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The mission of the Department of Reading, Foundations, and Technology (RFT) at Missouri State University is to prepare professional educators of the highest quality. We seek to help students recognize, accept, and enhance the central place of teachers in the public affairs of this nation and world. Our goal is to prepare reflective teachers, specialists, and administrators who are committed to the education of children and the ideals of literacy, scholarship, leadership, lifelong learning, and service to society. Students completing our programs have the ability to make informed instructional, curricular, technological, and personal decisions that help all students. The Department of Reading, Foundations, and Technology values the continual professional development of its faculty and students through teaching, scholarship, and service. All faculty activities that advance these goals form the basis for promotion, tenure, appointment, and compensation decisions.

Promotion, tenure, appointment, and compensation policies of the RFT department are designed to be consistent with the Missouri State Faculty Handbook and other University policies. In particular, these include policies on the Missouri State 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. In cases of unforeseen conflict, policies shall have priority in the order listed above, with the Missouri State Faculty Handbook policies followed in all cases.

In accordance with the Missouri State Faculty Handbook, faculty with “exceptional records of accomplishment” may apply early for tenure and promotion. The RFT faculty define an exceptional record of accomplishment as one that far exceeds the expected guidelines for the given level. For example, it would be expected that someone with an exceptional record in research would have more than twice as many publications from Category A#1 as required for the given level. An exceptional record in teaching would include sustained student evaluations that are the highest in the department. Simply meeting the required guidelines ahead of schedule does not constitute an exceptional record.

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

I. DEPARTMENT PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES

1. The RFT P&T committee shall be comprised of all tenured faculty and shall operate under Robert’s Rules of Order. The department as a whole will elect a chair.

   A. Charge – Each member of the P&T Committee will individually review each applicant’s materials and documentation for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. The P&T Committee will meet as a whole to discuss each candidate’s documentation and vote.

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

3. All voting on personnel matters at the meeting will be by secret written ballot and results will be made available to attending faculty during the meeting.
4. Signed written statements by tenured faculty will be allowed to be read by committee members for the consideration of a candidate’s suitability for reappointment, promotion, or tenure and will become part of the discussion in shaping the written documents. In advance of the committee meeting, a candidate may ask a tenured faculty member to speak on his/her behalf during the meeting.

5. The specific voting count and accompanying document will be reported to both the candidate and the Department Head, with the understanding that this information will be forwarded to the COE Dean and the Provost’s Office.

6. Committee Letters

A. The chair will write a letter, or designate someone to write a letter, for each candidate summarizing the major, relevant points of discussion (pro and con) as related to the established Reading, Foundations, and Technology Department criteria for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. In doing so, the chair records suggestions made for written comments about the candidate and asks two other people to record notes to provide "checks and balances" of three "views" or attempts at accuracy and fairness. Additionally, the committee will review the applicant’s letters from previous years to determine whether or not the applicant followed recommendations made in the RPT letters. Letters from outside reviewers will also be taken into consideration and may be addressed in the letter. The understood goal is to provide a picture of the thinking and documentation behind the votes to be given to the candidate, the Department Head, and other academic administrators.

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

C. All tenured faculty members may sign the letter written by the chair. If, however, a person cannot in good conscience sign the letter, that person may attach a signed letter expressing concerns about the content of the letter. Such letters will be attached to the official committee letter, available to the committee members, and forwarded with the committee letter to the Department Head and other academic administrators.

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

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

II. PROCESSES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

All processes shall follow the schedule of and adhere to the deadlines published in the Academic Work Calendar 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 P&T Committee, who will undertake security of the application. The P&T Committee will make the original recommendation in all cases involving promotion, tenure, or appointment.

Schedule for P&T Evaluations

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

Dossier

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 according to the guidelines provided on the Provost’s Website at time of application. This dossier must be submitted by the due date
to the department head and cannot be changed once it is submitted, except for additions to the curriculum vita with the approval of the department head.

**Promotion and Tenure Evaluation**

After submission of the dossier, the P&T committee will review the materials and write an evaluative report. External review materials, may be required, as per *Faculty Handbook* (p. 77), and will be included in the P&T committee review. The candidate can assist the committee by identifying potential external reviewers. 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 P&T committee will include the following data and information:

- Reference to the documents and other data used as the basis for the P&T recommendation;
- An evaluation of the effectiveness of the faculty member on each of the evaluative criterion areas (i.e., teaching, research, and service), and an evaluation summary;
- Signatures of tenured faculty who support the recommendation*;

*If there is a split vote among the tenured faculty, 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 P&T recommendations, and the procedures for appeal of P&T 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 P&T evaluative processes as well.

**Disposition of P&T Evaluations**

The written P&T evaluation will be copied and distributed as follows:

1. Original to Department Head for departmental file (P&T 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*, p. 74). The P&T committee will make the initial recommendation and forward the recommendation for a one year reappointment, two 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). The schedule of annual appointments is in accordance with the Provost’s “Standards for Notice of Nonreappointment.”*
 Appeals of P&T Recommendations

When a candidate signs the evaluation of the P&T committee, the Dean, and/or the Department Head, he or she may attach a rebuttal if there are concerns about accuracy or bias. If the candidate does not agree with the final decision given by the Provost, an appeal can be made by following the procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook 4.7.

