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The purpose of this document is to describe the department expectations and procedures with regard to annual performance evaluation (Section 1), reappointment and tenure (Section 2), and promotion to professor (Section 3).

1. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

The Department of Psychology evaluates its faculty members annually in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Within each of those areas, the department recognizes four levels of performance—below-expected, at-expected, above-expected, and outstanding. A faculty member's performance in an area is below-expected if it is not at-expected or higher.

A. Performance Levels

Teaching

Teaching is the communication of discipline-related knowledge and skills to students.

The following evaluation matrix will be used to establish a faculty member's teaching performance level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Student Evaluations of Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Peer/Chair Evaluations of Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other Teaching-Related Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Each rating will include one decimal place (e.g., 1.2, 3.0, 4.6)

1. Student Evaluations of Teaching

Rating Scale

1 = poor
2 = fair
3 = good
4 = very good
5 = excellent
For each course taught, a course evaluation score will be calculated by averaging the mean item ratings on the student evaluation of teaching. The faculty member will select course evaluation scores for at least 50% of the courses taught each semester, and the selected course evaluation scores will be averaged to obtain a rating.

2. Peer/Chair Evaluations of Teaching

Rating Scale

1 = poor
2 = fair
3 = good
4 = very good
5 = excellent

3. Student Mentoring

Student mentoring is individualized mentoring of students that promotes reading, writing, critical thinking, and other skills on the part of the student.

Rating Scale

0 = poor (the faculty member is not engaged in student mentoring or the mentoring process has produced minimal skill development on the part of students)
1 = good (there is adequate skill development on the part of students)
2 = excellent (there is a breadth and depth of skill development on the part of students)

For each student mentored, the faculty member will summarize the activities performed by the student, and the written list of activities will be signed by the faculty member and the student.

4. Other Teaching-Related Activities

This item refers to teaching-related activities that do not contribute to formal teaching workload, but that can be time-consuming. Such activities might include membership on thesis or oral examination committees, professional development activities in support of teaching, author of grant proposals to support teaching activities, and supervision of student learning activities outside of the classroom that might not qualify as mentoring. The faculty member will list the activities and the approximate time-consumption of each activity (e.g., 3 thesis committees x 6 hours per committee = 18 hours, 1 grant proposal = 80 hours, 3 students supervised x 10 hours of direct contact or work review per student = 30 hours). For each activity, the department chair may adjust the hours up or down if he or she deems them to be unreasonable. The total time-consumption of all of the activities will be rated using the following scale:
0 = minimal (less than 30 hours over 2 semesters; i.e., activities average less than 1 hour per week over 30 weeks)
1 = moderate (90 hours over 2 semesters; i.e., activities average 3 hours per week over 30 weeks)
2 = considerable (150 hours over 2 semesters; i.e., activities average 5 hours per week over 30 weeks)

The four item ratings will be used to establish the faculty member's teaching performance level as follows:

At-expected

Sum of items 1 and 2 is 6.0 or higher

Above-expected

Sum of items 1 and 2 is 8.0 or higher, and
Sum of items 3 and 4 is 1.5 or higher

Outstanding

Sum of items 1 and 2 is 9.0 or higher, and
Sum of items 3 and 4 is 2.0 or higher

Scholarship

"Scholarship is the use, application, or synthesis of existing knowledge and methodologies with the aim of (1) establishing new understanding and knowledge, (2) developing new technologies, methodologies, or materials, (3) creating or rendering artistic works, or (4) solving discipline-related problems or general societal problems. Scholarly products must be communicated with peers through appropriate outlets. The nature and relative importance of these outlets are to be determined by individual departments. However, outlets requiring greater peer review should be preferred over outlets requiring less peer review, and outlets with a larger audience should be preferred over outlets with a smaller audience." (PAc 11)

The Department of Psychology distinguishes between Tier 1 and Tier 2 outlets. Tier 1 outlets (1) implement peer-review and (2) are competitive or require substantial effort on the part of an author. Examples of Tier 1 outlets include peer-reviewed books, peer-reviewed national or international journals, and peer-reviewed grant proposals to national granting agencies to support scholarly activities. Relative to Tier 1 outlets, Tier 2 outlets typically (1) implement less rigorous peer-review, (2) are less competitive, and (3) require less effort on the part of an author. Examples of Tier 2 outlets include book chapters, regional journals, grant proposals to local or regional granting agencies to support scholarly activities, professional conferences, technical reports, and conference proceedings.
The following evaluation matrix will be used to establish a faculty member's scholarship performance level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Scholarly Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Scholarly Products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Scholarly Activity

Examples of scholarly activity include reviewing the research literature, planning and conducting studies, analyzing data, presenting the results of scholarly activities at professional conferences, writing manuscripts, and writing grant proposals to support scholarly activities. For clinical faculty, activities toward full licensure by the Kentucky Board of Examiners of Psychology will be considered scholarly activity. The faculty member will list the activities and the approximate time-consumption of each activity (e.g., study 1: 15 hours preparation + 10 hours data analysis + 5 hours subject contact = 30 hours, study 2: 10 hours preparation + 10 hours data analysis + 5 hours subject contact = 25 hours, prepare and present poster = 10 hours). For each activity, the department chair may adjust the hours up or down if he or she deems them to be unreasonable. The total time-consumption of all of the activities will be rated using the following scale:

0 = none  
1 = low (60 hours over 2 semesters; i.e., activities average 2 hours per week over 30 weeks)  
2 = moderate (180 hours over 2 semesters; i.e., activities average 6 hours per week over 30 weeks)  
3 = high (300 hours over 2 semesters; i.e., activities average 10 hours per week over 30 weeks)

The rating for scholarly activity will include one decimal place (e.g., 1.2, 2.0, 2.6).

2. Scholarly Products

Rating Scale

0 = none  
1 = contributing author of a Tier 2 product  
2 = primary author of a Tier 2 product or contributing author of a Tier 1 product  
3 = primary author of a Tier 1 product

where primary author refers to first or second authorship, and contributing author refers to third authorship or higher. For clinical faculty, attainment of full licensure by the Kentucky Board of Examiners of Psychology will be rated 3.
The rating for scholarly products will not include decimal places (e.g., 0, 1, 2, 3).

The two item ratings will be used to establish the faculty member's scholarship performance level as follows:

*At-expected*

A rating of 1.0 or higher on item 1, and
Sum of items 1 and 2 is 2.0 or higher

*Above-expected*

A rating of 2.0 or higher on item 1, and
A rating of 2 on item 2

*Outstanding*

A rating of 2.0 or higher on item 1, and
A rating of 3 on item 2

Notes

1. Scholarly projects that are unpublished or unfunded after reasonable attempts have been made to get the projects published or funded may qualify for a rating under Scholarly Products. The rating will depend on the faculty member's contribution to the project and on the external reviewers' comments. For example, if the faculty member was primary author of an unfunded grant proposal to a national granting agency and the external reviewers' comments were positive, then the unfunded grant proposal may receive a rating of 3.

2. Multiple products that are simple variations of one another will count as a single product (e.g., multiple presentations that are simple variations of one another will count as a single presentation).

3. If the faculty member is not the primary author of a Tier 1 product, but is the primary author of one or more Tier 2 products or the contributing author of one or more Tier 1 products, then the faculty member may argue that the quality or quantity of these products justifies a rating of 3 rather than a rating of 2. For example, if the faculty member was primary author of two very different papers presented at prestigious conferences then that might justify a rating of 3.

