

**2016 DEPARTMENT GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATIVE PROCESSES:  
FACULTY REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, TENURE AND MERIT  
EVALUATION GUIDELINES FOR THE  
DEPARTMENT OF MARKETING  
MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY**

The Marketing (MKT) department agrees to be in compliance with the latest edition of the Faculty Handbook and the latest revisions of the University and College of Business (COB) Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, including such rules and procedures dealing with the awarding of merit compensation. Revisions of the University and COB guidelines will always take precedence over departmental guidelines.

The MKT department agrees to follow the general evaluation procedures of the University regarding the steps involved, appeal procedures, etc. Further, we agree to follow the general criteria for these decisions discussed and included requirements for tenure, promotion, teaching, research, service and merit. *Section 3.3 in the Handbook states that "The provisions for promotion and tenure listed below for each rank represent the conditions the tenure-track faculty member must meet in order to be minimally eligible for consideration for a change in status."* Thus, basic competence in itself is not sufficient to justify the granting of tenure and/or promotion.

The following guidelines are intended to elaborate further upon the University guidelines, to make those guidelines more explicit, and to assure standardization of these procedures within the College of Business and Department of Marketing. Other documents such as the "COB Policy Manual" should be consulted when considering standards and making evaluations.

The evaluation for reappointment, promotion and tenure should not be confused with the objectives setting process done by individuals, departments, and COB. The objectives have to do with achieving ends that are relevant to current department and COB goals and often reflect minimum requirements. Faculty members MUST keep in mind the requirements stated in this document that are used for promotion and tenure decisions and then formulate specific objectives that will lead to their desired outcomes that fit their needs, deficits, etc. Achieving yearly COB and department objectives, documents minimal standards and is not a guarantee that criteria for other administrative decisions have been met. This would depend upon how consistent those objectives are with the requirements stated in this document.

### **I. Marketing Department Personnel Committee**

The Marketing Department Personnel Committee shall consist of a minimum of five (5) tenured ranked faculty members; the majority will be at the rank of Professor. All members must be tenured. Members of the committee will be chosen annually by ranked members of the department by secret ballot at the first available opportunity. Members of the Committee may serve consecutive terms. Tenure, promotion, merit, and reappointment recommendations will be the responsibility of this committee and provided to the Department Head.

## **II. Regular Performance Reviews**

Each year (annually) the faculty member will submit in writing and then formally discuss with the department head (1) results of prior performance 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 in which more improvement is required.

## **III. Review of Faculty**

Every year (annually) the Personnel Committee and then the department head will make a full and substantive performance review of instructors, probationary faculty and tenured, ranked faculty at the appropriate time on the academic calendar. 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 annually over a twelve (12) month calendar period; input for research shall be reviewed over the previous two (2) calendar years to obtain a two-year rolling average. Faculty members with doctorates must annually remain Scholarly Academic (SA) or less commonly, Practicing Academics (PA), if tenured or on tenure track. Those without doctorates must annually remain as Scholarly Practitioners (SP), or Instructional Practitioners (IP), depending upon their position appointments. Faculty should consult the current COB Policy Manual for the minimum qualifications required depending on their classification. Faculty with a Ph.D., or who are ABD completing a Ph.D., are to be categorized as Scholarly Academic (SA). New faculty will have a reasonable grace period to meet Scholarly Academic qualifications. Faculty must also employ Digital Measures to record all of their research and other activities. A letter of evaluation will be addressed to the faculty member, with copies sent to the department files and the dean.

## **IV. Special Review for Tenure Eligible Probationary Faculty**

Two years prior to the final date to apply for tenure, the Personnel Committee and the department head will each conduct a pre-tenure review (usually considered the third year review), both will specify one of three outcomes, satisfactory, questionable, unsatisfactory. Copies will be sent to the candidate, department and dean.

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

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

It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to initiate the action to be considered for tenure and/or promotion. For reappointment decisions, the department head and faculty will follow appropriate university procedures. 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 applications, including all student evaluations, previous performance reviews, and their Vita. The documentation could include letters of acceptances or copies of articles, evidence of a publication's peer-review process, course syllabi, letters of appointment for major service assignments, or anything the faculty member feels will help his/her case (see evaluation approaches discussed later in this document). 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.

(All recommendations will originate from the Department Personnel Committee and be forwarded to the department head.)

#### B. Process for Annual Appointments

**Faculty are requested to *carefully* read and perform under the guidelines found in the Faculty Handbook.** This section describes the fact that Faculty participate in five separate, but interrelated, evaluative processes: (1) a regular performance review by the department head, (2) a special assessment of tenure progress during the probationary period, (3) review of application for tenure, (4) review of application for promotion, and (5) for untenured, ranked faculty only, review of application for annual appointment, and/or promotion to Senior Instructor. The candidate initiates the reappointment, submitting materials to the chair of the Department Evaluation Committee. The committee's recommendation is then sent to the department head. The candidate signs the department head's recommendation and receives copies of both. The department head cannot be a committee member. The department head and the committee's recommendation are then sent to the dean.

#### C. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

"The primary responsibilities of faculty at Missouri State University are Teaching, Research, and Service. By accepting an appointment at this University, an individual in a tenure track position assumes a responsibility to pursue scholarly activities in each of these areas." (Faculty Handbook 3.7.1). In the College of Business this requires research published in quality, peer-reviewed journals.

Only faculty in tenure track positions are eligible for tenure. As stated in section 3.7.2 of the Faculty Handbook, "Tenure is based on a thorough evaluation of the candidate's total contribution to the University. The choices that the University makes in granting tenure are crucial to its endeavors toward academic excellence. A decision to grant tenure must reflect an assessment of high professional competence and performance measured against University standards. Recommendations for tenure are made in accordance with department, college, and University policies and procedures. It is the responsibility of the applicants for tenure to provide sufficient relevant documentation as evidence in support of their Teaching, Research, and Service activities. ...all evaluations for tenure shall address the manner in which each candidate has performed in Teaching, Research, and Service. Basic competence in itself is not sufficient to justify granting

tenure, for such competence is a prerequisite for the initial appointment. The decision to grant tenure in is inherently and inescapably judgmental and is a deliberate action indicating the person has been selected as a member of the permanent faculty because of demonstrated high-quality performance and relative merit” (Faculty Handbook, section 3.7.2). To be qualified to receive tenure in the Marketing Department, the faculty member must have demonstrated sustained effectiveness in teaching, peer-reviewed scholarship, research, and service toward the fulfillment of the University mission and COB and MKT Goals and objectives. “Sustained effectiveness” to qualify for tenure in the Marketing Department means that the faculty member clearly demonstrates above average performance in teaching or research, and expected performance in service. It also means consistent annual performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

Applicants for tenure and/or promotion should prepare their materials using a matrix according to the guidelines and forms required from the Provost’s office. The Provost’s office requests that the applicant place the departmental guidelines required for tenure and/or promotion on one side of the matrix, and how the applicant has met those requirements on the other side. Thus, it provides reviewers in the Provost’s office with an overall comparison. Tenure track faculty should begin this process with their first annual review, and add materials each year to show steady progress toward meeting tenure and promotion requirements.