Responsibility

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

III. GUIDELINES FOR TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE

1. SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship is defined as research, inquiry, and investigation. 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.

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. Items should be listed in the format of the current edition of APA at the time of submission and documentation provided. Also, the type of journal or conference should be included for faculty and administrators who may not be familiar with 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.

FOR TENURE (since coming to Missouri State University)

Must have a minimum of six from Categories A-C.

- Two must be from Category A #1, one of which must be sole author.
- Three additional must be from Categories A-B.

FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR (since last promotion)

Must have a minimum of six from Categories A-C.

- Two must be from Category A #1, one of which must be sole author.
- Three additional must be from Categories A-B.

FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR (since last promotion)

Must have a minimum of seven from Categories A-C.

- Three must be from Category A #1, one of which must be sole author.
- Three additional must be from Categories A-B.

FOR PROMOTION TO DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR

Must have an extensive publishing record that far exceeds expectations for a professor and a distinguished national/international reputation in the candidate’s field to be verified through letters from outside reviewers.
Category A

1. Scholarly/research articles in international/national peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media.

2. Author or editor of scholarly book(s), book chapter(s), monograph(s), anthology(ies), published production script(s) either print-based or other electronic media.

3. External grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media ($10,000+) that required substantial faculty effort.

4. Primary author of individual CAEP (or current college or university accrediting body) standard or Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) provided that the SPA report gains program national recognition.

Category B

1. Scholarly/research articles published in regional peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media.

2. Articles published in major national discipline-based, print-based or electronic media

3. Primary author, editor, project manager or production specialist of published major educational curriculum material including electronic media

4. Grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media or listed key personnel

5. International, national or regional scholarly peer-reviewed conference presentation(s), conference proceedings(s), or grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media or listed key personnel

6. Student research projects mentored by faculty members resulting in national peer-reviewed publications

7. National or regional awards for research

Category C

1. Scholarly/research articles published in state peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media.

2. Student research projects mentored by faculty members resulting in regional or state peer-reviewed publications

3. Local/University Grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media. (<$10,000)

4. State and local peer-reviewed conference presentations(s) or conference proceeding(s)

5. Non-refereed publication(s) and electronic media

6. Scholarly, creative work(s), and electronic presentation(s) other than electronic media as described above

7. Grant and contract proposal(s) as well as accompanying written report(s) emanating from such project(s)
8. Honors or awards for research

9. Student research projects mentored by faculty members that result in national, regional or state peer-reviewed conference presentations

10. Peer reviewer for a journal

11. Manuscripts under review

12. Preparation of custom texts, reading packages, or ancillary materials for one’s own courses

13. Book reviews, essays, and abstracts published in refereed journals

14. Grant or research consultant

2. TEACHING

Teaching is defined as course instruction that is conducted under the auspices of MSU. It includes on-campus, off-campus, online teaching, blended courses, study away programs; research advisement in which instruction is the primary objective (directing Seminar projects, directing or advising RFT and/or College or University student committees, such as University Honors Distinction projects); thesis committees; dissertation committees; preparation and/or development of course materials and assessments; 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.

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 teaching represented in the faculty member’s teaching accomplishments.

Required Criteria as identified from the Faculty Handbook

1. High student evaluations and/or student feedback based on university course evaluations (not to count for more than 50% of teaching) (on a 5 pt. scale, >4.00 where 5 is the highest; <2.0 where 1 is the highest)

2. Course syllabi reflect current research, theory, applicable standards and evidence-based practices and are revised regularly. Content and applications of the syllabi follow an appropriate sequence in both basic and advanced programs

3. Active leadership or engagement in continuing improvements in curriculum design, course development, program review, program and/or course assessments, and evaluation studies. Actively leading, participating and/or collaborating with program faculty related to program issues could include but is not limited to; committing to and completing share of group tasks in timely manner, sharing relevant information with other program faculty in a timely manner, contributing to program and departmental discussions and related tasks.

4. Appropriately accessible and responsive to students through a variety of means (e.g., office hours, electronic communication)

5. Provide evidence of student feedback and responses to student questions in a timely, efficient, and effective manner.

6. Provide evidence of knowledge and use of a variety of appropriate teaching strategies and evaluation methods with grading and feedback in regards to student work in a timely, efficient, and effective manner.
In addition to meeting Required Criteria for teaching as identified in the Faculty Handbook 1.1.3.1, General Criteria 3.2.3, Teaching Criteria 3.2.3.1, and Faculty Evaluation of Teaching 4.2.1, the faculty member should provide documentation of:

**FOR TENURE (since coming to Missouri State University)**
At least five of the Additional Criteria listed below.

**FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR (since last promotion)**
At least seven of the Additional Criteria listed below.

**FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR (since last promotion)**
At least seven of the Additional Criteria listed below.

Provide evidence/documentation of the following.

**Additional Criteria (selected by faculty member; see required number above)**

1. Development of web-based, online, or blended courses
2. Providing opportunities for out-of-class application, experiential learning, field work, or service learning
3. Academic advising including number of advisees, portfolios, seminar advisement, and special projects.
4. Continual professional education, advanced study, e.g. certificates, certificates of completion, etc.
5. Honors and awards for teaching
6. Positive written comments by students (unsolicited, exclusive of university course evaluations)
7. Faculty-generated student mid-semester and/or end of semester anonymous Likert-scale surveys or other evaluation measures where results are analyzed and used as a means to make decisions about classroom climate, student engagement, expectations and rigor, and/or instruction.
8. Student outcome data related to course objectives and program assessments used to improve course instruction and outcome data
9. Peer evaluations and/or observational feedback by appropriate program faculty resulting in improved teaching practices or positive peer evaluations and/or observational feedback by appropriate program faculty
10. Presentations related to teaching, e.g. guest lectures, campus presentations, community presentations, K12 presentations, etc.
11. Effective use of instructional technology in course design and/or in the classroom such as Blackboard, etc.
12. Effective use of resources, coursework, and instructional strategies in the classroom that are explicitly related to issues of diversity, cultural competence/proficiency, and/or equity
13. Chair of thesis or doctoral committee
14. Member of thesis or doctoral committees
15. Excellence in teaching including enhancement of higher-order thinking skills, high-impact teaching strategies, and/or scholarly student outcomes
16. B- 12+ involvement relevant to teaching in schools and/or agencies
17. Meeting departmental/university responsibilities in regard to program and course design and implementation (e.g., collaboration with peers, completion of tasks in a timely manner)
18. Applying theory to practice inherent to the specific discipline
19. Using university and/or teacher-generated evaluation data in planning and implementing instruction
20. Creating and/or modifying courses to meet SPA/CAEP requirements and/or providing data for a SPA or CAEP report.
3. SERVICE

Service includes university and non-university related professional service such as consulting with community agencies and state offices, being a guest speaker, attendance at and participation in professional association meetings, being a journal consultant or editor, and contributions to professional conferences and workshops. This category may include unpaid service to the community and/or department, college and university committee work; membership on masters, specialist, and doctoral committees that are external to the department; duties as 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 and/or guidance in course selection.

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 sustained service represented in the faculty member’s service accomplishments.

FOR TENURE (since coming to Missouri State University)
Extends beyond expected performance to include service that demonstrates sustained success in at least three areas (see guidelines below)

FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR (since last promotion)
Extends beyond expected performance to include service that demonstrates sustained success in at least five areas (see guidelines below)

FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR (since last promotion)
Extends beyond expected performance to include service that demonstrates sustained success in at least five areas (see guidelines below)

Provide evidence/documentation of each the following.

1. University service that furthers the university’s Public Affairs mission.
2. University committees and/or governance that would, in part, include the following specific activities: 1) Attending scheduled committee meetings; 2) Disseminating information obtained from committee meetings, emails, and reports to appropriate audiences (e.g., RFT faculty, COE faculty) in a timely manner; and 3) participating in ad-hoc committees.
3. College service such as the Dean’s Faculty Advisory Committee, College Budget Committee, accreditation committee, staff search committees that would include the following specific activities: 1) Attending scheduled meetings; and 2) Disseminating information obtained from committee meetings, emails, and reports to appropriate audiences (e.g., RFT faculty, COE faculty) in a timely manner.
4. Department service such as departmental policy revision committees or faculty search committees that would include the following specific activities: 1) Attending scheduled meetings; and 2) Disseminating information obtained from committee meetings, emails, and reports to appropriate audiences (e.g., RFT faculty, COE faculty) in a timely manner.
5. Program service such as participation in program or curriculum revisions, chair or member of program advisory board, chair or member of accreditation committee, academic advisor, chair or member of faculty search committee, thesis chair or member, program coordination duties beyond teaching.
6. Chairing or serving as a board member or officer of a professional organization at the local, state, national, or international level.
7. Serving as an editor or member of an editorial board of a professional journal at the state, national, or international level.
8. Serving as a reviewer or guest reviewer for a professional journal at the state, national, or international level.
9. Sponsoring an active student organization
10. Active involvement in relevant professional associations at the local, state, regional, national, and/or international levels including scholarships, internships, and grants awarded for attendance at such events.
11. Providing mentoring or advising beyond teaching requirements including mentoring of other faculty members.
12. Providing opportunities for student experiences outside the expectations of teaching.
13. Active involvement in schools, agencies, and organizations at the local, state, regional, national, and/or international levels.
14. Professional development activities such as participation in campus discussions and expanding opportunities for shaping the learning environment.
15. Providing presentations to support individuals or groups in local communities, states, national or international.
16. Providing professional expertise to business, industry, schools, community organizations and agencies, and colleagues in other university programs through collaborative projects, presentations, or specific consultations.
17. Providing unpaid consultation services to external constituents within the faculty member’s professional expertise.
18. Volunteering for local, community, state, national, international organizations.
19. Writing opinion editorials or other articles in newspapers or other media such as television or radio.