**Service**

The Department of Psychology recognizes service to the university, the profession, and the community. Service to the university includes service to the institution, the college, and the department.
The following evaluation matrix will be used to establish a faculty member's service performance level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Service to the University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Service to the Profession or Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Each rating will include one decimal place (e.g., 3.2, 4.0, 4.6)

1. **Service to the University**

Examples of service to the university are contributions to university committees, organizations, programs, or projects, as well as participation in short-term activities or projects (e.g., SOARs and student advising). The faculty member will list service activities to the university and the approximate time-consumption of each activity (e.g., Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee: 5 meetings x (1 hour per meeting + 2 hours prep work per meeting) = 15 hours, student advising: 10 advisees x 0.5 hours per advisee = 5 hours). For each activity, the department chair may adjust the hours up or down if he or she deems them to be unreasonable.

**Rating Scale**

0 = none  
1 = minimal  
2 = fair (participation in short-term activities or projects)  
3 = good (contributing member of active committees, programs, or projects)  
4 = very good (leadership role in active committees, programs, or projects; or substantive role in labor-intensive committees, programs, or projects)  
5 = excellent (leadership role in labor-intensive committees, programs, or projects)

The rating should also take into consideration the quantity of service to the university. For example, a faculty member who is a contributing member of active committees might receive a 3.0 rating if he or she is on two such committees and a 3.8 rating if he or she is on five such committees. However, a rating cannot exceed 4.4 unless there is evidence that the faculty member occupied a leadership role in a labor-intensive committee, program, or project.

**Role of Faculty Mentor**

Although the Department Chair along with all tenured faculty within the department share the responsibility of guiding and supporting tenure-track faculty toward tenure, each tenure-track faculty will be assigned a Faculty Mentor. The faculty mentor will assume primary responsibility in assisting the candidate in understanding University policies and procedures related
to teaching, advising, research, service, travel, etc., and will provide guidance and feedback on specific activities related to tenure.

The faculty mentor will document all meetings and recommendations that occurred with the tenure-track faculty and will deliver all supporting documents regarding the meetings and recommendations to the Department Chair at the end of the fall and spring semester.

The Department Chair will provide to the tenure track faculty the customary annual review letter. Even though the annual review letter will remain confidential, any recommendations for continued progress to tenure will be extracted from the letter and delivered to the Mentor and the tenure track faculty. The Department Chair will also meet with the Mentor and the tenure track faculty at the end of the fall and spring semester. The purpose for this meeting will be to guide and support both the Mentor and the tenure track faculty. These meetings may be between the Department Chair and the Mentor without the tenure track faculty present, or between the Department Chair and the tenure track faculty without the Mentor present, or among the Department Chair, the Mentor and the tenure track faculty.

The Department Chair will review and evaluate the effectiveness of the mentor program and the Mentor in relation to the mentee’s progress at the end of the spring semester.

**The Faculty Mentor is a University service activity and will be assessed using the same rating scale as any other University service activity.**

2. *Service to the Profession or Community*

Examples of service to the profession or community are contributions to committees, organizations, programs, or projects that are external to the university and whose functions are to serve the profession or community. The faculty member will list service activities to the profession and community, and the approximate time-consumption of each activity (e.g., edited a book = 40 hours, reviewed 3 manuscripts x 8 hours per manuscript = 24 hours, supervised 10 practicing master's level clinical psychologists x 4 hours per individual = 40 hours). For each activity, the department chair may adjust the hours up or down if he or she deems them to be unreasonable. Any service activity with a regional engagement component (Brain Awareness, Internships, Practicum, Science Fair, etc.) will receive a .5 increase to the rating.
Rating Scale

0 = none
1 = minimal
2 = fair (participation in short-term activities or projects)
3 = good (contributing member of active committees, programs, or projects)
4 = very good (leadership role in active committees, programs, or projects; or substantive role in labor-intensive committees, programs, or projects)
5 = excellent (leadership role in labor-intensive committees, programs, or projects)

The rating should also take into consideration the quantity of service to the profession or community. For example, a faculty member who is a contributing member of active committees might receive a 3.0 rating if he or she is on two such committees and a 3.8 rating if he or she is on five such committees. However, a rating cannot exceed 4.4 unless there is evidence that the faculty member occupied a leadership role in a labor-intensive committee, program, or project.

The two item ratings will be used to establish the faculty member's service performance level as follows:

At-expected

Rating of 2.5 or higher on item 1

Above-expected

(1) A rating of 2.5 or higher on item 1, and
(2) A rating of 3.5 or higher on item 1 or 2

Outstanding

(1) A rating of 2.5 or higher on item 1, and
(2) A rating of 4.5 or higher on item 1 or 2

B. Evaluation Procedure

1. Department-approved student evaluations of teaching will be administered in every class each semester.

2. The department chair will observe tenure-track faculty members' teaching performance in at least one class per semester, and tenured faculty members' teaching performance in at least one class per calendar year.

3. The faculty member will submit, to the department chair, a summary of teaching, scholarship, and service activities for the period under review. The chair may request additional information from the faculty member.
4. For each of the three areas, the department chair will evaluate the faculty member's performance as below-expected (rating = 0), at-expected (rating = 1), above-expected (rating = 2), or outstanding (rating = 3) using Section 1.A as a guide. Then, the chair will assign the faculty member an overall performance evaluation using the following formula:

If the rating for teaching is 0, the faculty member's overall performance evaluation will be below-expected. Otherwise, the faculty member's overall performance evaluation will be determined as follows:

*Outstanding:* The sum of the three ratings is at least 6 and there is at least one rating of 3.

*Above-expected:* The sum of the three ratings is at least 4. Also there must be at least one rating of 3 or at least two ratings of 2.

*At-expected:* The sum of the three ratings is at least 3 and there is at most one rating of 0.

*Below-expected:* The sum of the three ratings is less than 3 or there is more than one rating of 0.

**C. Flexible Workload Agreements (FWAs – see PAc 29)**

If a faculty member had an FWA for the full period under review, the evaluation procedures and criteria outlined in the FWA shall be used to evaluate the faculty member's performance in lieu of the evaluation procedures and criteria outlined in the FEP.

If a faculty member had an FWA for half of the period under review, the evaluation of the faculty member under the FWA shall account for half of the faculty member's total evaluation and the evaluation of the faculty member under the FEP shall account for the remaining half.

Any FWA negotiated between a faculty member and the department chair must provide an overall evaluation of the faculty member's performance as below-expected, at-expected, above-expected, or outstanding.

**D. Appeal Process**

The faculty evaluation process must be perceived as objective, fair, and equitable. Each faculty member will receive a written evaluation of their performance and the opportunity to discuss the evaluation and FEP recommendation with the chair. As a result of this discussion, the Department Chair may modify the FEP evaluation. If there is a continuing disagreement between the Chair and the faculty member relating to the FEP recommendation, then the faculty member may formally appeal the
evaluation/recommendation through the chair to a Departmental Appeals Committee. The faculty member shall notify the Chair of his or her desire to appeal the Chair’s evaluation within seven business days of receiving the evaluation. The Chair shall then convene a Departmental Appeals Committee consisting of three tenured faculty members within the department: one chosen by the Chair, one chosen by the faculty member, and the third chosen by the two selected committee members. The Appeals Committee will then review the faculty members’ FEP portfolio, the Chair’s recommendation, and a summary of share recommendations for the Department’s other faculty. Within seven business days after receiving the appeal, the committee will make a recommendation to the Chair to maintain or change the Chair’s recommendation, with written justification. The faculty member will also receive a copy of the committee’s recommendation. The Chair or the faculty member may accept or reject the committee’s recommendation. If either party rejects the committee recommendation, all materials will be forwarded to the Dean for a final determination.

2. REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE

The purpose of reappointment and tenure reviews is to develop and retain highly competent faculty members. The specific procedures for reappointment and tenure review are described in PAc 27.

A. Requirements for Tenure

Teaching

The first step in the review process is an evaluation of teaching effectiveness. That is, unless a determination is made that the faculty member is an effective teacher, tenure will not be granted. At a minimum, effective teaching requires a thorough knowledge of the subject, the ability to present material in a clear fashion, and the ability to work with, motivate, and serve as a role model for students. In addition, evidence of effective advising, mentoring, involvement of students in the faculty member’s research program, and supervision of students, as well as general availability to students, shall be considered important components of teaching.

