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

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

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

1. DEPARTMENT PROMOTION, TENURE, AND COMPENSATION PROCEDURES

a) Committees and Membership

1. **CLSE Department Personnel Committee (DPC).** The CLSE Department Personnel Committee (DPC) shall consist of all tenured full-time members of the faculty, regardless of rank, including full-time instructors and clinical faculty with renewable appointments (except for those acting in a university administrative appointment, those who have been officially notified of termination for reasons other than retirement, those who are currently under sanction as defined in the Faculty handbook and those upon whose applications the Committee would be acting).

2. **CLSE Promotion, and Tenure Committee (PT).** A subcommittee, the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PT) shall consist of all tenured faculty within the CLSE Department. Individuals who vote on promotion decisions should be at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires. All tenured faculty are expected to vote on the awarding of tenure, but shall abstain from any evaluation that involves a conflict of interest.

3. **CLSE Promotions Committee (PC).** The Promotions Committee shall consist of the Personnel Committee (DPC) reduced by those faculty members of rank below that for which the candidate is applying.

4. **CLSE Compensation Committee (CC).** Finally, a department Compensation Committee (CC) shall be comprised of a four-person panel elected annually from among the full Personnel Committee, rotating such that no member shall serve for more than three years consecutively. Representatives from the four primary program areas shall be included (i.e., counseling, leadership, special education, and student affairs).

b) The precise terms of every appointment, including terms for appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, and annual review shall be stated in the initial appointment contract letter. The conditions of appointment may vary between individuals in the various programs within the CLSE department.
This document is to be reviewed every three years by the faculty in the CLSE department.

The guidelines in effect at the time of hire or promotion are those to which the faculty member is to be evaluated unless the faculty member elects to use newer guidelines or the guidelines are older than six years at the time of evaluation. As per the Faculty Handbook, the guidelines in effect at the time of hire are to be signed by the faculty member and the department head and placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file.

Both the initial contract with the University and the annual discussions with the department head present opportunities for role specialization for each faculty member. Evaluation of a faculty member is to be consistent with the member's role as determined by those factors. Nevertheless, the MSU Faculty Handbook clearly requires performance in all of the three traditional areas of teaching, research, and service as a prerequisite to tenure and to promotions. Therefore, roles of those faculty members with an interest in tenure or in promotion must be framed with the Department Head in such a way as to permit demonstration of acceptable levels of performance in all three areas in order to be eligible for consideration for tenure or promotion. Ideally, the decisions regarding individual faculty member role specialization should be discussed among the program area faculty to increase awareness of individual faculty expectations and provide stronger overall support for the entire program.

Mentoring is an essential component of successful promotion and tenure processes. The CLSE department head should assure that all faculty members are engaged in mentoring, either as mentors or mentees, as appropriate to their rank, tenure status, and expertise.

II. PROCESSES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

All processes shall follow the schedule of and adhere to the deadlines published in the Calendar for Faculty Evaluation prepared by the Provost's office and distributed at the beginning of the academic year. The candidate's application will be presented to the chair of the PT Committee, who will undertake security of the application. The PT Committee will make the original recommendation in all cases involving promotion, tenure, or appointment.

Schedule for PT Evaluations

1. Every faculty member on probationary or tenure appointment shall be evaluated. Evaluation of probationary appointees shall be conducted early in the second semester of their first year, and toward the end of their third semester, so that there will be a reasonable basis for decisions to reappoint in accordance with the schedule in the MSU and College of Education Policies on Promotion and Tenure and Faculty Evaluation. Evaluation of probationary appointees shall also be conducted during the second semester of their third, fourth and fifth year and during their sixth year.

2. Tenured faculty will be evaluated by the Department Head every year after their first tenured appointment.

Dossier

Please refer to the Provost's Website for procedures at time of application. Probationary faculty members initiate this process by submitting relevant materials to the chair of the departmental personnel committee by a date specified by the committee. The faculty member will assemble a dossier consisting of the following items, some of which are required by the Faculty Handbook. This dossier must be submitted by the due date to the department head and cannot be changed once it is submitted, except for additions to the curriculum vita with the approval of the department head. The dossier may include:

a. Original application form;

b. Matrix of Scholarship;

c. Complete updated curriculum vitae (professional in its appearance and appropriately formatted, including listed presentation and publication citations);
d. Yearly activity summaries;

e. Personal Summary Statement of 2-5 pages summarizing accomplishments, background, goals, plans (should include information regarding the manner in which constructive feedback was addressed in previous years);

f. Prior department head and faculty evaluations plus a summary in matrix form (all past evaluations completed on the candidate by the department head and faculty committees); (Example provided for one year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Area of Evaluation</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1)</th>
<th>Progressing (2)</th>
<th>Expected (3)</th>
<th>Above Expected (4)</th>
<th>Excellent (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DH, Self, PT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DH, Self</td>
<td>PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DH, PT</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g. Student Course Evaluation Summaries and other teaching evaluation documents;

h. Copies of scholarly products (e.g., journal articles, papers presented, books, book chapters, grants, completed grant applications)

i. Any letters that might be requested by the PT Committee from on or off-campus individuals in the discipline, who have been asked to comment on the professional competence of the person being evaluated. Permission to contact these individuals must be granted by the person being evaluated.

j. For those individuals being considered for tenure, all reappointment letters will be included; for those being considered for promotion, all letters of evaluation since their last promotion will be included.

k. External review letters (required, as per Faculty Handbook, and will be included in the PT committee review. The candidate can assist the committee by identifying potential external reviewers. Additional guidelines for external reviewers can be found on the Provost's website);

l. Departmental guidelines used for evaluation;

m. The above documents may be supplemented by other sources of evaluative information offered by the faculty member.

**PT Evaluation**

After submission of the dossier the PT committee will review the materials and write an evaluative report. The Department Head shall not be a participant in the voting or deliberations of the departmental committee.

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

a. Reference to the documents and other data used as the basis for the PT recommendation;

b. An evaluation of the effectiveness of the faculty member on each of the evaluative criterion areas (i.e., teaching, research, and service), and an evaluation summary;

c. Signatures of faculty eligible to vote who support the recommendation*;

*If the vote among the eligible faculty is not unanimous, the minority may file a report, signed by each member of the minority, which will be forwarded with the majority recommendation.
The schedule of evaluations, disposition of written PT recommendations, and the procedures for appeal of PT recommendations follow the procedures approved for the College of Education and the University at large. Data and evidence submitted for merit/market compensation purposes may be used as the basis for PT evaluative processes as well.

