



**Missouri State**  
U N I V E R S I T Y

---

## CAMPUS MEMO

**TO:** CNAS Faculty  
**FROM:** Tammy Jahnke, CNAS  
**DATE:** Monday, December 08, 2008  
**RE:** CNAS Merit Compensation Plans

Attached is the revised recommendations (which I have accepted) from the CNAS College Compensation Committee. There are several minor changes and a couple of major changes that you will want to note. On page three please note that there are now intermediate levels available between each level – 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, 4, 4.5 and 5. One page eight you will see the pre-determined cut points for 2008.

COLLEGE OF NATURAL AND APPLIED SCIENCES

Temple Hall Room 142

Phone Number 417-836-5249 • Fax Number 417-836-6934

[www.cnas.missouristate.edu](http://www.cnas.missouristate.edu)

Email [cnas@missouristate.edu](mailto:cnas@missouristate.edu)

**CNAS Merit Compensation Plans  
Guidance for Revisions FA08  
CNAS Personnel Committee**

This document is intended to provide guidance to CNAS Departments when revising merit compensation plans. The overall objective is to make merit plans across the College more consistent without dictating a rigid system that would not adequately take into account the variations in expectations across the disciplines. Specific objectives are to:

- clarify meanings of the merit levels;
- improve consistency for categorizing activities and outcomes into different merit areas;
- provide general philosophies on important factors in merit considerations;
- clarify changes in policies related to the *Best Practices for the Missouri State Compensation System* Document (September 2008, <http://www.missouristate.edu/provost/59379.htm>) issued by the Provost.

The guidelines provided here are intended to help departments produce merit policies that are discipline-specific yet may still be compared to the policies of other departments. These should be seen as not infringing upon the principle of “departmental ownership.” Rather, consistency in basic principles and organization should be a benefit to all departments for the following reasons:

- When challenges and appeals are presented to the Dean’s Office and to the CNAS Personnel Committee, policies that are relatively consistent with those of other departments will allow the Dean and Committee to evaluate those policies more readily and render decisions more fairly.
- When a department wishes to justify awarding a distribution of merit scores that is significantly higher than the target distribution, it will be much easier if that department’s merit policies set benchmarks for performance that can be compared to those of other departments.

Meaning of merit levels.

- Level 3 (“Competent”) should represent a level of performance consistent with University and Department expectations, consistent with the Faculty Handbook and departmental policy statements. It may be considered a baseline level of performance: it indicates that the faculty member is carrying out all requirements in a satisfactory manner, consistent with a normal level of performance compared to other faculty within CNAS. This level of merit is considered the norm for performance. There should be no pejorative connotation to a level 3 rating.
- Level 4 (“Commendable”) should represent a level of performance *significantly* above normal (i.e., not just performance above minimum standards).
- Level 5 (“Outstanding”) should represent a demonstrably *excellent* level of performance, evidenced by an unusual level of achievement. It should be reserved for exceptional performance.
- Level 2 (“Development needed”) should represent performance *that* does not meet expectations (from the Faculty Handbook and Departmental policies) in some significant

manner (in quality or quantity) but with failings not serious enough to initiate review processes.

- Level 1 (“Unsatisfactory”) should indicate serious deficiencies in performance in the area in question.
- Intermediate levels: The Best Practices document states that departmental committees may be permitted to assign intermediate levels in 0.5 increments, e.g., 3.5, 4.5. These assignments would normally be used to indicate performance that, for example, a 3.5 level could be assigned for performance that was clearly beyond basic satisfactory levels (3) but not enough to warrant a meritorious (4) rating. Any department that opts to allow assignment of intermediate ratings should clarify this in its guidelines.

While there is no specified distribution of merit level assignments, assignment of higher (4, 4.5, and 5) merit levels should be justifiable.

#### Policy guidelines:

1. Consistency with Tenure and Promotion Policies: Merit plans must be consistent with tenure and promotion policies at both the University and Departmental levels. Activities that are required and/or encouraged for tenure and promotion should be recognized as such in merit policies. Likewise, merit policies should not have any specific requirements for merit evaluations that are not tied to tenure and promotion guidelines.

Nonetheless, the tie-in between merit evaluations and tenure and promotion decisions is, of necessity, only qualitative. Merit evaluations reflect performance over relatively short periods of time, whereas tenure and promotion decisions are based on a faculty member’s cumulative performance over an extended period of time. Low to moderate levels of achievement may be sufficient to attain merit evaluations of “Competent” (3) and perhaps even “Commendable” (4) without, over the extended period, meeting requirements and expectations for tenure and promotion.

2. Assignment of activities and outcomes to Teaching, Research, and Service: Meritorious activities and outcomes should generally be assigned to specific areas. Where the Faculty Handbook indicates into which area a particular activity or outcome falls, it will be mandatory that departmental policies be consistent, e.g., academic advising must be considered under Teaching, and it will *not* be within the prerogative of any department to place that activity under Service. Activities and outcomes that are not clearly categorized by the Faculty Handbook have often been consistently assigned into Teaching, Research, or Service by Departments across the College, and should remain so. Lists of a wide variety of activities and outcomes classified into specific areas are included as appendices to this document. These were compiled and consolidated from the Spring 2007 Departmental merit plans and from the Faculty Handbook. Where there were inconsistencies, these lists recommend classifications that we feel are most consistent with general usage and the faculty handbook. For reference, relevant sections from the Faculty Handbook are provided in Appendix E.