The Department Tenure Committee and the Department Chair shall review multiple indices of teaching effectiveness (see Section 2.E below). Although favorable student evaluations of teaching are expected, student evaluations alone shall not be considered as sufficient evidence of effective teaching. Given the qualitative nature of this assessment, it is important that the faculty member be provided with clear and constructive feedback regarding his or her performance and progress toward meeting departmental expectations in teaching. The faculty member is expected to take this feedback into consideration in the annual revision of his or her courses.

Scholarship
Faculty members are expected to establish a program of independent or collaborative (with faculty at Morehead State University or other universities) research in their area of training and expertise. Faculty members are also expected to seek intramural (if available) and extramural support for their research program through the submission of grant proposals. The research program should lead to presentations at state, regional, or national professional meetings and conferences, and to refereed publications. Clinical faculty members will be expected to attain licensure by the Kentucky Board of Examiners of Psychology. Progress toward licensure is considered scholarship. Clinical faculty members should attain temporary licensure by two calendar years from their original appointment date, and must attain full licensure by the date of their application for tenure. In addition, faculty members are expected to attend and participate in discipline-based professional meetings, workshops, and where appropriate, continuing education activities.

Evaluation of the faculty member's scholarship performance will be based on both the quantity and quality of all scholarly activities. The faculty member should demonstrate a progressive increase in such activities.

Service

Faculty members are expected to contribute their time and energy to a variety of service activities both within and outside the university community. Important service activities within the university include membership and active participation on departmental, college, and university committees, and sponsorship of co-curricular activities. External service may include work for professional organizations and for community, state, and federal agencies. Service on editorial boards, grant review committees, as an ad hoc journal reviewer, and leadership positions in professional organizations at the state, regional, or national level are encouraged.

It is anticipated that a faculty member's service activities will gradually increase during the probationary period. In recognition that service commitments involve varying degrees of time and effort, the faculty member will be expected to provide details concerning his or her service activities such that evaluation of service can address both the quantity and quality of these activities.

B. Reappointment Review for Tenure-Track Faculty

The faculty member will submit a tenure portfolio (see PAc 27) and supporting documents (see Section 2.E below) to the department chair. As part of the tenure portfolio, the faculty member must include a letter of intent, addressed to the department chair, stating the desire to be considered for reappointment and containing a summary of activities during the probationary period that justifies the case for reappointment.

The department chair will make the tenure portfolio and supporting documents available to the Department Tenure Committee. The Department Tenure Committee will examine
the tenure portfolio and supporting documents and (1) produce a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, (2) offer specific recommendations for enhancement if necessary, and (3) recommend reappointment or non-reappointment of the faculty member.

C. Tenure Review

The faculty member will submit a tenure portfolio (see PAc 27) and supporting documents (see Section 2.E below) to the department chair. As part of the tenure portfolio, the faculty member must include a letter of intent, addressed to the department chair, stating the desire to be considered for tenure and containing a summary of activities during the probationary period that justifies the case for tenure.

The department chair will make the tenure portfolio and supporting documents available to the Department Tenure Committee. The Department Tenure Committee will examine the tenure portfolio and supporting documents and produce a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The Department Tenure Committee will then recommend tenure or non-tenure of the faculty member.

D. Reappointment Review for Instructors (see PAc 34)

The instructor will submit a letter of intent and supporting documents of teaching (see Section 2.E below) to the department chair. The letter of intent, addressed to the department chair, will state the desire to be considered for reappointment and will contain a summary of teaching activities during the prior year that justifies the case for reappointment.

The department chair will make the letter of intent and supporting documents available to the Department Tenure Committee. The Department Tenure Committee will examine the materials and produce a written evaluation of the instructor's performance in the area of teaching. The Department Tenure Committee will then recommend reappointment or non-reappointment of the instructor.

E. Supporting Documents

The faculty member should submit documentation that will allow the Department Tenure Committee to thoroughly evaluate the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Teaching

Documentation of teaching should, if applicable, include

- University-approved student evaluations of teaching
- Department-approved student evaluations of teaching
• Department-approved peer or chair evaluations of teaching
• Other evaluations of teaching, if any
• Course syllabi
• Grade distributions for all courses
• Representative course materials
• New or innovative teaching methods
• Mentoring or student supervision activities
• Participation in thesis or oral examination committees
• Development or preparation of new courses
• Professional development activities in support of teaching
• Grant proposals to obtain funding to support teaching activities
• Other indicators of teaching effectiveness

The faculty member may, in writing, comment on any of the documentation. Commentary may appear as part of the supporting documents or in the letter of intent.

**Scholarship**

Documentation of scholarship should, if applicable, include

• Scholarly products
• Current scholarly projects
• Grant proposals to obtain funding to support scholarly activities
• Professional development activities in support of scholarly activities
• Other indicators of scholarship

The faculty member may, in writing, comment on any of the documentation (e.g., comment on one's contribution to the scholarly products). Commentary may appear as part of the supporting documents or in the letter of intent.

**Service**

Documentation of service should, if applicable, include

• University service activities
• Professional service activities
• Community service activities
• Professional development activities in support of service activities
• Grant proposals to obtain funding to support service activities
• Other service activities

The faculty member may, in writing, comment on any of the service activities (e.g., comment on the effort and responsibility required by an activity). Commentary may appear as part of the supporting documents or in the letter of intent.

**3. PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR**
The purpose of promotion to professor is to recognize that a faculty member has made sustained contributions of the appropriate magnitude and quality in teaching, scholarship, and service since the last promotion. The specific procedures for promotion to professor are described in PAc 2.

A. Requirements for Promotion to Professor

For a favorable recommendation for promotion to professor, the faculty member must provide evidence of continued excellence and dedication to teaching, and outstanding accomplishments, since the last promotion, in either scholarship or service, with superior performance in both. Although a faculty member's cumulative record will be considered, emphasis will be placed upon the time period since the last promotion in evaluating the faculty member's record. A faculty member that is judged to be weak in any area will not be recommended for promotion to professor.

Teaching

The evaluation of teaching effectiveness will be conducted in a manner similar to that for tenure (see Section 2.A.Teaching). Evidence must clearly indicate that the faculty member is not only an effective teacher, but is also committed to teaching excellence.

Scholarship

The evaluation of accomplishments in scholarship will be conducted in a manner similar to that for tenure (see Section 2.A.Scholarship). A faculty member is expected to have maintained an active research program. A faculty member judged outstanding will have made significant contributions to his or her field through continued research productivity as evidenced by refereed publications, presentations at regional and national meetings, and funded intramural (if available) and extramural research grants (or grant proposals deemed meritorious).

Service

The evaluation of accomplishments in service will be conducted in a manner similar to that for tenure (see Section 2.A.Service). A faculty member is expected to have actively served on committees at the department, college, and university levels. Thus, merely serving on a large number of committees will not be considered as evidence of outstanding service. A faculty member judged outstanding will have had leadership roles on university committees, professional organizations, or in professional service to the profession, community, state, region, or nation. Although quantity of service will be considered, the faculty member's demonstrated competence and productivity in service are considered most important.
B. Promotion Review

The faculty member will submit a promotion portfolio (see PAc 2) and supporting documents (see Section 2.E above) to the department chair. As part of the promotion portfolio, the faculty member must include a letter of intent, addressed to the department chair, stating the desire to be considered for promotion and containing a summary of activities during the promotion review period that justifies the case for promotion to professor.