**Disposition of PT Evaluations**
The written PT evaluation will be copied and distributed as follows:

1. Original to Department Head for departmental file (PT Committee responsibility)
2. Copy to Dean's Office (distributed by the department head)
3. Copy to faculty member (distributed by the department head)

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

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

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

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

**Schedule for Notification of Appointment/Non-Reappointment**

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

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

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

**III. TENURE TRACK ACADEMIC POSITIONS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

a. **Teaching**
   Teaching is defined as course instruction that is conducted under the auspices of MSU. It includes on-campus and off-campus teaching; research advisement in which instruction is the primary objective (directing Seminar projects, membership on CLSE student committees); dissertation committees; preparation of course materials; development of new courses and online courses, procurement and preparation of class and laboratory equipment and supplies; program direction, advisement, paper or project grading and supervision of practice, fieldwork, and internship experiences.
Expected performance [minimum required to be considered for Tenure] is achieved by:

- Meeting all Faculty Handbook teaching responsibility criteria of developing educated persons.
- Providing evidence of effective teaching which includes examples of competence in courses.
- Average student evaluation ratings (on a 5-pt. scale; 3.01-3.5 where 5 is the highest)
  (Absence of the overall evaluation average indicated above creates a refutable presumption that performance may be unacceptable. A candidate may rebut this presumption of unacceptability based on other facts and/or circumstances particular to his or her teaching experience.)

Above expected performance [minimum required to be considered for promotion to Associate] is achieved through sustained performance, as evidenced by:

- Typically achieving high student evaluations (on a 5-pt scale; >3.51 where 5 is highest); and exceeding expected performance in at least three ways, including, but not limited to, the following:
  - Evidencing engagement in the scholarship of teaching
  - Course development activity (e.g., alignment with standards/competencies or updating materials)
  - Curriculum development activity
  - Support of undergraduate and graduate research efforts
  - Effective student advisement
  - Coordination of academic program
  - Contribution to the public affairs mission
  - Special efforts to bring diversity to students’ experiences
  - Experiential learning
  - Innovative use of instructional technology
  - Curriculum/instructional efforts related to accreditation
  - Efforts to increase accessibility to education beyond one’s typical assignments (e.g., Internet courses)
  - Completion of specialized training for teaching (e.g., NISL)
  - Assessment of teaching (e.g., peer review of teaching, specialized assessments)

Excellent performance [Minimum required to be considered for promotion to Full or Distinguished Full] is achieved through leadership in teaching by:

- Typically achieving high student evaluations (on a 5-pt scale; >4.00 where 5 is highest); and
- Meeting above expected performance in at least five ways, including, but not limited to, those listed above.

Evidence of Quality Teaching:
Some examples that would provide evidence/documentation for Expected, Above Expected, and Excellent performance:

- student evaluations and/or student feedback (50% or less of the evidence provided)
- course syllabi and policy statements
- alignment of courses with standards/competencies identified by the discipline
- samples of assignments
- samples of examinations
- representative samples of work turned in by students
- experiential learning in teaching, as applicable to the discipline
- course or curriculum development
- innovative instructional methods
- development evidence of instructional technology utilization
- on-line course information
- special access opportunities such as distance learning delivery
- providing opportunities for out-of-class application, field work, or service learning
- academic and career advising
- continuing professional education, advanced study, e.g., certificates
- honors and awards for teaching
- written comments by students
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• student outcome data related to course objectives and program assessment
• peer evaluations by appropriate program faculty
• publications and presentations related to teaching
• cooperative scholarship with students, including publications, presentations
• direction of theses or special projects
• service on thesis committees
• participation on doctoral committees
• participation in doctoral comprehensive examinations
• department head assessment of teaching contributions in any of the above areas.
• other ways, as identified by the appropriate program faculty

b. Scholarship

Scholarship is defined as research, inquiry and investigation in the fields appropriate to each program within the CLSE department. Specific modes of research include:

Discovery - gaining knowledge of or ascertaining the existence of something previously unknown or unrecognized;

Application - using established knowledge to solve significant problems

Synthesis - bringing knowledge together from disparate sources to produce a whole work that is greater than the sum of its parts;

Criticism - using established values (aesthetic, logical, ethical) to evaluate quality of artifacts (e.g., art, legal decisions, news media); and

Creation - production of unique forms of expression, generation of new interpretations, theory-building, and model-building.

The CLSE department recognizes the value of engaged public research and its central role within the university’s Public Affairs mission, as well as the academic disciplines of counseling, educational administration, student affairs administration, and special education. Consistent with the language within the Faculty Handbook, public research “encompasses different forms of constructing knowledge about, for, and with diverse publics and communities. Through a coherent, purposeful sequence of activities, it contributes to the public good and yields outcomes of public and intellectual value… this scholarly activity should involve a partnership with the public and/or private sector that enriches knowledge, addresses and helps solve critical societal issues, and contributes to the public good… Engaged Public Research includes Research focused on civic participation in public life, participation by engaged scholars, and the impact of public scholarship on all constituencies. Projects that advance Engaged Public Research must be subjected to critical academic peer review and should include input from a rigorous review conducted by involved community partners who collaborated with the public scholar. This input must assess the significance of the project, the quality of the relationship, and the impact on public good.”

Both the quantity and the quality of scholarship are to be evaluated. Evidence of quality includes evidence of the perceived quality of journals in which the candidate has published, evidence of citation of the candidate’s work by other scholars, and letters of support from recognized scholars in the candidate’s discipline. The following standards are offered as guidelines – quality work that is different than the minimums specified can be justified by the level of overall quality of scholarship represented in the faculty member’s research accomplishments.

Manuscripts which have been accepted by an editor and are considered “in press” may be counted in the category in which they would occur if they were fully published and the faculty member in so listing a work is committing themselves to make whatever final steps are necessary (e.g., reviewing a proof, signing a copyright contract, etc.) to assure the work does come to publication. For example, a faculty member has obtained a letter from the editor
of a national peer reviewed journal stating that there manuscript has been accepted for publication would qualify as “in press” and therefore be counted as a Category A product. However, a faculty member may not count the same work as more than one product in evaluations that are to summarize more than one year’s contributions. For example, in a three-year, tenure, or promotion review, a product may be counted only once even though it may have been counted in two successive years (the first as in press and the second as published).

**Expected Performance** [Minimum required to be considered for Tenure] (since coming to Missouri State University or with credit granted toward tenure when hired)
- Must have a minimum of FIVE from Categories A, B, or C.
  - At least TWO must be from Category A.
  - At least THREE must be from Categories A or B.

**Above Expected Performance** [Minimum required to be considered for promotion to Associate]
Demonstrated sustained performance in scholarship, as evidenced by a minimum of SIX from Categories A, B, or C, with:
- At least THREE must be from Category A, including at least one from Category A+.
- At least FOUR must be from Category A or B, including one as sole or first author.