The activities and outcomes classified in the appendices are presented in order to aid departments in their own classifications. Some important points about these lists:

- The lists of activities and outcomes are not presented in order of relative merit.
  - The lists of activities and outcomes are not exhaustive. There will invariably be additional items to add, and some may be relevant to only one department.
  - Because there are significant differences between the disciplines represented in CNAS, one set of classifications may not be satisfactory for all Departments. Departments have latitude to amend the recommended classifications to fit their particular needs, so long as the classifications are rational and are not in conflict with the Faculty Handbook.
  - In some cases, Departments may allow individual faculty to decide into which category an activity should be assigned, providing that the faculty member can provide adequate justification. For example, a grant aimed at improving classroom instruction would normally fall under Teaching; however, if the faculty member was comparing different teaching methods in a manner such that there was an education research component to the work, the activity could be justified under Research.
  - Some activities or outcomes may show up in more than one area, and their classification will depend on the specific situation. For example, writing a textbook may logically count as a teaching activity (and the publication of the text as a teaching outcome); however, some textbooks involve substantial research efforts and serve not just as texts but also as professional references. Such texts could be classified under research. Other activities and outcomes that may be legitimately classified in more than one way, and are therefore listed under two or more areas in the appendices, include faculty development and software development.
3. “Double counting” is not permissible: However individual merit items are classified, it is essential that any particular activity or outcome be counted in only one area, i.e., “double-counting” should not be permitted. In the preceding example, a faculty member might opt to receive credit for her/his grant activities under either Teaching or Research, but not under both. This does not, however, require an achievement related to an activity to be put into the same category. Mentoring research students probably fits best under Teaching, but the products of the students’ research efforts, e.g., publications in scholarly journals, may legitimately be regarded as Research.
4. Quantitative merit systems (point systems): Departmental policies may include quantitative “objective” components (i.e., “point systems”). However, these may not be used to eliminate judgment from the process. Two important considerations must be taken into consideration: First, these systems can be used as one means of evaluating merit, but assignment of the “3” (Competent) merit rating should be tied exclusively to whether or not the faculty member is meeting performance requirements as outlined in the Faculty Handbook and departmental policy statements: Irrespective of quantitative evaluations, a faculty member who *is* meeting basic requirements should not be assigned a merit rating below 3, and a faculty member who *is not* meeting basic requirements must not be assigned a merit rating of 3 or above.

A fundamental problem with numerical systems is that numerical point-counting schemes may give the illusion of being “objective”, but decisions on where to apply cutoffs for

different merit scores are inherently subjective. For example, if the system is set up so that most faculty members may accumulate enough points to earn a merit rating of “5”, then the system has subjectively established a very low threshold for “outstanding” performance. If a numerical point system is employed, the Department should be able to demonstrate that individuals earning 4 and 5 ratings are, in fact, performing at levels that are “commendable” and “outstanding.”

5. Significance of quality in evaluations: The *quality* of faculty activities and outcomes (value and/or impact) should play at least as important a role as their *quantity* (number of activities and outcomes) when assessing merit. Service differs from teaching and research in that there is no standard review process that provides an assessment of quality. Thus, for the area of service only, the number of service activities may play an important role in assessing impact. Nonetheless, departments should give special consideration to any indicators of service quality or impact that are available (service awards, grants received to support service activities, chairing committees with significant responsibilities, written assessments of service impact provided by collaborators or recipients, etc.). Departmental documents should clearly articulate how quality will be assessed and incorporated into merit evaluations for each of the areas of teaching, research, and service.
6. Evaluation of teaching: Particular care must be taken with respect to quantitative evaluations of teaching performance (especially student evaluations). Teaching evaluations are subject to many influences (class size, class level, classes aimed at non-majors versus majors, etc.) that are out of the control of the instructor. Numerical evaluations may count, *at most*, 50% towards merit evaluations for teaching. Departments may elect to adopt additional standardized methods for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, such as peer evaluations and exit exams.

Departmental guidelines must also recognize that the Teaching area includes many activities outside of classroom instruction, e.g., academic advising and mentoring students. Departmental policies for evaluation of Teaching must consider the range of activities included under that category by the Faculty Handbook and the supplementary list provided in the Appendices.

7. Evaluation of merit in context of load: Merit evaluations for research should be carried out within the context of the faculty member’s overall load, particularly when the faculty member has received compensated time (release time) specifically for research. Generally, there should be an expectation for reasonably higher productivity for someone who has received a reduced teaching load (lower TLE) to allow more time for research. This should not apply, however, to a faculty member who has received a lower teaching load to allow him/her to take on more service responsibilities. This consideration applies only to quantitative assessments (productivity). Regardless of load, qualitative assessments (quality/impact of research) should play a major role in merit evaluations.

Expectations for productivity should not be linked directly to the faculty member’s percent allocations toward research. However, ranges of performance weights are restricted based on

the faculty member's load. Specific ranges, as currently published on the website for the Provost's Office, are given in Appendix D.