Artifacts for service activities might include the following to show the depth, breadth, and quality of participation:
- Approved minutes from committee meetings
- Letters/e-mails from committee chairs
- Printed agenda, program or correspondence from presentations/speeches
- Review letters or list of materials reviewed
- Dated list of student organization events and activities

Summary of P&T Qualifications

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.

IV. Policy for Appointment to Senior Instructor

The following process outlines the steps that leads to the appointment to Senior Instructor as presented in the revised Faculty Handbook (see relevant section below):

1. “3.6.2 Senior Instructor. An Instructor who has demonstrated excellence in teaching and service at Missouri State University for at least five years may be appointed as a Senior Instructor. Senior Instructors are expected to provide
leadership in teaching, contribute to course and curriculum development and provide appropriate university service. Senior Instructors may participate in research or creative activities. A Senior Instructor shall be appointed to a specific term not to exceed five years and may be reappointed to one or more additional terms, contingent upon satisfactory performance reviews, educational needs and continued funding. If a Senior Instructor applies for and is appointed to a tenure-track faculty position, the time spent as Senior Instructor at Missouri State University will not count toward the probationary period for tenure and promotion. Senior Instructors on 9-month appointments will receive benefits for 12-months."

2. Instructors are eligible to apply for appointment to Senior Instructor in the spring semester of their 5th year of employment with the university.

3. The teaching portfolio will be submitted to the departmental personnel committee for review in accord with the dates specified in the Academic Work Calendar. The portfolio should include supporting documentation of sustained excellence in teaching over the prior five or more academic years. The evidence may include, but not be limited to, student course evaluations, peer evaluations, artifacts of curricular development, student learning outcomes, and other supporting documentation included as part of the written summary detailing rationale for the appointment in accord with departmental guidelines.

4. The departmental personnel committee will submit recommendations to the Department Head in accord with the timelines specified in the Academic Work 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 for the appointment to Senior Instructor in writing of approval or non-approval of the appointment. The Academic department will be responsible for initiating the personnel action forms designating the change of appointment and incremental salary increase.

FOR PROMOTION TO SENIOR INSTRUCTOR

1. TEACHING

Exceeding expected performance of effective teaching in at least five ways (see guidelines below)

Provide evidence/documentation of the following.

1. High student evaluations and/or student feedback (not to count for more than 50% of teaching) (on a 5 pt. scale, >4.00 where 5 is the highest; <2.0 where 1 is the highest)
2. Course syllabi reflect current research, theory and evidence-based practices and are revised regularly. Content and applications of the syllabi follow an appropriate sequence in both basic and advanced programs.
3. Active involvement in continuing improvements in curriculum design, course development, program review, assessments, evaluation studies, participation in professional development activities including the following specific activities: Actively participating and collaborating (e.g., committing to and completing share of group tasks in timely manner, sharing relevant information with other program faculty in a timely manner, contributing to program and departmental discussions and related tasks) with program faculty related to program issues
4. Effective use of instructional technology in the classroom such as Blackboard, etc.
5. Development of web-based courses, online, or blended
6. Providing opportunities for out-of-class application, field work, or service learning
7. Continual professional education, advanced study, e.g. certificates
8. Honors and awards for teaching
9. Written comments by students
10. Student outcome data related to course objectives and program assessments
11. Peer evaluations by appropriate program faculty
12. Presentations related to teaching
13. Cooperative scholarship with students, including publications, presentations where the faculty member is not one of the authors, but helped the students with their research.
14. Excellence in teaching including enhancement of higher order thinking skills and scholarly student outcomes
15. Periodic, ongoing B- 12+ involvement in relevant schools and/or agencies
16. Meeting departmental/university responsibilities in regard to program and course design and implementation (e.g., collaboration with peers, completion of tasks in a timely manner)
17. Applying theory to practice inherent to the specific discipline
18. Using evaluation data in planning and implementing instruction

2. SERVICE
Extends beyond expected performance to include service that demonstrates **sustained** success in at least three areas (see guidelines below)

