

MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

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

DEPARTMENT: COMPUTER INFORMATION SYSTEMS

COLLEGE: BUSINESS

SEMESTER/YEAR OF CURRENT REVIEW: Fall ~~2017~~ 2015

SEMESTER/YEAR OF NEXT REQUIRED REVIEW: Summer ~~2020~~ 2018

DEPARTMENT ADOPTION SIGNATURES:

[Signature] 4-28-17  
Department Personnel Committee Chair Date

Joshua M Davis 4-28-17  
Department Head Date

APPROVAL SIGNATURES:

[Signature] 4-28-17  
Dean Date

Chris Craig 4-28-17  
Provost Date

THIS PLAN IS IN EFFECT FROM ~~2017~~, THROUGH ~~2020~~.  
2015 2018

FACULTY EVALUATION PLAN FOR INFORMATION SYSTEM FACULTY IN THE  
DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER INFORMATION SYSTEMS (CIS) FOR 2017 – 2018

According to statements contained in the Faculty Handbook, each member of the ranked faculty will be evaluated every year with one of the purposes of that evaluation being the establishment of a system for making decisions concerning reappointment, promotion, and granting of tenure. An annual review of this document by the tenured faculty will take place in September. Any changes or recommendations will be presented to the voting tenured faculty for approval. The faculty is reminded that this document should be consistent with the policies and practices of the College of Business (COB) as well as the University.

The general faculty descriptions for tenure and promotion are outlined in the Faculty Handbook (3.3) and should be consulted as an additional source of information. The general criteria for these decisions are discussed and include teaching, research, and service. In any case, the CIS guidelines for reappointment, tenure, and promotion indicate the relative differences from “outstanding” and “below expected” within the current CIS ranks of instructor, clinical faculty, assistant professor, associate professor and professor.

The following guidelines are intended to elaborate further upon the University guidelines to make them more explicit and assure standardization of these procedures with the College of Business.

The evaluation for tenure, promotion and merit should not be confused with the objective setting process done by individual departments and COB. The objectives have to do with achieving ends that are relevant to current COB goals and often reflect the minimum requirements. Annual performance/merit evaluations examine relative (ranked) performance for a discrete period of time. Although the guidelines for performance/merit will be similar to those for reappointment, tenure and promotion, there is a clear distinction in the purpose, process and outcomes associated with these evaluations. Reappointment, tenure and promotion decisions to associate and professor are predicated on an applicant’s complete body of work (teaching, research and service) from the initial date of employment. Promotion to full also considers the body of work since the last promotion. Merit examines a one year period for teaching and service and a two year period for research. Therefore, while performance/merit evaluations provide some indication of process by probationary faculty and/or those seeking promotions, it is important to note that favorable rankings on annual basis are necessary, but not sufficient for reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions. Faculty members must keep in mind the requirements stated in this document that are used for tenure, promotion and reappointment decisions and then formulate objectives that will lead to their desired outcomes and that fit their needs, deficits, etc. Achieving yearly objectives is no guarantee that criteria for other administrative decisions have been met. This would depend upon how much those objectives are consistent with the requirements stated in this document.

## **The Annual Review**

The annual Tenure and Promotion Spring review process is the annual review for tenured faculty and instructors. This process is also the same review for merit. For untenured faculty, the Spring review is discussed in the section, "Annual Review for Reappointment and Tenure & Promotion."

All faculty are awarded a score based on the following guidelines. These are general guidelines and can be changed as the committee reviews each self-reported annual review package. For example, a single journal article could be awarded a score of 5 points for an academic journal such as MIS Quarterly (MISQ), a generally accepted Top 5 journal in the information systems literature.

### Teaching

Evaluation Avg	Merit Score
Below a 4.0	= 3.0-3.95 (something less than a 4.0 in other words)
4.0-4.25	= 4.0
4.25-4.5	= 4.5
4.5+	= 5.0

Teaching is also considered with student comments, course difficulty, and importance in the curriculum.

### Research

1 article in 2 years	= 4 (also supported by prior research productivity history)
2 articles	= 4.5
3 or more	= 5
No articles	= 2

### Service

Largely a subjective review based on the number/significance of committees and degree of effort required.

The faculty submit performance weights in the Spring term for the next academic year. Then a final score is calculated as such:

Merit Score = (Teaching Score x Teaching Weight) + (Research Score x Research Weight) + (Service Score x Service Weight).

Revised May 2017

### **Instructors & Clinical Faculty**

The instructor weight ranges are:

Teaching: 80-90%

Research: 0-10%

Service: 10-20%

The full-time clinical faculty are usually working professionals and assigned the rank of instructor and are classified as either IP (Instructional Practitioner) or SP (Scholarly Practitioner). Some clinical faculty are on the graduate faculty and classified as Per Course.