8. Time period for assessment of research productivity: A fair assessment of research productivity (specifically, outcomes) cannot be obtained over a period as short as one year. Although evaluations occur annually, current guidelines from the Provost's office permit research products that take more than one year to achieve to be counted over multiple years ("Implementation of the Missouri State Compensation Plan, May, 2007"). We strongly encourage CNAS departments to base their assessments of peer-reviewed research on a time period longer than one year, typically two or three years, and the time period should be specified in each department's policy statement. This will generate a "running average" assessment that is reformulated annually. For the current year this will be relatively easy to implement since each department is allowed to construct its own form for reporting faculty activities. Faculty members with less than three years of service should be evaluated over their entire period of service since being hired.

Similarly, grants are often multiyear. A faculty member who has received a multiyear grant should receive merit credit for the grant over the period of its duration. If the grant's monetary value is a consideration establishing the grant's contribution to merit, the total amount should be prorated over the grant's lifetime. Departments may have additional specific guidelines for how grants are counted toward merit.

9. Peer-reviewed research – identification: In order for merit criteria to be as consistent as possible with tenure and promotion criteria, peer-reviewed research should be considered as significantly more meritorious than research that is not peer-reviewed. CNAS will interpret "peer-reviewed research" to include all of the following:
  - a. Publication in a venue for which critical review and positive recommendation by a group of professional peers is a prerequisite. This will include many professional journals (print and online), monographs, and edited volumes. Publications of this type are typically referred to as "peer-reviewed publications", and their dissemination by the publisher is an automatic certification that a peer-review process occurred.
  - b. Exhibition of a creative scholarly project for which critical review and positive recommendation by a group of professional peers is a prerequisite. This type of exhibition is typically referred to as a "juried exhibition", and the appearance of research products in such an exhibition is an automatic certification that a peer-review process occurred.
  - c. A creation or discovery for which a patent is received, but only in those instances where the work is not also reported in a peer-reviewed publication.
  - d. In some cases, contract reports and technical reports to funding agencies may meet the standards of peer-review as described above. The nature of the review process and the mode of dissemination of results to the professional community must be carefully documented for each such report. It must be the case that 1) acceptance of the report by the funding agency was contingent upon peer endorsement and 2) the final report was appropriately advertised and disseminated to the community of professional peers. The

departmental committee, not the researcher, will determine whether or not these standards have been met.

- e. Research outcomes that do not meet any of the standards for peer-review listed above may be considered as peer-reviewed if the author/creator can provide a compelling set of positive and objective endorsements by a group of professional peers (excluding any who may involve a conflict of interest) to the satisfaction of the evaluating committee.
- f. Contract work that is confidential due to copyright, patent, or security concerns presents a special problem. Such work may be of high quality and/or impact, yet it is impossible to meet the standards of peer-review. A department may decide to count confidential contract work as meritorious research for the purposes of merit evaluation, but should spell out clear guidelines for doing so in its policy statements.

10. Peer-reviewed research – evaluation: The evaluation of productivity in the area of peer-reviewed research can be particularly difficult and subjective. Because research is often collaborative in nature, special care must be taken to avoid “double-counting”. The following guidelines for assessing the record of peer-reviewed research should apply:

- a. Research merit evaluations should consider both quality (positive impact) and effort. Quantity of peer-reviewed research (e.g., the number of publications or exhibits) should be assessed only in relation to the effort represented by each. Peer-reviewed research in different specialties may require significantly different levels of effort. Important components of effort include the preparation of grant proposals, time devoted to carrying out projects, and time devoted to the production of a creative product.
- b. All peer-reviewed research should not be treated as equally meritorious. Relative assessments of quality and impact should be made using indicators that are appropriate to discipline. Examples of such indicators might include the selectivity, impact, or audience of a particular journal or exhibition, the number of professional citations to a publication, the results of external reviews, and other considerations.
- c. No single item of peer-reviewed research may be counted more than once. Thus, the reprinting of an older publication, the publication in a different form of results that have been published elsewhere, or a patent obtained based on work that is also published, would not count as a new instance of peer-reviewed research.
- d. For multi-author peer-reviewed research, the faculty member should clearly account for his or her contribution. The value of that research towards the faculty member’s merit evaluation should be weighted in terms of contribution. This is particularly important for peer-reviewed research resulting from collaborations. However, because of the unique nature of research collaborations with students, a department may choose to allow any of its faculty members to claim full credit for her/his students’ contributions to the faculty member’s publications.

11. Target distribution for ratings: The Best Practices document clearly states that there is no institutional target for the distribution of performance levels. However, the underpinning of a merit-based compensation system is that differences in performance should be recognized. Hence, there must be a distribution in assigned performance levels (not all faculty are “outstanding”), and any Department’s distribution of merit level assignments should be

justifiable in the context of the meanings of the merit levels.

12. Cut values for Performance Categories: For CNAS, composite merit level scores assigned in 2009 will be used to assign individuals to overall Performance categories according to the Table on the right.

