professional certification or registration in a field related to the mission of the department.

Dimension Group D: Course Management

21. Major examinations and project due dates follow the time plan found in the course policy statement.
22. Provides adequate time for reviewing test items during class sessions.
23. Feedback on assignments submitted by students was provided in a timely manner.
24. Periodic tests and major papers or projects were returned in a timely manner.

Teaching Dimension Group Definitions and Assessment Techniques:

Dimension Group A: Instructional Delivery Skills:
Definition: "those human interactive skills and characteristics which 1) make for clear communication of information, concepts, and attitudes, and 2) promote or facilitate learning by creating an appropriate effective learning environment."
Assessment: This is a student-reaction measure that can be measured appropriately through student evaluation items. Other acceptable means of evaluation include self-reporting, peer assessment, video, administrator assessment, and course outcomes.

Dimension Group B: Instructional Design Skills:
Definition: "those technical skills in 1) designing, sequencing, and presenting experiences which induce student learning, and 2) designing, developing, and implementing tools and procedures for assessing student learning outcomes."
Assessment: Generally, students are not capable of assessing a faculty member's instructional design skills; however, student course comments may be appropriate for some items. The primary assessment of this Dimension should be through a combination of self-reporting and peer assessment, administrator assessment, and course outcomes.

Dimension Group C: Content Expertise:
Definition: "that body of skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced education, training, and /or experience."
Assessment: Generally, students are not capable to assess this dimension. The primary assessment of this dimension should be through peer and department review; in some instances student comments may be appropriate.

Dimension Group D: Course Management:
Definition: "those bureaucratic skills in operating and managing a course including, but not limited to, timely grading of examinations, timely completion of drop/add and incomplete grade forms, maintaining published office hours, arranging for and coordinating guest lecturers, and generally making arrangements for facilities and resources required in the teaching of a course."
Assessment: This can be assessed through items on student evaluation scores and by the department head. Other acceptable means of evaluation include self-reporting, peer assessment, administrator assessment, and course outcomes.

Assessment of Performance Level:
The determination of a performance level in teaching is a subjective evaluation made by considering all factors a faculty member claims to have achieved. The number of factors claimed and the level of proficiency demonstrated are both important in this evaluation. Hence, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to substantiate any claims of achievement and proficiency.
(1) Student Assessed Factors: The evidence for achievement of a Performance Level via student evaluations must not exceed 50% of all evidence and/or performance criteria. Generally, Dimension Groups A and some factors in D can be measured appropriately through student evaluation scores and comments; and conversely Dimension Groups B and C may not be appropriate for those measures.
(2) Other Factors: Possible sources of documentation for a faculty member claiming success on a specific factor are provided. Where the suggested documentation indicates self-reporting and no other specification is provided, a faculty member should use judgment in supplying appropriate and persuasive support for the claim. Factors other than those listed may be claimed, but as is the case with all factors claimed, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide documentation in support of those claims.

Correlation Table:
Faculty Productivity Factors versus Student Evaluation Instrument Questions

Faculty Evaluation Guidelines for Teaching: Dimension	Faculty Evaluation Guidelines for Teaching: Factor	Student Evaluation Instrument Question number
A	A	1
	B	3
	C	14
	D	6,17
	E	19
D	N	15
	O	15

Student Evaluation Questions

Scale: A = Strongly Agree, B = Agree, C = Have no strong feelings in either direction
D = Disagree, E = Strongly Disagree