### **Ranked Professors**

The College of Business classifies the ranked faculty as Scholarly Academics (SA) or Practicing Academics (PA), based on scholarly and/or field activity. Ranked professors who do not meet either of these classifications are placed on 12-hour teaching assignments. Most ranked professors have the weights of 40% - 40% - 20% for teaching, research, and service, respectively.

The weights may range:

#### Teaching

- Tenured – 9-hour                      30-60%
- Tenured—12 hour                      50-80%

#### Research

- Tenured – 9-hour                      30-60%
- Tenured—12 hour                      10-40%

#### Service

- Tenured – 9-hour                      10-20%
- Tenured—12 hour                      10-20%

Promotion from assistant to associate can be granted separately from tenure. The committee seeks a consistent and substantial record of performance in the three areas of teaching, research, and service. Promotion to Full professor is based on the body of work performance since the last promotion, typically seven years.

## **I. Annual Review for Reappointment and Tenure & Promotion**

This section is written for probationary tenure track faculty. Each year probationary faculty members will submit in writing and then formally discuss with the department head (1) results of prior performance evaluations and (2) objectives for forthcoming performance (progressive performance expectations where pertinent). After the meeting and consistent with the current Faculty Handbook and other University and COB Guidelines, the department head will submit a written summary in the form of an annual evaluation to the personnel file, faculty member, and department personnel committee as required. This annual letter should include a discussion of areas of achievement as well as areas where improvement is required.

The faculty member is invited to present any relevant materials that support satisfactory progress in teaching, research and service and is encouraged to review the criteria for promotion and tenure as indicated in this document. A matrix for self-evaluation is provided at the end of this document.

The progress toward tenure will be discussed and a rating of satisfactory, questionable, or unsatisfactory will be assigned. A signed copy of the review will be placed in the faculty member's department personnel folder and one signed copy will be given to the faculty member. In no way should these annual reviews be construed as a final decision related to tenure and/or promotion.

## **II. Review of Faculty**

The review of the faculty is executed for two reasons: 1) the annual review for tenured faculty and 2) reappointment and tenure for pre-tenured probationary faculty.

- 1) Every year the Personnel Committee (3 tenured CIS faculty) and then the department head will make a full and substantive performance review of probationary faculty and tenured, ranked faculty at the appropriate time. Student evaluations will be collected over a calendar year for each course taught fall and spring and the results of each professor's total courses taught averaged for evaluation purposes. Input for teaching and service shall be reviewed over a twelve (12) month calendar period; input for research shall be reviewed over the previous two (2) calendar years as a two-year rolling average. A letter of evaluation will be addressed to the faculty member, with copies sent to the department files and the dean.
- 2) Reviews for reappointment, and tenure will be conducted by the CIS Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Committee, consisting of all

tenured CIS faculty. Reviews for promotion will be conducted by those members on the CIS RTP Committee holding rank higher than that of the applicant.

### **III. External reviews for tenure and promotion**

- a. Who is qualified to be an external reviewer—The individual should possess a terminal degree. Reviewers typically hold academic appointments. Reviewers with academic appointments should be employed in institutions/programs at or above the level of institution in which the candidate is employed and should hold rank above the level of the candidate. When appropriate, reviewers holding terminal degrees may be drawn from research/creative institutes, foundations, organizations or the private sector.
- b. Conflicts of interest disqualify reviewers—Individuals with whom the candidate has collaborated with or studied under are generally ineligible. Individuals with whom the individual has a personal relationship are generally ineligible. Candidates should disclose any relationship or association with a potential reviewer prior to their selection, so as to avoid any potential conflict of interest.
- c. What instructions are given to an external reviewer—Standard instructions are to review CV and samples of work in terms of the criteria (also sent) of the candidate's home institution and department. Information on the candidate's teaching load should be provided to the reviewer. Only work that is eligible for consideration under the terms of appointment should be submitted to reviewers.
- d. Confidentiality of external reviews—Reviews are solicited and returned to the department head and included in the dossier.
- e. Scope of review—The reviewer is invited to consider the whole of the candidate's CV, but the primary focus of the external review is on scholarship and research. It is expected that faculty in one's own department and institution can fairly access contributions in teaching and service.

### **IV. The Dossier**

From the Provost Office Web site, a list of items for a dossier is recommended. The page for "Solicitation of External Reviews", located at <http://www.missouristate.edu/provost/selectextreviewers.htm> gives the current list of review materials to aid an external reviewer. Historically the list has contained:

- Faculty applicant's personal statement (2-5 pages, summarizing program of research)
- An up-to-date curriculum vita
- Departmental criteria for tenure and/or promotion which have been approved by the Dean and the Provost that aligns with the criteria in the

Missouri State University Faculty Handbook. Relevant University criteria found in the Faculty Handbook also can be provided.