<u>Performance Category</u>	<u>Composite Rating</u>
5	5.00
4+	4.50 – 4.99
4	4.00 – 4.49
4–	3.65 – 3.99
3+	3.40 – 3.64
3	3.00 – 3.39
2+	2.50 – 2.99
2	2.00 – 2.49
1	1.00 – 1.99

13. Other policy clarifications or recommendations from the Best Practices document.

- a. Faculty members, consulting with their Heads, are to decide on weighting for different performance categories (teaching, research, service) at the beginning of each year. Renegotiation of performance weights is supposed to be restricted to cases where a faculty member has had a change in “assignment”, e.g., if an individual has taken on additional service responsibilities not anticipated at the start of the year. Renegotiation is also permitted if faculty members “attain unanticipated significant recognition, honors, or awards during a year for any of teaching, research, or service.”
- b. Departmental personnel committees, Heads, and the Dean are encouraged to recognize and reward performance that goes beyond the specific criteria stated in approved guidelines (see Best Practices document for more guidelines).
- c. Each faculty member’s evaluations, particularly those adjusted after the initial performance evaluation, should be accompanied by written feedback that justifies the faculty member’s rating, and particularly any upward or downward adjustment, to the departments rating criteria.
- d. Departments are strongly encouraged to have faculty provide self-evaluations of their performance with rationale for specific ratings in teaching, research, and service. The CNAS Personnel Committee endorsed this recommendation, and suggests that departmental policy statements outline expectations for and limitations to such self-evaluations (e.g., a 1 page limit to minimize time required both for the faculty member and for the committee).

## **Appendix A. Teaching**

See also 2007 Faculty Handbook, Sections 4.2.1, attached in Appendix D.

The activities and outcomes listed here are not presented in order of relative merit, and they should not be regarded as an exhaustive enumeration of all meritorious activities and outcomes.

### **Teaching Activities:**

1. Classroom teaching (lecture, laboratory, or studio formats).
2. Coordination of a multi-instructor course.
3. Supervision of classroom teachers (teaching assistants, instructors, etc.).
4. Supervision of pre-service teachers.
5. Academic advising of undergraduate students (including participation in SOAR), including pre-professional advising. Note, however, that advising as part of a committee-based preprofessional committee (e.g., premedical committee) should be considered under service.
6. Maintaining office hours.
7. Supervision of a graduate student.
8. Member of an MSU graduate student thesis or seminar committee, or as an external member of a graduate student thesis or seminar committee, particularly when the faculty member provides significant guidance to the graduate student. This activity may alternately be included under service (University service for an MSU student, Service to professional peers for an external student).
9. Development of a new course.
10. Development of a new laboratory or studio exercise.
11. Preparation or revision of educational materials such as textbooks, lab manuals, class handouts, educational software, and educational websites, and related efforts such as preparation of a grant or contract proposal to support these activities. These activities may alternately be considered as research activities if they involve a significant research component.
12. Improvement in course/curriculum content, including significant revisions to a course's content.
13. Incorporation of novel pedagogical techniques or technologies.
14. Faculty development in the area of teaching (participation in workshops, seminars, institutes, or meetings to develop teaching or advising skills).
15. Supervision of undergraduate research.
16. Supervision of independent study.
17. Guest lectures in classes that are not your official responsibility.
18. Incorporation of additional topics or exercises for an honors section, for students in a regular section taking the course for honors credit, or for graduate students in a combined undergraduate level-graduate level class.
19. Providing help/tutorial sessions outside of scheduled contact hours.
20. Administration or supervision of service learning or cooperative education opportunities, and supervision of interns.
21. Organizing and/or conducting educational field trips for students, especially for the first time.
22. Presentation at a workshop or conference on teaching.
23. Preparation of a grant proposal to support or enhance teaching.

24. Administration of a grant received for the support or enhancement of teaching.
25. Contributing to or helping provide access to educational opportunities for MSU students at other institutions (Study away, London program, National study tour, etc.)
26. Development of assessment tools to help evaluate teaching effectiveness (e.g., entrance/exit exams).
27. Use of writing-intensive exercises to assess student learning.
28. Other (must justify recognition as a teaching activity).

**Teaching outcomes:**

1. Peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness by another faculty member.
2. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness prepared by an administrator based on a review of your portfolio.
3. Student evaluations.
4. Results of standardized exit exams.
5. Completion of a graduate thesis or seminar paper under your supervision.
6. Textbooks, text chapters, lab manuals, and class handouts. Publication of a textbook may alternately be considered under research if the preparation of the text involved a significant research component, and especially if the text could also serve as a professional reference.
7. Receipt of a grant to support textbook or lab manual. This may alternately be included under Research if the text or lab manual itself would be evaluated under research.
8. Educational software and websites prepared.
9. Course policy statements and outlines.
10. Receipt of a teaching award (as a classroom teacher or thesis advisor).
11. Receipt of an award for academic advising.
12. Grant proposal submitted to support or enhance teaching or academic advising.
13. Receipt of a grant to support or enhance teaching or academic advising.
14. Research presentation by a student (graduate or undergraduate) mentored by you.
15. Research publication by a student (graduate or undergraduate) mentored by you, on which you are not an author.
16. Recognition or award received by a student for whom you provided significant mentoring (thesis award, etc.).
17. Other (must justify relevance as an indicator of teaching effectiveness).

## **Appendix B. Research**

See also 2007 Faculty Handbook, Sections 4.2.2, attached in Appendix D.

The activities and outcomes listed here are not presented in order of relative merit, and they should not be regarded as an exhaustive enumeration of all meritorious activities and outcomes.

### **Research activities:**

1. Faculty development in the area of research:
  - Participation in workshops, seminars, colloquia, professional meetings, etc. for the purpose of enhancing research skills, refining research questions, or improving research knowledge base.
  - Internship, apprenticeship, or collaborative work with other professional researchers (at MSU or elsewhere) for the purpose of learning new research skills. The new skills and their value must be described.
  - Maintenance or acquisition of expertise in areas of professional research interest by reading professional journals and monographs.
2. Preparation of a grant or contract proposal for funding to support research (including teaching research) or other scholarly activity.
3. Administration of a grant or contract received for research (including teaching research) or other scholarly activity.
4. Evidence of research activity (including teaching research), including evidence of research in progress, and preparation or submission of a manuscript for the publication of research results.
5. Submission of an original design or creative project for publication or exhibition.
6. Preparation of a new text, or revision of a previously published text, and related activities such as preparation of a grant or contract proposal to support those activities, where that activity involves a significant research component.
7. Other research activities (must justify).