**Excellent Performance** [Minimum required to be considered for promotion to Full] (since promotion to Associate)
Demonstrated leadership in scholarship, as evidenced by a minimum of SIX from Categories A, B, or C, with:
- At least THREE must be from Category A, including at least one from Category A+.
- At least FOUR must be from Categories A or B, including one as sole or first author.
- And a minimum of TWELVE across the cumulative record, SIX from Category A, TWO from Category A+, and EIGHT from Categories A or B including TWO as sole or first author.

**Extraordinary Performance** [Minimum required to be considered for promotion to Distinguished Full] (since promotion to Full)
Must show an extensive record at this or another institution throughout one’s career, including a minimum of the criteria needed for associate and full professor, meaning EIGHTEEN from Categories A, B, or C.
- At least NINE must be from Category A.
- At least TWELVE must be from Categories A or B.
Must have original work refereed by credible sources in leading publications/venues at the national and international level, such as a minimum of SIX items in Category A+ areas:
- Scholarly/research articles published in international/national peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media
- Author or editor of scholarly book(s).
- External grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media (typically $10,000+)
Must document scholarship quality which includes a collection (two or more) of the following
- Awards
- Published Journal Rankings in the Applicant’s field
- Acceptance rates
- Impact Factors
- Citation Indexes
- Critical Reviews
- Evidence of Leadership Roles in National/International Organizations relative to the area of candidates’ expertise or pursuant to their accomplishments
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Categories of Scholarly Work

CATEGORY A
(Definition of A+: These are national/international scholarly products that are published and have been subject to peer-review.)

- Scholarly/research articles published in international/national peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media (A+)
- Student research projects mentored by faculty members resulting in international/national peer-reviewed publications (A+)
- Author or editor of scholarly book(s) (A+ if peer-reviewed).
- Author or editor of book chapter(s), monograph(s), anthology(ies), published production script(s), either print-based or other electronic media. (A+)
- External grant applications that require substantial faculty effort
- External grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media (typically $10,000+) (A+).
- Primary author of CAEP Folio or Professional Organization Folio.

CATEGORY B

- Scholarly/research articles published in regional or state peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media.
- Articles published in major national discipline-based, print-based or electronic media.
- Student research projects mentored by faculty members resulting in state/regional peer-reviewed publications
- Reviews for university self-studies that require substantial faculty effort.
- Primary author, editor, project manager or production specialist of published major educational curriculum material including electronic media.
- National or regional scholarly peer-reviewed conference presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s).
- National or international awards for research

CATEGORY C

- Local/university grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media (typically <$10,000).
- State and local peer-reviewed conference presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s).
- Nonrefered publication(s) and electronic media.
- Submissions for publication that have not been accepted for publication.
- Scholarly, creative work(s), and electronic presentation(s) other than electronic media as described above.
- Grant and contract proposal(s) as well as accompanying report(s) emanating from such project(s).
- Student/faculty collaborative research project(s).
- Completed dissertation as Chair of dissertation committee(s)
- Peer Reviewer for journal.
- Research consultant.
- Honors or awards for research.
- Reprints of articles previously published in edited books or referenced journals.
- Preparation of custom texts, reading packages, or ancillary materials for one's own courses.
- Other, as judged by appropriate program faculty.

Service
Service includes university and non-university related professional service such as counseling at the University Counseling Center, consulting with community agency and state offices, speech making, attendance at and participation in professional association meetings, being a journal consultant or editor, and contributions to professional conferences and workshops. This category also includes unpaid service to the community. It also includes department, college and university committee work; membership on masters, specialist, and doctoral committees that are external to the department; duties as Department Head, other departmental administrative
appointments; and membership on special committees and bodies such as the Graduate Council, the Faculty Senate, or the Institutional Review Board. University Service also includes the advisement of students which is not related to instruction but rather to program completion, guidance in course selection, career objectives, and informal counseling.

As per the Faculty Handbook, University Citizenship is of paramount importance. Any faculty member, in order to succeed in the area of service at Missouri State University, must succeed in University Citizenship. Service in the other three areas (Professional Service, Public Service, and Professional Consultation) are not individually prescriptive, they are inclusive of service and may be considered. Success in one or more of these areas is required for tenure and for promotion to Associate Professor. Sustained success in one or more areas is required for promotion to Full Professor. Attained success in service is indicated by active participation; sustained success is defined as active participation in three or more years of a service area (Professional Service, Public Service, and Professional Consultation).

**Expected performance** [Minimum required to be considered for Tenure] includes:
- Demonstrated success in University Citizenship as evidenced by contributing fairly to the task of shared governance at three or more levels (program, department, college, or university), and
- Attained success in one or more additional areas, i.e., Professional Service, Public Service, or Professional Consultation.

**Above expected performance** [Minimum required to be considered for promotion to Associate] extends beyond expected performance to include:
- Demonstrated success in University Citizenship as evidenced by contributing fairly to the task of shared governance at all levels (program, department, college, or university), and
- Attained success in one or more areas, i.e., Professional Service, Public Service, or Professional Consultation.

**Excellent performance** [Minimum required to be considered for promotion to Full or Distinguished Full] extends beyond expected performance to include:
- Demonstrated success in University Citizenship as evidenced by contributing fairly to the task of shared governance at all levels (program, department, college, or university),
- Recognition as a leader with a cumulative record in service to the university, and
- **Sustained** success in one or more areas, i.e., Professional Service, Public Service, or Professional Consultation.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates should archive various artifacts of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their service activities, to include, but not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limited to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Letters of appreciation from committee chairs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department heads, deans, or organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minutes of meetings in which active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation was demonstrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reports generated by participation in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committees or organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Service awards or recognitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other documents appropriate for the type of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service rendered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Professional Consultation: providing professional expertise to different individuals or groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates should archive various artifacts of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their service activities, to include, but not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limited to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Letters of appreciation from committee chairs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department heads, deans, or organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minutes of meetings in which active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation was demonstrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reports generated by participation in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committees or organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Service awards or recognitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other documents appropriate for the type of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service rendered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. NON-TENURE TRACK ACADEMIC POSITIONS

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

Instructor

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

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

**Senior Instructor**

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

**Clinical Faculty**

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

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

Evaluation of Faculty with Clinical Appointments (Faculty Handbook, 2013)
The University recognizes the need to evaluate faculty members with specialized assignments according to the requirements of their appointment letters. Clinical faculty should be so designated in appointment letters. Clinical faculty are vital to the success of certain programs in professional fields 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. Areas of performance evaluation for renewal of contract are clinical education and service and evaluation for promotion specific to clinical faculty are clinical education and service and professional productivity.