The department chair will make the promotion portfolio and supporting documents available to the Department Promotion Committee. The Department Promotion Committee will examine the promotion portfolio and supporting documents and produce a written evaluation of the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The evaluation should address not only the quantity of activities, but also their quality. The Department Promotion Committee will then recommend promotion or non-promotion of the faculty member.
# 2013 FEP Psychology

## Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings of Teaching</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
<th>At Expectations</th>
<th>Above Expectations</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - Student Evaluations</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - Peer/Chair Evaluations</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum of A and B</strong></td>
<td>Less than 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - Student Mentoring</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Note 3</td>
<td>Note 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - Other Teaching related activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Note 4</td>
<td>Note 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum of C &amp; D</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value to add to overall evaluation</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: the course evaluation score will be calculated by averaging the mean item ratings on the student evaluations

Note 2: the Peer/Chair evaluation score is 1 = poor, 2= fair, 3=good, 4= very good, 5 = excellent

Note 3: Evaluation of mentoring 0 = poor, 1= good, 2 = excellent. Written documentation required

Note 4: Time spent in other teaching activities (research, thesis, etc): Less than 30 hrs over 2 semesters = 0

30 to 90 hrs over 2 semesters = 1 and over 90 hrs over 2 semesters = 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
<th>At Expectation</th>
<th>Above Expectations</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Activity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Products</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td>Less than 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value to add to overall evaluation</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following define the numbers in the above table

**Scholarly Activity**
0 = none
1 = low (60 hours over 2 semesters; i.e., activities average 2 hours per week over 30 weeks)
2 = moderate (180 hours over 2 semesters; i.e., activities average 6 hours per week over 30 weeks)
3 = high (300 hours over 2 semesters; i.e., activities average 10 hours per week over 30 weeks)

**Scholarly Products**
0 = none
1 = contributing author of a Tier 2 product
2 = primary author of a Tier 2 product or contributing author of a Tier 1 product
3 = primary author of a Tier 1 product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items of Service</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
<th>At Expectation</th>
<th>Above Expectations</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service to University</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to Profession/Community/Region (see Note 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value to add to overall evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note 1:** Numbers in cells represent minimum values

**Note 2:** Regional Engagement activities will receive a .5 increase

**Both Categories use same self rating scale**
0 = none
1 = minimal
2 = fair (participation in short-term activities or projects)
   (contributing member of active committees, programs, or projects)
3 = very good (leadership role in active committees, programs,
   or projects; or substantive role in labor-intensive committees, programs, or projects)
4 = excellent (leadership role in labor-intensive committees, programs, or projects)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
<th>At Expectations</th>
<th>Above Expectations</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching (0, 1, 2, or 3 from earlier determination)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>At least 1</td>
<td>At least 1</td>
<td>At least 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship (0, 1, 2, or 3 from earlier determination)</td>
<td>Notes 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Note 3</td>
<td>Note 4</td>
<td>Note 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (0, 1, 2, or 3 from earlier determination)</td>
<td>Notes 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Note 3</td>
<td>Note 4</td>
<td>Note 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>Less than 3</td>
<td>At least 3</td>
<td>At least 4</td>
<td>At least 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL EVALUATION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: A 0 rating for teaching results in an overall evaluation of below expectations regardless of any other activity.

Note 2: More than 1 rating of 0.

Note 3: There is at most 1 rating of 0.

Note 4: There must be at least one rating of 3 OR at least two ratings of 2.

Note 5: There must be at least one rating of 3.
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This document outlines the procedures and expectations to be used for on-going professional evaluation of faculty in the Department of Foundational & Graduate Studies in the College of Education.

The evaluation for Performance Based Compensation Increases will be for one calendar year beginning January 1st and ending December 31st. Tenure and promotion evaluations will be based upon the academic year.
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This document provides the policies and information that govern the following annual evaluation, tenure, promotion, and evaluation of fixed term faculty in the Foundational and Graduate Studies in Education (FGSE) Department in the College of Education

Morehead State University PAc-30: Performance-Based Compensation Plan for Faculty states:

It shall be the policy of Morehead State University to systematically evaluate individual faculty performance by means of a departmental faculty evaluation process which specifies performance expectations in teaching, scholarship, and service and which is consistent with University guidelines for faculty evaluation. All returning tenured and tenure-track faculty are required to participate in the process of evaluation as specified in their departmental Faculty Evaluation Plan (FEP).

Performance-based compensation will be based on the concept that criteria exist in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service against which the performance of individual faculty will be compared for evaluation. These criteria will not be a set of fixed universally-applied standards, but a set of flexible standards which will accommodate the unique nature of the disciplines in which faculty teach, engage in scholarly activities, and serve. The application of the standards should accommodate the specific role of the individual within the department and should recognize the variables which affect opportunities for scholarship and service.

Morehead State University Pac-35: Faculty Evaluation Plans states:

The FEP shall include: A description of other requirements (if any) of the department not already stated in University, college, or school policy for faculty seeking reappointment, tenure, or promotion and for performance-based compensation increases.

Framework for Evaluation

Evaluation of faculty in a college of education is a complex multi-dimensional undertaking. It cannot take a one-size-fits-all approach. It must have the flexibility to respond to the following considerations.

1) It must be applicable to individuals at various stages in their careers in a manner that encourages them to make meaningful decisions. Within the context created by some of the other factors outlined here, individual faculty members must be able to decide how to use their time and energy without being penalized because they deviate from some arbitrary standard.

2) The basis for evaluation needs to be responsive to the long-term mission and the current priorities of the academic department. Faculty members in a college of education must be aware that they are part of a collaborative enterprise, which requires them to balance their personal agendas with the needs of the organization.

3) While we are all part of the Department of Foundational and Graduate Studies in Education, it is important to note that the faculty represent a wide array of disciplines. Each of these disciplines has its own set of opportunities and expectations related to
professional practice, scholarly productivity, and service to the discipline. These unique differences, opportunities and expectations should be taken into account in the evaluation process of individual faculty.

4) Finally, this framework for evaluation must articulate consistent standards of quality that, while responding to the diversity of the faculty, are recognized within the college and across the University.

The framework presented in this document attempts to provide a practical structure for meeting this challenge.

Central to the process outlined in this document is the annual self-evaluation document and the Flexible Workload Agreement (FWA) if applicable developed by each faculty member. In this annual presentation of their activities, faculty members are required to concisely make the case that during the last year they have spent their time in activities that have contributed to their students, their discipline, and the University. In this presentation they should demonstrate a rational decision making process about where they put their time and energy. Based on this, administrators and peers can, within a collegial relationship, evaluate and provide constructive feedback on these efforts. In addition to reviewing activities of the past year, this document calls for the development of a personal growth plan for the next year. Thus, it is that the annual review provides each faculty member with an opportunity to identify benchmarks in an ongoing process of continuous improvement.

The Department’s Faculty Evaluation Plan and/or the FWA provides the basic statements of the standards and criteria for evaluating an individual's academic work and as such has direct implications for a number of other processes beyond the annual merit pay process. However, merit pay is separate from these other processes; and, consequently, meeting or exceeding merit pay criteria does not automatically ensure a favorable tenure or promotion decision. Merit pay evaluations are based on annual performance whereas tenure and promotion evaluations are based on cumulative performance. Importantly the criteria for annual evaluation ratings and the criteria for those used to determine merit pay eligibility should be markedly similar.

The University processes for granting of tenure and promotion to professors uses the criteria outlined within this document as the basis for decision-making. In a similar light, this document provides the criteria and process for post tenure review and evaluation of instructors.

**Tenure**

The process for progress towards tenure is defined in PAc-27. The Department evaluation process is based on the criteria defined in PAc-27 and reflects growth in the criteria identified for annual performance review.

1) The Department Tenure Review Committee will annually evaluate all non-tenured faculty. In compliance with PAc-27 the Department Tenure Review Committee shall consist of all eligible tenured faculty members in the department.