**Provide evidence/documentation of each the following.**

1. Active involvement in furthering the university’s public affairs mission.
2. Writing opinion editorials or other articles in newspapers or other media such as television or radio.
3. Providing presentations to support individuals or groups in local communities, states, the nation, or other countries.
4. Volunteering for local, community, state, national, international organizations.
5. Active involvement in relevant professional associations at the local, state, regional, national, and/or international levels including scholarships, internships, and grants awarded for attendance at such events.
6. Chairing or serving as a board member or officer of a professional organization at the local, state, national, or international level.
7. Serving as an editor or member of an editorial board of a professional journal at the state, national, or international level.
8. Serving as a reviewer or guest reviewer for a professional journal at the state, national, or international level.
9. Sponsoring an active student organization
10. Providing mentoring or advising beyond teaching requirements including mentoring of other faculty members.
11. Providing opportunities for student experiences outside the expectations of teaching.
12. Active involvement in schools, agencies, and organizations at the local, state, regional, national, and/or international levels.
13. Providing professional expertise to business, industry, schools, community organization and agencies, and colleagues in other university programs through collaborative projects, presentations, or specific consultations.
14. Providing unpaid consultation services to external constituents within the faculty member’s professional expertise.
15. Program, department, college, and University committees and/or governance that would in part include the following specific activities: 1) Regularly attending required program, department, college, and University committee meetings; 2) In cases when one can not attend a required college or University...
committee meeting, arranging for a colleague to attend meeting in his/her place; 3) Disseminating information obtained from committee meetings, emails, and reports to appropriate audiences (e.g., STE faculty, COE faculty) in a timely manner; and 4) Collaborating directly with program and department faculty related to issues and concerns that arise related to specific program and department issues.

16. Program service such as participation in program or curriculum revisions, chair or member of program advisory board, chair or member of accreditation committee, academic advisor, chair of member of faculty search committee, thesis chair or member, program coordination duties beyond teaching.

17. Department service such as departmental policy revision committees, space utilization committee, faculty search committees, department Library representative.

18. College service such as the Dean’s Faculty Advisory Committee, college program committees, accreditation committee, staff search committees.

19. University service such as Graduate Council, Library Advisory Committee, Professional Education Committee.

20. Professional development activities such as participation in campus discussions and expanding opportunities for shaping the learning environment.

21. Continuous service involvement as reflected in the individual professional development plan.

V. Clinical Faculty Appointments (This section will be updated with college criteria which is in development)

The 2007 Missouri State University Faculty Handbook provides for the classification and ranking of Clinical Faculty.

1. 3.6.11 Clinical Faculty. 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.

2. 4.3 Evaluation of Faculty with Clinical Appointments. 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 (Refer to Section 4.2.3.2). Areas of performance evaluation and evaluation for promotion specific to clinical faculty are clinical education and professional productivity.

3. 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 these evaluations, which should be based on the cumulative performance of clinical faculty members as reflected in their annual reviews.

During the first period of appointment (typically a year), this evaluation will be conducted after at least one full semester of service. Faculty members will be notified of the status of their contract (renewal, non-renewal) by the end of the semester in which they were evaluated.

After a clinical faculty member has completed the initial contract period (usually one year), evaluations will be conducted in the fall semester that precedes the following June termination of the current contract. Faculty members will be notified of the status of their contract (renewal, non-renewal) by the end of the fall semester in which they were evaluated.

4. Evaluation of Applications for Promotion
The department promotion and tenure committee will evaluate clinical faculty for promotion in a process similar to that of promotion for academic faculty. A clinical faculty member beyond the rank of clinical instructor may be appointed by the Department Head to the department promotion and tenure committee when decisions regarding renewal of contract and promotion of clinical faculty are under consideration. When a faculty member submits application for promotion, the evaluation of that application shall not preclude the regular yearly review. Such evaluations shall proceed according to the schedule announced in the Academic Work Calendar prepared by the Provost and distributed at the beginning of the academic year. Such evaluations will be based upon the departmental statement of expectations provided to the faculty member and the regular yearly reviews, as well as the documentation presented by the candidate. Each faculty member making application is responsible for assembling evidentiary documentation, for making the case in support of the application, and for submitting materials according to established deadlines. Recommendations at each level will be based upon data supplied by the candidate, as well as departmental data.

5. Process of Recommendations on Promotion
At each stage of evaluation, (i.e., the RFT RPT Committee, Department Head, Dean, and the Provost), the candidate will be given a copy of the recommendation and the written rationale for the recommendation. At each subsequent stage, a copy of the recommendation and a probative rationale therefore will also be furnished to the departmental committee for its information and records.

Recommendations; rationales; previous faculty evaluations by the department RPT committee and department head; and current vita will be forwarded to the next stage for evaluation. Supporting materials will be forwarded as far as the Dean’s office; they will be forwarded beyond the Dean’s office at the request of the Provost. The candidate may choose to withdraw the application from consideration at any stage of the process.

Guidelines for Clinical Faculty Reappointment and Promotion
College criteria will be inserted once developed.