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

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

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

Demonstration of the use of effective modalities – experiential learning, collaborative learning, etc.
- Assignments such as hands-on practice with class demonstration
- Peer group work
- Self-analysis of writings and projects in class
- Lecture and discussion techniques
- Online course materials and design
- Use of instructional technologies to present concepts, to facilitative class organization and discussions, and to enhance learning.

Leadership in teaching
- Demonstrate leadership in curriculum development
- Perform advisement duties
- Manage or coordinate grants or programs
- Other factors in the area of service that may indicate commitment and leadership may be included, e.g., evidence of advising to student organizations, engagement in organizing events, conferences, or other activities that contribute to the Missouri State University community.

Contribution to course and curriculum development
- Development of new courses or major revisions to existing courses
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• Evaluating and adopting new texts
• Use of technology to enhance learning, e.g., development of an online course

University service
• Service to the university in the form of consistent, active service on departmental, college, or university committees.
• Community engagement as professional opportunities allow
• Service in professional teaching organizations

Application Process
The teaching portfolio will be submitted to the departmental personnel committee for review in accordance with the dates specified in the tenure and promotion calendar (typically early October). The departmental personnel committee will submit recommendations to the Department Head in accordance with the timelines specified in the Tenure and Promotion Calendar. The Department Head will review all relevant information and make a recommendation to the Dean, who will also conduct a review and forward recommendations to the Provost. The Provost will notify the candidate of approval or non-approval of the appointment to Senior Instructor in writing, with copies to the Department Head and Dean. The Academic department will be responsible for initiating the personnel action forms designating the change of appointment and incremental salary increase.

Portfolio Requirements for Application to Senior Instructor
The following is a general guideline of what your portfolio should include and how it should be organized. Please use separate tabs for items, with the first five items arranged in the order listed. Candidates can contact the Provost's Office for clarification.

Please include these items in this order:

1. Application form for Promotion to Senior Instructor
2. Criteria used (department specific)
3. Curriculum Vitae
4. Statement of Philosophy of Teaching
5. Yearly Performance Reviews from Departmental Personnel Committee, Department Head, and Dean (for the current year and the previous four years that are being evaluated). If such reviews are not available for all previous years, other equivalent evidence may be substituted.
6. Please include these items, although not necessarily in this order. Limit your supporting materials to items generated during the five years that are under evaluation.
7. List of courses taught with enrollment numbers
8. Sample syllabi for all courses taught
9. Summary report of student evaluations with samples of student evaluations (do not include all student evaluations, but have available in the event they are requested)
10. Samples of class handouts and other curricular-related materials (e.g., exams, course assignments, etc.)

11. Examples of course and curricular development
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12. Other artifacts that may indicate leadership in the area of teaching may be included – e.g., artifacts of curricular development, student learning outcomes, documentation of excellence in advising, utilization of new teaching techniques and delivery methods, attendance at faculty development workshops to improve pedagogy, unsolicited letters or notes from past students, etc.

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

Criteria for Original Appointment and/or Promotion (COE Guidelines, 2013)
Faculty may be initially appointed to the rank of Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, or Clinical Professor. Minimal qualifications for initial appointment to each rank are provided in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLINICAL FACULTY APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION CRITERIA PER CLINICAL RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointment &amp; Promotion Criteria per Clinical Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensure or certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific type &amp; quantity of experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience supervising students or others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Work (For initial appointment or promotion to higher ranks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching (updated March 2016 to align with CLSE rubrics for teaching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of effective teaching; average student evaluation ratings (on a 5-pt. scale; 3.01-3.5 where 5 is the highest).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Service | Participates in Program & Department Activities | Documentation of Program, Department, and College Service | Documentation of Program, Department, College and University Service |

**Annual Evaluations OF Clinical Faculty**

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

**Evaluation for Renewal of Contract**

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

This document reflects the MINIMUM requirements for a faculty member to be eligible for consideration for tenure and/or promotion. As such, it does not provide a guarantee that a faculty member will be granted tenure and/or promotion as that decision is based on an overall evaluation of the time period being considered and the presentation of sufficient evidence. The expectations outlined in this document need to be considered in light of individual workload assignments negotiated between the faculty member and the department head which may require modified expectations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Furthermore, in some cases activities may be counted in multiple areas, such as when a faculty member engages in the scholarship of teaching. [See Faculty Handbook, 2015, 3.7.2]

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

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

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

Instructors
Instructors with neither research nor service requirements will be assigned 15 hours teaching each semester. Instructors with no research but some service requirements may be assigned 12 hours teaching each semester, as deemed appropriate by the department head and college dean. If instructors choose to engage in research or service activities beyond an equivalent of 3 hours assigned time, they may do so but with no additional reassigned time beyond 3 hours, maintaining a teaching assignment of 12 hours. Note. The CLSE faculty contend that the level, type, and size of classes, as well as TLE of various activities, justify additional consideration when determining workload for instructors.

Tenure-Track Ranked Faculty
All ranked faculty (tenured and untenured) will be assigned 9 hours teaching provided the faculty member documents an established research agenda. Three hours will be assigned for research. Service is an expectation that will not result in reassigned time except for special or extenuating circumstances, as detailed in this document. All ranked faculty with tenure who cannot document an established research agenda [or choose not to] will be assigned 12 hours teaching with service expectations and some documented scholarly activity.

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

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

Standard Workload - MSU policy
Per the university faculty workload policy, “standard workload” is 24 equated hours across an academic year with the exception of instructors without a service component. The conceptual framework for this standard workload is a total workload of 30 equated hours with six equated hours being allocated for maintaining currency in one’s field, advising duties, and normal department, college, and University service activities. The departmentally-approved activities of each faculty member will often vary, and in many cases the standard workloads for individual faculty members will also vary. Research-active faculty members are typically granted a three hour reassignment per semester to promote scholarly
endeavors at the University, resulting in an equated 18-hour instructional workload for an academic year. Research and other agreed upon activities are negotiated between the Department Head and the faculty member, with the approval of the College Dean.