- Information on the number of hours taught and other pertinent details concerning the candidate's teaching assignment in each academic year since the last promotion or since the time of hire if this is a tenure consideration.
- Samples of research selected by the candidate that are of the type for which the enclosed criteria would be applied as part of the tenure and/or promotion decision. Only materials produced since the last promotion should be considered. Materials from each academic year in the current rank are encouraged in order to document ongoing productivity.

## **V. Role of the Candidate**

### **a. Annual Review**

1. The candidate is evaluated every year before the tenure decision for reappointment for the next academic year. This is a discussion of the current year's achievements.
2. Provide appropriate materials, including annual assignment.
3. Work with department head and faculty to address feedback.
4. Develop appropriate assignment with department head.

### **b. Pre-Tenure Review**

1. The first "pre-tenure" review should occur in the candidate's third year on the tenure track. This is a review related to tenure.
2. Distinctions from annual reviews for reappointment should be clear; at a minimum, the full portfolio should be provided for review.

### **c. Tenure and Promotion**

1. Identify potential external reviewers.
2. Prepare the dossier.
3. Prepare the professional statement.
4. Work with department head if updating materials is required.

## **VI. Role of Faculty Review and the Reappointment Tenure & Promotion Committee**

- a. Individuals who vote on the actions to be taken should be expected to review the materials provided by the candidate.

- b. If the department wishes, it can assign voting rights and responsibilities on reappointment, pre-tenure review and promotion to committee members, who are obligated to thoroughly, review all materials.
- c. Individuals who vote on promotion decisions should be at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires. All tenured faculty are expected to vote on the awarding of tenure.
- d. The Chair of the Faculty Review Committee should work to ensure that all appropriate tasks of the reviews are carried out and that all candidates receive clear and appropriate feedback and guidance.
- e. Department heads who are associate professors should have a means of receiving feedback from the faculty on their progress toward promotion.

## **VII. Role of Department Head**

### **a. Annual Reviews**

1. Assessment—Faculty performance is summarized and evaluated in a professional manner. Information on faculty assignment should be included in the assessment.
2. Constructive Guidance—If remediation is required, guidance is provided and an appropriate faculty assignment is developed.
3. University Forms—should include year being evaluated by date and chronology (e.g., 2006-2007 and 2<sup>nd</sup> year in rank) and number years' credit toward tenure consistent with University policy.

### **b. Annual and Pre-Tenure Reviews**

Provide feedback to the candidate to assist in preparation of the full portfolio.

### **c. Tenure and Promotion**

1. Identify (with the collaboration of the faculty committee) potential external reviewers.
2. Solicit external reviews, submit appropriate materials and set deadlines. Communicate with the reviewer as necessary, solicit additional reviews (with the consultation of the candidate, and committee if needed) to ensure minimum number obtained.
3. Ensure that all appropriate information is included in the dossier, including updates as needed.

## **VIII. Role of Dean**

### **a. Annual Reviews and Reappointments**

1. Mentor department heads to work with candidates and faculty to provide feedback, guidelines and committee assignments.



2. Review Draft and Annual Evaluations by Department Heads.
  3. Meet with Department Head(s) and Faculty members(s) as needed.
- b. **Pre-Tenure review**
1. Ensure the cumulative reviews warrant reappointment.
  2. Meet with candidates and department heads in cases of performance below expectation. Review performance and assignments and provide direction for future actions.
- c. **Tenure and Promotion**
1. Ensure appropriate standards and procedure.
- d. **Feedback to Associate Professor Department Heads**
1. Department heads who are associate professor and wish to work toward promotion during their service as head need to receive feedback on their progress toward promotion.

## **IX. Promotion to Professor**

Associate professors aspiring to the rank of professor should receive annual feedback from the department head on their progress. At the request of the associate professor, the department head can request that those individuals who would be voting on the faculty member's future promotion provide feedback on that progress as well.

## **X. Application for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment**

### **A. Outline of Procedure**

The individual faculty member will initiate the action to be considered for tenure or promotion. Non-tenured faculty will automatically be considered for reappointment. In all cases, the data upon which reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions will be made will include information provided by the individual faculty member as well as departmental data. It is the faculty members' responsibility to provide documentation to support their application. For evaluation decisions a faculty member shall submit a complete file of all the following supportive material for the time period being evaluated:

Teaching:

- Course syllabi
- Examination
- Homework and project assignments
- (Other materials may be included)*

Research:

- Copies of articles, cases, books, etc. which have been published, accepted for publication, and/or submitted for publication.

Papers as submitted and/or accepted for presentation

Papers as printed in proceedings

Software and documentation

*(Other materials may be included)*

Service:

Name of journal(s) and professional meetings served as a reviewer, along with number of papers reviewed.

Faculty members may submit any documentation in support of those service activities reported in the CIS Faculty Merit/Annual Activity Report.

Such documentation will be in accordance with University and COB guidelines and will use the approved forms and meet deadlines as specified by that year's Academic Work calendar.