### **Research outcomes:**

1. Publication or exhibition of a creative project, original results or a synthetic review, as author or coauthor, in a peer-reviewed professional journal or venue.
2. Publication of original results or a synthetic review, as author or coauthor, in a peer-reviewed book or monograph intended for a professional audience. Publication should be by a recognized publisher in the field.
3. Peer-reviewed research contract report, submitted to and accepted by the funding agency. If the endorsement of peers was not a prerequisite for acceptance of the report, then the nature of the peer-review must be described and the results must be documented.
4. Patent received for a discovery or invention arising from discipline-appropriate research.
5. Publication, not peer-reviewed, of original results or a synthetic review, as author or coauthor, in a book or monograph intended for a professional audience.
6. Publication of original results or a synthetic review, as author or coauthor, by invitation in an edited professional volume.
7. Publication of original results or a synthetic review, as author or coauthor, in a journal, proceedings volume, or report that is not peer-reviewed but is intended for a professional

- audience. For presentations where the proceedings is an integral requirement, the presentation and proceedings should not be counted separately.
8. Original design or creative project for publication or exhibition that is appropriate to the discipline but is not juried or peer-reviewed.
  9. Research contract report accepted by the funding agency, not peer-reviewed.
  10. Book review or letter to the editor that contributes original research results or synthesis in your professional area. The novel research component must be explained and justified.
  11. Invited presentation of research results at a professional meeting.
  12. Peer-reviewed presentation of original results at a professional meeting, either orally or by poster. The nature of the review process must be described.
  13. Non-reviewed presentation of original results at a professional meeting, either orally or by poster.
  14. Co-authorship on a presentation of original results at a professional meeting. If peer-reviewed, the nature of the review process must be described.
  15. Research presentation (seminar) at another academic or research institution.
  16. Citations to your research in scholarly publications by persons other than yourself and co-authors.
  17. Research (including teaching research) grant or contract proposal submitted to a local, state, regional, national, or international funding agency or organization.
  18. Research (including teaching research) grant or contract received.
  19. Clear documentation of research in progress.
  20. Receipt of a scholarship, fellowship, internship, or endowment to provide research opportunities (sabbatical leave, summer fellowship, endowed professorship, etc.).
  21. Evaluations of research quality and impact solicited from academic peers at other institutions (external review).
  22. An honorary research award, including election to honorary professional societies.
  23. Reprinting of original research articles in special collections or texts.
  24. Editorials, commentaries, or book reviews featuring your research, that were contributed to professional or popular journals by persons other than yourself, co-authors, or collaborators.
  25. Publication of a new text, or publication of a revised text, where the text reflects significant research, especially when the text may serve as a professional reference.
  26. Receipt of a grant or contract to support publication of a new or revised text, where the text itself would be considered under research.
  27. Other (must justify relevance as an indicator of research productivity).

## **Appendix C. Service**

See also 2007 Faculty Handbook, Sections 4.2.3, attached in Appendix D.

The activities and outcomes listed here are not presented in order of relative merit, and they should not be regarded as an exhaustive enumeration of all meritorious activities and outcomes.

### **Service activities**

#### ***Service to the University***

1. Chairperson of a committee or council of the department, college, or university.
2. Member of a committee or council of the department, college, or university.
3. Non-classroom and non-committee departmental assignments. Examples include, but are not limited to: equipment and inventory maintenance; specimen collection, preparation and curation; library development; graduate student coordinator; secondary education coordinator; monitoring of dual-enrollment courses; computer lab network manager; webmaster.
4. Director of a formal unit or Center within the University (CASE, JVIC, BSFS, etc.)
5. Member of an MSU graduate student thesis or seminar committee. This activity may alternately be evaluated under teaching, particularly when the faculty member provides significant guidance to the graduate student.
6. Service as a faculty mentor.
7. Sponsorship of student organizations or clubs (Tri-Beta, SPS, OAAC, Premedical Society, etc.).
8. Preparation of grant proposals to support service activities.
9. Administration of a grant received to support service activities.
10. Faculty development in the area of service (participation in workshops, meetings, symposia, etc. designed to build or enhance service skills).
11. Obtain and/or maintain licensing status in a professional area.
12. Participation in university promotional activities (fund solicitation, etc.).
13. Student recruitment activities (Majors fair, recruitment trips to local high schools and colleges, etc.).
14. Conduct peer-review of teaching effectiveness for a colleague.
15. Contribution toward program or departmental accreditation.
16. Organize or lead a scholarly field trip for a Department or campus organization.
17. Other University service activities (must justify).

#### ***Service to professional peers***

1. Service to professional societies and organizations as an officer, committee member, meeting organizer, symposium organizer, meeting host, panel member, etc.
2. Editorial work for a professional journal.
3. Editorial work on a professional book.
4. Peer-reviewing of manuscripts submitted to professional journals or edited volumes.
5. Peer-reviewing of original designs or creative projects that are appropriate to the discipline.
6. Peer-reviewing of grant proposals submitted to external funding agencies.
7. External member of graduate student thesis or seminar committee. This activity may alternately be evaluated under teaching, particularly when the faculty member provides significant guidance to the graduate student.