The application for promotion shall not preclude the regular yearly review. Evaluations will be based upon departmental statements of expectations provided to faculty upon employment, regular yearly reviews and documentation presented by the candidate. They will be evaluated according to performance in present rank. New faculty members should have a copy of these guidelines made available to them within the first month of their arrival on campus.

External reviewers from comparable institutions will evaluate the research of tenure track faculty applying for tenure and promotion. The applicant and the department head should meet during the spring semester before the applicant turns in all application materials in the fall semester. The faculty member and the department head will select four external reviewers collaboratively. The list of reviewers will be submitted to the Dean who will certify that the selection process has followed guidelines. The department head will contact the reviewers early in the process to encourage reviewers to agree to complete the reviews as quickly as possible. Candidate materials will be made available to the external reviewers by the department head, who will also track the receipt of the reviews. The reviews will be available to the departmental personnel committee and the department head, Dean and Provost. Reviews will be available to the applicant only if approved by the external reviewer(s). (See Section 4.8.2.2 of the Faculty Handbook)

The departmental Personnel Committee shall evaluate each applicant separately for tenure and/or promotion. It is expected, unless unusual circumstances occur, that if an Assistant Professor is deemed acceptable for tenure, he or she should also be worthy of promotion to Associate Professor. The committee will submit a separate evaluation form to the department head regarding the recommendation for or against promotion or tenure and the rationale behind its decision per the following evaluation criteria:

TENURE: Above average performance in teaching or research, and expected performance in the other two.

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR: Above average performance in teaching or research, and expected performance in the other two.

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR: Outstanding performance in teaching or research and above average performance in the other two.

PROMOTION TO DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR: The Faculty Handbook, Section 3.3.4 gives explicit criteria for this rank.

C. Criteria for Non-Tenured Instructors to become a Senior Instructor

APPOINTMENT TO SENIOR INSTRUCTOR: The Faculty Handbook Section 3.5.2 provides explicit criteria for this rank. “An Instructor who has demonstrated excellence in teaching and service for at least five years (not necessarily consecutive) may be appointed as a Senior Instructor. Senior Instructors are expected to provide leadership in teaching, contribute to course and curriculum development, and provide appropriate university service. Senior Instructors may participate in Research. A Senior Instructor shall be appointed to a specific term not to exceed five years and may be reappointed to one or more additional terms, contingent upon satisfactory performance reviews, educational needs and continued funding. A Senior Instructor who is reappointed will be reappointed at that rank.” (Section 3.5.2 of the Faculty Handbook)

The criteria for reviewing applications for appointment to Senior Instructor are presented below. Note that appointment to Senior Instructor in the Marketing Department requires applicants to demonstrate acceptable performance in all three areas: teaching, research, and service. The differences between appointment to Senior Instructor and promotion to the professorial ranks are twofold. First, appointment to Senior Instructor does not require a terminal degree, as is the case for promotion in 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. Instructor and Senior Instructor appointments are non-tenure track positions.

The existing departmental promotion committee will submit recommendations to the Department Head in accord with the timelines specified in the Tenure and Promotion Calendar. The Department Head will review all relevant information and make a recommendation to the Dean who will also conduct a review and forward 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 will be responsible for initiating the personnel action forms

designating the promotion, and the accompanying salary increase.

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

Instructors are eligible to apply for appointment to Senior Instructor in the fall semester of their 5th year of employment with the University. 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 criteria developed in accord with the faculty handbook and university parameters.

Specific criteria for promotion to Senior Instructor are presented below:

All COB Faculty members, including Instructors, are evaluated annually using approved departmental guidelines. The criteria for appointment 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 appointment to Senior Instructor are based on the needs of the department as related to the new AACSB classification system.

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

The departmental committee will refer to departmental guidelines and requirements in regard to the assignment of the ratings (satisfactory, questionable, and unsatisfactory performance) consistent with university yearly performance ratings. It is also extremely important that faculty consult the latest College of Business Policy Manual regarding the maintenance of Faculty Qualifications and Engagement, in one of the four AACSB faculty classifications to which they are classified. Tenured or tenure-track faculty in the Marketing Department should generally be considered Scholarly academics (SA). Specific items are mentioned in the COB Policy Manual.

## **VI. COB Guidelines for Teaching, Scholarly Research, and Service Activities**

**The latest version of the University and General COB Faculty Evaluation Guidelines for teaching, research, service and merit will be followed in the evaluation of faculty.**

The following departmental guidelines are supplied to help further define the activities suggested in the University and COB Faculty Evaluation Guidelines as related to teaching, research, and service. Faculty should also look to incorporate the three pillars of the University's Public Affairs Mission (Ethical Leadership, Community Engagement, and Cultural Competence) in their teaching, research, and service activities wherever possible.

### **A. Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness**

Teaching is among the most important responsibilities of any institution of higher education. Our goal is to develop educated persons (Faculty Handbook section 4.2.1.2). Evaluating and improving on this activity is an ongoing and critical function of faculty and administration. Teaching effectiveness must be taken seriously with review and evaluation occurring on many levels. The attributes considered to be indicative of effective teaching vary among individuals and across disciplines.

#### **1. Approaches to Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness:**

The department recognizes that teaching effectiveness cannot be measured in isolation. It is related to the total workload of professors and must be looked at from the totality of what it means to be a member of the faculty.

It is the unanimous recommendation of the department that a reasonable period of time be used in assessing a faculty member's teaching effectiveness. For faculty members in their first years, limited teaching assessment information is available. However, as they are evaluated over multiple semesters, trends emerge and evaluations of teaching effectiveness become more useful.

The department also recognizes that there are measures of teaching effectiveness that may be valid at one level of analysis and invalid at another. For example, accreditation and professional certification may be valid in determining the effectiveness of a program or department but questionable in measuring effectiveness of an individual professor. Employer and alumni surveys provide another example of program assessment that probably should be avoided as a measure of teaching effectiveness of individual professors.

The department also believes that multiple methods of measuring teaching effectiveness of individual faculty members are desirable. The department recognizes that different measures assess different aspects of teaching effectiveness and that each has advantages and

disadvantages. Outlines of six approaches for a faculty member to prepare in the evaluation of their teaching effectiveness are provided below. The approaches should not be viewed as some minimum checklist. Instead, it is the department's intent to provide examples of approaches that might be used, factors of teaching effectiveness that each approach might measure, and factors for which the approaches might be less appropriate than other approaches. Effective classroom teaching performance and overall quality instructional effort are essential conditions to be demonstrated for reappointment, promotion and tenure.

## **2. Approaches:**

### **a. Self-Evaluation** (May also be peer reviewed)

#### Examples:

Portfolios

Narratives about approaches, philosophy, innovations, etc.