2) All non-tenured faculty must submit a cumulative contract renewal portfolio annually, as required by PAc-27. (Contract renewal is based on the academic year rather than the calendar year.) In order to ensure that all materials are evaluated, the vita and documentation in the portfolio must be arranged according to the attached outline at the end of this document.

3) All probationary faculty members must be observed teaching at least once annually by the chair and/or senior colleagues (as designated by the chair or the immediate supervisor). The faculty member should initiate the request for observation from the chair at least a
month before the portfolio is due. The results of these observations must be included in the annual portfolio and in the final application for tenure.

4) As noted below under the discussion of evaluation of teaching (page 10), faculty members are strongly encouraged to seek formal student feedback on the quality of instruction for every course. At the minimum, probationary faculty must provide documentation of this feedback from the university-approved student evaluation form for at least two courses a semester. The departmentally-approved student evaluation form should be used in their other courses. In other words, all courses should be evaluated each semester. All course evaluations submitted for annual reviews must likewise be included in the final application for tenure.

5) Over the course of his/her probationary period, a candidate for tenure should have:
   a) Consistently earned above average ratings on evaluation of teaching and have observations by the chair and/or department colleagues that demonstrate high achievement in teaching,
   b) Been active as a scholar as reflected in multiple scholarly presentations at least at the regional level and should have some publications, and
   c) Served on a variety of committees across campus, served in leadership roles, and/or provided significant service to other appropriate professional settings.

6) In addition to these achievements non-tenured faculty should have fulfilled basic duties and expectations, which include attending faculty meetings regularly, meeting and starting classes on time, maintaining regular availability to students, advising regularly, and fulfilling various departmental service functions (participating in TEP interviews and assisting in schedule development, for example). Faculty who do not fulfill these duties may not qualify for tenure even if the quantity of work in the annual review materials earns them high ratings.

7) All non-tenured faculty shall be allocated one mentor from within or outside the home department. The mentor may or may not be within the discipline area but should be from within the College of Education unless otherwise specified in the FWA. The non-tenured faculty shall retain a mentor until the non-tenured faculty submits their final tenure portfolio. The mentor may be reviewed and/or re-assigned at the request of either the mentor or the non-tenured faculty.

8) The faculty mentor should assist the non-tenured faculty member in the compilation of tenure portfolios. They should meet with the non-tenured faculty before submission of the tenure portfolio and discuss the annual review.

9) The mentor must make written recommendations to the Department Tenure Review Committee based on their discussions with the non-tenured faculty member. The recommendations of the mentor should be available to the non-tenured faculty member before submission to the Department Tenure Review Committee.

10) In accordance with PAc-27, a faculty member may apply for equivalent service to be applied towards the tenure probationary period. As stated in the PAc, “a faculty member must apply for equivalent service no later than the end of the first semester following appointment to Morehead State University.” Any application for equivalent service must be reviewed by the Department Tenure Review Committee, who will then review the application and make a recommendation based on a review of the materials according to how well they meet the FGSE FEP guidelines. For example, if a faculty member comes to MSU from another institution and requests two years of equivalent service, then the faculty member will submit the request and the documentation of the previous two
consecutive years to be reviewed. The Department Tenure Review Committee will then evaluate those two years according to the FGSE FEP guidelines. The committee will then make a recommendation of the number of years of equivalent service to the Department Chair/Associate Dean, College Dean, and Provost. Any faculty member granted equivalent service time should include documentation of equivalent service time granted in the reappointment/tenure portfolio.

11) The Department Tenure Review Committee will review non-tenured faculty portfolios and the recommendations of the Department mentor. They will make one of the following recommendations to the Chair.
   a) The candidate's contract should be renewed and the non-tenured faculty member is on the correct course for consideration of tenure.
   b) The candidate's contract should be renewed, but the candidate is not performing to the level commensurate for consideration of tenure.
   c) The candidate's contract should not be renewed.

12) The Chair will write his/her evaluation of the non-tenured faculty member (per PAc-27) and, prior to submitting the report, will meet with each non-tenured faculty member to discuss the evaluation. The Chair’s written evaluation will be made available to the faculty member. After meeting with the faculty member, the chair’s written report will be sent to the Dean along with the portfolio and the recommendation of the Department Tenure Review Committee.

13) The Dean of the College will submit a recommendation to the Provost and Executive Vice-President for Academic Affairs based on the recommendations of the Department Tenure Review Committee and the Chair. (PAc-27)

14) If the non-tenured faculty member disagrees with the recommendation of the Department Tenure Review Committee, the Department Chair, and/or the Dean of the college, he/she may submit a letter of response at any point in the process to any of the administrators involved. (PAc-27)

**Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor**

1) The Promotion Process is guided by PAc-2-Promotion Review. The criteria for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor are the same as those for Tenure.

2) Therefore, in compliance with PAc-27, all faculty members successfully awarded tenure shall automatically be promoted to associate professor.

3) PAc – 1 Academic Titles.

**Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor**

1) The Promotion Process is guided by PAc-2: Promotion Review.

2) PAc-1: Academic Titles

**Department Promotion Committee.** All faculty members applying for promotion must submit a portfolio to the Department Promotion Committee. After reviewing the candidate’s portfolio the Department Promotion Committee will make a recommendation to the Chair to support or decline the application for promotion.

**Criteria for Promotion.** Although successful annual evaluation cannot be the sole determining factor in the decision of the Department’s Promotion Committee to support or decline an application, the criteria defined under the heading of “performance expectations” of this Faculty Evaluation Plan (FEP) should be used in determining successful professional growth in the areas of teaching, professional achievement, and service as defined in PAc-2. While the faculty
member’s cumulative record of performance may be considered, the focus for this review will be placed on the period since the last promotion.

To be promoted to the rank of Professor, a faculty member should have a **consistent record** (i.e., across at least a 5 year period after promotion to associate professor) of

- Above expected evaluations of teaching,
- Above expected service at the local, state, regional and/or national levels, and
- Professional achievement at the regional and/or state levels with some recognition of his/her professional achievement at the national level.

Faculty applying for promotion to professor should have fulfilled basic duties and expectations which include fulfilling appropriate classroom responsibilities (i.e. online, face-to-face, etc.), maintaining appropriate availability to students, advising of students, participating in departmental and/or college service, regularly participate in contract renewal and tenure decisions (specifically, review portfolios and either attend tenure committee meetings or submit sealed ballot to chair in advance), and regularly attending faculty meetings.

**Annual Evaluation Procedures**

The following sections outline the procedures for submission, review, and appeal of annual merit pay reviews within the Department of Foundational and Graduate Studies in Education.

The sole exception to the review process will be faculty on sabbatical leave. They will receive the same merit pay rating as awarded at the departmental level the previous year.

**Annual Self-Evaluation**

In accordance with University guidelines (PAc-27), all tenured and tenure track faculty members will prepare and submit the items outlined below by the date designated by the Provost on the annual academic calendar. The annual review is for the calendar year. All information will be submitted through Faculty 180.

**Annual Productivity Report.** Each faculty member should update Faculty 180 by the date designated, being sure to include information outlined on the list of Annual Productivity Components (see attached example).

**Annual Self-Ratings.** [Enter these in the “Other” (Item #12) section of Faculty 180.]

Each faculty member is required to complete a self-evaluation for each of the three sections on teaching, professional achievement, and service, and provide a short justification for the rating in each area. Faculty members must also complete an overall self-rating (see the chart at the end of the Annual Productivity Components).

Faculty should have supporting evidence (i.e. proposals, syllabi, publications, etc.) available for review upon request.

**Departmental Review**

1) The departmental chair will review the information contained in Faculty 180 for all eligible tenured and tenure-track faculty using the guidelines below and his/her best professional judgment.

2) Faculty overall performance evaluation ratings will be determined using the criteria outlined under “Overall Levels of Performance” on page 12 of this document.
3) The chair will prepare a notice and rationale of the performance score awarded for each tenured and tenure-track faculty member by the date designated by the Provost.