**Overload – MSU policy**

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

**Definitions and Policies regarding “Research Active” status**

*Research Active – Adopted by COE Faculty Advisory Council April 1, 2015 [updated from 2010 CLSE policy]*

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

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

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

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

**Annual Evidence of Research Agenda**

Annual evidence of a research agenda will be presented at the time of annual review, via documentation posted on Digital Measures. Examples of annual evidence would include, but not be limited to:

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

**KPI-Recognized Research Product**

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

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

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

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

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

**Reassigned Time and Summer Compensation Activities**

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

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

[MSU Policy: http://www.missouristate.edu/policy/op3_33_workload.htm]. Normally, overload compensation, as well as summer compensation, shall be computed by taking 2.5% of the faculty member’s salary times the number of equated hours. “Compensation [for summer] will be based on a rate of at least two and one-half percent of base salary per teaching load equivalent. For courses that do not meet the minimum enrollment guidelines, the administrator and faculty member may negotiate for a salary rate that is less than two and one-half percent of base salary per teaching load equivalent” (*Faculty Handbook*, Section 5.8, 2015). Compensation paid by units external to the college is determined by agreements negotiated among the external unit and the individual faculty member in consultation with the department head and dean.

**Summer Assignments**

[COE policy: http://education.missouristate.edu/163937.htm] The courses and number of sections to be taught in the summer sessions will be determined by and based on student need. While summer teaching, et al. assignments are not guaranteed, faculty may teach up to 8 hours as an in-load summer assignment. In some circumstances faculty may teach 9 hours in the summer, but will receive compensation for 8 hours.

**Minimum Course Enrollment Guidelines**

[COE policy: http://education.missouristate.edu/163937.htm] Generally, course section enrollments in the College of Education, for all academic terms (Fall, Spring and/or Summer) should meet the following minima:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Level</th>
<th>Minimum Section Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100-299</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-599</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 and above</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Determination of Reassigned Time

Application Process
[COE policy, http://education.missouristate.edu/163937.htm] The application process entails the following steps:
- Faculty request reassigned time during annual workload negotiations with department heads.
- Heads discuss with dean who provides oversight
- Heads notify faculty in writing regarding workload negotiation, including reassigned time.
- If unexpected circumstances arise, requests for reassigned time may be considered at times other than during the annual workload negotiation.

Criteria for Granting and/or Renewing Reassigned Time
The following criteria must be met for possible grants and/or renewing reassigned time:
- Progress/performance is assessed during annual workload negotiations.
- Criteria for progress/performance are governed by departments' promotion, tenure and reappointment policies, departmental merit evaluation policies, and evaluations by departmental committees and/or departmental heads. Department heads are encouraged to provide 9 hours or less to faculty members who are research active and/or pursuing eligibility for university tenure and promotion.
- Faculty whose performance is not satisfactory in service, research (excluding instructors), or teaching, whether at the research active status or not, are generally not eligible for reassigned time according to the university workload policy.

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

- **Program Coordinators.** Faculty members who coordinate an academic program shall receive a workload adjustment or compensation for those activities. The amount of adjustment/compensation will vary depending upon the work required for the coordination of each program. Factors to consider when determining appropriate compensation/adjustment are the level of program marketing, student recruitment, student advisement, internship coordination, clinic coordination, and adjunct faculty coordination required for effective program operation. Typically, program coordinators are to receive:
  - Program Coordination = 3 hours of reassigned time (fall and spring)
  - Program Coordination = 2-3 hours of compensation (summer)

- **Off-Site Intern Supervision.** Each EAD Masters/Specialist student registers for one credit hour of off-site internship. Faculty supervisors receive one equated hour of credit for supervising four interns (.25 per student, per one hour of off-site internship).
  - Four (4) off-site interns = 1 hour of reassigned time (fall and spring)
  - Four (4) off-site interns = 1 hour of compensation (summer)

- **On-Site Intern Supervision.** Each EAD Masters/Specialist student registers for two credit hours of on-site internship. Faculty supervisors receive one equated hour of credit for supervising 2 interns (.25 per student, per hour of on-site internship).
  - Two (2) on-site interns = 1 hour of reassigned time (fall and spring)
  - Two (2) on-site interns = 1 hour of compensation (summer)

- **On-Site Counseling Intern Supervision.** Each counseling intern at the Center City Clinic (or other affiliated approved site) registers for the internship course as well as receiving one-hour weekly face-to-face supervision, tape and case note review, and clinical oversight from a licensed supervisor. Faculty supervisors receive one (1)
equated hour for supervising one (1) intern (fall/spring) and .75 hour compensation for summer supervision (4 interns = 3 equated hours).
  o One (1) intern = 1 hour of reassigned time (fall and spring)
  o Four (4) interns = 3 hours of compensation (summer)

- **Student Affairs Practicum.** Students in the Student Affairs masters program each complete 6 hours of practicum. The workload equivalency for faculty supervisors is .25 per hour per student (.75 for each student for 3 hours of practicum).
  o Eight (8) practicum students = 3 hours of reassigned time/compensation.

- **Counseling Practicum.** Counseling students register for 3 credits of practicum, however, students meet together and work separately with clients during live-supervised lab for a course equivalency of six hours. Furthermore, CACREP Standard I. Q. requires that a maximum load of six (6) practicum students be registered in one three-hour (3) course. Any students beyond six (6) should count as .5 equated hours per student enrolled in the three-hour practicum course.

- **Field Study Research.** Each EAD specialist student completes three hours of research while doing their field study research. Per the university Faculty Workload Policy (2000) it is recommended that thesis advisors (similar to field study advisors) receive .75 equated hours for 3 credit hours of student thesis. This would correspond to four students, 3 credit hours each, resulting in a 3 equated hour workload adjustment.
  o Four (4) Field Study Students = 3 hours of reassigned time (fall/spring) [cannot be repeated for multiple semesters for same students]
  o Four (4) Field Study Students = 3 hours of compensation (summer) [cannot be repeated for multiple semesters for same students]

- **Thesis Supervision.** Per the university Faculty Workload Policy (2000) it is recommended that thesis advisors receive .75 equated hours for 3 credit hours of student thesis. This would correspond to four students, 3 credit hours each, resulting in a 3 equated hour workload adjustment.
  o Four Students Supervised for Three Hours of Thesis Each = 3 hours of reassigned time (fall/spring) [cannot be repeated for multiple semesters for same students without registering for additional credit hours]
  o Four Students Supervised for Three Hours of Thesis Each = 3 hours of compensation (summer) [cannot be repeated for multiple semesters for same students without registering for additional credit hours]

- **Dissertation Advisement.** University of Missouri policy recommends one (1) hour of reassigned time for advisement of two (2) students working on their dissertations. This would correspond to .25 equated hours per dissertation credit hour (students register for 2 credits during each regular semester, 1 credit during summer).
  o Two (2) dissertation advisees = 1 hour of reassigned time (fall and spring)
  o Four (4) dissertation advisees = 1 hour of compensation (summer)

- **Student Research Committee Membership.** Faculty who serve on student research committees (for theses, field studies, and dissertations) are eligible to accrue reassigned time for such activity. The responsibility of committee member is approximately one-fifth that of an advisor. (If used here it cannot also be counted as service.)
  o Ten (10) student research committees = 1 hour of reassigned time (fall and spring)

- **Independent Study.** Faculty who supervise students on independent study projects approved by the department head are eligible to receive reassigned time for such activity.
  o Nine (9) independent study courses = 3 hours or reassigned time (fall or spring).
  o Three (3) independent study courses = 1 hour compensation (summer).