Periodic (semester, annual, three-year, etc.) summary of teaching effectiveness.

Periodic (semester, annual, three-year, etc.) plan for subsequent courses.

Course materials (syllabi, policy statements, samples of assigned work, projects, sample of exams).

Representative samples of work turned in by students.

Evidence of significant course or curriculum development.

Instructional methods (including instructional technology).

Summary of field-based learning experiences (practice, student teaching, internships, field work, service learning).

Promoting appreciation for diversity

Computer based instruction.

On-line course information.

Laboratory materials.

Summary of individual student projects supervised (special reading courses, honor components, etc.).

Summary of graduate student seminars and theses supervised.

#### Possible Factors of Teaching Effectiveness to Evaluate:

Organization of courses

Clarity of goals, procedures and expectations

Appropriateness of contents to curricular objectives

Increasing students involvement in Study Away programs and Co-op programs

Incorporating ethical decision-making and international dimensions in course coverage

Incorporating Service Learning credit into courses

Being prepared

Rigor of courses

Knowledge of discipline

Extent of student involvement

Fairness of policies  
Number of preparation over period of time  
Ability to express things clearly in writing  
Respect for students  
Interest and action toward improvement of teaching  
Use of instructional technology  
Course development activities

Self-Evaluation should not be used to evaluate:

Oral communication skills  
Enthusias

**b. Student Evaluation of Instruction:**

Examples:

Positive student evaluations  
Ratings on various items/dimensions (standardized form or forms)  
Written comments  
Documented student interviews, individual or group between faculty and/or administration

Possible Factors of Teaching Effectiveness to Evaluate:

Clarity of learning objectives and expectations  
Organization of course  
Relationship between exams/assignments and course objectives and content  
Presentation skills  
Ability to present material clearly  
Availability to assist students  
Willingness to assist students  
Fairness of applying policies  
Respect for students  
Faculty member's efforts to motivate and involve students  
Encouragement of questions/comments from students  
Willingness to provide adequate and timely feedback to students (including returning assignments and exams in a timely manner).

Student evaluations should not be used to evaluate:

Professors' knowledge of subject matter  
Faculty members' competence or course rigor

### **c. Peer Evaluation**

Classroom visits and observation  
Review of portfolio (see self-evaluation)  
Review of course materials  
Review of videotapes of class presentations  
Scholarship of teaching (publications and presentations)  
Research in subject (as a measure of currency and knowledge)

#### Possible Factors of Teaching Effectiveness to Evaluate:

Knowledge of subject matter  
Use of appropriate methods and instructional support  
Rigor of course  
Presentation skills (if observing)  
Non-verbal communication skills  
Organization of class materials  
Appropriateness of content  
Faculty members' responsiveness to student needs  
Appropriateness of reading materials, text and exams

#### Peer evaluation should Not be Used to Evaluate:

Being prepared  
Availability and willingness to assist students  
Clear expectations  
Enthusiasm  
Fairness

### **d. Learning Outcome Measures:**

#### Examples:

Standardized testing (when and where available)  
MFAT or similar nationally normed exams (for program assessment only)  
Pattern of final grade distribution (used in appropriate context)  
Students' performance on group final  
Students' performance on field-based instruction (for program assessment only)

#### Possible Factors of Teaching Effectiveness to Evaluate:

Factors of knowledge, information, and/or skills to be gained by the students.

#### Learning Outcomes Measures should Not Be Used to Evaluate:

Any factor other than factors of knowledge, information, and/or skills gained by the students

**e. Alumni and/or Employer Feedback FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION ONLY:**

Examples:

Surveys  
Focus groups  
Interviews

Possible Factors of Teaching Effectiveness to Evaluate:

Relevance of course/program content to later situations  
Development of personal growth, values, etc.  
Courses in program that benefited most  
Suggested changes in program  
Areas of deficit in courses, programs, or those graduating from the program.

*Alumni or Employer Feedback Should Not Be Used to Evaluate:*

Teaching effectiveness of individual faculty member

**f. Administrator Evaluation:** (Primarily department head)

Possible Factors of Teaching Effectiveness to Evaluate:

Availability to students  
Participation in curricular development  
Appropriate use of instructional technology

***3. Recommended Evaluation Procedures/Expectations (In accord with Faculty Senate Action 18-97/98 adopted 2/12/98):***

The department is responsible for preparing procedures for evaluating teaching effectiveness for teaching faculty in the department in accordance with the University and COB rules and procedures.

The department should be explicit about what factors of teaching effectiveness are to be measured and how these are to be assessed. This information shall be communicated to all faculty members.

The department should review procedures used to measure teaching effectiveness at least every three years.

The department should avoid using a single approach to evaluating teaching effectiveness. It is recommended that student evaluation of instruction be one of the approaches used. Student evaluation, however, should be used with other appropriate approaches.

Direct comparisons or rankings of faculty between departments should be avoided; although, teaching instrument scores, from departments in the same college using a common evaluation instrument, can be useful.

If statistical data are used in assessing teaching effectiveness, some understanding of statistical analysis is expected of those doing the assessment.

Evaluation should be made within the context of general type and nature of course (graduate, general education, upper division, etc.)

For tenure and promotion decisions, College committees, Deans and the Provost should honor the recommendations of the department and department head in all but the most unusual circumstances. This requires rigorous evaluation by the Department Personnel Committee and the department head.

The numerical ratings on the student evaluation forms are an important source of information. However, student evaluations will not be considered as the only factor in judging teaching effectiveness. According to the Faculty Handbook, student teaching evaluations can only be used for a maximum of 50 percent of the weight of evaluation in the area of teaching.

There is evidence that student ratings are influenced by extraneous factors, although the main influence seems to be the teacher's performance on a variety of dimensions. 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 in view of the trichotomy ratings, the average rating for that course, the number of students, and the level of students.

In summation, 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. Examples include, but are not limited to:

1. Courses taught: undergraduate or graduate, number of students enrolled, student credit hours, new course preparations, number of preparations per semester.
2. Other teaching activities: guest lecturers, number of independent readings, and other teaching activities.

3. Directing a master's thesis as chairperson or as a significant advisor.
4. Activities to improve teaching: new teaching methods, professional upgrading (participation in workshops, institutes, seminars, conferences, educational trips, pedagogical reading and research, etc.).
5. Activities to improve curriculum: revision of existing courses, development of new courses, preparation of materials to integrate new equipment or software into existing courses.
6. Development of other teaching related materials.
7. Student evaluations of teaching: summary scores from college standard course evaluation form (course rating, instructor rating, and interest in course).
8. Peer evaluations of teaching methods and materials, course syllabi or policy statements, examinations, students' written assignments, handouts, presentation skills.
9. Teaching awards, honors, recognition by student organizations, etc.

NOTE: For criteria purposes, directing a master's thesis may be EITHER under Teaching or Service Activities depending on the situation, but not under both.

10. Academic advising: number of advisees, willingness to assist students, etc. The Marketing Department, as a unit of the College of Business, employs the services of the Business Advisement Center for student class scheduling and individual student learning plans. While no individual students are specifically assigned to Marketing Faculty, faculty often provide extra guidance and counseling to students as needed.
11. Publications of textbooks, cases, or other pedagogical material.

NOTE: 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.

Reprint(s) of publications should not count as additional articles or publications but can be used as general evidence of well-recognized contribution to the field.

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

The following items are examples (not exhaustive) of what should be considered in judging a faculty member's scholarly endeavors: 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 candidate must indicate the percentage of contribution he or she made to each publication having multiple authors, and the impact factor associated with the publication outlet. Additionally, the burden is on the candidate to supply documentation supporting assessment of quality of scholarship. The "Marketing Department Guidelines" provide additional assignments of items for numerical point values.

1. Publication of articles in national peer-reviewed journals, regional peer-reviewed journals and non-peer-reviewed journals. The minimum publication expectation for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor in the Marketing Department is six to twelve quality peer-reviewed articles in six years. An additional six to twelve quality peer-reviewed articles are minimally required for promotion to Full Professor in the Marketing Department. The department Personnel Committee should determine the individual and overall quality of the articles, based upon published journal impact factors (i.e. Cabell's CCI), acceptance rates, and other quality measures. Non-peer-reviewed articles are not considered in the promotion and tenure decision.
2. Publication of a 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, philanthropic organizations, and non-peer-reviewed articles.
7. Reprints of articles previously published in edited books or in peer-review journals.
8. Presentation of papers at state, regional, national, and international professional meetings that 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.

### **Ranking of Marketing Department Journals**

The department has determined that academic journals are to be considered within the category of “elite,” “A,” “B,” or “C”. Other consideration should be given to publications rated in one of the top 10 journals in the overall field of business. Should a faculty member publish a manuscript in one of these “elite” journals, the faculty member should be duly rewarded. Given that it may require a review process of two years or more to publish in one of these elite journals, the reward should include recognition and/or a monetary award if funds are available. Other journals may be considered for the “elite” category with proper documentation, such as the “Ranking of Marketing Journals” published by the *Academy of Marketing Science*, or from other credible sources.

Journal quality for merit evaluation purposes should be examined from the perspective of 1) overall reputation and journal quality (it is the faculty member’s responsibility to support quality claims), and 2) whether the journal was sole-authored or co-authored. Each faculty member should indicate his or her percentage of contribution to the article. Legitimate exceptions may exist, and those should be presented, documented, and explained. Sole authored articles should be valued more than multiple authored manuscripts. Equally, an article with two authors should be valued higher than a journal with three authors. Lead authorship on a manuscript might also be considered more valuable than being second or third authors. Each of the previous situations assume the articles have been published in journals with similar quality levels. While it is an important collegial approach for tenured faculty to help new faculty through co-authoring efforts, it is also important that new faculty be able to demonstrate their ability to publish independently. Finally, 3) the number of articles a faculty member has at the end of a reporting period, along with the number of co-authors in those articles, and the quality of the published journals, should be used to rank each faculty members research efforts in their respective departments. Articles that develop and empirically test new theory should be rated as higher quality than articles which simply reflect a position statement by the author(s). So called “weekend articles” and journals published in very low quality publications, as well as “pay-to-publish” journals, are to be avoided. The number of unique references cited in the manuscript may also be helpful in determining article quality. Faculty are encouraged to publish in a variety of journals requiring various levels of difficulty; including those requiring theory development, empirical theory testing, applications of theory, and other suitable outlets. A blended strategy is important. The

full article copied from the journal, should be included with the tenure, promotion and merit applications. Faculty members should clarify their total contributions to each article.

Books provide prestige to the University and to the College of Business. In some cases, students have actually chosen Missouri State University because COB faculty authored major manuscripts and textbooks. Therefore, the existing merit guidelines regarding the value of books for merit should be honored. Proceedings and presentations of faculty are also important research efforts, although their value must be tempered by the value placed on them by AACSB. Journal articles are clearly more valuable to COB in maintaining AACSB accreditation, and therefore should be more valuable than proceedings and presentations for merit purposes. To remain a Scholarly Academic (SA) each year, a faculty member must have at least three refereed quality journals in five years on a rolling average basis. Exceptions exist for new faculty who in their first year are just starting their research activities. Other faculty members are not to wait until the last year before reaccreditation to publish two quick journal articles. Research and publishing in quality journals, whether faculty members are tenured or untenured, should be an ongoing activity for all faculty members. Failure to remain SA will result in tenured faculty members losing any reduced teaching load benefits (9hrs). They will be required to teach a full load of (12hrs) and they will be disallowed from teaching in the summer sessions, eMBA, and China programs until the faculty member is again SA qualified. Any faculty member who is not considered SA will be required to present a written plan of how they will become SA within a reasonable time frame.

Major research grants received by faculty members must also be considered for merit purposes. If the faculty member receives significant release time (a sabbatical leave) or a large monetary stipend, this information must be presented in his or her merit application. Such grants should also result in significant future publications.

### **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 or committees, or on behalf of local, regional, national, or international professional or community organizations. Provision of a list of committee memberships is not sufficient for “expected” service. Candidates must list specific contributions (i.e. offices held, specific time commitments, and other levels of involvement) that demonstrate significant and meaningful service. Activities to be considered include the following examples:

1. Membership and elected office, or other position of leadership held in professional organizations(s) (for example, committee membership, chairing, etc.).
2. Special assignments for professional organizations; for example, directing seminars, conducting 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 department, college or University committees or task forces.
7. Involvement in student organizations that demonstrates significant contribution to the success of the student organization.
8. Teaching courses or seminars through the Continuing Education Program, Center for Business and Economic Development, or any other University sponsored seminar.
9. Directing a master's thesis as chairman or as a significant advisor.
10. Special university, college, or department assignments deemed significant.
11. Community, regional, state, and national activities deemed significant.
12. Other meaningful and significant professional activity.

#### **D. Standards for Evaluation**

The evaluation plans describe the standards that are appropriate for each of the areas to be evaluated (teaching, research and service). It is the applicant's responsibility to provide evidence of the peer-review or refereed process for all publications and to substantiate rationale for achievement in each of the areas of teaching, research and service as *level 1, level 2, level 3, level 4, or level 5*, as defined in the Merit Calculations Forms found at the end of this document.

The policy defining procedure for review of the department for evaluation purposes will be reviewed annually by departmental faculty.

Faculty will be reviewed annually, but tenured faculty can elect to be evaluated on an average of the past two years. The annual review (merit/compensation) will also be used as the annual performance review for faculty.

Weights must also be assigned to each faculty member with regard to teaching, research and service. The past history in Marketing, for the regular tenure track faculty member, has been to place equal emphasis on teaching and research with lesser emphasis on service. This approach was necessary for COB to acquire and maintain AACSB accreditation. Our emphasis is in harmony with the mission for a master's level school. Smaller unaccredited programs would have a higher weighting on teaching and the doctoral granting schools would have higher weighting on research. Therefore, our future emphasis for the traditional tenure track or tenured

faculty member needs to be in the historical Marketing Department format. The expected norm for the Marketing faculty member is nine credits of teaching per semester, plus scholarly activity resulting in a minimum of three quality peer reviewed journals every five years evaluated on a yearly basis, plus service activity as appropriate. Non-tenured, tenure-track faculty should be publishing more as described Section B. – Research and Scholarly Activity on page 3 of this document. Please note that current AACSB standards require each department to have 90 percent of the faculty be Scholarly Academics (SA), Practice Academics (PA), or Scholarly Practitioners (SP). Tenured faculty must maintain Scholarly Academic (SA) status. The above expectations and output meet the requirements for accreditation purposes. However, it is important to note that there are exceptions to the normal requirements based upon reassigned time for special circumstances (grant buy-outs, director of graduate programs, special projects, auditorium classes, etc.). Therefore, during the annual review, the department head discusses with each faculty member the expectations of weights on teaching, research and service for the coming year. So as to ensure equitable treatment across the College, significant variances must be approved by the department head and the dean.

The merit process involves each individual faculty member deciding, with their respective department head's support, what percentages of their efforts they want to be measured in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The University guidelines provide some flexibility regarding each of the three areas as long as they total 100 percent. For any one reporting year for tenure track faculty, teaching effort may be negotiated from 35 to 50 percent, research from 40 to 60 percent, and service from 10 to 20 percent of an individual's yearly evaluation. For Instructors, the percentage of effort can range from 80 to 90 percent for teaching, from 0 to 10 percent for research, and from 10 to 20 percent for service. It is also important to recognize that for COB to maintain AACSB accreditation, all faculty members must contribute in the area of research. This is an especially important consideration, given that AACSB accreditation requires that 90 percent of all COB faculty members must be considered Scholarly Academics (SA), Practice Academics (PA), or Scholarly Practitioners (SP). Marketing faculty holding Ph.D.s should be Scholarly Academics (SA). This requirement includes both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty. To be Scholarly Academic (SA) qualified, tenure track faculty must have a doctorate in their discipline of instruction and have authored at least three quality refereed journal articles over the past five years. Instructional Practitioners (IP) faculty must have relevant professional experience related to their area of instruction and should have some scholarly activity within the past five years. Every faculty member should contribute to reaching the 90 percent faculty-qualification requirement.

**Note:** To maintain AACSB International accreditation, a performance ratio of 40/40/20 is the general standard weighting required of tenure track, Scholarly Academic, ranked Marketing faculty to maintain a minimum level of general production in teaching (40), scholarly activity/research (40) and service (20). However, in those circumstances where significant additional activity is requested, then this ratio can be altered for tenure-track full time faculty. For example, those teaching a 12-hour load could be considered for a 50/30/20 performance index. For Instructors teaching a four-course large enrollment load, they might in some circumstances have a ratio of teaching, research and service of 70/20/10, depending on the needs of accreditation standards and other requirements.

Regardless, these ratios need to be discussed in advance with and approved by the department head the year before evaluation.

---

## MARKETING DEPARTMENT GUIDELINES FOR MERIT

The guidelines approved by the Marketing Department will be used annually as a basis for evaluating the performance of the department's faculty members. The resulting performance ratings from all departments will then be used by COB to determine annual compensation increases for all COB faculty members, when funds are available. If merit funds are not available (salary increase pool is less than 2 percent), a shortened spreadsheet form will be made available to simplify the recording of each faculty member's achievements as shown below. Tenure-track, untenured faculty should also prepare full documentation for tenure progress evaluations by the personnel committee, department head and dean. It is important to note that the shortened spreadsheet form is still employed as part of the University's evaluation procedures previously discussed. These materials can be valuable in future years where merit monies are available. Note that the performance evaluations also may provide an indication of progress by probationary faculty; however, distinctly different guidelines exist for tenure and promotion decisions. Therefore, it should be understood that performance evaluated as competent for compensation purposes is not sufficient for tenure and promotion. The tenure and promotion guidelines will be the basis for determining tenure and/or promotion.

The guidelines found in this document pertain to two classes of faculty in the Marketing Department: tenure-track faculty and full-time non-tenure-track lecturers. Primary consideration is given to tenure track faculty, but where expectations differ for non-tenure track lecturers such differences are noted.

Faculty must understand that the merit system not only requires a measurement of the **quantity** of a faculty member's performance, but also must include an examination of the **quality** of a faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service. It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide both the list of items that they want considered for merit, and to provide supporting material, referenced to the specific areas of teaching, research, and service. Specific merit subjects should be referenced in bullet format in the main merit summary document with supporting documentation attached as an appendix.

Another important consideration is that all COB faculty members must realize and understand that the existing merit system is based on a forced distribution system. This forced distribution system was designed and formulated by the University Compensation Committee, not the College of Business. The University Compensation Committee determined that approximately 15 percent of the faculty should be in the top ranking of a level 5, that approximately 35 percent of the faculty should be in the next highest ranking of a level 4, and that approximately 50 percent of the faculty should be considered average in the level 3 category. The fact that the current system artificially forces approximately half of the faculty into the "average" category is potentially problematic regarding faculty motivation and collegiality.



lecturers, research and publication may substitute for maintenance of professional qualification. Other than this difference, expectations are similar. Importantly, expectations for teaching competence do not differ from those of tenured or tenure-track faculty. In addition, full-time lecturers should expect to perform service. The remainder of this document provides specific guidance as to what may constitute meritorious performance by Marketing.

### **Teaching Evaluations**

*Specific factors for assessing teaching are based on Appendix B of the Final Report of the President's 2006 Compensation Committee, and Section 4.2.1.2 of the current Faculty Handbook.* It offers structure beneficial for AACSB accreditation purposes. Additional factors are influenced by AACSB accreditation standards as well as other positions taken by professional bodies with strong interest in business education.

Evaluation factors are categorized into four dimensions recommended by *the President's 2006 Compensation Committee*. Possible sources of documentation for a faculty member claiming success on a specific factor are provided in parenthesis after the description of the factor. Where the suggested documentation indicates self-reporting and no other specification is provided, a faculty member should use judgment in supplying appropriate and persuasive support for the claim. Factors other than those listed below may be claimed, but as is the case with all factors claimed, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide documentation in support of those claims. Note that it is not necessary for a faculty member to achieve success on all factors to receive a high ranking in teaching. Furthermore, accommodation is made for faculty to rely more heavily on student evaluations, although not exclusively, or to rely more heavily on factors other than student evaluations, although also not exclusively.

It is again the faculty members' responsibility to provide both the item for merit consideration and its supporting documentation. The overall teaching score does provide an excellent measurement of how the faculty member is perceived by students in the classroom, and as such must be incorporated into the overall evaluation. No matter how rigorous an instructor or professor is in the classroom, they still must present the material to the student in a clear and interesting manner. Good teaching is more than just covering the material.

### **Determination of Teaching Performance Levels**

The following point system was designed by the Marketing Department Personnel Committee to quantify the achievements of faculty in the area of teaching.

There are two components to the teaching evaluation: student evaluation scores and additional teaching factors. When combined, an overall teaching merit level will be determined for a **one year** time period. The following point system was designed by the Marketing Department Personnel Committee to quantify the additional teaching factors component over a **one year** time period.

Note: According the MSU administration, these are the minimums required to reach each possible merit level, they do not guarantee the faculty member will receive this level of merit.

<b>TEACHING MERIT LEVEL (Note: A single activity can be counted only once within and across categories, i.e. Teaching, Research, or Service.)</b>			
<b>Student Evaluation Score Merit Level</b>	<b>Semester</b>	<b>Courses</b>	<b>Your Student Evaluation Score</b>
	<b>Spring 2012</b>	(1)	
		(2)	
	<b>Fall 2012</b>	(3)	
		(4)	
<b>Average = (<math>\sum</math> Student Evaluation Scores) / 4</b>			
<b>Teaching Merit Level (1) (based on Average Student Evaluation Scores)</b>		<b>Level 5: <math>\geq 4.2</math></b> <b>Level 4: 4.0 to <math>&lt;4.2</math></b> <b>Level 3: 3.75 to <math>&lt;4.0</math></b> <b>Level 2: <math>&lt;3.75</math></b> <b>Level 1:</b>	<b>Teaching Merit Level (1) (Circle One)</b> <b>5 4 3 2 1</b>
<b>Additional Teaching Factors Merit Level</b>	<b>During the past ONE (1) year, I taught, attended, received, or complied with, or my courses involved</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Your Points</b>
Class Preparations	At least 3 different course preparations (courses must have substantially different content).	2	
Class Size	Section enrollment of at least 50 (after drop/add).	3	
Distance Learning	Distance learning sections.	3	
Field Trips/Community Service	Course related field trips or community service activities.	2	
Grading Exams/Written Materials	Personal grading of student written materials or exams (other than Scantron grading).	2	
Graduate Teaching	Graduate classes.	3	

Grants	An external/internal grant related to teaching.	4	
	Submitted an external/internal grant related to teaching.	1	
Guest Speakers	Course related guest speakers.	1	
New Preparations	New course preparation.	1	
Night class	Night class section.	1	
Public Affairs Mission/Service Learning	Incorporation of a public affairs/service learning component.	2	
Reporting Requirements	Timely reporting of items such as grades, student attendance and final exam scheduling.	1	
Student Competition	Supervision of students in outside, discipline related competition.	2	
Student Projects	Supervision and grading of student class projects (oral/written).	1	
Supervision of Graduate Thesis/ Independent Study/Student Internship	Supervision of graduate thesis, undergraduate independent study project, or student internship.	2	
Syllabi/Policy Statements	Syllabi and/or course policy statements that meet all departmental/college/university guidelines.	1	
Teaching Award/Student Recognition	National teaching award.	4	
	National student, discipline related, competition 1 <sup>st</sup> -3 <sup>rd</sup> place award.	5	
	University teaching award.	4	
	Other student recognition for teaching	1	
Teaching Improvement	Meetings, seminars or conferences or take courses to improve course delivery or design skills.	1	
Technology in the Classroom	Use of technology in the classroom (Internet based instruction, statistical software, Blackboard, Photoshop, Illustrator, etc.).	3	
Trichotomy	Trichotomy 3 sections.	3	

Other	Other teaching activities not listed above but deemed worthy of consideration by the Marketing Department Personnel Committee. (Please provide documentation.)		
	<b>Total Points</b>		
<b>Teaching Merit Level (2) (based on Total Points)</b>	<b>Level 5: &gt;8</b> <b>Level 4: 6-8</b> <b>Level 3: 2-5</b> <b>Level 2: &lt;2</b> <b>Level 1:</b>	<b>Teaching Merit Level (2) (Circle One)</b>	<b>5 4 3 2 1</b>
<b>Teaching Merit Level Average</b>	<b>Average = (Teaching Merit Level (1) + Teaching Merit Level (2)) / 2</b>		<b>Teaching Merit Level Average</b>

## **Research/Scholarly Productivity Evaluation**

Scholarly activities take many and varied forms. Objective and fair evaluation of an individual's research and scholarly activities requires consideration of the quality, quantity, and nature of outlets for dissemination of research. Research may involve four different modes of scholarship: scholarship of discovery (original research), scholarship of integration (review and integration of prior research), scholarship of application (application of current knowledge and innovations to important practices), and scholarship of teaching (involving students in research and the process of inquiry and discovery). The University Compensation Committee left to the Department/School and College exact dimensions for research evaluation. Section 4.2.2.2 of the Faculty Handbook offers additional overall criteria for evaluating research regardless of the category of scholarship involved. These overall criteria are incorporated into COB guidelines. In addition, the College is motivated by AACSB accreditation requirements, and as a consequence, the College requires that all tenure-track faculty members engage in some mode of scholarship and publish in acceptable outlets, primarily peer-reviewed journals. Such research should expand knowledge and/or demonstrate growth in one or more area of expertise. All categories or modes of scholarship are acceptable.

Evaluation of faculty research performance follows the general guidelines of the University. Within those guidelines, however, COB believes that fair evaluation must recognize that publication in some outlets brings more prestige to COB and that some kinds of research take longer to complete. On the other hand, faculty members should recognize that MSU does not offer a doctoral program in business or accounting and that the scholarship of integration and the scholarship of application in general are more appropriate to COB's mission than some forms of the scholarship of discovery. Although COB does not wish to discourage the scholarship of discovery, faculty members should be aware that in general, most forms of the scholarship of discovery require more time to complete than most forms of the scholarship of application or integration, and that any additional credit given for the scholarship of discovery relative to that given for the scholarship of application or integration may not fully reflect the time differential. Outcomes from research and scholarly activity follow.

### **Determination of Research/Scholarly Productivity Performance Levels**

The following point system was designed by the Marketing Department Personnel Committee to quantify the achievements of faculty in the area of research over a **two year** time period.

Note: According to the MSU administration, these are the minimums required to reach each possible merit level, although they do not guarantee the faculty member will receive this level of merit.

**RESEARCH MERIT LEVEL (Note: A single activity can be counted only once within and across categories, i.e. Teaching, Research, or Service.)**

<b>Research Factors by Number of Authors</b>	<b>During the past TWO (2) years, I published, received, submitted, or presented</b>	<b>Points per occurrence</b>	<b>Your Points</b>
<b>One Author</b>	Elite level journal.	15	
	First edition text.	10	
	A level journal.	10	
	Grant >=\$100,000 (appropriate external/internal funding).	10	
	2 <sup>nd</sup> (or greater) edition text.	8	
	B level journal.	8	
	Grant \$20,000-\$99,999 (appropriate external/internal funding).	8	
	A level proceedings.	6	
	National recognition for research including national best paper award.	6	
	C level journal.	3	
	Grant \$1,000-\$19,999 (appropriate external/internal funding).	3	
	Book (1 <sup>st</sup> edition) related to field.	3	
	Invited Presentation (no proceedings).	2	
	Software (non-compensated).	2	
	Other proceedings including abstracts.	2	
	COB best paper award.	2	

	Paper submitted to level B or above journal/submitted a grant (not reported as published/accepted/funded).	1	
	Reprinted article.	1	
	Chapter contributed to a text (first edition/discipline relevant).	1	
<b>Two or Three Authors</b>	Elite level journal.	12	
	First edition text.	8	
	A level journal.	8	
	Grant >\$100,000 (appropriate external/internal funding).	8	
	2 <sup>nd</sup> (or greater) edition text.	6	
	B level journal.	6	
	Grant \$20,000-\$99,000 (appropriate external/internal funding).	6	
	A level proceedings.	4	
	National recognition for research including national best paper award.	4	
	C level journal.	2	
	Grant \$1,000-\$19,999 (appropriate external/internal funding).	2	
	Book (1 <sup>st</sup> edition) related to field.	2	
	Invited Presentation (no proceedings).	1	
	Software (non-compensated).	1	
Other proceedings including abstracts.	1		

	COBA best paper award	1	
	Paper submitted to level B or above journal/submitted a grant (not reported as published/accepted/funded).	.7	
	Reprinted article.	.7	
	Chapter contributed to a text (first edition/discipline relevant).	.7	
<b>Four or More Authors</b>	Elite level journal.	7	
	First edition text.	4	
	A level journal.	4	
	Grant >\$100,000 (appropriate external/internal funding).	4	
	2 <sup>nd</sup> (or greater) edition text.	3	
	B level journal.	3	
	Grant \$20,000-\$99,000 (appropriate external/internal funding).	3	
	A level proceedings.	2	
	National recognition for research including national best paper award.	2	
	C level journal.	1	
	Grant \$1,000-\$19,999 (appropriate external/internal funding).	1	
	Book (1 <sup>st</sup> edition) related to field.	1	
	Invited Presentation (no proceedings).	.5	
	Software (non-compensated).	.5	

	Other proceedings including abstracts.	.5	
	COB best paper award.	.5	
	Paper submitted to level B or above journal/submitted a grant (not reported as published/accepted/funded).	.2	
	Reprinted article.	.2	
	Chapter contributed to a text (first edition/discipline relevant).	.2	
<b>Other Research Factors</b>	University research award.	4	
	COB research award	2	
	Other research activities not listed above but deemed worthy of consideration by the Marketing Department Personnel Committee. (Please provide documentation.)		
	<b>Total Points for TWO (2) Years</b>		
<b>Research Merit Level (based on Total Points for TWO (2) Years)</b>	<b>Level 5: &gt;16 pts</b> <b>Level 4: 12-16 pts</b> <b>Level 3: 4-&lt;12 pts</b> <b>Level 2: &lt;4 pts</b> <b>Level 1:</b>	<b>Research Merit Level (Circle One)</b>	<b>5   4   3   2   1</b>

## Service Evaluation

Service should be looked at in two contexts. The first should be in the context of service to the University, COB, and the faculty member's department. The second component would include service outside the university (i.e. service to the community). This is an important aspect given Missouri State University's Public Affairs Mission. Service should be examined across the entire portfolio of any faculty member. It is expected that a vast majority of service claimed by a faculty member will be to the University, COB, and individual departments. At no time should service outside the University exceed or be provided at the expense of any service to the University, College, or Department. Professional service and professional consultation are valued by the University and should be encouraged. If a faculty member receives release time for a service activity, the amount of release time must be reported because this may become an assignment rather than a service activity. While we realize that service to the community of Springfield, the State of Missouri, and our Country is important; before any external service is considered for merit purposes, required service to the University, COB, and one's Department must be accomplished.

It is the faculty member's responsibility to document and support his or her case for merit in the area of service. It is suggested that faculty members maintain a service log to document meeting times and hours spent on service activities. It is also important for faculty members to recognize that work in professional organizations related to their disciplines is different than work provided in outside organizations similar to hobby activities.

## Determination of Service Performance Levels

The following point system was designed by the Marketing Department Personnel Committee to quantify the achievements of faculty in the area of service over a **one year** time period.

Note: According the MSU administration, these are the minimums required to reach each possible merit level, they do not guarantee the faculty member will receive this level of merit.

<b>SERVICE MERIT LEVEL (Note: A single activity can be counted only once within and across categories, i.e. Teaching, Research, or Service.)</b>			
<b>Service Factors</b>	<b>During the past ONE (1) year, I attended, served as, reviewed, completed, maintained, or received</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Your Points</b>
COB Meetings	The COB all faculty meeting.	1	
Commencement	At least one commencement.	1	
Department Meetings	All departmental meetings (unless excused by the Department Head).	1	
Professional Organization Membership	Membership in professional organization related to my discipline.	1	
Reports	All reports requested by Department Head/Dean/Provost in a timely manner.	1	
Student Organizations	Faculty advisor to a business student professional organization.	3	
		<b>Points per occurrence</b>	
Committees/Faculty Senate	A member of a University, COB, or departmental committee, or faculty senate.	2	
	A chairperson of University, COB, or departmental committee, or chair or chair elect of faculty senate.	3	
Professional Organizations	Board member or officer in a local professional organization related to my discipline.	1	
	Session chair or discussant	1	

	Track chair for a professional conference.	2	
	Board member or officer of a regional professional organization related to my discipline.	2	
	Board member or officer in a national professional organization related to my discipline.	3	
Research Related Service	Editor of a scholarly journal.	4	
	Member of a scholarly journal editorial review board.	2	
	Reviewer of manuscripts, books, cases, etc. related to my discipline.	1	
Other	University service award.	4	
	Other service activities not listed above but deemed worthy of consideration by the Marketing Department Personnel Committee. (Please provide documentation.)		
	<b>Total Points</b>		
<b>Service Merit Level (based on Total Points)</b>		<b>Level 5: &gt;8 pts</b> <b>Level 4: 6-8 pts</b> <b>Level 3: 2-5 pts</b> <b>Level 2: &lt;2 pts</b> <b>Level 1:</b>	<b>Service Merit Level (Circle One)</b> <b>5 4 3 2 1</b>

## **Determination of Overall Merit Level**

To determine a faculty member's overall merit level, a formula was designed by the Marketing Department Personnel Committee. The formula uses a faculty member's scaled and standardized merit levels to form a combined merit level. The scaled merit level is the weighted sum of a faculty member's scaled teaching, research, and service merit levels. The standardized merit level is the weighted sum of a faculty member's standardized teaching, research, and service merit levels; the COB mean and standard deviation are used to standardize teaching and the Marketing Department means and standard deviations are used to standardize research and service merit levels. The combined merit level is the sum of 75 percent of the scaled and 25 percent of the standardized merit levels. The combined merit level represents the final merit level recommended for the faculty member. (Note: A faculty member's standardized merit level cannot be calculated until the Marketing Department mean and standard deviation are determined.)

---

**Merit Levels: Scaled, Standardized, and Combined**

<b>Calculation of Scaled Merit Level (1 to 5 Scale) Using Teaching, Research, and Service Merit Levels and Personal Weights (e.g. .40, .40, .20)</b>									
<b>Teaching</b>			<b>Research</b>			<b>Service</b>			<b>Scaled Merit Level (1 to 5 Scale)</b>
Average Merit Level	Weight	(Merit Level)* (Wt)	Merit Level	Weight	(Merit Level)* (Wt)	Merit Level	Weight	(Merit Level)* (Wt)	
		<b>(1)*(2)</b>			<b>(4)*(5)</b>			<b>(7)*(8)</b>	<b>(3)+(6)+(9)</b>
<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(4)</b>	<b>(5)</b>	<b>(6)</b>	<b>(7)</b>	<b>(8)</b>	<b>(9)</b>	

<b>Calculation of Standardized Merit Level (1 to 5 Scale) Using Standardized Scores for Teaching, Research, and Service and Personal Weights (e.g. .40, .40, .20)</b>												
<b>Teaching</b>				<b>Research</b>				<b>Service</b>				<b>Total Standardized Merit Level (1 to 5 Scale)</b>
Student Evaluation		Additional Teaching Factors		Combined Standardized Score	Weighted Combined Standardized Score	Total Points	Standardized Score	Weighted Standardized Score	Total Points	Standardized Score	Weighted Standardized Score	
Score	Standardized Score	Total Points	Standardized Score									
	$\frac{((1) - 4.2)}{(\text{COBA Std Dev})}$		$\frac{((3) - \text{MKT Mean})}{(\text{MKT Std Dev})}$	$((2) * .5) + ((4) * .5)$	$(5) * \text{Wt}$		$\frac{((7) - \text{MKT Mean})}{(\text{MKT Std Dev})}$	$(8) * \text{Wt}$		$\frac{((10) - \text{MKT Mean})}{(\text{MKT Std Dev})}$	$(11) * \text{Wt}$	$\frac{(((6) + (9) + (12)) * .67) + 3}{1}$
<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(4)</b>	<b>(5)</b>	<b>(6)</b>	<b>(7)</b>	<b>(8)</b>	<b>(9)</b>	<b>(10)</b>	<b>(11)</b>	<b>(12)</b>	

<b>Calculation of Combined Merit Level (1 to 5 Scale) Using Teaching, Research, and Service Merit Levels and Personal Weights (e.g. .40, .40, .20)</b>		
<b>Scaled Merit Level</b>	<b>Total Standardized Merit Level</b>	<b>Combined Merit Level</b>
		$(\text{Scaled Merit Level} \times .75) + (\text{Total Standardized Merit Level} \times .25)$

## PERFORMANCE-BASED EQUITY ADJUSTMENTS

**Faculty written requests for equity adjustment:** In order for faculty members, including lecturers and faculty who hold administrative appointments, to receive consideration for a salary adjustment, they *MUST* submit a written request to their department head/director/supervisor.

Note: The committee recognizes that the *Faculty Handbook*, Section 2.10.1.4 (Equity Adjustments) says that faculty members *may* submit a request for an equity adjustment. After extensive deliberation, it is the recommendation of the Marketing Department that to be considered, any faculty member or staff member who wishes to be considered for a salary equity adjustment *must* submit a written request. This request should be a maximum of two pages and should include in outline form: **Teaching** – evaluation scores for the past three years and any supporting material; **Research** - Journal articles, co-authors (if any) and placement of articles and other scholarly research and/or supporting materials; **Service** – listed in chronological order.

### Guidelines Regarding Equity Adjustments

- I. *Performance should not be a determining factor in an equity adjustment.* While a record of satisfactory performance must be established as a qualification for eligibility, and though an individual may be denied an equity adjustment based on a record of unacceptable performance, the decision to award an equity adjustment should be based on the extent of the applicant’s current level of pay inequity.
- II. *The level of pay inequity can be based on compa ratio analysis or a similar process.* All academic areas have access to relevant labor market data that incorporates both rank and discipline. Within a college the same data base can be used for all faculty to provide an index that indicates both the pay level relative to market and the relative level of internal inequity. One frequently-used metric is a compa ratio comparison which is simply a ratio analysis of an individual’s current pay level relative to the market median for that individual’s rank and discipline. Consider the following examples:

Rank and Discipline	Current Pay	Market Median	Compa Ratio
professor, mech. engineering	\$76,000	\$89,000	.854
associate, mech. engineering	\$71,000	\$78,000	.910
assistant, mech. engineering	\$72,000	\$75,000	.960

- III. In this example all salaries are under market, but the professor of mech. engineering would be the most inequitably underpaid because she has the lowest compa ratio relative to market for rank and discipline.

- IV. The compa ratio analysis has the advantage of directly dealing with both internal and external equity issues simultaneously. External inequity issues are addressed because the direct market comparison yields a compa ratio that provides a ratio of an individual's salary relative to market. A compa ratio greater than 1.00 indicates a pay level above the market median, while any compa ratio below 1.00 indicates a pay level below market median -- the lower the compa ratio the greater the inequity relative to market. Internal inequities are addressed by comparing compa ratios across individuals. In our example above, although the professor has a pay level \$4,000 more than the assistant, the professor's compa ratio of .854 tells us she is about 15% below market median for her rank and discipline while the assistant's compa ratio of .96 tells us he is only 4% below market for his rank and discipline. Even though the assistant is paid less than the professor in actual dollars, he is still less under-paid than she.
- V. We recommend that no separate consideration be given to gender equity because these compa ratio comparisons will automatically favor the individual most underpaid, male or female. If females are paid less than males by rank and discipline it will be picked up in the compa ratio analysis and the lower compa ratio for female applicants will translate to a greater equity adjustment. If we do consider gender separately then we would also have to, by law, consider situations where men are paid less than women within rank and discipline.
- VI. We recommend that equity adjustments be made on an individual basis by rank and discipline. Differences across disciplines created by the operation of labor market forces should not be considered in the equity adjustment process. Attempting to alter the operation of the labor markets with an internal policy creates as much inequity as it remedies. The courts have long recognized in comparable cases that organizations can take the labor market as a given and have no responsibility to adjust internal pay relationships that reflect market rates.