VI. ANNUAL EVALUATION AND COMPENSATION PROCEDURES
All faculty members are required to submit annual reports every year and will be evaluated every year. Individual faculty members provide a 3-page or shorter Annual Activity Report (see Appendix A) of their activities in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service for the Compensation Committee. During January of each year, the Compensation Committee will utilize department evaluation criteria (see below) to conduct reviews of annual reports. Each member of the department Compensation Committee will assign a numerical rating on each of the three performance dimensions for each faculty member being reviewed; then a final rating shall be a consensus of judgment among the Compensation Committee members after considering all relevant information. The Compensation Committee shall rate each faculty member on each criterion according to the following five categories: Exceptional, Commendable, Competent, Development Needed, and Unsatisfactory. The Unsatisfactory level of evaluation is characterized by an absence of evidence; whereas the Development Needed level is characterized by inconsistent or minimal evidence. Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric matrix below. These examples are only guides for the committee.
1. Compensation Committee Composition
   A. The Compensation Committee will be comprised of all tenured faculty members.
   B. A committee chair will be elected by all RFT faculty.
   C. A subcommittee consisting of one tenured faculty member from RDG, FOU, and IMT will be elected by all RFT faculty.

2. Compensation Committee Procedures
   A. Each committee member will:
      1) review each faculty member’s Activity Report (see Appendix A);
      2) rate each person for research, service, and teaching;
      3) turn the rating form in to the Compensation Committee Chair.
   B. The subcommittee will compile the ratings. They will give each faculty member the rating given by the majority of the faculty. In the event of a tie, the committee will reexamine the materials and provide a rating.
   C. The Committee Chair will forward the final ratings to the Department Head. The Compensation Committee’s performance rankings will be forwarded to the department head. The department head will review the faculty annual activity reports and the ratings provided by the department Compensation Committee. 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.
   D. Faculty will submit the following to the Department Head:
      1. Annual Activity Report Form (maximum of 3 pages) with three (3) headings: Research, Service, Teaching
         a. Under each heading, bullet accomplishments and work (using P&T descriptors and guidelines)
         b. Use narrative descriptions to qualify, explain, draw attention to necessary bulleted items (this may include amount of work, extended commitment, extra time, etc.)
   3. 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 RFT department.
   4. This document is to be reviewed annually by the faculty in the RFT department.
   5. 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.
   6. Information provided to the faculty member by the department head on or before the date specified on the compensation calendar:
      A. The committee’s ratings on the three performance dimensions.
      B. 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.
C. If the department head’s rating on any of the three performance dimensions differs substantially from that submitted by the department Compensation Committee, the department head will provide a brief written rationale to the faculty member explaining the distinction.
D. 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.

7. Information provided to the faculty member by the dean on or before the date specified on the compensation calendar:
   A. His/her final composite rating.
   B. 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.

**Compensation Matrix for TEACHING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Development Needed</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance/results</th>
<th>Performance/results</th>
<th>Performance/results</th>
<th>Performance is consistently below acceptable levels. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and immediate improvement is required.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>consistently exceed competent levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in most aspects of performance.</td>
<td>frequently exceed competent levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in certain aspects of performance.</td>
<td>consistently at expected levels. Meets job requirements.</td>
<td>inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing at the expected level (see guidelines below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding expected performance of effective teaching in at least five ways (see guidelines below)</td>
<td>Exceeding expected performance of effective teaching in at least three ways (see guidelines below)</td>
<td>Meeting all Faculty Handbook teaching criteria; providing evidence of effective teaching (see guidelines below)</td>
<td>Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing at the expected level (see guidelines below).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This represents minimum criteria for compensation of a rating

Required Criteria as identified from the Faculty Handbook

1. High student evaluations and/or student feedback based on university course evaluations (not to count for more than 50% of teaching) (on a 5 pt. scale, >4.00 where 5 is the highest; <2.0 where 1 is the highest)
2. Course syllabi reflect current research, theory, applicable standards and evidence-based practices and are revised regularly. Content and applications of the syllabi follow an appropriate sequence in both basic and advanced programs
3. Active leadership or engagement in continuing improvements in curriculum design, course development, program review, program and/or course assessments, and evaluation studies. Actively leading, participating and/or collaborating with program faculty related to program issues could include but is not limited to; committing to and completing share of group tasks in timely manner, sharing relevant information with other program faculty in a timely manner, contributing to program and departmental discussions and related tasks.
4. Appropriately accessible and responsive to students through a variety of means (e.g., office hours, electronic communication)
5. Provide evidence of student feedback and responses to student questions in a timely, efficient, and effective manner.
6. Provide evidence of knowledge and use of a variety of appropriate teaching strategies and evaluation methods with grading and feedback in regards to student work in a timely, efficient, and effective manner.

Additional Criteria (selected by faculty member; see required number above)