1. The department head shall make available the student evaluation instruments and the statistical summary, which contains the frequency count, mean, standard deviation and comparative data for each of the COB Evaluation Items 1-13.
2. The committee shall forward the final voting results for each faculty member as well as the voting result for teaching, research and service for each faculty member to the department head.
3. The committee shall provide each faculty member with the voting rationale for teaching, research, and service.
4. Applicants for promotion, tenure, and reappointment may request a meeting with the committee chair after the recommendation of the committee has been decided and communicated to the applicant.

## **B. Selection of RTP Committee Members**

1. The CIS RTP committee for tenure and reappointment decision for CIS faculty will be composed of all tenured CIS area faculty.
2. The committee for promotion shall be composed of a subset of the RTP Committee members holding rank equal to or higher than the rank being applied for. A separate committee shall be established for each rank. If a promotion committee of three faculty or more cannot be established, faculty members from other departments may be selected in accordance with the COB guidelines to achieve the minimum number of three.
3. Excluded from the RTP Committee shall be the department head, relatives or spouses of the applicant, faculty members who have been officially notified of non-reappointment for reasons other than

retirement, faculty members who are currently under sanction, and individuals upon whose application that committee would be acting.

### **C. Committee Responsibilities**

The RTP committee shall select a chair. In the event that one or more subcommittees are required for promotion decisions voting members will have the option of selecting a new chair for those deliberations.

#### **Reappointment**

The committee will inspect all items provided by the individual being considered for reappointment and made available by the department head.

The committee shall assess the ability of the applicant to reach the desired levels of performance in the teaching, research, and service areas. The committee will recognize that student evaluation input is a necessary part but not the sole criterion in the evaluation of teaching.

An attempt should be made to reach consensus, but if that is not possible, a majority vote of the committee will be used to make the recommendation. The committee members shall provide each faculty member with rationale for recommendations in the area of teaching, research and service. The actual voting results (For and Against) and rationale/justification will be forwarded to the Department Head.

A copy of the recommendation shall be sent to the applicant at the time the recommendation is submitted to the department head.

#### **Tenure/Promotion**

The committee(s) will inspect all items provided by the individual being considered for tenure/promotion and made available by the department head. The committee shall assess the performance of the applicant in the teaching, research, and service areas. The committee will recognize that student evaluation input is a necessary part but not the sole criterion in the evaluation of teaching.

An attempt should be made to reach consensus, but if that is not possible, a majority vote of the committee will be used to make the recommendation. The committee members shall provide each faculty member with rationale for recommendations in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The actual voting results (For and Against) and rationale/justification will be forwarded to the Department Head.

A copy of the recommendation shall be sent to the applicant at the time the recommendation is submitted to the department head.

#### **D. Criteria for Reappointment**

The applicant for reappointment shall demonstrate that he or she is making appropriate progress in the areas of teaching, research and service to earn tenure in the time allowed for the rank. The CIS RTP committee will evaluate each applicant in the areas of teaching, research and service. The department head shall notify the individual of this evaluation in writing. This letter should include a discussion of areas in which improvement is required.

#### **E. Standards for Tenure and Promotion**

The CIS RTP committee shall evaluate each applicant separately for tenure and promotion according to departmental guidelines. The committee will submit a separate evaluation form to the department head regarding the recommendation for or against promotion or tenure and the rationale for its decision based on departmental, college and university guidelines.

Four levels of performance are applicable for COB evaluations in the categories of teaching, research, and service for tenure and promotion. These levels of performance are **outstanding, above average, average and below average.**

The departmental committee will refer to its departmental guidelines in regard to the assignment of the ratings (expected, above average, and outstanding performance).

**TENURE:** Requires **above average** performance in teaching or research, **average** performance in the other two categories.

Basic competence is required for an initial appointment; for tenure "high-quality performance and relative merit" are required. (FH 3.7.2)

**PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR:** Requires **above average** performance in two of the three categories, and **average** performance in the other one OR **outstanding performance** in teaching or research and **average** performance in the other two categories. The Faculty Handbook requires sustained effectiveness in teaching, research and service (FH 3.3.2) for promotion to associate professor.

**PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR:** Requires **outstanding performance** in research or teaching, and **above average** performance in the other two OR **outstanding performance** in two of the three categories, and **average** performance

in the other category. The Faculty Handbook requires that professors be recognized leaders who have a cumulative record of teaching effectiveness, of peer-reviewed scholarship, research, or creative activity appropriate to the discipline, and of substail service appropriate to the discipline (FH 3.3.3)

**PROMOTION TO DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR:** COB Guidelines and the Faculty Handbook require the rank of Professor and a record of extraordinary performance in at least two categories and a sustained record of accomplishments in the remaining category. (FH 3.3.4)