1. Course objectives and requirements were clearly stated early in the course.
2. Grading is consistent with course objectives and requirements.
3. Professor appears to be adequately prepared for class.
4. Professor is effective in presenting and clarifying material.
5. Professor's teaching methods promote learning.
6. Professor provides an opportunity to discuss questions about grades and course material.
7. Overall this is an effective teacher, considering the subject matter being taught.
8. I would rate my interest in this course when I signed up for it as:
   A=very high, B=high, C=average, D=low, E=very low
9. I would assess my own preparation for class as:
   A=always prepared, B=usually prepared, C=somewhat prepared, D=rarely prepared, E=never prepared
10. At this moment, the grade I expect to receive in this course is:
    A=A, B=B, C=C, D=D or P, E=F
11. Textbook: overall I would rate the primary textbook as:
    A=excellent, B=good, C=average, D=poor, E=no text
12. How did the class size affect learning:
    A=very conducive to learning, B=satisfactory, C=too small, D= too large, E=no particular affect
13. In terms of contributing to my career goals or well-rounded education, I would rate this course as:
    A= Excellent, B=Beneficial, C=Somewhat Beneficial, D=Little Benefit, E=No opinion
14. Professor's instruction relates to the subject matter of the course
15. Professor uses the class time effectively
16. Professor returns student work in a timely manner
17. Professor responds to student inquiries
18. Professor teaches the course in an intellectually challenging manner
19. Professor shows enthusiasm for the subject matter of the course
20. Professor includes practical applications or relevant examples

Research/Scholarly Productivity and Performance Evaluation

Scholarly activities take many and varied forms. Objective and fair evaluation of an individual's research and scholarly activities requires consideration of the quality, quantity, and nature of outlets for dissemination of research. Research may involve four different modes of scholarship: scholarship of discovery (original research), scholarship of integration (review and integration of prior research), scholarship of application (application of current knowledge and innovations to important practices), and scholarship of teaching (involving students in research and the process of inquiry and discovery). Research and scholarly activity are valued by the accrediting agencies:ACCE, ABET, IFMA, and AACSB. The department requires that all tenure-track faculty members engage in some mode of scholarship and publish in acceptable outlets, primarily peer-reviewed journals. Such research should expand knowledge and/or demonstrate growth in one or more areas of expertise. All categories or modes of scholarship are acceptable. Outcomes from research and scholarly activity follow.

Determination of Research/Scholarly Productivity Performance Levels

Faculty will be ranked in one of five levels which correspond to the rating scales recommended by the President's Compensation Committee. Level 5 (Exceptional) is the highest level achievable by a faculty member, while level 1 (Unsatisfactory) is the lowest level.

Level 1: Unsatisfactory. Performance is below Competent for two years in a row. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and immediate improvement is required. See Level 3 for a description of Competent performance.

Level 2: Development Needed. Performance has fallen below Competent. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and improvement is required. See Level 3 for a description of Competent performance.

Level 3: Competent: Performance is consistently at expected levels. Meets job requirements. This level requires:

1. On an annual basis achievement of at least one outcome from Outcome Group A; and
2. On a biennial basis achievement of one outcome from Outcome Group B.

Level 4: Commendable: Performance frequently exceeds Competent levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in certain aspects of performance. Factors for consideration at this level are:

- Total quantity of journal articles per the evaluation period
- Quality of journal articles
- Total number of lead authorships of journal articles per the evaluation period
- Amount and impact of external funding for research
- A prestigious award for research or publications
- First edition publication of a college level textbook

Level 5: Exceptional: Performance consistently exceeds Competent levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in most aspects of performance. Factors for consideration at this level are:

- Total quantity of journal articles per the evaluation period
- Quality of journal articles
- Total number of lead authorships of journal articles per the evaluation period
- Amount and impact of external funding for research
- A prestigious award for research or publications
- First edition publication of a college level textbook
- Publication in an "elite journal", as approved by the Committee considering acceptance rate, type of research (pedagogical, original research, applied research, qualitative, etc.), journal's review procedures, original contribution to the body of knowledge, etc. It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide full justification for the classification of a journal as "elite" to the Committee.

Research/Scholarly Productivity Outcome Groups

---------- Outcome Group A ----------

1. Submits a paper to and has it sent out for review by a journal of respectable quality with a reasonable review process. *
2. Has a paper accepted for presentation at a regional, national or international meeting.
3. Has a paper published in the proceedings of a professional meeting.
4. Has a review published of a professional, academic or scholarly textbook related to the faculty member's discipline.
5. Submits an internal research proposal for University funding.
6. Submits a grant proposal for external funding in an amount equal to or greater than $25,000 and for which there is a reasonable expectation of inspiring one or more publishable journal articles.
7. Performs significant research for textbook development.
8. Has an article reprinted that has been previously published in a peer-reviewed journal.
9. Serves as a reviewer of papers for a scholarly journal of respectable quality with a reasonable review process.*

---------- Outcome Group B ----------**

10. Has an article, case or other material published or unconditionally accepted for publication in a journal of respectable quality with a reasonable review process.* (Can be claimed when accepted or when published but not both.)
11. Receives external funding in an amount equal to or greater than $25,000 for grant proposals which have reasonable expectations of inspiring one or more publishable journal articles.
12. Contributes a chapter or other significant work to a college textbook.
13. Has a college textbook published in a second or higher edition.
14. Has a book published, other than a college textbook, related to an appropriate discipline.
15. Serves as the editor or serves on the editorial review board of a scholarly or professional journal of respectable quality with a reasonable review process.*
16. Has a previously published article reach a commendable level of impact or recognition.

* Journal of respectable quality with a reasonable review process: This indicates an academic journal with a double-blind peer-review process and a reasonable acceptance rate.

** Significant research outcomes from Research Outcome Group B achieved in the immediately preceding year can also be reported.

Service Productivity and Performance Evaluation

Consistent with the criteria given for tenure and promotion, annual evaluation of service shall be based on the degree of the faculty member's contribution in two main categories: service as scholarship and service as citizenship. Many factors go into successful service activities. Representative factors considered in evaluating service activities follow. Other activities not specifically mentioned can also be considered provided they bring prestige to the Department/College/University and require a comparable level of time and effort as the types of activities listed in each group.

Determination of Service Performance Levels

Faculty will be ranked in one of five levels, which correspond to the rating scales recommended by the President's Compensation Committee. Level 5 (Exceptional) is the highest level achievable by a faculty member, while level 1 (Unsatisfactory) is the lowest level.

Level 1: Unsatisfactory. Performance is consistently, defined as two years in a row, below acceptable levels. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and immediate improvement is required. See Level 3 for a description of Competent performance.

Level 2: Development Needed. Performance has fallen below Competent. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and improvement is required. See Level 3 for a description of Competent performance.

Level 3: Competent: Performance is consistently at expected levels. Meets job requirements. This level requires on an annual basis:

1. Achievement of all outcomes from Outcome Group A; and
2. Achievement of at least two outcomes from Outcome Group B.

Level 4: Above Competent: To be considered Above Competent, there should be evidence that performance/results frequently exceed Competent levels. A high degree of proficiency including some leadership responsibility must be demonstrated in some activities. There should be a reasonable balance between two main categories; service of scholarship and service of citizenship. In addition, the combination must include activities both internal and external to the university. This level requires on an annual basis numerous activities in terms of quantity, quality, and/or time/effort from Outcome Groups A, B, and/or C. The higher the level of visibility and prestige and the more significant the activities and accomplishments, the more substantive the activity will be judged. Providing evidence of performance/results as described is not a guarantee that the Above Competent rating will be achieved.

Level 5: Exceptional: To be considered Exceptional, there should be evidence that performance/results consistently exceed Competent levels. A very high degree of proficiency, including significant leadership responsibility, must be shown in most activities. There should be a reasonable balance between two main categories; service of scholarship and service of citizenship. In addition, the combination must include activities both internal and external to the university. This level requires on an annual basis numerous activities and multiple examples in terms of quantity, quality, and/or time/effort from Outcome Groups A, B, and C. The higher the visibility and prestige and the more significant the activities and accomplishments, the more substantive the activity will be judged. Providing evidence of performance/results as described is not a guarantee that the Exceptional rating will be achieved.

Service Productivity Outcome Groups

---------- Outcome Group A ----------

Service as Citizenship:

1. Generally cooperates with reasonable requests from the University, College, and Department regarding filling out reports and participating in meetings or other activities that are requested of all University, College or Department faculty members, e.g., annual performance reports, faculty meetings, commencement ceremonies, and departmental committees.

Service as Scholarship:

2. Maintains active membership in at least one professional organization related to the faculty member's discipline.

---------- Outcome Group B ----------

Service as Citizenship:

3. Participates in community related service that has value to the general population and the University community that requires a significant amount of time and effort.
4. Serves as the Department Senator in the MSU Faculty Senate.
5. Serves on a committee of the University, College, or Department.
6. Serves as the faculty advisor or co-advisor to a student professional organization or other similarly *highly active* student organization, preferably with national ties, that brings prestige to the University, College, or Department, and that requires a substantial amount of time of the faculty member.

Service as Scholarship:

7. Serves as a reviewer of papers, a discussant, or a session chair for a regional, national, or international meeting of a professional organization.
8. Serves on a board, as an officer, or other position in local/regional professional (related to the faculty member's area of expertise) or civic activity that brings prestige to the University, College, or Department, and that requires of the faculty member an amount of time equal to that as serving on a University, College, or Department committee.

---------- Outcome Group C ----------

Service as Citizenship:

9. Serves as the immediate past Chair, Chair, or Chair Elect of the Missouri State Faculty Senate.
10. Serves in a leadership role on a highly active College or University committee that requires an enormous amount of time of the faculty member and has an impact on University policy or operations. (objective evidence must be provided to support time requirements)
11. Serves as the faculty advisor to a student professional organization or other similarly highly active student organization, preferably with national ties, that brings prestige to the University, College, or Department through student competitions or other activities that require an enormous amount of time of the faculty member.

Service as Scholarship:

12. Serves as the editor or on the editorial review board of a scholarly or professional journal.
13. Serves on a board, as a national or international officer, or other position of a professional (related to the faculty member's area of expertise) or civic activity, or comparable post at the state or regional level, that brings prestige to the University, College, or Department, and which requires of the faculty member much more time than serving on a University, College, or Department committee.

Appendix D: TCM Annual Evaluation (Merit) Report Forms

Faculty Annual Evaluation
January 1, xxxx to December 31, xxxx

Faculty Name:

Department:

Current Rank:

Current Date:

To:

Part A: Annual Evaluation Summary

I. Teaching:

II. Research:

III. Service:

Part B: Rationale for Evaluation fo Teaching, Research and Service

I. Teaching Outcomes (List outcomes achieved within each Teaching Outcome Dimension and provide comments where appropriate.)

Dimension A:

Dimension B:

Dimension C:

Dimension D:

II. Research Outcomes (List outcomes achieved within each Research Outcome Group and provide citations and comments where appropriate.)

Group A:

Group B:

III. Service Outcomes (List outcomes achieved within each Service Outcome Group and provide comments where appropriate.)

Group A:

Group B:

Group C:

Student Evaluations of Teaching Performance (Summary)
Courses Taught/Student Evaluations

Faculty Name: _____

Semester	Course Number	Credit Hours	Number of Students	Trichotomy	Mean Student Evaluation
Spring 200_					
Summer 200_					
Fall 200_					
Totals					

INSTRUCTIONS for TCM Annual Evaluation (Merit) Summary Report Form:

To provide uniformity within the Department, please use the following as guidelines for completing the TCM Annual Evaluation (Merit) Summary Report Form (The form is available in MS Word format). When compiling your report, place the cursor in the appropriate box and start typing, allowing the space to expand to accommodate whatever length explanation you require. Please add text only in the white areas of the forms.

1. Part A: Annual Evaluation Summary

   The Annual Evaluation Summary is the first sheet of the Report and is intended to be a self-evaluation of your achievements during the evaluation period. Please write it using the third person. See the attached hypothetical example.

   The Annual Evaluation Summary is made up of three sections, one for each component of your evaluation, Teaching, Research, and Service. In the box provided, briefly state what outcomes you have achieved that will support the evaluative summary of your performance. Note that this is only a summary. The details, rationale, and evidence will need to be supplied in subsequent sections of the report. (Note: Please do not rate the level of your performance. The Department's Committee assigns those levels based on the performance of all personnel within the entire department.)

2. Part B: Rationale for Evaluation of Teaching, Research, and Service

   Following the Annual Evaluation Summary are three sections to be used to provide any details, rationale, or evidence supporting your evaluation. A section exists for each component of your faculty responsibilities: Teaching, Research, and Service. Each section has subsections that correspond to the different Outcome Dimensions/Groups that make up the component per the Departmental Faculty Evaluation Guidelines. The combined length of these three sections supporting your Annual Evaluation Summary should not exceed six pages (i.e., approximately two pages per section).

3. Attachments
   A. A current Academic Vita.
   B. Student evaluations of your teaching performance referenced in section “I. Teaching Outcomes” and explained under the caption “Rationale for Evaluation of Teaching, Research, and Service” above must be included. In addition, a summary sheet for student evaluations that includes a listing of all your courses and the corresponding scores must be included. A form for this summary sheet has been included in this appendix. These pages are not considered part of the six maximum specified in the immediately preceding paragraph.
   C. Any necessary supporting documents should be attached to the hard-copy Faculty Evaluation Report submitted to your departmental committee. For example sufficient evidence that an article has been accepted during the evaluation period would be a copy of the acceptance letter, while sufficient evidence of a publication during the period would be a copy of the table of contents from the journal.

EXAMPLE

This form is to be used for reporting your achievements in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service during the calendar year identified. However, significant research outcomes from Research Outcome Group B achieved in the immediately preceding year also can be reported as explained in Appendix C: Faculty Compensation Evaluation Guidelines.

Facaulty Name:

Department:

Current Rank:

Current Date:

To:

In keeping with the requirements of the Provost's Office, the College of Business Administration, and the Department of Technology and Construction Management, please accept this "Faculty Annual Evaluation." I believe that the summary and outcomes provided ample evidence of my performance for the previous year. Please advise if further information is needed.

Thank-you for your considerations.

Annual Evaluation Summary Form

I. Teaching

Professor Smith claims achievement of all minimum competency factors. Note that all factors measured by the student evaluation instrument are claimed based on Professor Smith’s composite student evaluation score of 4.2 (per "Note b" of TCM Department Guidelines). Appropriate documentation and supporting rationale for all minimum competency factors (F through M and P through R), and for additional factors 1, 3, 9, 12, 17, 19, 23 and 24, are attached.

II. Research

Professor Smith achieved (1) four outcomes from Research Outcome Group A [factors 1, 4, 5, and 8], and (2) one outcome from Research Outcome Group B [factor 12]. Copies of all acceptance letters are attached.

III. Service

Professor Smith achieved (1) all outcomes from Service Outcome Group A [regular attendance at department meetings and membership in the National Association of Industrial Technology], (2) two outcomes from Service Outcomes Group B [factors 4 and 7]. Appropriate documentation of achieved outcomes is attached.

Appendix E: TCM Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Faculty Member: _____

Course Title: _____ Date: _____

	(Circle One)
1. The lecture (or other teaching approach) was well organized.	not at all 1 2 3 4 5 highly
2. It was obvious that the faculty member was prepared.	not at all 1 2 3 4 5 highly
3. The faculty member was enthusiastic about the subject matter.	not at all 1 2 3 4 5 highly
4. The faculty member encouraged student participation.	not at all 1 2 3 4 5 highly
5. The faculty member made good use of instructional cues—such as writing key points on chalkboard, telling students that key points are important, using graphs or charts, etc.	not at all 1 2 3 4 5 highly
6. The faculty member projected his or her voice so that students could hear.	not at all 1 2 3 4 5 highly
7. The faculty member varied his or her voice to help hold students' interest.	not at all 1 2 3 4 5 highly
8. If I were a student, I would enjoy taking this class.	not at all 1 2 3 4 5 highly
9. It is likely students would rate the teacher highly.	not at all 1 2 3 4 5 highly
10. Overall quality of this class session:	weak 1 2 3 4 5 outstanding

11. The major strengths of the classroom session were:

12. The major weaknesses of the classroom session were:

13. What, if anything, could be done to improve the faculty member's teaching technique?

Additional Comments (use back of page if necessary):

Observer: _____ Date: _____

Signature: _____