1. Development of web-based, online, or blended courses
2. Providing opportunities for out-of-class application, experiential learning, field work, or service learning
3. Academic advising including number of advisees, portfolios, seminar advisement, and special projects.
4. Continual professional education, advanced study, e.g. certificates, certificates of completion, etc.
5. Honors and awards for teaching
6. Positive written comments by students (unsolicited, exclusive of university course evaluations)
7. Faculty-generated student mid-semester and/or end of semester anonymous Likert-scale surveys or other evaluation measures where results are analyzed and used as a means to make decisions about classroom climate, student engagement, expectations and rigor, and/or instruction.
8. Student outcome data related to course objectives and program assessments used to improve course instruction and outcome data
9. Peer evaluations and/or observational feedback by appropriate program faculty resulting in improved teaching practices or positive peer evaluations and/or observational feedback by appropriate program faculty
10. Presentations related to teaching, e.g. guest lectures, campus presentations, community presentations, K12 presentations, etc.
11. Effective use of instructional technology in course design and/or in the classroom such as Blackboard, etc.
12. Effective use of resources, coursework, and instructional strategies in the classroom that are explicitly related to issues of diversity, cultural competence/proficiency, and/or equity
13. Chair of thesis or doctoral committee
14. Member of thesis or doctoral committees
15. Excellence in teaching including enhancement of higher-order thinking skills, high-impact teaching strategies, and/or scholarly student outcomes
16. B- 12+ involvement relevant to teaching in schools and/or agencies
17. Meeting departmental/university responsibilities in regard to program and course design and implementation (e.g., collaboration with peers, completion of tasks in a timely manner)
18. Applying theory to practice inherent to the specific discipline
19. Using university and/or teacher-generated evaluation data in planning and implementing instruction
20. Creating and/or modifying courses to meet SPA/CAEP requirements and/or providing data for a SPA or CAEP report.
### Compensation Matrix for RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Commendable</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Development Needed</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance/results</td>
<td>consistently exceed competent levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in most aspects of performance.</td>
<td>Performance/results</td>
<td>frequently exceed competent levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in certain aspects of performance.</td>
<td>Performance/results</td>
<td>are consistently at expected levels. Meets job requirements.</td>
<td>Some performance deficiencies exist. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and improvement is required.</td>
<td>Performance is consistently below acceptable levels. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and immediate improvement is required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. At least 2 scholarship products from Category A AND 1 or more in Categories A-C (see guidelines below)</td>
<td>1. At least 2 scholarship products from Categories A or B (see guidelines below)</td>
<td>1. Have submitted 1 or more in Categories A or B AND fulfilled at least 1 in Category C (see guidelines below)</td>
<td>1. Submitted at least 1 in Categories A-C AND fulfilled at least 1 in Category C (see guidelines below)</td>
<td>1. No publications or submissions from Categories A-B (see guidelines below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Documented research agenda is being accomplished</td>
<td>2. Documented research agenda is in place and being actively pursued</td>
<td>2. Documented research agenda is in place</td>
<td>2. Documented research agenda needs to be adjusted or research agenda needs to be documented</td>
<td>2. Little evidence of scholarship in Category C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This represents minimum criteria for compensation of a rating</td>
<td>This represents minimum criteria for compensation of a rating</td>
<td>This represents minimum criteria for compensation of a rating</td>
<td>This represents minimum criteria for compensation of a rating</td>
<td>This represents minimum criteria for compensation of a rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Category A

1. Scholarly/research articles in international/national peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media.
2. Author or editor of scholarly book(s), book chapter(s), monograph(s), anthology(ies), published production script(s) either print-based or other electronic media.
3. External grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media ($10,000+) that required substantial faculty effort.
4. Primary author of individual CAEP (or current college or university accrediting body) standard or Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) provided that the SPA report gains program national recognition.

### Category B

1. Scholarly/research articles published in regional peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media.
2. Articles published in major national discipline-based, print-based or electronic media.
3. Primary author, editor, project manager or production specialist of published major educational curriculum material including electronic media.
4. Grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media or listed key personnel.
5. International, national or regional scholarly peer-reviewed conference presentation(s), conference proceedings(s), or grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media or listed key personnel.
6. Student research projects mentored by faculty members resulting in national peer-reviewed publications.
7. National or regional awards for research.
Category C

1. Scholarly/research articles published in state peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media.
2. Student research projects mentored by faculty members resulting in regional or state peer-reviewed publications
3. Local/University Grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media. (<$10,000)
4. State and local peer-reviewed conference presentations(s) or conference proceeding(s)
5. Non-refereed publication(s) and electronic media
6. Scholarly, creative work(s), and electronic presentation(s) other than electronic media as described above
7. Grant and contract proposal(s) as well as accompanying written report(s) emanating from such project(s)
8. Honors or awards for research
9. Student research projects mentored by faculty members that result in national, regional or state peer-reviewed conference presentations
10. Peer reviewer for a journal
11. Manuscripts under review
12. Preparation of custom texts, reading packages, or ancillary materials for one’s own courses
13. Book reviews, essays, and abstracts published in refereed journals
14. Grant or research consultant

Compensation Matrix for SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Commendable</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Development Needed</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance/results consistently exceed competent levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in most aspects of performance.</td>
<td>Performance/results frequently exceed competent levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in certain aspects of performance.</td>
<td>Performance/results are consistently at expected levels. Meets job requirements.</td>
<td>Some performance deficiencies exist. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and improvement is required.</td>
<td>Performance is consistently below acceptable levels. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and immediate improvement is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extends beyond expected performance to include service that demonstrates sustained success in more than one area (see guidelines below)

This represents minimum criteria for compensation of a rating

5
4
3
2
1

1. University service that furthers the university’s Public Affairs mission.
2. University committees and/or governance that would, in part, include the following specific activities: 1) Attending scheduled committee meetings; 2) Disseminating information obtained from committee
meetings, emails, and reports to appropriate audiences (e.g., RFT faculty, COE faculty) in a timely manner; and 3) participating in ad-hoc committees.