4) Any faculty member may request a face-to-face meeting with the chair to obtain clarification of the rationale for the assigned score.

5) Each faculty member who receives an overall rating of “less than expected performance” will meet with the departmental chair to identify areas for professional growth during the next year. The actions identified to address areas of deficiency shall be integrated into the faculty member’s individual plan for professional development (see Annual Self Evaluation, page 19) and should be explicitly addressed in the next year’s self-evaluation. Regardless of other ratings, faculty members who receive a rating of less than expected in any area should target that area for professional growth in the coming year.

6) If a faculty member disagrees with his/her Performance Based Compensation Increase award he/she may initiate the Appeal Process found on page 6.

7) All materials related to this review will remain in the possession of the chair until after the final date for appeal.

Department Faculty Evaluation Committee

Membership. The Department Faculty Evaluation Committee (DFEC) shall consist of one faculty member from each program in the department in the fall of the academic year for a one-year term. All voting members of the Committee shall: (1) be full-time faculty; (2) be tenured or in a tenure-track position; and (3) have served at least one full year at the University. There will be no limit on the number of terms a faculty member may serve. The Department Chair shall not serve on this committee.

The Committee shall elect their chair from the membership of the Committee by September 15 of the academic year at a first meeting convened by the Department Chair.

Duties/Responsibilities. This committee is to provide ongoing faculty oversight to the merit pay process by fulfilling the following responsibility:

1) Annually the committee shall review this document and respond to any other authorities such as the President, the Provost, the Dean, or various committees of the Faculty Senate calling for updating or revising this FEP. In this process, it shall be responsible for revising and submitting proposed revisions to the faculty, chairs, Dean, Faculty Senate, and other administrators as necessary, for approval.

Appeals

1) The Department Faculty Evaluation Committee (DFEC) will serve as the appeals body, should it be needed, in the merit pay review process. As stated previously, the Department Faculty Evaluation Committee (DFEC) shall consist of one faculty member from each program in the department in the fall of the academic year for a one-year term. All voting members of the Committee shall: (1) be full-time faculty; (2) be tenured or in a tenure-track position; and (3) have served at least one full year at the University. For the purposes of an appeal, a quorum will be four voting members, but every effort should be made to have all five voting members present. In the event that the faculty member appealing the merit pay evaluation is a member of the committee, another faculty member from the program who meets the eligibility requirements will be selected by the other members of the committee to represent that program during the appeals process.
Decisions shall be based upon a majority vote of the committee members in attendance at a committee meeting. Voting shall be by secret ballot. All information will be confidential.

2) If a faculty member disagrees with his/her department merit pay evaluation, he/she may request a meeting with the department chair (or next level supervisor) to discuss the evaluation. The purpose of the meeting will be to determine if a satisfactory resolution can be reached through informal discussion. If the appellant and the department chair reach agreement, the chair will within five working days provide for the appellant and the Dean a written description of the agreement.

3) If the disagreement is not satisfactorily resolved, the department chair (or next level supervisor) will indicate within five working days the reasons for not changing the evaluation. Only after this process is complete may the appellant appeal to the Department Faculty Evaluation Committee. To file an appeal, the faculty member must succinctly state in writing the reasons he/she believes the evaluation should be changed. The statement must be filed with the elected chair of the committee within five working days after receiving the department chair’s written rejection of the informal appeal. The appeal may be based upon procedural or substantive grounds.

4) The department chair will provide copies of the appellant’s merit pay materials (printed from Faculty 180), the original evaluation and the written rejection of the informal appeal to the Department Faculty Evaluation Committee.

5) The Department Faculty Evaluation Committee will meet separately with the appellant and the Department Chair within 7 working days after the chair of the committee receives a written appeal. The committee will review all pertinent written material and may request additional material if necessary. The committee will, by a majority vote, render a written decision. The decision shall be the final step of this appeal process.

Step 5 shall complete the merit pay appeals process for the Department of Foundational and Graduate Studies in Education. Appellants who do not accept the decision at the department level may have access to other reviews or appeals if provided by Morehead State University policy.

**Performance Expectations**

The following sections outline specific guidelines for the evaluation of teaching, professional achievement, and service. Each section contains the following elements:

1) A narrative introduction that provides a context for the material provided in to the two accompanying tables.

2) A list of relevant activities. Within these lists, individual activities are categorized on a three-level scale that attempts to account for the relative time and effort involved in each activity. This scale of expected, above expected, and outstanding is not intended to negatively reflect on any activity or the efforts of any faculty members. It simply tries to capture the extra effort that is involved in bringing some projects to fruition.

This framework acknowledges various ways in which faculty can contribute to the mission of the Department, College, and University. It suggests that sometimes a “lower-rated activities” can indeed trump “higher-rated activities.” For example, publication of a peer-reviewed journal article has traditionally been a highly valued activity at a University and it should be. Traditionally, some activities are frequently discounted as “just service” and not contributing to scholarship. The scale used in this document reflects the fact that a professional development workshop for a local school is valued but less so than the substantial effort involved in bringing...
an article to press. However, within this framework, an individual faculty member can demonstrate that an ongoing series of well-developed professional workshops certainly merit consideration that equals or exceeds a single publication.

Within the framework of annual evaluation, the overall faculty performance will be evaluated and weighted as follows: Teaching, 60%; Professional Achievement, 25%; Service, 15%.

As cited in PAc-35: If a faculty member is involved in regional engagement, evidence should be provided of how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond. This is not a separate category of the FEP, but should be reflected in the faculty member’s teaching, professional achievement and service as appropriate.

**Teaching**

Teaching is central to the role of regional universities like Morehead State. Therefore, the evaluation of teaching is central to the overall evaluation of individual faculty members. The importance of this aspect of evaluation emphasizes that it is not a simple task. The extensive literature on evaluation of teaching makes it clear that this is one of the greatest challenges facing schools and colleges today. Factors such as student preparation, subject matter, teaching philosophy, level of course, and others make it very difficult to come up with a simple scheme for evaluating teaching.

There seems to be strong consensus that evaluation of effective teaching cannot be reduced to a single number on a form completed by students. Nonetheless, student perspective on the quality of instruction is a critical component in achieving this task. Faculty members are encouraged to systematically collect formal student feedback on every course.

The framework provided in this document tries to avoid the pitfall of reducing evaluation of teaching to a single number. The down side of this decision is that effective evaluation of teaching becomes a much more complex undertaking. Multiple factors have to be considered. These can include student perceptions, student outcomes, peer and administrative review, review of teaching activities and materials, review of tests and other assessments, and an understanding of the faculty member’s individual philosophy of teaching. Like all else in this document, this section is not prescriptive. Individual faculty and departments need to explore innovative ways of effectively evaluating instruction. (Please note: In the examples used in this section reference is made to a T-score on the IDEA evaluation form. This is only an example. It does not imply that this instrument or this score is the standard for evaluation of teaching in the Department of Foundational and Graduate Studies. )

In addition to what goes on in the classroom, a variety of other factors are directly related to quality of teaching. These can include time and effort devoted to advising, supervising field experience, supervising clinical practice candidates, supervising practicum candidates, efforts at program revision, pursuit of external funds to improve program resources or student opportunities, variety of courses taught, the development of expertise related to instruction, efforts at recruitment, and other evidence of commitment to students and teaching. These factors merit serious consideration. For example, an extensive commitment of time and energy to advising 50 or more advisees makes a substantial contribution to individual and program success.

In this college, the task is further complicated by the fact that for many of us pedagogy is our subject matter. This means that for some faculty members the boundary between teaching and scholarship is less than clear.