In addition, the Faculty Handbook recognizes that “professionalism and collegiality are essential to teaching, scholarship, research, creative activity, and service activities and are evidenced in at least two important ways: maintaining high standards of professional ethics and performing as a responsible member of the University community.” (FH 3.2.3)

**Table 1: COB STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION**

TENURE OR PROMOTION TO RANK		PERFORMANCE CATEGORY			TOTAL POINTS
		TEACHING	RESEARCH	SERVICE	
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	OPT. A	1	1	1	3
TENURE	OPT. A	2	1	1	4
	B	1	2	1	4
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	OPT. A	2	2	1	5
	B	2	1	2	5
	C	1	2	2	5
	D	3	1	1	5
	E	1	3	1	5

<b>PROFESSOR</b>	OPT. A	3	2	2	7
	B	2	3	2	7
	C	3	3	1	7
	D	3	1	3	7
	E	1	3	3	7

POINTS: AVERAGE = 1; ABOVE AVERAGE = 2; OUTSTANDING = 3

The “Standards for Tenure and Promotion” outlined above do not prescribe a numeric system for measuring performance levels. The following table is presented only to clarify the optional performance paths and to suggest the relative weight of evidence of performance that should be required to distinguish professorial ranks and tenure. The following tables for teaching, research, and service is a summary of the detailed explanation of the three areas of teaching, research, and service.

**XI. Computer Information Systems Guidelines for Teaching, Research, and Service Activities**

The following guidelines are supplied to help further define the activities suggested in the University guidelines as related to teaching, research, and service.

**A. Teaching**

Effective classroom teaching performance and overall quality instructional effort are essential conditions to be demonstrated for reappointment, promotion and tenure.

The numerical ratings on the student evaluation form are an important source of information. Currently on the student evaluations, there are three averages in course instruction, course administration, and course assessment. However, student evaluations will not be considered as the only factor in judging teaching effectiveness. There is evidence that student ratings are influenced by extraneous factors. Thus, the numbers represent general values but certainly not specific points. Due to the influence of student interest, physical environment, course grades, etc., the student evaluations must be considered with the average rating for that course, the number of students, and the level of students.

Effective teaching results from the combination of many factors. To objectively and fairly evaluate an individual's teaching performance requires consideration of several important facets of teaching. For example:

1. Courses taught: undergraduate or graduate, number of students enrolled, student credit hours, new course preparation involved, number of preparations per semester.
2. Other teaching activities: guest lecturers, number of master's research projects, number of independent readings, and other teaching activities.
3. Activities to improve teaching: new teaching methods, professional upgrading (participation in workshops, institutes, seminars, conferences, educational trips, pedagogical reading and research, etc.).
4. Activities to improve curriculum: revision of existing courses, development of new courses, and preparation of materials to integrate new equipment or software into existing courses.
5. Development of cases or other teaching related materials.
6. Student evaluations of teaching: summary scores from college standard course evaluation form (course rating, instructor rating, and interest in course).
7. Peer evaluations of teaching methods and materials: course syllabi or policy statements, examinations, students' written assignments, handouts, presentation skills.
8. Teaching awards, honors, recognition by student organizations, etc.
9. Academic advising: number of advisees, willingness to assist students, etc.
10. Publication of textbooks, cases, or other pedagogical material.

## **B. Research and Scholarly Activity**

The following items are examples of what should be considered in judging a faculty member's scholarly endeavor. It should be construed to include theoretical or empirical "discovery research," applied research, applying other's discoveries to new contexts, written cases with instructor's manual, computer software, and textbooks and other pedagogical writing. The COB "Scholarly Productivity Guidelines" give additional information.

1. Publication of articles in national peer-reviewed journals, regional peer-reviewed journals, and non peer-reviewed journals.
2. Publications of scholarly book or monograph by national or international publishers or university presses, completed chapters in books currently under contract and/or in progress, and articles as chapters in edited books for which one is given public credit in print.
3. Publication of textbooks, cases, or other pedagogical material.
4. Book reviews and essays published in peer-reviewed journals.
5. Monographs published and disseminated by foundations or government agencies.
6. Monographs or essays written for and published by professional associations and philanthropic organizations, and non-peer-reviewed articles.
7. Reprints of articles previously published in edited books or in peer-reviewed journals.
8. Presentation of papers at state, regional, national, and international professional meetings, which result in published refereed proceedings.
9. Invited presentations at state, regional, national, and international professional meetings.
10. Presentations of papers at state, regional, national, and international professional meetings that do not result in professional publication.
11. Research proposals successfully funded and grant reports emanating from such projects.
12. Research proposals submitted but not funded.
13. Research projects in active progress.
14. Development of software.

\*For criteria purposes textbooks, cases, and pedagogical material may be either under Teaching or Scholarly Activity depending upon the situation, but not under both. For AACSB reporting purposes, these materials should be reported as scholarly activity.



**\*\*Faculty must clearly indicate whether or not credit is being sought for an article in the year when it receives unconditional acceptance or when it is published (consistent with prior COB Activity Reports).**

### **C. Service**

Service includes activities performed within a college or department, such as committee work and special assignments delegated by a dean or department head. Service also includes activities performed on behalf of University-wide task forces and committees, or on behalf of local, regional, national, or international professional or community organizations. Activities to be considered include the following examples:

1. Membership and elected office, or other position of leadership held in professional organization(s); for example, committee membership, chairing, etc.
2. Special assignments for professional organizations; for example, directing seminars, workshops, advising student organizations.
3. Participation at professional meetings in the capacity of moderator, track chairperson, speaker, reactor, discussant.
4. Work performed in a professional consultant capacity.
5. Professional honors.
6. Membership or leadership in departmental, college, or University committees or task forces.
7. Involvement in student organizations.
8. Teaching courses or seminars through the Continuing Education Program, Center for Business Research and Development, or any other University sponsored seminar.
9. Special University, college, or department assignments deemed significant.
10. Community, regional, state, and national activities deemed significant.
11. Other professional activity.

### **D. Specific Criteria for Evaluation**

The evaluation criteria presented below for the CIS faculty gives additional specificity to University and COB guidelines for faculty evaluation. The criteria listed are not intended to be all-inclusive, nor are they intended to communicate that an individual should have accomplished all items listed to be categorized in that level. Further, while extraordinary volume in one level may justify advancement to the next higher level, the achievement of a single item at any level does not necessarily justify a rating at that level. Individuals charged with making evaluations (administrators or faculty committees) are expected to use good judgment in categorizing faculty performance.

## 1. Teaching<sup>1</sup>

### Level I – Outstanding

Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated outstanding teaching by:

- Very high student evaluations
- Very high peer evaluations of teaching materials
- Honors or recognition for teaching materials
- Publications of well-reviewed textbook, cases, or other teaching materials
- Significant work in program development
- Evidence of very effective advising and tutoring

### Level II – Above Average

Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated expected teaching by:

- High student evaluations
- High peer evaluations of teaching materials
- Revision of established courses
- Preparing new courses
- Development of new course material for faculty use
- Involvement in seminars, workshops, conventions as a learner
- Evidence of effective advising and tutoring

### Level III – Average

Individuals whose performance is this level will have demonstrated expected teaching by:

---

<sup>1</sup> For criteria purposes textbooks, cases, and pedagogical material may be either under Teaching or Scholarly Activity depending upon the situation, but not under both. For AACSB reporting purposes, these materials should be reported as scholarly activity.

- Good student evaluations
- Good peer evaluations of teaching materials
- Teaches all assigned classes
- Meets class regularly
- Works well with colleagues in multiple section courses
- Involvement to accept varied teaching assignments
- Evidence of acceptable advising and tutoring

Level IV – Below Average

Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated a teaching performance below the minimum expected. The characteristics are:

- Poor student evaluations
- Poor peer evaluations of teaching materials
- Lack of or poorly prepare teaching materials
- Unwilling to accept varied teaching assignments
- Evidence of inadequate advising and tutoring

2. Research and Scholarly Activity 2

Level I – Outstanding

Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated exceptional professional activity by earning more than 6 peer-reviewed publications plus:

- Publication of scholarly book or monograph by a reputable, peer reviewed university or commercial press
- Receipt of major grant from an off-campus agency or foundation
- Presentation at a national or international professional meeting with proceedings

Level II – Above Average

Individual whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated above average professional activity by earning at least 6 peer-reviewed publications plus:

- Publication of article(s) in lesser (i.e. deemed less than international, national and regional peer-reviewed journals)

---

<sup>2</sup> For criteria purposes textbooks, cases, and pedagogical material may be either under Teaching or Scholarly Activity depending upon the situation, but not under both. For AACSB reporting purposes, these materials should be reported as scholarly activity.

- Publication in professional/trade magazines
- Author of chapter in scholarly book
- Editor of scholarly book
- Review of articles for peer-reviewed journal
- Receipt of MSU grants or small off-campus grants
- Presentation(s) of invited talk at national professional meeting
- Presentation of paper at national professional meetings without proceedings
- Presentation of paper at regional professional meeting with proceedings

#### Level III – Average

Individual whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated expected professional activity by earning at least 6 peer-reviewed publications plus:

- Evidence presented demonstration research activities in progress that have not yet produced publications manuscripts under consideration, etc.
- Presentations at regional professional meeting without proceedings.
- Presentations at local professional meetings or on campus.
- Publication of non-peer reviewed paper.
- Publication of minor paper in regional publication
- Attendance at national, state, or local professional meetings
- Assistance to colleagues with research projects/proposals
- Published book reviews

#### Level IV- Below Average

Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated a performance at or below the minimum expected. The characteristics seen are:

- Less than 6 peer reviewed publications.
- Insufficient evidence of significant research or scholarly activity.
- Insufficient evidence of effort to remain current in field.
- Insufficient attendance at professional meetings

\*\*Faculty must be clearly indicated whether or not credit is being sought for an article in the year when it receives unconditional acceptance or when it is published (consistent with prior COB Activity reports).