8. Preparation of software or a website that is a useful resource for peers in the areas of service , teaching, and/or research.
9. Member of a site-visit team for the accreditation of an academic program at another institution.
10. External reviewer of a promotion and/or tenure application for a faculty member at another institution.
11. Organize or lead a scholarly field trip for an external audience.
12. Other professional service activities (must justify).

### ***Service to the Community***

1. Service to the public education system beyond MSU, such as: presentations in local schools; organization or presentation of workshops for primary and secondary students (Expanding Your Horizons, Science Olympiad, etc.); participation in science fairs, the Missouri Junior Academy of Sciences, Math contests, the Missouri Minerals Workshop, etc.
2. Participation in discipline-appropriate career-development events and organizations (FFA, 4H, agricultural events at public fairs, etc.)
3. Public speaking engagements related to your professional expertise and duties.
4. Service as a board member or officer of a private organization whose mission is complementary to that of the university or the department, such as the Nature Conservancy, the Missouri Prairie Foundation, the Sierra Club, etc.
5. Participation in television, radio, or print media interviews that relate to professional duties.
6. Use professional expertise to serve as a member of a public service board, regulatory agency, planning committee, or professional registration commission of state, regional, national, or international scope.
7. Non-compensated professional consultation that is outside of formally assigned committee or advisory duties and is appropriate to the discipline. Examples include fielding phone calls from the general public, running workshops for colleagues or public groups, providing statistical advice, providing expert testimony, outreach to farmers and other agricultural organizations, etc.
8. Other community service activities (must justify).

### **Service outcomes:**

1. Reports, survey instruments, guides, and other documents generated in pursuit or fulfillment of service activities.
2. Service awards from the college or university.
3. Awards for meritorious service to external societies or organizations.
4. Written evaluations received that address the quality of, or the effort devoted to, service to the department, college, or university. Such evaluations should come from colleagues who supervised or cooperated in service activities, and may be solicited or unsolicited.
5. Popular articles or books directly related to your professional expertise or duties.
6. Materials designed to enhance the teaching, service, or research effectiveness of professional peers, such as special collections, computer programs, web sites, and improved technologies, provided that no profit is realized.
7. Professional book or monograph for which you are an editor or co-editor.
8. Published book review that draws upon your professional expertise.
9. Other service outcomes (must justify).

## Appendix D. Merit Performance Parameters

The following information is directly from the Provost's website (the link is found under Faculty Development), <http://www.missouristate.edu/provost/performance.htm>, and represents information available as of October, 2008. These guidelines may be subject to change. In unusual circumstances, weights outside of these ranges may be permitted but require the approval of both the Department Head and the CNAS Dean.

### University Performance Parameters

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.

#### **I. Tenured Faculty -- 9-hour TLE**

<b>Minimum Weight</b>	<b>Performance Dimension (Role)</b>	<b>Maximum Weight</b>
30%	Teaching/Advising/Program Director/Accreditation Activity	60%
30%	Research/scholarship/creative activities	60%
10%	Service	20%

#### **II. Tenured Faculty -- 12-hour TLE**

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

#### **III. Probationary Faculty**

<b>Minimum Weight</b>	<b>Performance Dimension (Role)</b>	<b>Maximum Weight</b>
45%	Teaching/Advising	60%
35%	Research/scholarship/creative activities	50%
5%	Service	15%

**IV. Renewable Lecturers & Greenwood Faculty**

<b>Minimum Weight</b>	<b>Performance Dimension (Role)</b>	<b>Maximum Weight</b>
80%	Teaching/Advising	90%
0%	Research/scholarship/creative activities	10%
10%	Service	20%

**V. Research Faculty (Mountain Grove, CASE, or as designated in appointment letter or approved by Provost)**

<b>Minimum Weight</b>	<b>Performance Dimension (Role)</b>	<b>Maximum Weight</b>
0%	Teaching/Grad Student Advising	25%
65%	Research/scholarship/creative activities	90%
10%	Service/Outreach activities	20%

**VI. Library Faculty**

<b>Minimum Weight</b>	<b>Performance Dimension</b>	<b>Maximum Weight</b>
60%	Librarianship (includes teaching)	80%
10%	Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities	30%
10%	Service	20%

## **Appendix E: 2007 Faculty Handbook Section 4.2**

### ***4.2 Evaluation of Faculty with Standard Appointments***

Faculty members are expected to be actively engaged in teaching, research, and service throughout their careers, but the University recognizes that, at different times, faculty members may shift emphasis from one category to another. It is generally expected that during the probationary period the emphasis should be on teaching and research and that at any time during one's career at Missouri State University, each faculty member must negotiate his or her workload with the Department Head (within broad University parameters approved by the Provost) , with the conditions of employment laid out clearly at the time of employment, and adjusted thereafter through negotiation with the Department Head and Dean as approved by the Provost (refer to Section 4.6.5). The obligations of the academic unit should not fall disproportionately on one segment of the faculty. The faculty are also expected to adhere to standards of ethical conduct in all areas of performance (refer to Section 3.1).

#### **4.2.1 Teaching**

##### **4.2.1.1 Teaching Mission**

The teaching mission at Missouri State University is to develop educated persons. In doing so, the University is committed to standards of excellence and academic integrity. An educated person:

- is someone who is literate in the broadest sense,
- has an appreciation of the responsibility of lifelong citizenship and an awareness of global issues,
- seeks solutions to problems by means of a broad base of knowledge, as well as in-depth mastery of at least one specific academic discipline,
- Has the skills and motivation to continue to learn after leaving the university, thus being prepared for both lifelong learning and lifelong productivity.

In support of developing educated persons, the University seeks to provide high-quality education that is accessible to a broad spectrum of individuals, including those facing challenges involving distance, income, or disability. Furthermore, in recognizing the value of an open and free exchange of ideas, Missouri State University promotes diversity in all of its forms as a means to provide a wide variety of sources of knowledge and perspectives.

##### **4.2.1.2 Goals and Criteria for Evaluating Teaching**

The following goals and criteria are the basis of evaluating faculty members' teaching effectiveness for tenure and promotion and for required performance reviews (refer to Section 4.2.1.3 for recommended methods of documenting teaching effectiveness). Please note that item 1 below is of paramount importance on this list, and that any faculty member, in order to succeed as a teacher at Missouri State University, must succeed in the areas of item 1 relevant to his or her teaching. Although items 2 a, b, c, and d are not individually prescriptive, they are inclusive of teaching and may be considered. Success in one or more of these areas, or related areas of equal weight, is required to attain tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Sustained success in one or more of these areas is required for promotion to full Professor.

#### **1. Developing Educated Persons**

Success in this area both describes successful teaching at this university and is a prerequisite for tenure and promotion

- a. Faculty members meet this goal when they demonstrate their effectiveness in cultivating students' knowledge base and skills both basic and specialized within a specific discipline.
- b. Faculty should strive to make explicit the relationship between the general education curriculum and various disciplinary curricula so students can integrate their acquired knowledge and skills for lifelong application.
- c. Evidence of continuing professional development also contributes to this goal.

## 2. Exceptional Modes or Qualities of Teaching

The specifics in this area need to be described in writing by the department from the beginning of employment, with any exceptions dependent on negotiation between the faculty member and the Department Head and the Dean, as approved by the Provost.

### a. Outstanding Performance as a Classroom Teacher

Beyond basic effectiveness as a teacher, outstanding performance may be evidenced by judgments made by students, peers, administrators, and colleagues with appropriate academic expertise. Further evidence may include external recognition for outstanding preparation of students for professional fields, and students receiving external recognition for outstanding work produced in the course. Such evidence may also include noteworthy research work done with undergraduate and/or graduate students, noteworthy work in student advisement, and internal or external grants to support innovative teaching.

### b. Experiential Learning

While it is expected that all of our teaching efforts contribute to developing citizen scholars, special efforts in this regard may be used to meet this goal. Faculty should provide evidence of service learning components in their courses or provide evidence for other structured activities that apply the course material to social issues, problems, tasks or enhancement.

### c. Accessibility

The criterion for this goal refers to efforts to increase accessibility to education beyond one's typical assignments. These may include, but are not limited to, offering distance learning, online and continuing education courses, public lectures or workshops, working with the community and public schools in providing access to education, developing educational materials that address accessibility issues.

### d. Diversity

Special efforts to bring diversity to students' educational experience might include inviting guest speakers who offer diverse viewpoints, taking students to locations where they will be exposed to an unfamiliar environment, and requiring students to seek out diversity as part of their course requirements.

#### **4.2.1.3 Documenting Teaching Effectiveness**

There are two primary components to documenting teaching effectiveness: Instructor inputs and student outcomes. Everything that contributes to or derives from a teaching/learning experience should address one or more of the criteria above. The following table identifies input/output elements and possible sources for documentation. The table below is not prescriptive, but offers faculty examples of ways to document teaching effectiveness. Student teaching evaluations can only be used for a maximum of 50% of the weight of evaluation in this area. Departments can refine these suggestions as appropriate for specific disciplines and a faculty member's specific job assignment. Only department and college administered hardcopy or online student evaluations may be used in the evaluation of reappointment, tenure, promotion, and performance.

<b>INPUTS AND OUTCOMES</b>	<b>DOCUMENTATION</b>
Instructor Inputs (developing educated persons)	
Clear identification of outcome goals in terms of knowledge and skills	Syllabi and assignment statements
Clear identification of relevance of courses to both major study and general education	Syllabi and assignment statements
Practiced and pedagogically informed delivery of course content	Teaching portfolio, evidence of professional development, peer evaluations
Up-to-date content and materials	Syllabi, sample materials (with explanatory narrative in dossier), curricular grants, development of new courses
Quality organization of course and diligence in application	Syllabi, sample assignments, peer evaluations, student evaluations
Appropriately rigorous expectations	Syllabi statements, quantity and quality of reading, writing, and performance assignments
Time, energy, and effectiveness	Teaching portfolio, peer evaluations, student evaluations
Instructor Inputs (exceptional modes or qualities of teaching)	
Opportunities for out-of-class application	Description of out-of-class activities, including service learning, field work, etc.
Special access opportunities such as distance-learning delivery	Syllabi and/or descriptions of alternative delivery methods/courses
Special efforts to diversify student experiences	Description of diversification objectives and efforts
Student Outcomes (all goals)	
Majority of students make progress on knowledge and skill objectives from baseline starting point	Aggregate information on pre/post knowledge and/or skill performance by students in each class (example: 10% of students were able to identify Renaissance art at beginning of semester, 75% by end)
Majority of students understand goals and relevance of courses, regardless of performance level	Student evaluations
Students receive external recognition for work produced in course	External letters, awards, commendations, reviews, news stories, etc.
Faculty member receives direct external recognition for preparation of students	Same as above

#### **4.2.2 Research**

The University recognizes the need to consider a broad spectrum of activities in the area of research due to the diversity and uniqueness of academic fields. Herein, research will be defined as the production and formal communication of creative scholarly works. The nature of research varies widely among different academic disciplines, but generally refers to the discovery, refinement, evaluation, and synthesis of information, the application of specialized knowledge to the solution of problems, and artistic activity. In the context of each academic discipline, research produces creative outcomes that are formally communicated to, and vetted by, peers. 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)

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

To qualify as research, activity in each of these areas must be disseminated and subjected to critical peer review or evaluation by the scholarly community so as to serve knowledge growth in a field or be of significant practical use.

These modes of research should be considered of equal weight and importance in the faculty evaluation process.

#### **4.2.2.1 Research Mission**

The process of research is understood as the production and formal communication of original creative, scholarly work, and, while the definitions of “scholarly” and “creative” may differ across academic disciplines, the process is understood to support the University’s general mission in all three fundamental areas of faculty responsibility: teaching, research, and service. Research both advances knowledge in a particular specialized academic field and encourages individual faculty development; it enhances the quality of education students receive. It also helps fulfill the University’s service obligation by contributing to the public welfare. Society benefits from the results of both basic and applied research (refer to Section 1.3.6).

#### **4.2.2.2 Goals and Criteria for Evaluating Research**

The following goals and criteria are the basis of evaluating faculty members’ research for tenure and promotion and for required performance reviews. Item 1 below is of paramount importance on this list, and any faculty member, in order to succeed in the area of research at Missouri State University, must succeed in item 1. Although Items 2, 3, and 4, are not individually prescriptive, they are inclusive of research and may be considered. Success in one or more of these areas is required to attain tenure and promotion from assistant to Associate Professor. Sustained success in one or more of these areas is required for promotion to full Professor.

##### 1. Expand Knowledge and/or Demonstrate Growth in Area of Expertise

*Includes all five categories of research at equal weight.*

Faculty members meet this goal if they have engaged in sufficient quantity and quality of peer-reviewed research in any of the five modes of scholarship appropriate to their field (as defined by department). The scholarship of teaching and learning is included here because any department may have faculty members who either specialize in education within their discipline, or who do research in this area because it is important to their academic field or part of their assignment by the department. This research content area should be fully recognized and evaluated according to the standards of one of the five modes of research.

## 2. Application of Research to Benefit University Constituents

The criterion for this goal refers to the application of research to solving problems or addressing situations significant to the public that require professional expertise.

## 3. Transmission

The criterion for this goal refers to transmission of scholarly product beyond that required for peer review in one's field. Faculty members meet this goal if they make a special effort to share knowledge and creative work with a broader audience.

## 4. Involvement of Students

Research is of added value in the University mission if the work involves students, either undergraduate or graduate, as active participants in the research process.

### **4.2.3 Service**

#### **4.2.3.1 Service Mission**

Faculty service at Missouri State University serves three purposes: to support the academic tradition of shared governance, to support the professional and organizational needs of the disciplines, and to bring the products of University work to the public for its benefit.

#### **4.2.3.2 Goals and Criteria for Evaluating Service**

The following goals and criteria are the basis of evaluating faculty members' service for tenure and promotion and for required performance reviews. Item 1 below is of paramount importance on this list, and any faculty member, in order to succeed in the area of service at Missouri State University, must succeed in item 1. Although items 2, 3, and 4 are not individually prescriptive, they are inclusive of service and may be considered. Success in one or more of these areas is required to attain tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. Sustained success in one or more of these areas is required for promotion to full Professor.

### 1. University Citizenship

In the interest of maintaining broad participation in the decision-making process at the University, faculty should recognize their responsibilities to the organization and contribute fairly to the task of shared-governance. This includes, but is not limited to, service on program, departmental, college and university committees and task forces. In so doing, faculty members increase the level of self-determination in their ranks.

Service activities supporting University citizenship may also include collaborations and contributions for the collegiate well-being such as providing professional development, participating in campus discussions, and expanding opportunities for shaping the learning environment.

### 2. Professional Service

The criterion for this goal refers to contributions to professional organizations within the faculty member's field. Professional association participation may include serving as a board member, division chair, officer, editor, reviewer, committee member, etc. Additionally, this may include sponsoring an active student organization, mentoring or advising, or providing opportunities for student experiences outside the expectations of teaching.

### 3. Public Service

Faculty members meet this goal when they provide evidence of using their professional skills and expertise to serve community, state, national or international public constituents. This may take the form of op eds or other articles in newspapers or other print media or on television or radio, etc. In this way, Faculty Members not only further the mission of public outreach, but also serve as models for their students who are encouraged to engage in similar activities.

#### 4. Professional Consultation

Faculty members may meet this goal by providing evidence of providing professional expertise to business, industry, schools, community organizations, and colleagues in other university programs. Consultation services to external constituents within the faculty member's professional expertise may be included in this area.