3. College service such as the Dean’s Faculty Advisory Committee, College Budget Committee, accreditation committee, staff search committees that would include the following specific activities: 1) Attending scheduled meetings; and 2) Disseminating information obtained from committee meetings, emails, and reports to appropriate audiences (e.g., RFT faculty, COE faculty) in a timely manner.

4. Department service such as departmental policy revision committees or faculty search committees that would include the following specific activities: 1) Attending scheduled meetings; and 2) Disseminating information obtained from committee meetings, emails, and reports to appropriate audiences (e.g., RFT faculty, COE faculty) in a timely manner.

5. Program service such as participation in program or curriculum revisions, chair or member of program advisory board, chair or member of accreditation committee, academic advisor, chair or member of faculty search committee, thesis chair or member, program coordination duties beyond teaching.

6. Chairing or serving as a board member or officer of a professional organization at the local, state, national, or international level.

7. Serving as an editor or member of an editorial board of a professional journal at the state, national, or international level.

8. Serving as a reviewer or guest reviewer for a professional journal at the state, national, or international level.

9. Sponsoring an active student organization

10. Active involvement in relevant professional associations at the local, state, regional, national, and/or international levels including scholarships, internships, and grants awarded for attendance at such events.

11. Providing mentoring or advising beyond teaching requirements including mentoring of other faculty members.

12. Providing opportunities for student experiences outside the expectations of teaching.

13. Active involvement in schools, agencies, and organizations at the local, state, regional, national, and/or international levels.

14. Professional development activities such as participation in campus discussions and expanding opportunities for shaping the learning environment.

15. Providing presentations to support individuals or groups in local communities, states, national or international.

16. Providing professional expertise to business, industry, schools, community organizations and agencies, and colleagues in other university programs through collaborative projects, presentations, or specific consultations.

17. Providing unpaid consultation services to external constituents within the faculty member’s professional expertise.

18. Volunteering for local, community, state, national, international organizations.

19. Writing opinion editorials or other articles in newspapers or other media such as television or radio.

**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 he or she has been discriminated against for any reason not related to job performance may consult with the Office for Equity and Diversity.

VII. PERFORMANCE PARAMETERS FOR COMPENSATION SYSTEM

In accord with University compensation guidelines, the faculty members of the Department of Reading, Foundations, and Technology 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. The following considerations need to be made for specific faculty issues.

1. Sabbaticals. Faculty who are on sabbatical are allowed to count 100% of the compensation weight for the area that was the focus of their sabbatical. For example, if the sabbatical was for research purposes, then 100% of their weight for the sabbatical period would count toward research.
2. New Faculty. New tenure-track faculty will be assigned a nine credit hour load for the first three years. This should be taken into consideration for compensation purposes. The purpose is to give new faculty time to get their research underway.

3. Reassigned Time. Reassigned time is typically for three credit hours for research or special projects. The portion of the reassigned time should be counted toward compensation in the area that it was received. For example, if the reassigned time was granted to work on a teaching project, then the time should be counted in the teaching section.
### 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. Instructors & Greenwood 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 equivalencies are based on the college faculty workload policies.

For faculty with reassigned time the above percentages are negotiable, as approved by the department head. Probationary faculty may use the Tenured Faculty tables above, as appropriate to their specific faculty load and faculty goals. Faculty who receive funding for teaching, research, or service projects are to be provided with opportunities to adjust their performance weights to reflect whatever area of activity in which funding occurs. The exact weight of such activities should be negotiated between the faculty member and the department head. The weight assigned must be approved by the dean.
APPENDIX A

Annual Activity Report Form

This report is a maximum of 3 pages organized with three (3) headings: Research, Service, Teaching. Under each heading, bullet accomplishments and work using P&T guidelines. Use narrative descriptions to qualify, explain, draw attention to necessary bulleted items (this may include amount of work, extended commitment, extra time, etc.). Please use the tables for lists of committee assignments and teaching load. Use as much space as needed for each section as long as you don’t exceed three pages. You may delete these directions on your form.

RESEARCH  Self Rating (1-5)__________

List complete reference (APA style). Please include P&T Categories

Narrative

SERVICE Self Rating (1-5)__________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee/Organization (complete title)</th>
<th>Level (University, College, Departmental, State, National, etc.)</th>
<th>Position (member or office held)</th>
<th>Time (amount spent per week on average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative
# TEACHING Self Rating (1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course title, code, and section #</th>
<th>Number of students enrolled</th>
<th>Delivery method (i.e. on campus, ITV, online)</th>
<th>Course Evaluation Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative