MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

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

SCHOOL: Teaching, Learning and Developmental Science

COLLEGE: Education

SEMESTER/YEAR OF CURRENT REVIEW: Fall 2023

SEMESTER/YEAR OF NEXT REQUIRED REVIEW: Fall 2026

DEPARTMENT ADOPTION SIGNATURES:

Chloe Bolyard (Nov 29, 2023 21:45 CST)   11/29/23

Department Personnel Committee Chair   Date

Denise D. Cunningham
Denise D. Cunningham (Nov 30, 2023 10:07 CST)   11/30/2023

Department Head   Date

APPROVAL SIGNATURES:

Barri Tinkler   11/30/2023

Dean   Date

Ken Brown   11/30/2023

Provost   Date

THIS PLAN IS IN EFFECT FROM Fall 2023 **THROUGH** Fall 2026.

SCHOOL OF TEACHING, LEARNING, AND DEVELOPMENTAL SCIENCE

REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

FALL 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Evaluation of Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Evaluation of Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

Introduction to the Evaluation Process
As noted in the 2021 Missouri State University Faculty Handbook, "Faculty performance criteria at Missouri State University are based on the purpose and mission of the institution. The general mission of the University, in relation to its faculty, is the advancement of learning, scholarly inquiry, and service, but this translates, in terms of its students, to the single purpose of developing educated persons" (p. 27). Missouri State University is guided by its public affairs mission of fostering ethical leadership, cultural competence, and community engagement.

The faculty in the School of Teaching, Learning, and Developmental Science (TLDS) are committed to advancing the University public affairs mission through an integrated trilogy of teaching, research, and service. In TLDS, we believe that:
- Teaching should be transformative and ethical.
- Research should enhance knowledge, inform practices, and improve the world through community-sustaining scholarship.
- Service is an integral part of the faculty role, and should help to assure the maintenance, growth, and well-being of the School, College, University, and the local and professional community.
- Teaching, research, and service efforts should inform one another.

Faculty members with standard appointments (tenure-track and tenured) are evaluated **annually** according to three areas of performance: teaching, research, and service. The TLDS guiding principles and criteria for teaching, research, and service are described further in their respective sections; faculty are expected to read the text in each section in its entirety as the principles inform the criteria.

TLDS faculty are expected to review and abide by all responsibilities in the University Faculty Handbook.

Evaluation of Teaching

TLDS Philosophy of Teaching
TLDS believes learning is a complex process that occurs at different rates for different individuals, and is a shared responsibility of the learner and educator that requires active involvement of the learner. Therefore, consideration should be given not only to the methods by which information is communicated, but also to the nature of the learner and their specific needs.

The TLDS faculty believe that teaching should be transformative and ethical. Therefore, the criteria outlined below are based on a combination of research, beliefs, values, and assumptions:
1. Research has demonstrated ethnicity, race, and gender bias in student evaluations of college professors (Basow, 1995; Basow & Silbert, 1987; Bavishi et al., 2010; Boring, 2017; Chavez & Mitchell, 2020; Fellon et al., 2004; Wilson, 1998). Thus, TLDS faculty commit to reviewing evaluations through this lens and focusing on faculty goals related to evaluations, rather than a specified numerical scale.
2. Teaching should connect theory to practice.
3. Teaching should focus on community relationships.
4. Teaching involves ongoing assessment of students.

TLDS faculty recognize that our School's tenure and promotion requirements should honor the fact that the ways we *do* transformative and ethical teaching differ among faculty. Therefore, these criteria provide flexibility in how we celebrate and document our teaching. Faculty should highlight their evolution as educators utilizing multiple sources of data to evaluate and enhance practice.

Definition of Terms	
Ethical teaching	From an inclusion perspective, teaching recognizes, understands, and challenges systems of exclusion.
Culturally sustaining	An asset-based pedagogy that sustains students' cultural backgrounds through schooling.
Mentoring	Mentoring reflects a unique relationship between individuals; mentoring is a learning partnership in which the goal involves the acquisition of knowledge; learning is a process; a mentoring relationship is reciprocal, yet asymmetrical and it may change over time (Eby, Rhodes & Allen, 2010).
Transformative	"Transformative learning is about change - dramatic, fundamental change in the way we (students) see ourselves and the world in which we live." (Learning in Adulthood, p. 166)

Evaluating Teaching Performance: Ranked Faculty

The following list outlines criteria for evaluating a faculty member's performance in teaching. Documentation can exemplify multiple criteria if described as such.

Promotion to Associate Professor: Faculty members seeking tenure and/or promotion to the rank of **Associate Professor** must provide evidence of the *required* criteria and **FOUR** of the *encouraged* areas, addressing at least one encouraged criterion from each goal (i.e., Teaching is Transformative and Teaching is Ethical).

Promotion to Full Professor: Faculty seeking promotion to *Full* status must provide evidence of the *required* criteria and **SEVEN** of the *encouraged* areas, addressing at least two encouraged criterion from each goal (i.e., Teaching is Transformative and Teaching is Ethical).

Annual Review Process: Each year for annual review, pre-tenure faculty must provide documentation for each of the *required* criteria. Each year, pre-tenure faculty can choose the *encouraged* criteria on which to focus and can provide evidence to assess continued growth prior to seeking promotion. Faculty should provide one teaching narrative that is organized by each teaching criterion (a sentence referencing the evidence or a short paragraph describing each with evidence linked within the document).

Artifacts Exemplifying Performance:

Faculty recognize that there are many ways to exemplify strengths in each criterion. Artifacts (for criteria without specific requirements) may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- examples of assignments or activities
- examples of learning objectives
- course content and materials
- grading practices
- awards
- letters of commendation
- tables describing professional development experiences
- updated syllabi
- examples of special projects
- statement of self-work related to growth in ethical teaching practices.

<u>**Criteria for Evaluating Teaching Performance: Ranked Faculty**</u>

Goal 1: Teaching is transformative:

- In my teaching, I solicit feedback from multiple sources, and assess and respond to student needs to inform my instruction and improve the learning community.
- My teaching gives students opportunities to learn how research and theory inform the discipline, reflect on and critique practices and assumptions, apply knowledge, and develop community engagement skills.

Criteria	Required/Encouraged	Evidence **Required evidence included where specified. Examples of potential evidence added for reference.**
A. Peer review of teaching and course syllabi.	**Required** for pre-tenured faculty (hired after January 2023) to submit one peer review for each of the first three years (three total). **Encouraged** for faculty hired before January 2023 and faculty seeking promotion to Full to submit one peer review.	**Required evidence:** Written narrative provided by the peer reviewer with corresponding syllabus highlighting strengths and areas for improvement. A different course syllabus will be reviewed each year (if applicable)**.**
B. Promotes the university public affairs mission.	**Required**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Assignments pertaining to public affairs ● Syllabus showing integration of public affairs

		● Civic engagement such as service-learning, outreach projects, etc. ● Evidence of participation in professional activities related to the public affairs mission
C. Student evaluations: **Formal –** end of semester university student evaluations. **Informal** – instructor-created, given during the semester.	**Required**: Formal **Encouraged**: Informal	**Required formal evidence:** ● Evaluation ToolKit responses ● Quantitative evaluation - table of evaluation means ● Thematic analysis of comments, written plan for improvement **Encouraged informal evidence:** ● Sample of informal evaluation ● Analysis of evaluation data
D. Participates in professional activities related to the development of teaching and/or completion of specialized training that will impact knowledge and/or skills in the discipline.	**Required**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Documentation of Showcase on Teaching & Learning ● ATLL workshops ● Professional organizations/ conferences ● Workshops ● Reading groups ● Certificates ● Transcript related to specific training ● Description of specific training
E. Engages in curriculum development. Utilizes student learning outcomes/feedback and instructor-created informal evaluation data to guide curriculum, planning, instruction, and assessment.	**Required**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● New course proposal ● Significant modification/redesign of a course ● Change of modality of delivery ● Course assignments or course syllabi to illustrate how you have used this data to modify the instruction ● Narrative summary
F. Fulfills professional teaching responsibilities, as stated in the Faculty Handbook, including: ● the use of instructional technology in course design and/or the classroom ● syllabi and course policy statements that outline university policies, with clear grading criteria and a systematic course outline	**Required**	**Required evidence:** Syllabi School Director Review

with topics covered, assignments, and due dates.		
G. Provides feedback focused on improving learning.	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Assignment with instructor feedback (personal information redacted)
H. Fosters high-impact student engagement and learning experiences, including but not limited to providing opportunities for out of class application, experiential learning, field work, or service-learning.	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Teaching awards ● Syllabus, assignments ● Student comments on formal evaluations ● Informal instructor-created assessment by students ● Study away or service-learning experiences ● Experiences with diverse populations ● Opportunities to interact with ethical leaders in the community/society
I. Uses research and theory to inform teaching.	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Syllabi ● Course assignments
J. Uses innovative instructional technology in course design and/or in the classroom.	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Description of Blackboard use ● FCTL awards ● Student comments on formal and/or informal evaluations
K. Provides *sustained* community engagement.	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Letters from community leader ● Syllabi and/or course assignments ● Awards
L. Mentors/advises students.	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Names of students and projects for mentoring; number of advisees and context
Goal 2: Teaching is ethical: ● Instruction, curriculum materials, assessments, and the learning environment are ethical and culturally sustaining. ● My teaching is informed by an ongoing commitment to ethical, culturally sustaining practices.		
Criteria	**Required/Encouraged**	**Evidence** **Required evidence included where specified. Examples of potential evidence added for reference.**
M. Provides instruction, curriculum materials, and assessments that are ethical and	**Required**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Course syllabi, assignments, example assignment evaluation

conducts equitable evaluations of student progress. Provides a learning environment that is ethical and culturally sustaining.		● Student formal or informal feedback ● Narrative self-reflection and plan for improvement
N. Is available to meet students' academic, professional efficacy, and socio-emotional needs. Treats students respectfully as unique individuals.	**Required**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Maintaining office hours ● Description of individual student meetings ● Documentation of course updates to best support students ● Student formal or informal feedback
O. Provides opportunities for students to critique practices, trends, and "taken-for-granted" assumptions in the field.	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Student comments ● Syllabi ● Assignments
P. Provides opportunities for students to recognize, understand, and challenge systems of exclusion.	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Student comments ● Syllabi ● Assignments
Q. Uses resources, content, and instructional strategies that are explicitly focused on ethical engagement.	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Student comments ● Syllabi ● Assignments
R. Participates in professional development to improve ability to incorporate ethical practices into their teaching.	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Description of professional development. ● Examples of planned teaching updates.

Evaluating Research Performance: Ranked Faculty

In TLDS, we believe research should enhance knowledge, inform practices, and improve the world through community-sustaining scholarship. Therefore, the guidelines outlined below are based on a combination of research, beliefs, values, and assumptions:

1. The systems and structures in place to disseminate scholarship (i.e., journals, professional organizations, and conferences) are often steeped in and perpetuate inequities by prioritizing mainstream ways of knowledge and communication and marginalizing other perspectives and languaging (Bendels, Muller, Brueggmann, & Groneberg, 2018; Merchant, Del Rio, & Boulware, 2021; Roberts, Bareket-Shavit, Dollins, Goldie, & Mortenson, 2020). Thus, TLDS faculty commit to honoring flexibility and acknowledging the variety of ways faculty share their expertise.
2. Relatedly, TLDS faculty are committed to reducing inequities based on access to financial resources. For example, TLDS faculty will discount manuscripts that accept author payment for accelerated publication.
3. Research endeavors should integrate teaching and service efforts. Faculty efforts to engage students in the research process should be highlighted.

4. Research endeavors should connect to the three pillars of Missouri State's Public Affairs Mission: Ethical Leadership, Cultural Competence, and Community Engagement.

The School's tenure and promotion requirements provide measurable criteria for sustainable, rigorous research in the School; however, we recognize and celebrate the varied ways that faculty disseminate their scholarship. Faculty are encouraged to articulate a clear area of research and to describe the myriad ways their scholarly work contributes to intellectual pursuit in their respective fields.

Definitions of Terms	
Accelerated publication	A service some journals offer that accepts payment to speed up the review process.
Community-sustaining	Work that centers on community strengths, not deficits.
Field	Specialization/discipline of scholarship.
Peer-review	"The evaluation of scientific or academic work, such as research or articles submitted to journals for publication, by other qualified professionals practicing in the same field" (APA, n.d.).
Research	The *Missouri State University Faculty Handbook* (2021) defines research in Research Mission (4.2.2.1) as "the production and formal communication of original creative, scholarly work." "Research both advances knowledge in a particular specialized academic field and encourages individual faculty development; it enhances the quality of education students receive. It also helps fulfill the University's Service obligation by contributing to the public welfare" (p. 29).
Scholarly book/book chapter	A book or book chapter subject to the peer-review process.

Criteria for Evaluating Research Performance: Associate Professor

Faculty members applying for promotion to **Associate Professor** with tenure must provide documentation of a **minimum of 10** of the following items. Items submitted must include at least **FOUR (4)** items from **Categories A and B** with at least **ONE (1)** item from **Category A**.

Each year for the annual review (pre-tenure), and when applying for promotion, faculty must include a short narrative summary describing how their research contributes to diversity, equity, and inclusion. The narrative will explain how faculty research contributes to community-sustaining scholarship that does not perpetuate inequities and problematic narratives in their area of expertise or directly examines inequities and barriers for inclusion of marginalized groups.

Category A:
1. *First-author* peer-reviewed article published or in press in international/national journals

Category B:

2. Peer-reviewed articles published or in press in international/national journals (first-author not required)
    a. Could include student/faculty collaborative research publication
3. Author or co-author of peer-reviewed book
4. Author or co-author of peer-reviewed book chapter
    a. Only 2 book chapters can count toward the 4 items required from Categories A & B (additional book chapters will count toward Category C)
5. Editor/co-editor of peer-reviewed journal, or special issue journal, or book
    a. Only 2 editorialships can count toward the 4 items required from Categories A & B (additional editorialships will count toward Category C)
6. Author of revised edition of a scholarly book or book chapter
7. Principal investigator or co-principal investigator for grant(s) that have been funded or grant report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media ($20,000+)
8. National or international scholarly peer-reviewed conference presentation(s), paper(s), or discussant role(s)
    a. Five (5) or more presentations (including discussant roles) can count as one (1) Category B item.
    b. The five presentations can only count as one (1) of the four (4) items in Category B.
    c. Presentations could include student/faculty collaborative research presentation

Category C:

9. International/national, peer-reviewed conference presentation (not bundled and counted in Category B)
10. Public, non peer-reviewed presentation of research or engagement with the public
11. Peer-reviewed articles published or in press in regional or state journals
12. Regional, state, and local peer-reviewed conference presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s)
13. Children's literature
14. Primary author, editor, project manager, or production specialist of published major educational curriculum material or validated measurement tools for research including electronic media
15. Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator of grant(s) that have been funded or grant report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media or listed key personnel, including local/university grants ($19,999-$1)
16. Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator of grant application submitted but unfunded ($20,000 +)
17. Peer reviewer for journal, book reviewer or editor
18. Research consultant
19. Primary research advisor/chair for completed student original research (thesis/seminar paper/dissertation/evidence-based practice statement)
20. Honors or awards for research
21. Submissions for publication that have not been accepted for publication
22. Reprints of articles previously published in edited books or refereed journals
23. Written "front materials" for a book (i.e. forward, preface, introduction).

Criteria for Evaluating Research Performance: Full Professor

Faculty members applying for promotion to **Full Professor** must provide documentation of a **minimum of 10** of the following items. Items submitted must include at least **five (5) items** from **Categories A and B** with at least **ONE (1)** item from **Category A**.

When applying for promotion, faculty must include a short narrative summary describing how their research contributes to diversity, equity, and inclusion. The narrative will explain how faculty research contributes to community-sustaining scholarship that does not perpetuate inequities and problematic narratives in their area of expertise or directly examines inequities and barriers for inclusion of marginalized groups.

Category A:
1. *Sole-author* peer-reviewed article published or in press in international/national journals

Category B:
2. Peer-reviewed articles published or in press in international/national journals (first-author not required)
    a. Could include student/faculty collaborative research publication
3. Author or co-author of peer-reviewed book
4. Author or co-author of peer-reviewed book chapter
    a. Only 2 book chapters can count toward the 4 items required from Categories A & B (additional book chapters will count toward Category C)
5. Editor/co-editor of peer-reviewed journal, or special issue journal, or book
    a. Only 2 editorialships can count toward the 4 items required from Categories A & B (additional editorialships will count toward Category C)
6. Author of revised edition of a scholarly book or book chapter
7. Principal investigator or co-principal investigator for grant(s) that have been funded or grant report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media ($20,000+)
8. National or international scholarly peer-reviewed conference presentation(s), paper(s), or discussant roles
    a. Five (5) or more presentations (including discussant roles) can count as one (1) Category B item.
    b. The five presentations can only count as one (1) of the four (4) items in Category B.
    c. Presentations could include student/faculty collaborative research presentation

Category C:
9. International/national, peer-reviewed conference presentation (not bundled and counted in Category B)
10. Public, non peer-reviewed presentation of research or engagement with the public
11. Peer-reviewed articles published or in press in regional or state journals
12. Regional, state, and local peer-reviewed conference presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s)
13. Children's literature

14. Primary author, editor, project manager, or production specialist of published major educational curriculum material or validated measurement tools for research including electronic media
15. Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator of grant(s) that have been funded or grant report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media or listed key personnel, including local/university grants ($19,999-$1)
16. Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator of grant application submitted but unfunded ($20,000 +)
17. Peer reviewer for journal, book reviewer or editor
18. Research consultant
19. Primary research advisor/chair for completed student original research (thesis/seminar paper/dissertation/evidence-based practice statement)
20. Honors or awards for research
21. Submissions for publication that have not been accepted for publication
22. Reprints of articles previously published in edited books or refereed journals
23. Written "front materials" for a book (i.e. forward, preface, introduction)

Evaluation of Service Performance: Ranked Faculty

In TLDS we believe faculty commitment to service is an integral part of the faculty role, as investment in service assures the maintenance, growth, and well-being of the School, College, University, and the local and professional community. Therefore, the guidelines outlined below are based on a combination of research, beliefs, values, and assumptions:

1. Service in academia has disproportionately burdened women, particularly women of color (Curtis-Boles et al., 2012; Miller & Roksa, 2019; Moore, 2017; Turner 2016).
2. Service should reflect engagement at multiple levels including: program, school, college, university, community, and field. The TLDS dept recommends/celebrates service at multiple levels (not all/not exhaustive). Service at all levels is appreciated but deeper, purposeful, committed service that aligns with faculty strengths and furthers the trilogy of scholarship is encouraged.
3. Service efforts should reflect investment and be outcome-focused.
4. Service should include sustained, reciprocal partnerships that foster social justice, diversity, equity, and inclusion at Missouri State University and in the local and professional community.

Service may include committee work and/or the completion of special projects. At the community level, service may involve volunteer work in professional organizations. At the national/international level, service may include committee leadership and work on special projects for professional associations. Faculty efforts to participate in student recruitment and retention events/activities and to engage students in service should be highlighted.

Definition of Terms	
Active participation	Being involved and taking part (e.g., regularly attending, voicing ideas, leading discussions, posing questions)
Continuous service	Evidence of constant service, can be at various levels at various times;

	Evidence of long-term relationship building
Leadership in service	Holds a leadership position within an organization/agency; explanation of creating new initiatives/impact and/or mentorship

Process:
All faculty members seeking tenure and/or promotion to **Associate Professor** must meet **the first goal** and at least **one of the subsequent goals** (2-4).

Faculty seeking promotion to **Full Professor** must document **sustained success AND leadership** in the first goal and at least **one subsequent goal (2-4)**.

Criteria for Evaluating Service Performance: Ranked Faculty:

The following section outlines criteria for a faculty member's performance in service based on the Goals and Criteria for Evaluating Service (4.2.3.2) outlined in MSU's Faculty Handbook (2021).

1. University Citizenship: "In the interest of maintaining broad participation in the decision-making process at the University, faculty must recognize their responsibilities to the organization and contribute fairly to the task of shared-governance. This includes, but is not limited to, continuous service participation and/or leadership on program, school, college, and university committees and task forces, as well as professional honors received due to this service. In doing so, faculty members increase the level of self-determination in their ranks.

Service activities supporting University citizenship may also include collaborations and contributions for the collegiate well-being such as
- providing professional development,
- participating in campus discussions,
- expanding opportunities for shaping the learning environment" (MSU Faculty Handbook, 2021, pp. 31-32).

University Citizenship may also include furthering the University's public affairs mission and, more specifically, involvement in special events such as Homecoming; recruitment and retention efforts, especially activities that support retention of marginalized students and faculty; and other areas of advancement of justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion.

To meet criterion 1, TLDS encourages service work on multiple levels: program, school, college, and university.

2. Professional Service: "The criteria for this goal refer to contributions to professional [and student] organizations within the faculty member's field. Professional association participation may include serving as a board member, division chair, officer, editor, reviewer, committee member, chairing or co-chairing a conference, moderator, reactor, or discussant, etc. of a professional organization. Additionally, this may include sponsoring, mentoring, or advising an

active student organization, or providing opportunities for student experiences outside the expectations of teaching" (MSU Faculty Handbook, 2021, p. 32).

Professional Service may also include receiving honors or special assignments from a professional organization. Membership on diversity, equity, and inclusion committees and efforts focused on incorporating equitable access should be highlighted.

3. **Public Service**: "Faculty members meet this goal when they provide evidence of using their professional skills and expertise to serve the community, state, national, or international public constituents. This may take the form of serving as a
board member, division chair, officer, editor, reviewer, committee member, etc. of a public organization, or writing op eds or other articles in newspapers or other print media or on television or radio, etc. In this way, Faculty members not only further the mission of public outreach, but also serve as models for their students who are encouraged to engage in similar activities" (MSU Faculty Handbook, 2021, p. 32).

Public Service may also include providing professional development or other professional service activities to schools and/or other agencies. Public service must be community-sustaining.

4. **Professional Consultation**: "Faculty members may meet this goal by submitting evidence of providing professional expertise to business, industry, schools, community organizations, and colleagues in other university programs**.** Consultation services to external constituents within the faculty member's professional expertise may be included in this area" (MSU Faculty Handbook, 2021, p. 32).

Faculty members will provide evidence of their areas of service through their curriculum vitae supplemented by a brief narrative which highlights their work in these areas. Faculty narratives must address how their service promotes equitable access and inclusive climates in their on-campus and outreach roles.