- **Banking of Hours.** Faculty members who do not “earn” enough additional equated hours during one semester for reassignment from a 3-hour course can “bank” the hours earned and later negotiate for a load reduction.
IX. CLSE Annual Evaluation and Compensation Guidelines

All faculty members are required to maintain a current record of accomplishments and activity using Digital Measures. From Digital Measures, annual reports will be generated every year in January and then evaluated. Individual faculty members provide a narrative summary (in the annual activity report within Digital Measures) of their activities in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. During January of each year, the CLSE Compensation Committee will utilize department evaluation criteria (see below) to conduct reviews of annual reports and will prepare narrative assessments of each faculty member. In addition, each member of the CLSE Compensation Committee will assign a numerical rating on each of the three performance dimensions for each faculty member being reviewed. The CLSE Compensation Committee shall rate each faculty member on each criterion according to the following five categories: Unsatisfactory, Progressing, Expected, Above Expected, and Excellent. The Unsatisfactory level of evaluation is characterized by an absence of evidence, whereas the Progressing level is characterized by inconsistent or minimal evidence.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As per the Faculty Handbook, in years when there will be no performance-based component to salary adjustments, the full-time faculty of a department may, by majority vote, opt to forgo a review by the departmental personnel committee; in those years, the review process shall start with the Department Head.
### TENURE-TRACK/TENURED FACULTY EVALUATION RUBRICS

#### Faculty Evaluation Rubric for Teaching

Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric matrix below. These examples are only guides for the committee; the final rating shall be a consensus of judgment among the CLSE Compensation Committee members after considering all relevant information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1)</th>
<th>Progressing (2)</th>
<th>Expected (3)</th>
<th>Above Expected (4)</th>
<th>Excellent (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in their teaching or persistent evidence of low quality teaching.</td>
<td>Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in their teaching.</td>
<td>Meeting all Faculty Handbook teaching responsibility criteria; Providing evidence of effective teaching; Average student evaluation ratings (on a 5-pt. scale; 3.01-3.5 where 5 is the highest).</td>
<td>Exceeding expected performance is achieved by high student evaluations (on a 5-pt. scale; &gt;3.51 where 5 is highest); and at least three of the following: Evidencing engagement in the scholarship of teaching; Course development activity (e.g., alignment with standards/competencies or updating materials); Support of student research efforts; Effective student advisement; Coordination of academic program; Development of internet courses; Curriculum/instructional efforts related to accreditation; Completion of specialized training for teaching; or Assessment of teaching (e.g., peer review of teaching, specialized assessments)</td>
<td>Excellent performance is achieved by: High student evaluations (on a 5 pt. scale, &gt;4.00 where 5 is the highest); And at least five of the ways listed in the Above Expected criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Evidence of Quality Teaching:
- student evaluations and/or student feedback (50% or less of the evidence provided)
- course syllabi and policy statements
- alignment of courses with standards/competencies identified by the discipline
- samples of assignments
- samples of examinations
- representative samples of work turned in by students
- experiential learning in teaching, as applicable to the discipline
- course or curriculum development
- innovative instructional methods
- development evidence of instructional technology utilization
- on-line course information
- special access opportunities such as distance learning delivery
- providing opportunities for out-of-class application, field work, or service learning
- academic and career advising
- continuing professional education, advanced study, e.g., certificates
- honors and awards for teaching
- written comments by students
- student outcome data related to course objectives and program assessment
- peer evaluations by appropriate program faculty
- publications and presentations related to teaching
- cooperative scholarship with students, including publications, presentations
- direction of theses or special projects
- service on thesis committees
- participation on doctoral committees
- participation in doctoral comprehensive examinations
- department head assessment of teaching contributions in any of the above areas
- other ways, as identified by the appropriate program faculty
Faculty Evaluation Rubric for Research/Scholarship

Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric matrix below. These examples are only guides for the committee; the final rating shall be a consensus of judgment among the CLSE Compensation Committee members after considering all relevant information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1)</th>
<th>Progressing (2)</th>
<th>Expected (3)</th>
<th>Above Expected (4)</th>
<th>Excellent (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in scholarship.</td>
<td>Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in scholarship.</td>
<td>At least one scholarship product from Category A or B, or at least two scholarship products from any of the Categories, A, B, or C.</td>
<td>At least two scholarship products from Category A or B.</td>
<td>At least two scholarship products from Category A and one scholarship product from B or C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CATEGORY A
- Scholarly/research articles published in international/national peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media.
- Student research projects mentored by faculty members resulting in international/national peer-reviewed publications.
- Author or editor of scholarly book(s).
- Author or editor of book chapter(s), monograph(s), anthology(ies), published production script(s), either print-based or other electronic media.
- External grant applications that require substantial faculty effort.
- Principal investigator for external grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media (typically $10,000+).
- Primary author of CAEP Folio or Professional Organization Folio.

CATEGORY B
- Scholarly/research articles published in regional or state peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media.
- Articles published in major national discipline-based, print-based or electronic media.
- Student research projects mentored by faculty members resulting in state/regional peer-reviewed publications.
- Primary author, editor, project manager or production specialist of published major educational curriculum material including electronic media.
- Reviews for university self-studies that require substantial faculty effort.
- National or regional scholarly peer-reviewed conference presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s).
- National or international awards for research.

CATEGORY C
- Local/university grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media (typically <$10,000).
- State and local peer-reviewed conference presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s).
- Non refereed publication(s) and electronic media.
- Submissions for publication that have not been accepted for publication.
- Scholarly, creative work(s), and electronic presentation(s) other than electronic media as described above.
- Grant and contract proposal(s) as well as accompanying report(s) emanating from such project(s).
- Student/faculty collaborative research project(s).
- Completed dissertation as Chair of dissertation committee(s).
- Peer Reviewer for journal (also listed in Professional Service but only counted in one area).
- Research consultant.
- Honors or awards for research.
- Reprints of articles previously published in edited books or referenced journals.
- Preparation of custom texts, reading packages, or ancillary materials for one's own courses.
- Other, as judged by appropriate program faculty.
Faculty Evaluation Rubric for Service

Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric matrix below. These examples are only guides for the committee; the final rating shall be a consensus of judgment among the CLSE Compensation Committee members after considering all relevant information.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Examples of Service Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. University Citizenship: serving the University organization and contributing fairly to the task of shared-governance</td>
<td>-Program service (e.g., participation on curriculum revision committee; chair or member of program advisory board; chair or member of accreditation committee; academic adviser at undergraduate or graduate level; faculty search committee member; thesis chair or thesis committee member, program coordination duties beyond teaching); -Departmental service (e.g., departmental policy revision committee; space utilization committee; faculty search committee member; department Library representative); -College service (e.g., member of Dean's faculty advisory committee; chair or member of COE Graduate Program Committee; member of CAEP accreditation committee; faculty, administrator, or staff search committee member) -University service (e.g., chair or member of University committees such as Graduate Council, Library Advisory Committee, University Assessment Committee; administrator or staff search committee member) -Additional service activities (e.g., task force chair or committee member; faculty participant in provost/dean initiatives; providing service learning activities; coordinating internships; participation in study away; advising a student organization; providing professional development activities; participating in campus discussions, and expanding opportunities for shaping the learning environment); or other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Professional Service: contributing to professional organizations within the faculty member's field</td>
<td>-Chairing or serving as a board member or officer of a professional organization at the local, state, national, and/or international levels; -Serving as an editor or member of an editorial board of a professional journal at the state, national, and/or international levels; -Serving as a reviewer or guest reviewer for a professional journal at the state, national, and/or international levels; -Sponsoring an active student organization; -Providing mentoring or advising to individuals who are not current students; -Providing opportunities for student experiences outside the expectations of teaching - Engaging in development/renewal (e.g., appropriate professional meetings, conventions, workshops, seminars) - Engaging in service and advocacy (e.g., program presentations, workshops, consultations, speeches, direct service) -Other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Public Service: serving community, state, national or international public constituents</td>
<td>-Writing op eds or other articles in newspapers or other print media or on television or radio, etc. -Providing presentations to support individuals and groups of individuals in local communities, states, the nation, and other countries -Volunteering for local, community, state, national, and international organizations -Other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professional Consultation: providing professional expertise to different individuals or groups</td>
<td>-Providing professional expertise to business, industry, schools, community organizations, and colleagues in other university programs through collaborative projects, presentations, or specific consultations -Providing unpaid consultation services to external constituents within the faculty member's professional expertise -Other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric matrix below. These examples are only guides for the committee; the final rating shall be a consensus of judgment among the CLSE Compensation Committee members after considering all relevant information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Progressing</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Above Expected</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in their teaching or persistent evidence of low quality teaching.</td>
<td>Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in their teaching.</td>
<td>Meeting all <em>Faculty Handbook</em> teaching responsibility criteria; Providing evidence of effective teaching; Average student evaluation ratings (on a 5-pt. scale; 3.01-3.5 where 5 is the highest).</td>
<td>Exceeding expected performance is achieved by: High student evaluations (on a 5-pt scale; &gt;3.51 where 5 is highest); and at least three of the following: Evidencing engagement in the scholarship of teaching; Course development activity (e.g., alignment with standards/competencies or updating materials); Curriculum development activity; Support of student research efforts; Effective student advisement; Coordination of academic program; Contribution to the public affairs mission; Innovative use of instructional technology; Development of internet courses; or Curriculum/instructional efforts related to accreditation; Completion of specialized training for teaching; or Assessment of teaching (e.g., peer review of teaching, specialized assessments).</td>
<td>Excellent performance is achieved by: High student evaluations (on a 5 pt. scale, &gt;4.00 where 5 is the highest); and at least five of the ways listed in the Above Expected criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence of Quality Teaching:
- student evaluations and/or student feedback (50% or less of the evidence provided)
- course syllabi and policy statements
- alignment of courses with standards/competencies identified by the discipline
- samples of assignments
- samples of examinations
- representative samples of work turned in by students
- experiential learning in teaching, as applicable to the discipline
- course or curriculum development
- innovative instructional methods
- development evidence of instructional technology utilization
- on-line course information
- special access opportunities such as distance learning delivery
- providing opportunities for out-of-class application, field work, or service learning
- academic and career advising
- continuing professional education, advanced study, e.g., certificates
- honors and awards for teaching
- written comments by students
- student outcome data related to course objectives and program assessment
- peer evaluations by appropriate program faculty
- publications and presentations related to teaching
- cooperative scholarship with students, including publications, presentations
- direction of theses or special projects
- service on thesis committees
- participation on doctoral committees
- participation in doctoral comprehensive examinations
- department head assessment of teaching contributions in any of the above areas
- other ways, as identified by the appropriate program faculty
Non-Tenured-Faculty Evaluation Rubric for Research/Scholarship

Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric matrix below. These examples are only guides for the committee; the final rating shall be a consensus of judgment among the CLSE Compensation Committee members after considering all relevant information.

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

**CATEGORY A**
- Scholarly/research articles published in international/national peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media.
- Student research projects mentored by faculty members resulting in international/national peer-reviewed publications.
- Author or editor of scholarly book(s).
- Author or editor of book chapter(s), monograph(s), anthology(ies), published production script(s), either print-based or other electronic media.
- External grant applications that require substantial faculty effort.
- Principal investigator for external grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media (typically $10,000+).
- Primary author of CAEP Folio or Professional Organization Folio.

**CATEGORY B**
- Scholarly/research articles published in regional or state peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media.
- Articles published in major national discipline-based, print-based or electronic media.
- Student research projects mentored by faculty members resulting in state/regional peer-reviewed publications.
- Primary author, editor, project manager or production specialist of published major educational curriculum material including electronic media.
- Reviews for university self-studies that require substantial faculty effort.
- National or regional scholarly peer-reviewed conference presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s).
- National or international awards for research.

**CATEGORY C**
- Local/university grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media (typically <$10,000).
- State and local peer-reviewed conference presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s).
- Nonrefered publication(s) and electronic media.
- Submissions for publication that have not been accepted for publication.
- Scholarly, creative work(s), and electronic presentation(s) other than electronic media as described above.
- Grant and contract proposal(s) as well as accompanying report(s) emanating from such project(s).
- Student/faculty collaborative research project(s).
- Completed dissertation as Chair of dissertation committee(s).
- Peer Reviewer for journal (also listed in Professional Service but only counted in one area)
- Research consultant.
- Honors or awards for research.
- Reprints of articles previously published in edited books or referenced journals.
- Preparation of custom texts, reading packages, or ancillary materials for one’s own courses.
- Other, as judged by appropriate program faculty.
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Non-Tenured Faculty Evaluation Rubric for Service

Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric matrix below. These examples are only guides for the committee; the final rating shall be a consensus of judgment among the CLSE Compensation Committee members after considering all relevant information.