Levels of performance for teaching are described more fully in the table that follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected (1 point total):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Cannot advance to Above Expected or Outstanding unless Expected criterion is met.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Above Expected (1.5 points EACH):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outstanding (2 points EACH):</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Each semester, every faculty member will solicit student evaluations of every course section taught (with the exception of directed studies, directed research, or capstone research courses), using IDEA and/or the departmentally-approved course evaluation. Tenure-track faculty members must also have a chair or chair-appointed peer evaluation of one of their courses each year.

- Course evaluation results must be in the average range for numeric scales (average T-score of 37-44 for IDEA; at least 3.0 average for the departmentally-approved course evaluation) and acceptable for narrative evaluations (chair/peer evaluation).

- Faculty members will be available to their students on a regular basis.

- Every course will be evaluated by students using either IDEA or FGSE instrument. EVERY course meeting the criterion below will be awarded 1.5 points. These points will be summed across classes, not averaged.
  
  - Teaching Evaluations. Average/midrange to high average/midrange scores on student evaluation instrument (For example: average T-score of 45-55 on IDEA form; at least 3.75 average for the departmentally approved course evaluation)
  
  - Non-required formal course observation by tenured peers or administrators (can be counted up to twice)
  
  - Develop instructional materials (videos, multimedia, supplements)
  
  - Substantially revise a course (more than just a change of textbook)
  
  - Teach a new course
  
  - Revise program
  
  - Use innovative techniques in existing course, first time being implemented
  
  - Include pre-test/posttest information showing significant student improvement over the course of a semester
  
  - Mentor student research (co-author, etc.)
  
  - Other comparable teaching activities…or outstanding achievement in teaching

- Every course will be evaluated by students using either IDEA or FGSE instrument. EVERY course meeting the criterion below will be awarded 2 points. These points will be summed across classes, not averaged.

  - Teaching Evaluations. High average/midrange to high/upper range scores on student evaluation instrument (For example: average T-score of 56-63 on IDEA form; at least 4.25 average for the departmentally approved course evaluation)
  
  - Relevant research (applied instructional research)
  
  - Develop a new course
  
  - Create new program
  
  - Earn a teaching award (from MSU entity or professional association)
  
  - Serve on an Ed.D or Ed.S committee
  
  - Teaching in overload without pay
  
  - Other comparable teaching activities…or outstanding achievement in teaching
Professional Achievement

The area of professional achievement has traditionally been the most clearly defined area in the evaluation of University faculty. This area of activity is seen as the contribution of the individual to their primary discipline. This typically includes continuing professional development, research, grantsmanship, publications, and presentations. One ongoing source of difficulty for faculty members in colleges of education has been the fact that their area of scholarship often entails pedagogy. This has led to some difficulty when colleagues from areas other than education review their achievement. As noted above this evaluation can be further complicated because a legitimate area of scholarship for education faculty can involve working directly with practitioners in public schools. The Department of Foundational and Graduate Studies in Education (FGSE) defines professional achievement broadly to include a number of activities in which the faculty member is involved. This may include extending academic discourse through original research, communicating scholarly discourse to other professionals through writing and formal scholarly presentations, contributing to public discourse and public education through creative productions and publications, and extending their own expertise through professional development.

Levels of performance for professional achievement are described more fully in the table that follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Achievement Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected (1 point total):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Membership in a professional organization (at whatever level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attend one PD event (1-6 hours long) (meeting, workshop, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have at least 1 peer-reviewed scholarly work (presentation, publication, grant) accepted OR documented work in progress (presentations, publications, grants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Cannot advance to Above Expected or Outstanding unless Expected criterion is met.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Above Expected (1.5 points EACH):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional engagement activities which contribute to professional achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Either author or co-author publication in a local, state, or regional refereed publication (includes ERIC or conference proceedings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serve as reviewer for local, state, or regional refereed conference proposals/abstracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Undertake a collaborative project with schools which results in applied research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actively maintaining a professional blog, podcast, or vodcast (or comparable activity) regarding your field of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attend additional PD events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refereed presentation at a local, state, or regional professional organization meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Obtain an internally funded grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Or equivalent activity or combinations of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outstanding (2 points EACH):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Obtain new professional licensure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serve on an editorial board of a journal and/or review manuscripts for journals in your discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serve as reviewer for national or international refereed conference presentation proposals/abstracts, or textbooks in your field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Direct internal or external grant activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refereed presentation at a national or international professional organization conference or meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Either author or co-author publication in national, or international journals (includes or conference proceedings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Edit, co-edit, and/or authorship of a book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Obtain an externally funded grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Publish a monograph, textbook, video, or CD-ROM as author or co-author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Receive a prestigious award for scholarship from MSU or a professional association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Receive a fellowship or faculty research award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Write an invited chapter in a book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Or equivalent activity or combinations of activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service

The area of service allows faculty members to demonstrate how they are meeting their responsibilities as professionals to contribute to the institution, their discipline, and the community. As a member of the University community, every faculty member has an obligation to contribute to the effective running of the institution. This document sees this as an important role, but one not limited to what occurs on campus. Traditionally, universities have acknowledged the obligation of faculty as professionals with specialized expertise to contribute to the community beyond the institution. So while service cannot overshadow teaching and professional achievement, it plays an important part in how faculty members fulfill their responsibilities. The framework in this document attempts to give faculty members flexibility in determining how they will meet this obligation.

Levels of performance for service are described more fully in the table that follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected (1 point total): [Cannot advance to Above Expected or Outstanding unless Expected criterion is met.]</th>
<th>Above Expected (1.5 points EACH):</th>
<th>Outstanding (2 points EACH):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Actively serve on committees on at least two different levels at MSU: department, college, university — whether standing committees, ad hoc, or task force. • Regularly attend department meetings. • If tenured, regularly participate in contract renewal and tenure decisions; specifically, review portfolios and either attend tenure committee meetings or submit sealed ballot to chair in advance.</td>
<td>• Work at a SOAR, open house, MSU night, or career day; • Participate in graduation; • Participate in Freshman Move-In day; • Participate in GSP Move-In day; • Be a DREAMS mentor; • Hold an office in a local professional organization; • Chair a departmental committee; • Serve on committees at three different levels at MSU (department, college, university); • Hold office or serve on a committee for a state or regional professional organization; • Serve on school board or site-based council; • Actively serve as advisor of a student organization; • Participate in a round of TEP interviews; • Participate in rating TPA presentations; • Participate in judging for the Celebration of Student Scholarship; • Speak at local community events; • Undertake a professional presentation for a civic, business, or community organization; • Present an in-service activity or workshop at MSU; • Submit a service grant proposal; • Consult in a field related to the faculty’s specialization; • Serve as program leader; • For tenured faculty, serve as a faculty mentor for more than two faculty (can only be counted once) • For tenured faculty, peer review a course (can only be counted twice) • Or equivalent activity or combinations of activities.</td>
<td>• Actively serve as chair of a college- or university-level committee at MSU; • Actively serve as secretary of a college- or university-level committee at MSU; • Actively serve as an officer or program chair for a national professional organization; • Actively serve on a state or national committee or task force related to the profession (e.g., KDE, PRAXIS, EPSB, CPE, etc.); • Do an accreditation visit; • Actively participate in national service; • Actively participate on a committee that was exceptionally demanding of time and effort (e.g. TEC, Faculty Senate executive committee, University tenure committee; Research and Creative Productions committee, college/university accreditation, etc.); • Serve on faculty senate and participate in its associated committee work; • Be awarded a service grant proposal; • Award for outstanding service, • Serve as interim chair; • Awarded and directed service-related grant; • Work with an intern in the KTIP or KPIP programs; • Meet on regular basis with school administrators; • Provide professional development for schools or community agencies; • Or equivalent activity or combinations of activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Overall Levels of Performance**

The determination of a faculty member’s **overall annual evaluation rating** is a performance score based on the following guidelines:

- To be eligible for a merit pay increase, a faculty member must meet the **EXPECTED level** in each area of review: Teaching, professional achievement, and service. If, for any reason, a faculty member does not meet the expected level of performance in one or more areas, he or she is not eligible for a merit pay increase in that year.