The Evaluation Process

Please review the Faculty Performance Evaluation Process found in the Missouri State University Faculty Handbook. The School will follow the annual Master Calendar to conduct its reviews and make its decisions. Faculty are expected to submit their review materials according to the master calendar.

The Provost will publish in the annual Master Calendar a university-wide timetable for all academic personnel decisions. All reviews occur according to this schedule. Faculty members shall submit application and/or review materials for annual review, tenure, promotion, and performance review to the school by the school-specified deadline that is based on the Master Calendar.

The TLDS Reappointment, Promotion, & Tenure (RPT) Committee will review applicants' materials according to the Master Calendar. The RPT committee will forward its evaluation and recommendation to

the School Director. The School Director forwards the RPT committee's evaluation and recommendation to the faculty member. The School Director forwards his/her evaluation and recommendation to the faculty member. After a discussion, the School Director forwards their evaluation and recommendation to the Dean of the College. The Dean makes a recommendation on reviews of progress toward tenure and promotion, required performance evaluations, and sends a list of all required actions with appropriate documentation, to the Provost.

For tenure and promotion, the Dean forwards his or her recommendations along with all previous recommendations to the Provost. The Provost makes the final recommendation for tenure and promotion decisions to the President and the Board of Governors.

For additional information regarding the review process, please review the MSU Faculty Handbook. Discussions and/or negotiations will occur in those cases where the recommendations are not acceptable to the higher-level administrator. In instances of disagreement between the personnel committee and the School Director, there shall be a good faith effort to resolve these differences. In all tenure and promotion cases where the recommendation of the School Director, Dean, Provost, or the President differs from that of the departmental personnel committee, the administrator initiating the change shall state in writing to the affected faculty member, the departmental committee, and other involved administrators, compelling reasons why he or she cannot agree with the original recommendation.

Throughout the entire process, confidentiality of information must be maintained. Faculty members at every level of decision-making must assume personal responsibility to ensure confidentiality is not violated.

RPT Committee
The TLDS RPT Committee includes **all** tenured faculty within TLDS and shall operate under Robert's Rules of Order. If the number of tenured TLDS faculty is less than three, then the balance shall be obtained from the pool of tenured faculty within the College of Education or other Colleges. Individuals who vote on promotion decisions should be at or above the rank for which the candidate aspires. Further excluded from serving on the RPT Committee are the following: the School Director, relatives or spouse of the applicant, faculty members who have been officially notified of non-reappointment for reasons other than retirement, faculty members who are currently under major sanctions as defined in the Faculty Handbook, and individuals upon whose application the committee would be acting.

RPT Chair
Each year, the RPT Committee will elect a Chair. This person is responsible for monitoring thee Master Calendar and setting meetings for the work of the RPT Committee. The Chair is also responsible for forwarding all **signed** letters to the School Director. The Chair of the TLDS RPT Committee also serves on the COE Personnel Committee. The Chair will serve for one academic year and can be elected for one additional consecutive year.

RPT Committee Responsibilities

1. RPT Committees shall elect their own Chairperson.
2. The Committee will inspect all items made available by the School Director and all those provided by the individual being reviewed. The Committee shall assess the performance of the applicant in teaching, scholarship, and service areas. At the request of the Committee, and at the option of the faculty being considered, additional material may be submitted.
3. An attempt should be made to reach consensus, but if that is not possible, a majority vote of the Committee will be used to make the recommendation. If there is a split vote, then the minority may file a report, signed by each member of the minority.

Annual Reviews
- All faculty, regardless of rank or tenure status, will undergo an annual review.
- Non-tenured faculty will complete a dossier (digital or hand copy) to be evaluated by the RPT Committee, School Director, Dean, and Provost.
- Tenured faculty, clinical faculty, and instructors will update Digital Measures/Faculty Success at least each semester to be used by the School Director to evaluate the faculty member's performance over the past year.
- "Annual review will follow the Master Calendar published by the Provost's Office each year.
- Faculty who receive recommendations for improvement in teaching, scholarship, and/or service in their evaluations by either the RPT committee and/or the School Director will receive a written remediation plan developed by the School Director. That faculty member will meet regularly with the School Director to evaluate progress towards the goals of the remediation plan and will update the remediation plan as needed. The results of this plan may have an impact on reappointment, promotion, or tenure decisions.

Application Procedure for Tenure and Promotion
The evaluation of applications for tenure or promotion will be as follows as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*. Faculty applying for tenure will be evaluated according to their performance in accumulated assignments since employment at Missouri State (unless they negotiated years brought in from another institution). Faculty applying for promotion will be evaluated according to performance in present rank.

Each faculty member making application is responsible for assembling evidentiary documentation, for making the case in support of the application, and for submitted materials according to established deadlines. Faculty are responsible for adhering to documentation guidelines outlined on the Provost's web site. Recommendations at each level will be based upon data supplied by the candidate, as well as department data.

The individual faculty member shall initiate the process for tenure and promotion. When a faculty member submits an application for promotion and tenure, the evaluation of that application shall not preclude the regular yearly performance review. In all cases, the data upon which tenure or promotion decisions will be made will include information provided by the individual faculty member, department data and regular annual reviews. It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide documentation to support their application. Candidates shall submit a complete file to the Chair of the RPT Committee of all supportive materials based on criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for the time period being evaluated.

In TLDS, the faculty will submit documentation materials for promotion and tenure according to the Provost's calendar. The materials will be submitted as a dossier, organized into areas of teaching,

research and service. Documentation of attainment of criteria will be required. The dossier will also contain the following:

    1) a current curriculum vitae;

    2) a copy of all RPT evaluation letters from the RPT Committee, School Director and Dean of the College; and

    3) a narrative of how the faculty met the criteria in each of the three areas

    4) a matrix of performance in teaching, research and service.

This will include copies of supporting materials including such items as published articles, chapters of books with relevant publication information, letters specifying grant awards, etc. For funded grants, a copy of the award letter/email, budget sheet, abstract, and any final report emanating from the grant should be included.

Evaluation for annual review will be based upon the member's goals and plans for achieving tenure. Faculty applying for tenure will be evaluated according to their cumulative performance since employment at Missouri State University (unless they negotiated years brought in from another institution). Faculty applying for promotion will be evaluated according to performance in their present rank. If credit for prior academic service was granted upon initial appointment, then the evaluation for annual review and promotion will include evidence from that time period.

Documentation of all materials will be in accordance with University and College of Education guidelines, will use the approved forms, and will proceed according to the Academic Work Calendar prepared and distributed by the Office of the Provost.

Process for Promotion and Tenure

1. The RPT Committee Chair shall forward to the School Director the overall voting results and rationale, current vita, and supporting documentation used as a basis for the evaluation. The School Director shall not participate in voting or deliberations of the School's RPT Committee prior to this forwarding. The School Director will make an independent evaluation and recommendation (See the Faculty Handbook).
2. At the time the recommendation is being forwarded to the School Director, the RPT Committee Chair shall forward to the candidate its recommendation, overall voting results, and written rationale.
3. Supporting materials will be forwarded to the Dean of the College of Education; and forwarded beyond the Dean's office only at the request of the Provost.
4. The candidate may choose to withdraw the application from consideration at any time or stage of the process.
5. Confidentiality will be maintained by all faculty members at every level throughout the decision making process. This includes discussion of or sharing information about faculty outside the confines of the RPT meetings. Confidentiality does not have a time line; at no time should information about faculty under consideration be shared. The only exceptions to this policy would be in sharing information with the School Director, Dean, or Provost.

External Reviews

- For full review of policies and procedures regarding external reviews, refer to the Provost's website: http://www.missouristate.edu/provost/externalreviewers.htm
- Qualified external reviewers should possess terminal degrees. They typically hold academic appointments. They should be employed in institutions/programs at or above the level of Missouri State University and should hold rank above the level of the candidate. When appropriate, reviewers holding terminal degrees may be drawn from research/creative institutes, foundations, organizations, or the private sector.
- Conflicts of interest disqualify reviewers. This would include individuals with whom the

candidate has collaborated or under which the candidate studied. Further, individuals with whom the candidate holds a personal relationship are also disqualified. Candidates should disclose any relationship or association with a potential reviewer prior to their selection in order to avoid any potential conflict of interest.

- To select external reviewers, the candidate submits the names of four potential reviewers. The School Director collaborates with the RPT committee and submits the names of four additional potential reviewers. The candidate, School Director, and the RPT committee work together to identify two names from each list, and then the four selected reviewers are contacted for the review.
- External reviewers should be instructed to review the candidate's CV and samples of work in relation to specific MSU and TLDS criteria. Only work that is eligible for consideration under the terms of appointment should be submitted to reviewers.
- Reviewers are solicited and returned to the School Director and included in the dossier.
- Each external reviewer is invited to consider the whole of the candidate's CV, but the primary focus of the external review is on scholarship and research. It is expected that faculty in one's own department and institution can fairly assess contributions in teaching and service.

Role of the Candidate

Regarding Annual Review:
- The candidate must provide appropriate materials, including his or her annual assignment (i.e., updated Digital Measures/Faculty Success)
- The candidate must work with the School Director and other members of the faculty, when appropriate, to address the feedback provided in the annual review.
- The candidate must develop an appropriate plan and process for growth with the School Director.

Regarding Tenure and Promotion
- The candidate will identify four potential external reviewers.
- The candidate will prepare his or her dossier.
- The candidate will prepare a professional statement to include in his or her dossier.
- The candidate will work with the School Director when and if materials need to be updated.
- The candidate will sign the RPT Committee Recommendation, the School Director's recommendation before it is forwarded to the Dean of the College of Education.

Role of Faculty and the RPT Committee
1. Departments should carefully review the composition of the RPT committee to ensure the committee composition is consistent with the requirements outlined in this document.

2. Each member of the RPT Committee will individually review each applicant's materials and documentation for reappointment and/or promotion. The RPT Committee will meet as a whole to discuss each candidate's documentation and vote.

3. A tenured faculty member voting on reappointment or promotion should make every effort to be present at the meeting of the committee as a whole, but may submit an absentee ballot and signed written comments along with a letter explaining obligatory professional or personal reasons for the absence to the chair prior to the RPT Committee meeting. In case of an emergency, tenured faculty members should contact the chair as soon as possible in order to submit absentee ballots and sign the final letters.

4. All voting on personnel matters at the meeting will be by secret written ballot and results will be made available to attending faculty during the meeting.

5. Signed written statements by faculty will be allowed to be read by committee members for the consideration of a candidate's suitability for reappointment or promotion and will become part of the discussion in shaping the written documents. In advance of the committee meeting, a candidate may ask a tenured faculty member to speak on his/her behalf during the meeting.

6. The specific voting count and accompanying document will be reported to both the candidate and the School Director, with the understanding that this information will be forwarded to the COE Dean and the Provost's Office.

7. Committee Letters

A. The chair will write a letter, or designate someone to write a letter, for each candidate summarizing the major, relevant points of discussion (pro and con) as related to the established TLDS criteria for reappointment and/or promotion. In doing so, the chair records suggestions made for written comments about the candidate and asks two other people to record notes to provide "checks and balances" of three "views" or attempts at accuracy and fairness. The understood goal is to provide a picture of the thinking and documentation behind the votes to be given to the candidate, the School Director, and other academic administrators.

B. The chair will show a draft of each letter to the members of the committee who were present at the RPT Committee meeting to seek their sense of whether or not the report is overstated, understated, or if any information is omitted. The chair will edit a final draft and place the final letters in the departmental office so all RPT Committee members who were present for the meeting can read and sign them.

8. Tenured faculty members leaving the meeting early for significant professional or personal obligations will be allowed absentee votes as they leave and may later sign the letter and have their votes included in the official count.

9. The meetings of the RPT Committee are to be held in Executive session, meaning "all said here remains here." The Faculty Handbook states: "Confidentiality must be maintained. Faculty members at every level of decision making must assume personal responsibility to ensure confidentiality is not violated." [Section 2.4.2]

10. The Chair of the RPT Committee should work to ensure that all appropriate tasks of the review are carried out appropriately, in a timely way, and that all candidates receive clear and appropriate feedback and guidance.

11. School Directors who are associate professors should have a means of receiving feedback from faculty on their progress toward promotion.

EVALUATION OF CLINICAL FACULTY

University Definition of Clinical Faculty
As noted in the *2016 Faculty Handbook* (4.3),

> *Clinical faculty are vital to the success of certain programs in professional fields such as communication sciences and disorders, nursing, physical therapy and physician assistant studies. Their primary purpose is to provide an authentic applied learning environment for students in these disciplines while maintaining their own applied expertise Clinical faculty translate new knowledge in their discipline into clinical practice and clinical practice into new knowledge. Clinical faculty members have the same service requirements as those with standard appointments (Refer to Section 4.2.3.2). Areas of performance evaluation and evaluation for promotion specific to clinical faculty are*

Clinical Faculty Original Appointment/Promotion, Annual Evaluations, Annual Renewal of Contracts

Faculty may be initially appointed to the rank of Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, or Clinical Full Professor. Minimal qualifications for initial appointment to each rank are provided in the table below. If Clinical Instructors have five (5) plus years of professional experience in the field, after three (3) years of full-time employment at Missouri State holding the rank of Clinical Instructor, and meets other required areas specified in this evaluation plan, the Clinical Instructor can apply to the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor.

Promotion from:	Education	Experience	Additional
Clinical Instructor to Clinical Assistant Professor	Doctorate or Master's	3 years as Clinical Instructor at MSU	Must meet criteria for teaching, service, and professional productivity
Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor	Doctorate or Master's	5 years at Clinical Assistant Professor at MSU OR 3 years at Clinical Instructor and 3 years at Clinical Assistant at MSU	Must meet criteria for teaching, service, and professional productivity
Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Full Professor	Doctorate or Master's and a specialization (certificate, license, specialized skill set) OR advancing your degree	5 years at Clinical Associate at MSU OR regional or national recognition	Must meet criteria for teaching, service, and professional productivity

<h1 style="text-align:center">**Evaluation of Teaching Performance: Clinical Faculty**</h1>

TLDS Philosophy of Teaching

TLDS believes learning is a complex process that occurs at different rates for different individuals, and is a shared responsibility of the learner and educator that requires active involvement of the learner. Therefore, consideration should be given not only to the methods by which information is communicated, but also to the nature of the learner and their specific needs.

The TLDS faculty believe that teaching should be transformative and ethical. Therefore, the criteria outlined below are based on a combination of research, beliefs, values, and assumptions:

- Research has demonstrated ethnicity, race, and gender bias in student evaluations of college professors (Basow, 1995; Basow & Silbert, 1987; Bavishi et al., 2010; Boring, 2017; Chavez & Mitchell, 2020; Fellon et al., 2004; Wilson, 1998). Thus, TLDS faculty commit to reviewing evaluations through this lens and focusing on faculty goals related to evaluations, rather than a specified numerical scale.
- Teaching should connect theory to practice.
- Teaching should focus on community relationships.
- Teaching involves ongoing assessment of students.

TLDS faculty recognize that our school's tenure and promotion requirements should honor the fact that the ways we *do* transformative and ethical teaching differ among faculty. Therefore, these criteria provide flexibility in how we celebrate and document our teaching. Faculty should highlight their evolution as educators utilizing multiple sources of data to evaluate and enhance practice.

Definition of Terms	
Ethical teaching	From an inclusion perspective, teaching recognizes, understands, and challenges systems of exclusion.
Culturally sustaining	An asset-based pedagogy that sustains students' cultural backgrounds through schooling.
Mentoring	Mentoring reflects a unique relationship between individuals; mentoring is a learning partnership in which the goal involves the acquisition of knowledge; learning is a process; a mentoring relationship is reciprocal, yet asymmetrical and it may change over time (Eby, Rhodes & Allen, 2010).
Transformative	"Transformative learning is about change - dramatic, fundamental change in the way we (students) see ourselves and the world in which we live." (Learning in Adulthood, p. 166)

Responsibilities:

The following responsibilities are included within a faculty member's teaching load. Failure to meet these responsibilities will negatively impact the faculty member's annual review and/or application for tenure and/or promotion:

1. Meeting classes according to scheduled expectations
2. Communicating and reinforcing course and University policies
3. Grading work in a timely manner
4. Maintaining class records
5. Advising and/or mentoring students as needed
6. Maintaining availability to meet with students through scheduled office hours or by appointment.
7. Protecting student records according to FERPA guidelines

Clinical faculty may review additional information regarding teaching responsibilities in the University Faculty Handbook.
https://www.missouristate.edu/Assets/policy/Faculty-Handbook-08-01-2021-rev-090921.pdf

Criteria for Evaluating Teaching Performance: Clinical Faculty

The following table outlines criteria against which a clinical faculty member's teaching performance will be evaluated. Clinical faculty must meet the required criteria and it is recommended that they work towards the encouraged/ optional criteria for teaching

Goal 1: Teaching is transformative:		
● In my teaching, I solicit feedback from multiple sources, and assess and respond to student needs to inform my instruction and improve the learning community. ● My teaching gives students opportunities to learn how research and theory inform the discipline, reflect on and critique practices and assumptions, apply knowledge, and develop community engagement skills.		
Criteria	**Required/Encouraged**	**Evidence** **Required evidence included where specified. Examples of potential evidence added for reference.**
A. Peer review of teaching and course syllabi.	**Required** Clinical Instructors (or Clinical Assistant Professors newly appointed) (hired after January 2023) submits one peer review for each of the first three years (three total).	**Required evidence:** Written narrative provided by the peer reviewer with corresponding syllabus highlighting strengths and areas for improvement. A different course syllabus will be reviewed each year (if applicable)**.**

	Encouraged Clinical faculty hired after January 2023 or clinical faculty seeking promotion to Associate or Full submit one peer review.	
B. Promotes the university public affairs mission.	**Required**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Assignments pertaining to public affairs ● Syllabus showing integration of public affairs ● Civic engagement such as service-learning, outreach projects, etc. ● Evidence of participation in professional activities related to the public affairs mission
C. Student evaluations: **Formal** – end of semester university student evaluations. **Informal** – instructor-created, given during the semester.	**Required** Formal On a 5-point scale with 5 being the best for seated courses the average student evaluation is between 2.00 and 3.49 where 1 is the highest; On a 1-point scale with 1 being the best possible rating, for online courses the average student evaluation is 2.0 and 3.49 **1-3** examples of recognition for excellence in teaching e.g., formal teaching awards, honors, letters of commendation, peer evaluation, etc. **Encouraged** Informal OR On a 5-point scale the average student evaluation is less than 2.00 where 1 is the highest	**Required formal evidence:** ● Evaluation ToolKit responses ● Quantitative evaluation - table of evaluation means ● Thematic analysis of comments, written plan for improvement **Encouraged informal evidence:** ● Sample of informal evaluation ● Analysis of evaluation data

	More than 3 examples of excellence in teaching e.g., formal teaching awards, honors, letters of commendation, peer evaluation, etc.	
D. Participates in professional activities related to the development of teaching and/or completion of specialized training that will impact knowledge and/or skills in the discipline.	**Required** Participates in **1-3** high quality professional development activities related to teaching. **Encouraged** Participates in **more than three** high quality professional development activities related to teaching	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Documentation of Showcase on Teaching & Learning ● ATLL workshops ● Professional organizations/ conferences ● Workshops ● Reading groups ● Certificates ● Transcript related to specific training ● Description of specific training
E. Engages in curriculum development. Utilizes student learning outcomes/feedback and instructor-created informal evaluation data to guide curriculum, planning, instruction, and assessment.	**Required** **1-3** examples of continuous improvement in curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments **Encouraged** **More than three** examples of evidence of continuous, strategic improvement in curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments based on assessment data; tries new research-based	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● New course proposal ● Significant modification/redesign of a course ● Change of modality of delivery ● Course assignments or course syllabi to illustrate how you have used this data to modify the instruction ● Narrative summary supported by artifact
F. Fulfills professional teaching responsibilities, as stated in the Faculty Handbook, including: • the use of instructional technology in course design and/or the classroom • syllabi and course policy statements that outline university policies, with clear grading criteria and a systematic course outline	**Required** Professional teaching responsibilities are consistently fulfilled.	**Required evidence:** Syllabi School Director Review

with topics covered, assignments, and due dates.		
G. Provides feedback focused on improving learning.	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Assignment with instructor feedback (personal information redacted)
H. Fosters high-impact student engagement and learning experiences, including but not limited to providing opportunities for out of class application, experiential learning, field work, or service-learning.	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Teaching awards ● Syllabus, assignments ● Student comments on formal evaluations ● Informal instructor-created assessment by students ● Study away or service-learning experiences ● Experiences with diverse populations ● Opportunities to interact with ethical leaders in the community/society
I. Uses research and theory to inform teaching.	**Required** Authentic and realistic applications inherent to the specific discipline **Encouraged** Assesses student application of authentic and realistic applications inherent to the specific discipline	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Syllabi ● Course assignments
J. Uses instructional technology in course design and/or in the classroom.	**Required** Uses technology to assist with duties and responsibilities in instruction/ mentoring/supervision such as using the university LMS to provide access to course materials and student grades. **Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Description of Blackboard use ● FCTL awards ● Student comments on formal and/or informal evaluations ● Narrative supported by artifacts

	Utilizes multiple uses of technological resources	
K. Provides *sustained* community engagement.	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Letters from community leader ● Syllabi and/or course assignments ● Awards
L. Mentors/advises students.	**Encouraged** Involvement in mentoring, advisement, recruitment, and/or retention of students (as required by program)	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Names of students and projects for mentoring; number of advisees and context

Goal 2: Teaching is ethical:
- Instruction, curriculum materials, assessments, and the learning environment are ethical and culturally sustaining.
- My teaching is informed by an ongoing commitment to ethical, culturally sustaining practices.

Criteria	Required/Encouraged	Evidence **Required evidence included where specified. Examples of potential evidence added for reference.**
M. Provides instruction, curriculum materials, and assessments that are ethical and conducts equitable evaluations of student progress. Provides a learning environment that is ethical and culturally sustaining.	**Required**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Course syllabi, assignments, example assignment evaluation ● Student formal or informal feedback ● Narrative self-reflection and plan for improvement
N. Is available to respond to students' academic, professional efficacy, and socio-emotional needs. Treats students respectfully as unique individuals.	**Required**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Maintaining office hours ● Description of individual student meetings ● Documentation of course updates to best support students ● Student formal or informal feedback ● Collaboration with program or department team to respond to student needs
O. Provides opportunities for students to critique practices,	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Student comments ● Syllabi

trends, and "taken-for-granted" assumptions in the field.		● Assignments
P. Provides opportunities for students to recognize, understand, and challenge systems of exclusion.	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Student comments ● Syllabi ● Assignments
Q. Course materials are explicitly related to continuing improvement in diversity, cultural competence and equity.	**Required**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Student comments ● Syllabi ● Assignments
R. Participates in professional development to improve ability to incorporate ethical practices into their teaching.	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Description of professional development. ● Examples of planned teaching updates.

Evaluation of Service: Clinical Faculty

In TLDS we believe faculty commitment to service is an integral part of the faculty role, as investment in service assures the maintenance, growth, and well-being of the School, College, University, and the local and professional community. Therefore, the guidelines outlined below are based on a combination of research, beliefs, values, and assumptions:

- Service in academia has disproportionately burdened women, particularly women of color (Curtis-Boles et al., 2012; Miller & Roksa, 2019; Moore, 2017; Turner 2016).
- Service should reflect engagement at multiple levels including: program, school, college, university, community, and field. The TLDS dept recommends/celebrates service at multiple levels (not all/not exhaustive). Service at all levels is appreciated but deeper, purposeful, committed service that aligns with faculty strengths and furthers the trilogy of scholarship is encouraged.
- Service efforts should reflect investment and be outcome focused.
- Service should include sustained, reciprocal partnerships that foster social justice, diversity, equity, and inclusion at Missouri State University and in the local and professional community.

Service at the community/professional level may involve volunteer work or may include committee work or leadership and work on special projects for professional associations/organizations/agencies. Faculty efforts to participate in student recruitment and retention events/activities and to engage students in service should be highlighted.

Criteria for Evaluating Service Performance: Clinical Faculty:

The following section outlines criteria for a faculty member's performance in service based on the Goals and Criteria for Evaluating Service (4.2.3.2) outlined in MSU's Faculty Handbook (2021).

Criteria	Required	Examples of evidence may include:
1. Evidence of application of clinical expertise to provide expert service to the local and professional school communities, hospitals, or community agencies.	**Required** Actively serves as liaison to school communities, hospitals, or community agencies. **Encouraged** Actively provides leadership as liaison to school communities, hospitals or community agencies.	• Screening of preschool children • Board member for school committee • Early Care Committee member • Search committee for child life specialist in a hospital setting
2. Evidence of involvement of students in service activities.	**Required** Provides service opportunities to students **Encouraged** Constructs/develops service opportunities for/with students	• Service-learning component to class , either integrated or component • Capstone project involving community agencies, organizations
3. Evidence of service to the university in the form of consistent, active service on school and college committees.	**Required** Participation in (preparing, attending, reporting) membership in School, College, or University Committees or Task Force **Encouraged** Leadership in School, College, or University Committees or Task Force; Professional honors; Faculty sponsorship of clubs, organizations, and special events; Special University, College, or School assignments or activities deemed significant such as recruitment events, Homecoming, etc.	• College Council • Program coordinator • COE Budget Committee
4. Evidence of continuous service	**Required** Service involvement is continually part of the individual workload including all areas of service (university, community/profession) **Encouraged** Service involvement is continually part of the individual workload, and the individual is especially successful	

	in more than one area of service (university, community, profession)	
5. Evidence of recruitment activities	**Encouraged** Involvement in university, college, or program recruitment events.	• Fall/Spring/Summer Showcase • Working with Children & Families Day • Visiting schools

Evaluation of Productivity/Research/Special Projects: Clinical Faculty

Clinical faculty may choose to be evaluated on research or special projects for promotion, although it is **not** a requirement of the position.

Clinical faculty applying for annual review may, but are not required to, provide documentation from the categories listed below describing Productivity/Research/Special Projects criteria. Clinical faculty who wishes to participate in extended research activities are required to negotiate load assignments with the School Director and will be held to the respective research agenda. Reassigned time for both research and service should not exceed three credit hours per semester.

Productivity/Research. Both quantitative and qualitative factors enter into assessment of the items below. The body of scholarly work will be appraised holistically and over time.

1. Author or editor of scholarly book(s) or children's literature
2. Principal investigator for grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media ($1500+)
3. Professional article (non-research) published in major international/national discipline-based, print-based or electronic media
4. Author or editor of book chapter(s), monograph(s), anthology(ies), published production script(s), either print-based or other electronic media
5. Scholarly/research articles published in regional or state peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media
6. Primary author, editor, project manager or production specialist of published major educational curriculum material including electronic media
7. Grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media or listed key personnel, including local/university grants ($300+)
8. International, national, regional, state, or local scholarly conference presentation(s), paper(s), discussant role(s), or conference proceeding(s).
9. International, national, regional, state, or local peer-reviewed conference presentation(s), papers(s), discussant role(s), or conference proceeding(s)
10. Primary author/chief compiler of program review/accreditation report e.g. CAEP, Specialty Program Area (SPA), DESE, EPP, or other Professional Organization
11. Non-refereed publication(s) and electronic media
12. Book reviews, essays, and abstracts published in peer-reviewed journals
13. Student/faculty collaborative research project(s) and formal presentations of findings
14. Completed thesis/dissertation as Chair of thesis/dissertation committee(s)
15. Peer Reviewer for journal

16. Research Consultant
17. Peer-reviewed creative endeavors
18. Honors or awards for research
19. Submissions for publication that have not been accepted for publication and grant proposals not currently funded
20. Scholarly, creative work(s), and electronic presentation(s) other than electronic media as described above
21. Reprints of articles previously published in edited books or peer reviewed journals
22. Research post-doctoral fellowship, etc.
23. Literature review, data collection, research work in the discovery phase

Special Projects. This includes activities beyond the aforementioned areas. Examples include but are not limited to: Creating, implementing, and/or evaluating a new course, long-term recruitment plan, university project or other administrator approved projects.

Criteria for Evaluating Research/Special Projects: Clinical Faculty

Appointment & Promotion Criteria by Clinical Rank	Clinical Instructor	Clinical Assistant Professor	Clinical Associate Professor	Clinical Full Professor
Research/ Productivity		2 scholarly works from the list above.	Must have at least 2 scholarly works from the list above since the last promotion.	Must have at least 2 scholarly works from the list above since the last promotion.
Special Projects		Actively participating in a special project as designated by university initiatives or COE initiatives. Projects may be ongoing and may continue over a span of time.	Actively participating in an additional (since last promotion) special project as designated by university initiatives or COE initiatives. Projects may be ongoing and may continue over a span of time.	Actively participating in an additional (since last promotion) special project as designated by university initiatives or COE initiatives. Projects may be ongoing and may continue over a span of time.

The Evaluation Process

The University recognizes the need to evaluate faculty members with specialized assignments according to the requirements of their appointment letters. Clinical faculty should be so designated in appointment letters. The following addresses the evaluation of clinical faculty.

Clinical faculty are vital to the success of certain programs in professional fields. Their primary purpose is to provide an authentic applied learning environment for students in these disciplines while maintaining their own applied expertise. Clinical faculty translate new knowledge in their discipline into clinical practice and clinical practice into new knowledge. Clinical faculty members have the same Service requirements as those with standard appointments. (Refer to Section 4.2.3.2.) Areas of performance evaluation and evaluation for promotion specific to clinical faculty are Clinical Education and Service.

Review Process for Promotion

The RPT Committee

The TLDS Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee (RPT) for all ranks of Clinical faculty shall be comprised of all tenured faculty and clinical faculty at or above the rank of the individual applying for promotion. The RPT Committee will operate under Robert's Rules of Order. The chair of the TLDS Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee shall also serve as chair of the Promotion committee for all ranks of clinical faculty. If the number of voting eligible TLDS faculty is less than three, then the balance shall be obtained from the pool of tenured faculty within the College of Education or other Colleges. The Dean will appoint any non-program members of the RPT Committee. All eligible faculty are expected to vote on awarding promotion. The following are excluded from serving on the RPT Committee: the School Director, relatives or spouse of the applicant, faculty members who have been officially notified of non-reappointment for reasons other than retirement, faculty members who are currently under major sanctions as defined in the Faculty Handbook, and individuals upon whose application the committee would be acting.

RPT Committee Responsibilities
1. Promotion and annual review committees shall elect their own chairperson.
2. The Committee will inspect all items made available by the School Director and all those provided by the individual being reviewed. The Committee shall assess the performance of the applicant in teaching and service areas. At the request of the Committee, and at the option of the faculty being considered, additional material may be submitted.
3. An attempt should be made to reach consensus, but if that is not possible, a majority vote of the Committee will be used to make the recommendation. If there is a split vote, then the minority may file a report, signed by each member of the minority.

Application Procedure for Promotion

Clinical faculty applying for promotion will be evaluated according to performance in present rank. When the Clinical Instructor has served in that capacity for a minimum of three (3) years, he/she may apply for promotion to Clinical Assistant Professor, a minimum of five (5) years in the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor before applying for Clinical Associate Professor, and a minimum of five (5) years as a Clinical Associate Professor before applying for Clinical Full Professor. When clinical faculty feels that he/she has met the criteria for the rank sought, the clinical faculty member indicates that he/she wishes to be considered for promotion by the deadline established by the University.

Each clinical faculty member making application is responsible for assembling evidentiary documentation for making the case in support of the application, and for submitting materials according to established deadlines. Recommendations at each level will be based upon data supplied by the candidate, as well as

department data.

The individual clinical faculty member shall initiate the process for promotion. When a clinical faculty member submits an application for promotion, the evaluation of that application shall not preclude the regular yearly performance review. In all cases, the data upon which promotion decisions will be made will include information provided by the individual clinical faculty member, department data and regular annual reviews. It is the clinical faculty member's responsibility to provide documentation to support their application. Candidates shall submit a complete file to the Chair of the RPT Committee of all supportive materials based on criteria in teaching and service for the time period being evaluated.

In TLDS, the clinical faculty will submit documentation materials for promotion at a date announced by the RPT Committee. The materials will be submitted as a dossier, organized into areas of teaching and service. Documentation of attainment of criteria will be required. The dossier will also contain the following: 1) a current curriculum vitae; 2) a copy of all RPT evaluation letters from the RPT Committee, School Director and Dean of the College; 3) matrix of teaching and service, and 4) a narrative of how the faculty met the criteria in teaching and service. This will include copies of supporting materials including such items as syllabi, course materials, artifacts emanating from service activities, etc.

Evaluation for annual review will be based upon the clinical faculty member's goals and plans for his/her work at MSU. Faculty applying for annual review and or promotion will be evaluated according to performance in their present rank.

Documentation of all materials will be in accordance with University and College of Education guidelines, will use the approved forms, and will proceed according to the Academic Work Calendar prepared and distributed by the Office of the Provost.

Clinical faculty who receive recommendations for improvement in teaching in their evaluations by either the RPT committee and/or the School Director will receive a written remediation plan developed by the School Director. That clinical faculty member will meet regularly with the School Director to evaluate progress towards the goals of the remediation plan and will update the remediation plan as needed. The results of this plan may have an impact on reappointment, promotion, or tenure decisions.

Process for Promotion
1. The RPT Committee Chair shall forward to the School Director the overall voting results and rationale, current vita, and supporting documentation used as a basis for the evaluation. The School Director shall not participate in voting or deliberations of the School's RPT Committee prior to this forwarding. The School Director will make an independent evaluation and recommendation.
2. At the time the recommendation is being forwarded to the School Director, the RPT Committee Chair shall forward to the candidate its recommendation, overall voting results, and written rationale.
3. Supporting materials will be forwarded to the Dean of the College of Education; and forwarded beyond the Dean's office only at the request of the Provost.
4. The candidate may choose to withdraw the application from consideration at any time or stage of the process.
5. Confidentiality will be maintained by all faculty members at every level throughout the decision-making process. This includes discussion of or sharing information about faculty outside the

confines of the RPT meetings. Confidentiality does not have a timeline; at no time should information about faculty under consideration be shared. The only exceptions to this policy would be in sharing information with the School Director, Dean, or Provost.

The Dossier

- The Dossier should be organized to demonstrate growth and impact in the area of teaching and service. There should be a clear alignment between and references within the narrative, the matrix, and the documentation provided.
- A copy of all RPT evaluation letters from the RPT Committee, School Director and Dean of the College must be included, as appropriate.
- A current CV must be included. The content and format of the CV should meet the highest professional standards in terms of preparation, format, and citations.
- A professional statement of how the faculty met the criteria for teaching, service and research/special projects must be included. This statement should be clear and it should outline how the candidate has used the feedback from previous years to ensure growth and impact.

TLDS Procedures Regarding Promotion of Clinical Faculty

Role of the Candidate

Regarding Annual Review:

- The candidate must provide appropriate materials, including his or her annual assignment (i.e., updated Digital Measures/Faculty Success)
- The candidate must work with the School Director and other members of the faculty, when appropriate, to address the feedback provided in the annual review.
- The candidate must develop an appropriate plan and process for growth with the School Director.

Role of Faculty and the RPT Committee

1. Departments should carefully review the composition of the RPT committee to ensure the committee composition is consistent with the requirements outlined in this document.
2. Each member of the RPT Committee will individually review each applicant's materials and documentation for reappointment and/or promotion. The RPT Committee will meet as a whole to discuss each candidate's documentation and vote.
3. A faculty member voting on promotion should make every effort to be present at the meeting of the committee as a whole, but may submit an absentee ballot and signed written comments along with a letter explaining obligatory professional or personal reasons for the absence to the chair prior to the RPT Committee meeting. In case of an emergency, tenured faculty members should contact the chair as soon as possible in order to submit absentee ballots and sign the final letters.
4. All voting on personnel matters at the meeting will be by secret written ballot and results will be made available to attending faculty during the meeting.
5. Signed written statements by faculty will be allowed to be read by committee members for the consideration of a candidate's suitability for reappointment or promotion and will become part of the discussion in shaping the written documents. In advance of the committee meeting, a candidate may ask a tenured faculty member to speak on his/her behalf during the meeting.
6. The specific voting count and accompanying document will be reported to both the candidate and the School Director, with the understanding that this information will be forwarded to the COE Dean and the Provost's Office.
7. Committee Letters
   A. The chair will write a letter, or designate someone to write a letter, for each candidate summarizing the major, relevant points of discussion (pro and con) as related to the established TLDS criteria for promotion. In doing so, the chair records suggestions made for written comments about the candidate and asks two other people to record notes to provide

"checks and balances" of three "views" or attempts at accuracy and fairness. The understood goal is to provide a picture of the thinking and documentation behind the votes to be given to the candidate, the School Director, and other academic administrators.

B. The chair will show a draft of each letter to the members of the committee who were present at the RPT Committee meeting to seek their sense of whether or not the report is overstated, understated, or if any information is omitted. The chair will edit a final draft and place the final letters in the departmental office so all RPT Committee members who were present for the meeting can read and sign them.

8. Voting faculty members leaving the meeting early for significant professional or personal obligations will be allowed absentee votes as they leave and may later sign the letter and have their votes included in the official count.

9. The meetings of the RPT Committee are to be held in Executive session, meaning "all said here remains here." The Faculty Handbook states: "Confidentiality must be maintained. Faculty members at every level of decision making must assume personal responsibility to ensure confidentiality is not violated." [Section 2.4.2]

10. The Chair of the RPT Committee should work to ensure that all appropriate tasks of the review are carried out appropriately, in a timely way, and that all candidates receive clear and appropriate feedback and guidance.

Role of School Director

Annual Reviews

- The School Director will evaluate RPT performance in a professional manner. He or she will clearly communicate evaluation outcomes and provide justification to/for whom it applies.
- The School Director will work to resolve any conflicts that may arise during the peer review process.
- The School Director will provide constructive guidance. If remediation is required, the School Director will develop a remediation plan and review it with the clinical faculty member.
- Based upon the results of annual reviews and reviews for promotion the School Director will engage in a self-evaluation regarding the degree to which he or she is creating and supporting the conditions needed to ensure clinical
  faculty thrived.

Promotion

- The School Director will not interfere with the function of the RPT Committee. The School Director will provide his or her feedback separately from (and not influenced by) the assessment provided by the RPT committee.
- The School Director will evaluate clinical faculty performance in a professional manner. He or she will clearly communicate evaluation outcomes and provide justification to/for whom it applies.
- The School Director will work to resolve any conflicts that may arise during the peer review process.
- Based upon the results of the review(s) for promotion, the School Director will engage in a self-evaluation regarding the degree to which he or she is creating and supporting the conditions needed to ensure clinical faculty thrived.

EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTORS

University Definition of an Instructor and a Senior Instructor

3.61 Instructor. An instructor is appointed to teach full-time and to provide appropriate service, and may participate in research or creative activities. An instructor may be appointed to an annual or to a multi-year term of up to five years. Contingent upon satisfactory performance reviews, educational needs and continued funding. The Instructor appointment is renewable without constraint of term limits. Instructors shall have earned terminal degree of possess the degree required for teaching in specific disciplines, have potential or demonstrated teaching ability, and a willingness to serve the academic unit, college, and University. An Instructor who has demonstrated excellence in teaching and service at Missouri State University for at least five years (not necessarily consecutive) may be appointed as a Senior Instructor. If an Instructor applies for and is appointed to a tenure0track position, the time spent as Instructor at Missouri State University will not count toward the probationary period for tenure and promotion. Instructors on 9-month contracts will receive salary compensation and benefits for 12 months.

3.62 Senior Instructor. An Instructor who has demonstrated excellence in teaching and service at Missouri State University for at least five years may be appointed as a Senior Instructor. Senior Instructors are expected to provide leadership in teaching, contribute to course and curriculum development and provide appropriate university service. Senior Instructors may participate in research or creative activities. A Senior Instructor shall be appointed to a specific term not to exceed five years and may be reappointed to one or more additional terms, contingent upon satisfactory performance reviews, educational needs and continued funding. If a Senior Instructor applies for and is appointed to a tenure-track faculty position, the time spent as Senior Instructor at Missouri State University will not count toward the probationary period for tenure and promotion. Senior Instructors on 9-month appointments will receive benefits for 12-months. (Faculty Handbook, Sec. 3.6.2)

Evaluation of Teaching: Instructors

TLDS Philosophy of Teaching
TLDS believes learning is a complex process that occurs at different rates for different individuals, and is a shared responsibility of the learner and educator that requires active involvement of the learner. Therefore, consideration should be given not only to the methods by which information is communicated, but also to the nature of the learner and their specific needs.

The TLDS faculty believe that teaching should be transformative and ethical. Therefore, the criteria outlined below are based on a combination of research, beliefs, values, and assumptions:
- Research has demonstrated ethnicity, race, and gender bias in student evaluations of college professors (Basow, 1995; Basow & Silbert, 1987; Bavishi et al., 2010; Boring, 2017; Chavez & Mitchell, 2020; Fellon et al., 2004; Wilson, 1998). Thus, TLDS faculty commit to reviewing evaluations through this lens and focusing on faculty goals related to evaluations, rather than a specified numerical scale.
- Teaching should connect theory to practice.
- Teaching should focus on community relationships.
- Teaching involves ongoing assessment of students.

TLDS faculty recognize that our School's tenure and promotion requirements should honor the fact that the ways we *do* transformative and ethical teaching differ among faculty. Therefore, these criteria provide flexibility in how we celebrate and document our teaching. Faculty should highlight their evolution as educators utilizing multiple sources of data to evaluate and enhance practice.

Definition of Terms	
Ethical teaching	From an inclusion perspective, teaching recognizes, understands, and challenges systems of exclusion.
Culturally sustaining	An asset-based pedagogy that sustains students' cultural backgrounds through schooling.
Mentoring	Mentoring reflects a unique relationship between individuals; mentoring is a learning partnership in which the goal involves the acquisition of knowledge; learning is a process; a mentoring relationship is reciprocal, yet asymmetrical and it may change over time (Eby, Rhodes & Allen, 2010).
Transformative	"Transformative learning is about change - dramatic, fundamental change in the way we (students) see ourselves and the world in which we live." (Learning in Adulthood, p. 166)

Responsibilities:

The following responsibilities are included within a faculty member's teaching load. Failure to meet these responsibilities will negatively impact the faculty member's annual review and/or application for tenure and/or promotion:

- Meeting classes according to scheduled expectations
- Communicating and reinforcing course and University policies
- Grading work in a timely manner
- Maintaining class records
- Advising and/or mentoring students as needed
- Maintaining availability to meet with students through scheduled office hours or by appointment.
- Protecting student records according to FERPA guidelines

Instructors may review additional information regarding teaching responsibilities in the University Faculty Handbook.

https://www.missouristate.edu/Assets/policy/Faculty-Handbook-08-01-2021-rev-090921.pdf

Criteria for Evaluating Teaching Performance: Instructors

The following table outlines criteria against which a faculty member's teaching performance will be evaluated. Instructors must meet the required criteria and it is recommended that they work towards the encouraged/ optional criteria for teaching

Goal 1: Teaching is transformative:

- In my teaching, I solicit feedback from multiple sources, and assess and respond to student needs to inform my instruction and improve the learning community.
- My teaching gives students opportunities to learn how research and theory inform the discipline, reflect on and critique practices and assumptions, apply knowledge, and develop community

Criteria		Evidence **Required evidence included where specified. Examples of potential evidence added for reference.**
A. Peer review of teaching and course syllabi.	**Required** Clinical Instructors (or Clinical Assistant Professors newly appointed) submits one peer review for each of the first three years (three total). **Encouraged** Clinical faculty seeking promotion to Associate or Full submit one peer review.	**Required evidence:** Written narrative provided by the peer reviewer with corresponding syllabus highlighting strengths and areas for improvement. A different course syllabus will be reviewed each year (if applicable)**.**
B. Promotes the university public affairs mission.	**Required**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Assignments pertaining to public affairs ● Syllabus showing integration of public affairs ● Civic engagement such as service-learning, outreach projects, etc. ● Evidence of participation in professional activities related to the public affairs mission
C. Student evaluations: **Formal** – end of semester university student evaluations. **Informal** – instructor-created, given during the semester.	**Required** Formal On a 5-point scale with 5 being the best for seated courses the average student evaluation is	**Required formal evidence:** ● Evaluation ToolKit responses ● Quantitative evaluation - table of evaluation means ● Thematic analysis of comments, written plan for improvement

	between 2.00 and 3.49 where 1 is the highest; On a 1-point scale with 1 being the best possible rating, for online courses the average student evaluation is 2.0 and 3.49 **1-3** examples of recognition for excellence in teaching e.g., formal teaching awards, honors, letters of commendation, peer evaluation, etc. **Encouraged** Informal OR On a 5-point scale the average student evaluation is less than 2.00 where 1 is the highest **More than 3 examples** of excellence in teaching e.g., formal teaching awards, honors, letters of commendation, peer evaluation, etc.	**Encouraged informal evidence:** ● Sample of informal evaluation ● Analysis of evaluation data
D. Participates in professional activities related to the development of teaching and/or completion of specialized training that will impact knowledge and/or skills in the discipline.	**Required** Participates in **1-3** high quality professional development activities related to teaching. **Encouraged** Participates in **more than three** high quality professional development activities related to teaching	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Documentation of Showcase on Teaching & Learning ● ATLL workshops ● Professional organizations/ conferences ● Workshops ● Reading groups ● Certificates ● Transcript related to specific training ● Description of specific training
E. Engages in curriculum development. Utilizes student learning outcomes/feedback and instructor-created informal evaluation data to guide	**Required** **1-3** examples of continuous improvement in curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● New course proposal ● Significant modification/redesign of a course ● Change of modality of delivery

curriculum, planning, instruction, and assessment.	**Encouraged** **More than three** examples of evidence of continuous, strategic improvement in curriculum, instruction, and/or assessments based on assessment data; tries new research-based	● Course assignments or course syllabi to illustrate how you have used this data to modify the instruction ● Narrative summary supported by artifact
F. Fulfills professional teaching responsibilities, as stated in the Faculty Handbook, including: ● the use of instructional technology in course design and/or the classroom ● syllabi and course policy statements that outline university policies, with clear grading criteria and a systematic course outline with topics covered, assignments, and due dates.	**Required** Professional teaching responsibilities are consistently fulfilled.	**Required evidence:** Syllabi School Director Review
G. Provides feedback focused on improving learning.	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Assignment with instructor feedback (personal information redacted)
H. Fosters high-impact student engagement and learning experiences, including but not limited to providing opportunities for out of class application, experiential learning, field work, or service-learning.	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Teaching awards ● Syllabus, assignments ● Student comments on formal evaluations ● Informal instructor-created assessment by students ● Study away or service-learning experiences ● Experiences with diverse populations ● Opportunities to interact with ethical leaders in the community/society
I. Uses research and theory to inform teaching.	**Required**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Syllabi

Criteria	Required/Encouraged	Evidence
	Authentic and realistic applications inherent to the specific discipline **Encouraged** Assesses student application of authentic and realistic applications inherent to the specific discipline	● Course assignments
J. Uses instructional technology in course design and/or in the classroom.	**Required** Uses technology to assist with duties and responsibilities in instruction/ mentoring/supervision such as using the university LMS to provide access to course materials and student grades. **Encouraged** Utilizes multiple uses of technological resources	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Description of Blackboard use ● FCTL awards ● Student comments on formal and/or informal evaluations ● Narrative supported by artifacts
K. Provides *sustained* community engagement.	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Letters from community leader ● Syllabi and/or course assignments ● Awards
L. Mentors/advises students.	**Encouraged** Involvement in mentoring, advisement, recruitment, and/or retention of students (as required by program)	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Names of students and projects for mentoring; number of advisees and context

Goal 2: Teaching is ethical:
- Instruction, curriculum materials, assessments, and the learning environment are ethical and culturally sustaining.
- My teaching is informed by an ongoing commitment to ethical, culturally sustaining practices.

Criteria	Required/Encouraged	Evidence

		Required evidence included where specified. Examples of potential evidence added for reference.
M. Provides instruction, curriculum materials, and assessments that are ethical and conducts equitable evaluations of student progress. Provides a learning environment that is ethical and culturally sustaining.	**Required**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Course syllabi, assignments, example assignment evaluation ● Student formal or informal feedback ● Narrative self-reflection and plan for improvement
N. Is available to respond to students' academic, professional efficacy, and socio-emotional needs. Treats students respectfully as unique individuals.	**Required**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Maintaining office hours ● Description of individual student meetings ● Documentation of course updates to best support students ● Student formal or informal feedback ● Collaboration with program or department team to respond to student needs
O. Provides opportunities for students to critique practices, trends, and "taken-for-granted" assumptions in the field.	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Student comments ● Syllabi ● Assignments
P. Provides opportunities for students to recognize, understand, and challenge systems of exclusion.	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Student comments ● Syllabi ● Assignments
Q. Course materials are explicitly related to continuing improvement in diversity, cultural competence and equity.	**Required**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Student comments ● Syllabi ● Assignments
R. Participates in professional development to improve ability to incorporate ethical practices into their teaching.	**Encouraged**	**Examples of evidence may include:** ● Description of professional development. ● Examples of planned teaching updates.

Evaluation of Service performance: Instructors

In TLDS we believe faculty commitment to service is an integral part of the faculty role, as investment in service assures the maintenance, growth, and well-being of the School, College, University, and the local and professional community. Therefore, the guidelines outlined below are based on a combination of research, beliefs, values, and assumptions:

- Service in academia has disproportionately burdened women, particularly women of color (Curtis-Boles et al., 2012; Miller & Roksa, 2019; Moore, 2017; Turner 2016).
- Service should reflect engagement at multiple levels including: program, school, college, university, community, and field. The TLDS dept recommends/celebrates service at multiple levels (not all/not exhaustive). Service at all levels is appreciated but deeper, purposeful, committed service that aligns with faculty strengths and furthers the trilogy of scholarship is encouraged.
- Service efforts should reflect investment and be outcome-focused.
- Service should include sustained, reciprocal partnerships that foster social justice, diversity, equity, and inclusion at Missouri State University and in the local and professional community.

Service at the community/professional level may involve volunteer work or may include committee work or leadership and work on special projects for professional associations/organizations/agencies. Faculty efforts to participate in student recruitment and retention events/activities and to engage students in service should be highlighted.

Criteria for Evaluating Service Performance: Instructors

The following section outlines criteria for a faculty member's performance in service based on the Goals and Criteria for Evaluating Service (4.2.3.2) outlined in MSU's Faculty Handbook (2021).

Criteria	Required	Examples of evidence may include:
1. Evidence of application of clinical expertise to provide expert service to the local and professional school communities, hospitals, or community agencies.	**Required** Actively serves as liaison to school communities, hospitals, or community agencies. **Encouraged** Actively provides leadership as liaison to school communities, hospitals or community agencies.	- Screening of preschool children - Board member for school committee - Early Care Committee member - Search committee for child life specialist in a hospital setting
2. Evidence of involvement of students in service activities.	**Required** Provides service opportunities to students **Encouraged** Constructs/develops service opportunities for/with students	- Service-learning component to class , either integrated or component - Capstone project involving community agencies, organizations
3. Evidence of service to the university in the form of consistent,	**Required** Participation in (preparing, attending, reporting) membership in School,	- College Council - Program coordinator - COE Budget Committee

	College, or University Committees or Task Force **Encouraged** Leadership in School, College, or University Committees or Task Force; Professional honors; Faculty sponsorship of clubs, organizations, and special events; Special University, College, or School assignments or activities deemed significant such as recruitment events, Homecoming, etc.	
active service on school and college committees.		
4. Evidence of continuous service	**Required** Service involvement is continually part of the individual workload including all areas of service (university, community/profession) **Encouraged** Service involvement is continually part of the individual workload, and the individual is especially successful in more than one area of service (university, community, profession)	
5. Evidence of recruitment activities	**Encouraged** Involvement in university, college, or program recruitment events.	• Fall/Spring/Summer Showcase • Working with Children & Families Day • Visiting schools

Evaluation of Productivity/Research/Special Projects: Instructor

An Instructor may choose to be evaluated on research or special projects for promotion, although it is **not** a requirement of the position.

An Instructor applying for annual review may, but are not required to, provide documentation from the categories listed below describing Productivity/Research/Special Projects criteria. An Instructor who wishes to participate in extended research activities are required to negotiate load assignments with the School Director and will be held to the respective research agenda. Reassigned time for both research and service should not exceed three credit hours per semester.

Productivity/Research. Both quantitative and qualitative factors enter into assessment of the items below. The body of scholarly work will be appraised holistically and over time.

Author or editor of scholarly book(s) or children's literature

Principal investigator for grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media ($1500+)

Professional article (non-research) published in major international/national discipline-based, print-based or electronic media

1. Author or editor of book chapter(s), monograph(s), anthology(ies), published production script(s), either print-based or other electronic media
2. Scholarly/research articles published in regional or state peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media
3. Primary author, editor, project manager or production specialist of published major educational curriculum material including electronic media
4. Grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media or listed key personnel, including local/university grants ($300+)
4. International, national, regional, state, or local scholarly conference presentation(s), paper, or conference proceeding(s).
5. International, national, regional, state, or local peer-reviewed conference presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s)
6. Primary author/chief compiler of program review/accreditation report e.g. CAEP, Specialty 7.
7. Program Area (SPA), DESE, EPP, or other Professional Organization
8. Non-refereed publication(s) and electronic media
9. Book reviews, essays, and abstracts published in peer-reviewed journals
10. Student/faculty collaborative research project(s) and formal presentations of findings
11. Completed thesis/dissertation as Chair of thesis/dissertation committee(s)
12. Peer Reviewer for journal
13. Research Consultant
14. Peer-reviewed creative endeavors
15. Honors or awards for research
16. Submissions for publication that have not been accepted for publication and grant proposals not currently funded
17. Scholarly, creative work(s), and electronic presentation(s) other than electronic media as described above
18. Reprints of articles previously published in edited books or peer reviewed journals
19. Research post-doctoral fellowship, etc.
20. Literature review, data collection, research work in the discovery phase

Special Projects. This includes activities beyond the aforementioned areas. Examples include but are not limited to: Creating, implementing, and/or evaluating a new course, long-term recruitment plan, university project or other administrator approved projects.

<u>**Criteria for Evaluating Research/Special Projects: Instructors**</u>

An Instructor applying for Senior Instructor must meet the teaching and service requirements specified in the criteria, **as well as** TWO scholarly works from the list above OR actively participating in a special projects as designated by university initiatives or COE initiatives. Projects may be ongoing and may continue over a span of time.

The Evaluation Process

Instructors applying for promotion will be evaluated according to performance in present rank. When the Instructor has served in that capacity for a minimum of five years, and when he or she feels that he or she has meet the criteria for the status sought, then the Instructor indicates that he or she wishes to be considered for promotion by the deadline established by the University for declaration.

Each Instructor making application is responsible for assembling evidentiary documentation, for making the case in support of the application, and for submitting materials according to established deadlines. Recommendations at each level will be based upon data supplied by the candidate as well as department data.

The individual Instructor shall initiate the process for promotion. When an Instructor submits an application for promotion, the evaluation of that application shall not preclude the regular yearly performance review. In all cases, the data upon which promotion decisions will be made will include information provided by the individual Instructor, department data and regular annual reviews. It is the Instructor's responsibility to provide documentation to support his or her application. Candidates shall submit a complete file to the Chair of the RPT Committee of all supportive materials based on criteria in teaching and service for the time period being evaluated.

In TLDS , the Instructor will submit documentation materials for promotion according to the Provost's calendar. The materials will be submitted as a dossier, organized into areas of teaching and service. Documentation of attainment of criteria will be required. The dossier will also contain the following:
1) a current curriculum vitae;
2) copy of all RPT evaluation letters from the RPT Committee, School Director, and Dean of the College; and
3) a matrix
4) a narrative of how the faculty met the criteria in teaching and service.
This will include copies of supporting materials including such items as syllabi, course materials, artifacts emanating from service activities, etc

Evaluation for annual review will be based upon the Instructor's goals and plans for his/her work at MSU. Faculty applying for annual review and or promotion will be evaluated according to performance in their present rank.