### 3. Service

### Level I-Outstanding

Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated exceptional service activities by:

- Serving as editor of a national journal
- Serving as major officer in a national professional organization.
- External recognition for service activities
- Demonstration of major leadership on campus
- Providing substantial leadership for major departmental programs (e.g. Computer day, Alumni Activities)

\*Significant participation in local service activities (service organizations, charities, etc.)

### Level II- Above Average

Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated above average service activities by:

- Serving as editor of a national journal
- Serving as major officer in a national professional organization.
- Serving as officer of local professional conferences. Manuscript reviewer for professional meetings
- Serving as a track chair at professional meetings
- Serving as chair of major university committee, college council or college committee.
- Substantive contributor to work of university or college committee, significant participation in major departmental programs. (e.g. Computer Day). Involvement in student organizations sponsor.
- Consulting activities
- Speaking to business and/or educational organizations
- Coordinator of an academic area
- Seminars or courses given for internal and external community, for example-non-credit courses and intersession courses.
- Major contribution to university/college/department through special administrative assignment
- Participation in local service activities (service organizations, charities, etc.)

### Level II - Average

Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated expected service activities by:

- Service on departmental, college, and university committees

- Participation in major departmental programs (e.g. Computer day)
- Evidence of other service to the university and community actively participating in professional organizations
- Manuscript reviewer for textbook publishers
- Servicing as a discussant and/or session chair at professional meetings
- Assisting with the professional growth of colleagues

#### Level IV - Below Average

Individuals whose performance is at this level will have demonstrated below expected service activities by:

- Failure or refusal to serve on departmental, college, and university committees
- Evidence of poor performance in service activities (failure to attend committee meetings, lack of attention to responsibilities, etc.
- Insufficient evidence of activity in professional organizations

## **XII. Senior Instructor & Clinical Faculty**

### **Senior Instructor**

The following process outlines the steps that lead to promotion from Instructor to Senior Instructor in the College of Business (COB).

1. Instructors are eligible to apply for promotion to Senior Instructor in the Fall semester of their 5th year of employment with the University. ***Instructors cannot be granted tenure.*** Number of years is not an entitlement for this promotion, and judgments will be made at all levels based on the standards for excellence in performing all assigned duties. In most cases, emphasis will be placed on the area of teaching as measured by departmental (school) criteria developed in accord with the faculty handbook and University parameters.
2. The criteria for reviewing applications for promotion to the Senior Instructor are presented below. Note that promotion to Senior Instructor requires applicants to demonstrate acceptable performance in all three areas: teaching, research, and service. The differences between promotion to Senior Instructor and promotion to the professorial ranks are twofold. First, promotion to Senior Instructor does not require a terminal degree as is the case for promotion to the professorial ranks. Second, the acceptable performance level in each area (i.e. teaching, research, and service) is different due to the difference in responsibilities between instructors and tenure-eligible faculty. In most cases, this would be reflected in the emphasis on teaching.

3. The existing departmental (school) promotion committee will submit recommendations to the Department Head (School Director) in accord with the timelines specified in the Tenure and Promotion Calendar. The Department Head (School Director) will review all relevant information and make a recommendation to the Dean who will also conduct a review and forward the 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. If approved, the academic Department (School) will be responsible for initiating the personnel action forms designating the promotion, and the accompanying salary increase.

### **Criteria for Promotion to Senior Instructor**

All COB Faculty members, including Instructors, are evaluated annually using approved departmental guidelines. The criteria for promotion from Instructor to Senior Instructor are based in part on these annual performance evaluations. In addition, accreditation of the College's programs by the Association for the Advancement of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) International is a high priority, and faculty qualifications are a significant component of the accreditation decision. Consequently, the criteria for promotion to Senior Instructor also are based on the COB definitions of "Scholarly Practitioner" (SP) and "Instructional Practitioner" (IP) faculty that were established to insure conformity with AACSB guidelines. Promotable instructors may be SP or IP.

The expectations for promotion from Instructor to Senior Instructor are based on a 12-hour teaching load or equivalent per semester and at least four years of full-time teaching experience in the Missouri State University College of Business prior to the semester in which the application for promotion is made. The minimum qualifications for an Instructor to be considered for promotion to Senior Instructor are: (1) an average performance rating in the area of teaching during the immediately preceding four years equal to 4.0 or higher which would be considered at least "Above Average," (2) average performance ratings in both areas research and service during the immediately preceding four years equal to 3.0 or higher which would be considered at least "Average," and (3) maintenance of SP or IP faculty status in accordance with the definitions established by COB.