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

### Service Area Examples of Service Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Examples of Service Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. University Citizenship: serving the University organization and contributing fairly to the task of shared governance</td>
<td>-Program service (e.g., participation on curriculum revision committee; chair or member of program advisory board; chair or member of accreditation committee; academic adviser at undergraduate or graduate level; faculty search chair committee member; thesis chair or thesis committee member, program coordination duties beyond teaching); -Departmental service (e.g., departmental policy revision committee; space utilization committee; faculty search committee member; department Library representative); -College service (e.g., member of Dean’s faculty advisory committee; chair or member of COE Graduate Program Committee; member of CAEP accreditation committee; faculty, administrator, or staff search committee member) -University service (e.g., chair or member of University committees such as Graduate Council, Library Advisory Committee, University Assessment Committee; administrator or staff search committee member) -Additional service activities (e.g., task force chair or committee member; providing professional development activities; faculty participant in provost/dean initiatives; providing service learning activities; coordinating internships; participation in study away; advising a student organization; participating in campus discussions, and expanding opportunities for shaping the learning environment); or other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Professional Service: contributing to professional organizations within the faculty member’s field</td>
<td>-Chairing or serving as a board member or officer of a professional organization at the local, state, national, and/or international levels; -Serving as an editor or member of an editorial board of a professional journal at the state, national, and/or international levels; -Serving as a reviewer or guest reviewer for a professional journal at the state, national, and/or international levels; -Sponsoring an active student organization; -Providing mentoring or advising; -Providing opportunities for student experiences outside the expectations of teaching -Engaging in development/renewal (e.g., appropriate professional meetings, conventions, workshops, seminars) -Engaging in service and advocacy (e.g., program presentations, workshops, consultations, speeches, direct service) -Other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Public Service: serving community, state, national or international public constituents</td>
<td>-Writing op eds or other articles in newspapers or other print media or on television or radio, etc. -Providing presentations to support individuals and groups of individuals in local communities, states, the nation, and other countries -Volunteering for local, community, state, national, and international organizations -Other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professional Consultation: providing professional expertise to different individuals or groups</td>
<td>-Providing professional expertise to business, industry, schools, community organizations, and colleagues in other university programs through collaborative projects, presentations, or specific consultations -Providing unpaid consultation services to external constituents within the faculty member’s professional expertise -Other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appeals of Annual Evaluation Ratings

Only a faculty member’s final composite performance rating may be appealed. Faculty will be provided clear information on the salary implications of the composite ratings prior to the deadline for submitting appeals to the department head as specified in the compensation calendar.

A faculty member who is dissatisfied with his/her final composite performance rating should first request a meeting with the department head to discuss the processes and underlying rationales by which the performance rating was determined. After the meeting with the department head, the faculty member may request a formal review of the rating by submitting a written appeal to the department head, stating the reasons for questioning the rating. At the request of the faculty member, the appeal, along with the department head response and other supporting materials, is forwarded to the dean. The dean transmits the appeal to the College Personnel Committee (or the College Compensation Committee, if one exists as a separate subcommittee of the Personnel Committee) for consideration. The College Personnel Committee (or Compensation Subcommittee) will consider the appeal. The committee’s review should make use of the department performance criteria, the narrative and ratings from the department personnel committee and the department head, the department head’s annual report of accomplishments, and summary descriptive measures (mean, median, mean, etc.) of the ratings of department faculty. If necessary, additional information may be requested by the committee in the process of their deliberations. The college committee will provide a written summary to the dean on the recommended disposition of the appeal.

If the dean makes a decision on the appeal that is different than that recommended by the college committee, the dean must provide a written rationale for that decision. The faculty member may continue to appeal to the Provost, who will review all written documents associated with the appeal.

The Provost may, at his/her discretion, meet with the faculty member. The Provost’s decision is final. If the Provost’s decision is different from the decision recommended by the college committee, the Provost must provide to the faculty member a written rationale for that decision. Only the performance rating itself can be appealed. Individuals who are successful on appeal will receive the salary increase merited by their revised performance rating. The actual percentage salary increase associated with each performance rating is not subject to appeal. This is the only appeal process to be utilized for appeals of the performance rating. Other grievance procedures, as outlined in the Faculty Handbook, are not applicable.

At any time, any employee who believes that they have been discriminated against for any reason not related to job performance may consult with the Office for Equity and Diversity.

Performance Parameters for Compensation System

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

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

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

I. Tenured Faculty -- 9-hour TLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Weight</th>
<th>Performance Dimension (Role)</th>
<th>Maximum Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Teaching/Advising/Program Director/Accreditation Activity</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Research/scholarship/creative activities</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Tenured Faculty -- 12-hour TLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Weight</th>
<th>Performance Dimension (Role)</th>
<th>Maximum Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Teaching/Advising/Program Director/Accreditation Activity</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Research/scholarship/creative activities</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Probationary Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Weight</th>
<th>Performance Dimension (Role)</th>
<th>Maximum Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Teaching/Advising</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Research/scholarship/creative activities</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Non Tenure-Track Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Weight</th>
<th>Performance Dimension (Role)</th>
<th>Maximum Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Teaching/Advising</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Research/scholarship/creative activities</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Name of Faculty Member: ____________________

Per CLSE Guidelines (Fall 2016-Spring 2019)

### Tenured Faculty -- 9-hour TLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Weight</th>
<th>Performance Dimension (Role)</th>
<th>Maximum Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Teaching/Advising/Program Director/Accreditation Activity</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Research/scholarship/creative activities</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tenured Faculty -- 12-hour TLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Weight</th>
<th>Performance Dimension (Role)</th>
<th>Maximum Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Teaching/Advising/Program Director/Accreditation Activity</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Research/scholarship/creative activities</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Probationary Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Weight</th>
<th>Performance Dimension (Role)</th>
<th>Maximum Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Teaching/Advising</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Research/scholarship/creative activities</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Which range is applicable?**

- [ ] Tenured—9 hour TLE
- [ ] Tenured—12 hour TLE
- [ ] Probationary

**Research Active?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

### Performance Dimension (Role) Chosen Weight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Dimension (Role)</th>
<th>Chosen Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Advising/Program Director/Accreditation Activity</td>
<td>_________ %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/scholarship/creative activities</td>
<td>_________ %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>_________ %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

____________________________ (Faculty Member Signature) _____________ (Date)

____________________________ (Department Head Signature) _____________ (Date)

Updated by CLSE Faculty, March 2016, Cindy MacGregor, Revision Committee Chair
Acknowledgment Page for New Hires

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

__________________________________________ (Faculty Member Signature) __________ (Date)

__________________________________________ (CLSE Department Head Signature) __________ (Date)