Documentation of all materials will be in accordance with University and College of Education guidelines, will use the approved forms, and will proceed according to the Academic Work Calendar prepared and distributed by the Office of the Provost.

Instructors who receive recommendations for improvement in teaching in their evaluations by either the RPT committee and/or the School Director will receive a written remediation plan developed by the School Director. That Instructor will meet regularly with the School Director to evaluate progress towards the goals of the remediation plan and will update the remediation plan as needed. The results of this plan may have an impact on reappointment, promotion, or tenure decisions.

All full-time Instructors participate in regularly scheduled performance reviews. Annual reviews are completed for the purpose of evaluating appropriate progress toward promotion review, as well as yearly performance review. Ideally, each instructor should be evaluated no more than once annually.

The Provost will publish in the annual Master Calendar a university-wide timetable for all academic personnel decisions. All reviews occur according to this schedule. Instructors shall submit application and/or review materials for annual review, promotion, and performance review to the department by the department- specified deadline that is based on the Master Calendar. (Instructors who begin in January will be formally evaluated for the first time in their first full academic year of employment). The department is expected to create and use a "paper trail" of annual evaluations, and when appropriate, recommendations, in the promotion, and annual review process.

Annual performance reviews and progress toward promotion reviews proceed through a series of formal evaluations and recommendations beginning with RPT Committee. The RPT Committee forwards its evaluation and recommendation to the School Director. The School Director forwards his or her evaluation and recommendation along with the School committee evaluation and recommendation to the Dean of the College. The Dean makes a recommendation on reviews of progress toward promotion, required performance evaluations, and sends a list of all required actions with appropriate documentation, to the Provost.

For promotion, the Dean forwards his or her recommendations along with all previous recommendations to the Provost. The Provost makes the final recommendation for promotion decisions to the President and the Board of Governors.

Discussions and/or negotiations will occur in those cases where the recommendations are not acceptable to the higher-level administrator. In instances of disagreement between the personnel committee and the School Director, there shall be a good faith effort to resolve these differences. In all promotion cases where the recommendation of the School Director, Dean, Provost, or the President differs from that of the school personnel committee, the administrator initiating the change shall state in writing to the affected faculty member, the school committee, and other involved administrators, compelling reasons why he or she cannot agree with the original recommendation.

Throughout the entire process, confidentiality of information must be maintained. Faculty members at every level of decision-making must assume personal responsibility to ensure confidentiality is not violated.

Review Process for Promotion
The RPT Committee

The TLDS Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) committee for the rank of Senior Instructors shall be comprised of all tenured faculty members, ranked Clinical Instructors and Senior Instructors and shall operate under Robert's Rules of Order. The chair of the TLDS Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion committee shall also serve as chair of the Reappointment and Promotion committee for the rank of Senior Instructor. If the number of tenured faculty and ranked Clinical Instructors is less than five, then the balance shall be obtained from the pool of tenured faculty within the College of Education or other Colleges. The Dean will appoint any non-program members of the RPT Committee. All tenured faculty members are expected to vote on awarding promotion. The following are excluded from serving on the RPT Committee: the School Director, relatives or spouse of the applicant, faculty members who have been officially notified of non-reappointment for reasons other than retirement, and faculty members who are currently under major sanctions as defined in the Faculty Handbook.

RPT Committee Responsibilities
1. Promotion and annual review committees shall elect their own chairperson.

2. The Committee will inspect all items made available by the School Director and all those provided by the individual being reviewed. The Committee shall assess the performance of the applicant in teaching and service areas. At the request of the Committee, and at the option of the faculty being considered, additional material may be submitted.

3. An attempt should be made to reach consensus, but if that is not possible, a majority vote of the Committee will be used to make the recommendation. If there is a split vote, then the minority may file a report, signed by each member of the minority, which will be forwarded with the majority decision to the School Director (see *Faculty Handbook*).

Application Procedure for Promotion and Annual Review

Instructors applying for promotion will be evaluated according to performance in **present** rank. When the instructor has served in that capacity for a minimum of five years and when he or she feels that he or she has meet the criteria for the status sought, then the instructor indicates that he or she wishes to be considered for promotion by the deadline established by the University for declaration.

Each Instructor making application is responsible for assembling evidentiary documentation, for making the case in support of the application, and for submitted materials according to established deadlines. Recommendations at each level will be based upon data supplied by the candidate, as well as department data.

The individual Instructor shall initiate the process for promotion. When an Instructor submits an application for promotion, the evaluation of that application shall not preclude the regular yearly performance review. In all cases, the data upon which promotion decisions will be made will include information provided by the individual Instructor, department data and regular annual reviews. It is the instructor's responsibility to provide documentation to support his or her application. Candidates shall submit a complete file to the Chair of the RPT Committee of all supportive materials based on criteria in teaching and service for the time period being evaluated.

In TLDS, the Instructor will submit documentation materials for promotion at a date announced by the RPT Committee. The materials will be submitted as a dossier, organized into areas of teaching and service. Documentation of attainment of criteria will be required. The dossier will also contain the

following: 1) a current curriculum vitae; 2) all evaluation letters from the RPT Committee, School Director and Dean of the College; 3) a matrix, and 4) a narrative of how the faculty met the criteria in teaching and service. This will include copies of supporting materials including such items as syllabi, course materials, artifacts emanating from service activities, etc.

Evaluation for annual review will be based upon the Instructor's goals and plans for his/her work at MSU. Faculty applying for annual review and or promotion will be evaluated according to performance in their present rank.

Documentation of all materials will be in accordance with University and College of Education guidelines, will use the approved forms, and will proceed according to the Academic Work Calendar prepared and distributed by the Office of the Provost.

Instructors who receive recommendations for improvement in teaching in their evaluations by either the RPT committee and/or the School Director will receive a written remediation plan developed by the School Director. That Instructor will meet regularly with the School Director to evaluate progress towards the goals of the remediation plan and will update the remediation plan as needed. The results of this plan may have an impact on reappointment, promotion, or tenure decisions.

Process for Promotion
1. The RPT Committee Chair shall forward to the School Director the overall voting results and rationale, current vita, and supporting documentation used as a basis for the evaluation. The School Director shall not participate in voting or deliberations of the School RPT Committee prior to this forwarding. The School Director will make an independent evaluation and recommendation.
2. At the time the recommendation is being forwarded to the School Director, the RPT Committee Chair shall forward to the candidate its recommendation, overall voting results, and written rationale.
3. Supporting materials will be forwarded to the Dean of the College of Education; and forwarded beyond the Dean's office only at the request of the Provost.
4. The candidate may choose to withdraw the application from consideration at any time or stage of the process.
5. Confidentiality will be maintained by all faculty members at every level throughout the decision making process. This includes discussion of or sharing information about faculty outside the confines of the RPT meetings. Confidentiality does not have a time line; at no time should information about faculty under consideration be shared. The only exceptions to this policy would be in sharing information with the School Director, Dean, or Provost.

The Dossier
- The Dossier should be organized to demonstrate growth and impact in the area of teaching and service. There should be a clear alignment between and references within the narrative and the documentation provided.
- A matrix identifying the criteria for teaching and service and the evidence alignment.
- A copy of all evaluation letters from the RPT Committee, School Director and Dean of the College must be included.
- A current CV must be included. The content and format of the CV should meet the highest professional standards in terms of preparation, format, and citations.

- A professional statement of how the faculty met the criteria for teaching must be included. This statement should be clear and it should outline how the candidate has used the feedback from previous years to ensure growth and impact.

TLDS Procedures Regarding Promotion of Instructors

Role of the Candidate

Regarding Annual Review:
- The candidate must provide appropriate materials, including his or her annual assignment (i.e., updated Digital Measures/ Faculty Success)
- The candidate must work with the School Director and other members of the faculty, when appropriate, to address the feedback provided in the annual review.
- The candidate must develop an appropriate plan and process for growth with the School Director.

Role of Faculty and the RPT Committee
1. Departments should carefully review the composition of the RPT committee to ensure the committee composition is consistent with the requirements outlined in this document.

2. Each member of the RPT Committee will individually review each applicant's materials and documentation for reappointment and/or promotion. The RPT Committee will meet as a whole to discuss each candidate's documentation and vote.

3. A tenured faculty member voting on reappointment or promotion should make every effort to be present at the meeting of the committee as a whole, but may submit an absentee ballot and signed written comments along with a letter explaining obligatory professional or personal reasons for the absence to the chair prior to the RPT Committee meeting. In case of an emergency, tenured faculty members should contact the chair as soon as possible in order to submit absentee ballots and sign the final letters.

4. All voting on personnel matters at the meeting will be by secret written ballot and results will be made available to attending faculty during the meeting.

5. Signed written statements by faculty will be allowed to be read by committee members for the consideration of a candidate's suitability for reappointment or promotion and will become part of the discussion in shaping the written documents. In advance of the committee meeting, a candidate may ask a tenured faculty member to speak on his/her behalf during the meeting.

6. The specific voting count and accompanying document will be reported to both the candidate and the School Director, with the understanding that this information will be forwarded to the COE Dean and the Provost's Office.

7. Committee Letters

    A. The chair will write a letter, or designate someone to write a letter, for each candidate summarizing the major, relevant points of discussion (pro and con) as related to the established TLDS criteria for promotion. In doing so, the chair records suggestions made for written comments about the candidate and asks two other people to record notes to provide "checks and balances" of three "views" or attempts at accuracy and fairness. The understood goal is to provide a picture of the thinking and documentation behind the votes to be given to the candidate, the School Director, and other academic administrators.

    B. The chair will show a draft of each letter to the members of the committee who were present at the RPT Committee meeting to seek their sense of whether or not the report is

overstated, understated, or if any information is omitted. The chair will edit a final draft and place the final letters in the departmental office so all RPT Committee members who were present for the meeting can read and sign them.

8. Voting members leaving the meeting early for significant professional or personal obligations will be allowed absentee votes as they leave and may later sign the letter and have their votes included in the official count.

9. The meetings of the RPT Committee are to be held in Executive session, meaning "all said here remains here." The Faculty Handbook states: "Confidentiality must be maintained. Faculty members at every level of decision making must assume personal responsibility to ensure confidentiality is not violated." [Section 2.4.2]

10. The Chair of the RPT Committee should work to ensure that all appropriate tasks of the review are carried out appropriately, in a timely way, and that all candidates receive clear and appropriate feedback and guidance.

Role of School Director

<u>Annual Reviews</u>

- The School Director will evaluate RPT performance in a professional manner. He or she will clearly communicate evaluation outcomes and provide justification to/for whom it applies.
- The School Director will work to resolve any conflicts that may arise during the peer review process.
- The School Director will provide constructive guidance. If remediation is required, the School Director will develop a remediation plan and review it with the instructor.
- Based upon the results of annual reviews and reviews for promotion the School Director will engage in a self-evaluation regarding the degree to which he or she is creating and supporting the conditions needed to ensure instructors thrived.

Promotion

- The School Director will not interfere with the function of the RPT Committee. The School Director will provide his or her feedback separately from (and not influenced by) the assessment provided by the RPT committee.
- The School Director will evaluate instructor performance in a professional manner. He or she will clearly communicate evaluation outcomes and provide justification to/for whom it applies.
- The School Director will work to resolve any conflicts that may arise during the peer review process.
- Based upon the results of the review(s) for promotion, the School Director will engage in a self-evaluation regarding the degree to which he or she is creating and supporting the conditions needed to ensure Instructor thrived.