### **COB Clinical Faculty**

In general, graduate clinical faculty are working professionals who possess a Master's degree with a minimum of 8 years professional discipline-specific work experience in progressively responsible positions. Clinical faculty are approved by a majority vote of the graduate faculty in applicant's COB department.

### **Tenure and Promotion Matrix**

The following matrix provides the probationary faculty member the opportunity to enumerate and summarize some of the significant achieved goals in teaching, service, and research listed above. These tables should be viewed in a **cumulative point of view**. Each year is an opportunity to add to a research stream, personalize effective course materials, and experience

Revised May 2017

committee and service opportunities. The matrix is required to be included in the promotion and tenure materials.

From Table 1 above, the relative performance of research, teaching, and service were shown for the different decisions such as tenure; tenure and promotion to associate; and promotion to professor. If AVERAGE = 1, ABOVE AVERAGE = 2 and OUTSTANDING = 3, the matrix can be tied back to Table 1. The faculty member should indicate how an item in a particular table justifies the shown point value.

Example. The first research matrix that is classified as "Outstanding" has point value = 3. From Table 1, the research score for tenure can be a 1 or 2; for promotion to associate, the research score can be 1, 2, or 3. Scoring a research score = 3, only requires an average (=1) in teaching and service. For promotion to professor, a research score = 3 appears in 3 of the 5 scenarios with the total points = 7.

Items may be freely added as the faculty members have different research, teaching, and service opportunities. The last two columns require that the faculty member check the appropriate category and then note the item from the vita or additional supporting material.



Revised May 2017

**Candidate:**

**Tenure Application:**

**Promotion To:**

**Department:**

**RESEARCH**

**Departmental Criteria**

*See Table 1 and Section XI of the Faculty Evaluation Plan in the Department of Computer Information Systems for more details.*

**(Outstanding** is evidenced by more than 6 peer-reviewed publications plus: Publication of scholarly book or monograph by a reputable, peer reviewed press; receipt of major grant from an off-campus agency or foundation; published proceedings from flagship national and international conferences)

**(Above Average** is evidenced by at least 6 peer-reviewed publications plus: Publications in professional/trade magazines; published chapters in scholarly books; editorial roles in scholarly books; article reviews for peer-reviewed journals; receipt of MSU grants or small off-campus grants; presentations and/or invited talks at professional meetings; published proceedings at regional, national, and international conferences)

**(Average** is evidenced by at least 6 peer-reviewed publications plus: Research in progress not yet under review; presentations at regional conferences without proceedings; presentations at local meetings or on campus; publication of non-peer-reviewed papers; publication in regional outlets; attendance at professional meetings; assisting colleagues with research)

**How I Meet Departmental Criteria**

**Location of  
Artifact/Notes**

**TEACHING**

Departmental Criteria	How I Meet Departmental Criteria	Location of Artifact/Notes
<p>See Table 1 and Section XI of the Faculty Evaluation Plan in the Department of Computer Information Systems for more details.</p> <p><b>(Outstanding</b> is evidenced by: Very high student evaluations; very high peer evaluation of teaching materials; honors or recognition for teaching; publication of well-reviewed textbooks, cases, or other teaching materials; significant program development work; evidence of very affective student advisement and tutoring)</p> <p><b>(Above Average</b> is evidenced by: High student evaluations; high peer evaluations of teaching materials; revisions of established courses; preparation of new courses; development of new course materials for faculty use; involvement in seminars, workshops, or conventions as a learner, evidence of effective advising and tutoring)</p> <p><b>(Average</b> is evidenced by: Good student evaluations, good peer evaluations of teaching materials; teaching all assigned classes; regular class meetings; working well with colleagues in multi-section courses; acceptance of varied teaching assignments; evidence of acceptable advising and tutoring)</p>		

**SERVICE**

Departmental Criteria	How I Meet Departmental Criteria	Location of Artifact/Notes
-----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------

See Table 1 and Section XI of the Faculty Evaluation Plan in the Department of Computer Information Systems for more details.

**Outstanding** is evidenced by: Editorial roles for national journals; major officer roles in national professional organizations; external recognition of service activities; demonstration of major leadership on campus; providing substantial leadership for major departmental programs [e.g., Computer Day, alumni activities])

**(Above Average** is evidenced by: Editorial roles for national journals; major officer roles in national professional organizations; officer roles in local professional conferences; reviewer roles for professional meetings; track chair roles for University committees; Chair roles for major college committee; substantive contribution to University or College committees; consulting activities; speaking roles for businesses or educational organizations; area coordinator roles; major contributions to the University/College/Department through administratively assigned roles; participation in local service activities)

**(Average** is evidenced by: Service roles on University/College/Department committees; participation in major departmental programs; evidence of other service to the University and/or community; reviewer roles for textbook publishers; discussant and/or session chair roles at professional meetings; assisting with the professional growth of colleagues)