- Each level of performance has a point value attached to it.
  - **Expected:** Once **ALL** activities in the expected level are completed, the faculty member is awarded one (1) point. One point is the maximum score for this level.
  - **Above Expected:** A faculty member is awarded 1.5 points for **EACH TIME** an activity in this level is completed. For example, under Service “Chair a Departmental Committee” is an above expected activity. If a faculty member chairs one departmental committee, then he or she is awarded 1.5 points. However, if the faculty member chairs two departmental committees, then he or she is awarded 3 points (1.5 points x 2 instances = 3 points). There is no maximum score for this level.
  - **Outstanding:** A faculty member is awarded 2 points for **EACH TIME** an activity in this level is completed. For example, under Professional Achievement “Refereed presentation at a national or international professional organization conference or meeting” is an outstanding activity. If a faculty member has one presentation at this level in the course of a year, he or she will be awarded two (2) points. However, if the faculty member has three presentations at this level, he or she is awarded 6 points (2 points x 3 instances). There is no maximum score for this level.

- Once the point totals are calculated, within the framework of annual evaluation, the overall faculty performance will be evaluated and weighted as follows: Teaching, 60%; Professional Achievement, 25%; Service, 15%. Therefore, the formula for calculating a faculty member’s overall performance score for a year is:

  \[
  \frac{(Teaching \times 60) + (Professional \text{ Achievement} \times 25) + (Service \times 15)}{3} = \text{Annual Score}
  \]

For example, if a faculty member scores 50 points in teaching, 27 points in professional achievement, and 20 points in service, the annual performance score would be calculated as follows:

- **Teaching:** 50 * 60 = 3000
- **Professional Achievement:** 27 * 25 = 675
- **Service:** 20 * 15 = 300
- **Scaled Average Score:** 3000 + 675 + 300 = 3975
  - 3975/3 = **1325 points on faculty member’s annual evaluation**

- Once the Department Chair has received, reviewed, and scored the annual evaluations of each member of the department, he or she will rank order, in accordance with UAR 137.01, each faculty member by point total. Faculty members will then be assigned a level of merit from 0-3. As the UAR states: “No more than the top 20% of faculty
members in the unit may be assigned a merit score of 3. No more than the top 70% of faculty members in the unit may be assigned a merit score of 2 or 3. There is no limit on the assignment of merit scores of 1 or 0.”

• In the event that faculty members have the same calculated annual performance score, the higher ranking will be given to the faculty member who achieved a higher teaching score. Should the faculty members have the same calculated teaching score, the Department Chair will make a decision based on the overall annual review submitted.

• Any faculty member rated as less than expected in either teaching, scholarship professional achievement, or service will meet with the departmental chair to identify goals for professional growth during the next year.

• Regardless of other ratings, any faculty member who receives a rating of less than expected in any area should target that area for professional growth in their goals for the coming year.

Related Processes

Post Tenure Review
In compliance with PAc-30 all tenured faculty must participate in an annual review. The criteria and the procedures outlined in this document provide a framework for ongoing evaluation of all faculty members after the granting of tenure. Further, this process provides for the development of a personal plan of correction if the tenured faculty member shall receive a less than expected rating in any area of professional activity.

Instructor Evaluation
As defined in PAc-34, “Instructors (formerly referred to as fixed-term instructors) are full-time employees contracted with full benefits for a one-year term with a teaching load of no more than 27 credit hours recommended. With the approval of the department chair and college dean, Instructors may have appointments renewed on an annual basis provided there are continued/justified instructional needs, adequate funds, and satisfactory evaluations according to departmental faculty evaluation plans (FEP). While Instructors will be evaluated primarily on teaching, they may provide service on departmental committees.”

Instructors will be evaluated primarily on their teaching by-the department Chair (or Chair designee). The Chair (or Chair designee) will observe the instructor’s teaching, examine the teaching portfolio submitted by the instructor (including forms for student feedback on teaching, syllabi, tests and other material providing support for quality teaching) and evaluate his/her performance based upon the same criteria for teaching used in the evaluation of tenure track faculty. A written evaluation will be completed and submitted to the faculty member according to the time schedule set by the University.

In accordance with UAR 137.01, Faculty Salary Plan, “the performance-based salary adjustment process for full-time, fixed-term faculty members will be conducted separately from Standing-I faculty members.” In addition, “Since full-time, fixed-term faculty members typically represent a small percentage of the full-time faculty workforce at MSU, their performance scores will be pooled at the college level for determining the distribution of merit scores (instead of at the department/school level as is the case for Standing-I faculty members).”

Evaluation of Clinical Faculty will be based primarily upon mentorship and teaching, when applicable. The evaluation instrument will be approved by the Department. Evaluation of Clinical Faculty will be completed by Program Coordinator or Department Chair or designee.
Morehead State University College of Education  
Department of Foundational and Graduate Studies  
Annual Productivity Components (Jan. 1-Dec. 31)

It is the faculty member’s responsibility to update Faculty 180 with information related to the components listed here. The list provides a broad range of activities within each area. Not all individuals will have information for every component.

Every FGSE faculty member will be provided with a standardized spreadsheet to aid in calculating points in each of the three areas and overall score. Use of the spreadsheet is ??.

**Teaching**

How would you score your overall performance in teaching? _____ points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPRING COURSES</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Evaluation Attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Reassigned time for ____ hours. Duties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMER COURSES</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Evaluation Attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reassigned time for ____ hours. Duties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL COURSES</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Evaluation Attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reassigned time for ____ hours. Duties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS (ST) / PRACTICUM STUDENTS (P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation MUST be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring: ST      P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTED STUDY PROJECTS</th>
<th>DIRECTED RESEARCH PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring:</td>
<td>Spring:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIST EXIT EXAMS / OTHER INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENTS ADMINISTERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring: 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IDEA Evaluation of Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>IDEA Item</th>
<th>IDEA Raw T</th>
<th>IDEA Adjusted T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall progress on objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved student attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall excellence of teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall excellence of course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 2</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>IDEA Item</th>
<th>IDEA Raw T</th>
<th>IDEA Adjusted T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall progress on objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved student attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall excellence of teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall excellence of course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 3</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>IDEA Item</th>
<th>IDEA Raw T</th>
<th>IDEA Adjusted T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall progress on objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved student attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall excellence of teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall excellence of course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 4</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>IDEA Item</th>
<th>IDEA Raw T</th>
<th>IDEA Adjusted T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall progress on objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved student attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall excellence of teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall excellence of course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Departmental Approved or Other Evaluation of Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Departmental or Other Course Evaluation Instrument</th>
<th>Overall Item Mean / Scale Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 2</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Departmental or Other Course Evaluation Instrument</th>
<th>Overall Item Mean / Scale Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 3</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Departmental or Other Course Evaluation Instrument</th>
<th>Overall Item Mean / Scale Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 4</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Departmental or Other Course Evaluation Instrument</th>
<th>Overall Item Mean / Scale Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chair / Peer Observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Name of Chair / Peer Observing</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 2</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Name of Chair / Peer Observing</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 3</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Name of Chair/Peer Observing</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Teaching Activities
**Professional Achievement**

How would you score your overall performance in professional achievement? ____ points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentations</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Presentation Title</th>
<th>Conference / Venue</th>
<th>Published in Proceedings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional refereed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State refereed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership in Professional Organizations</th>
<th>Names of Organizations to Which You Belong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development Participation (conferences, workshops, courses, in-service activities)</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professional Licensure or Certification (please list)**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Professional Achievement Activities**
**Service**

How would you score your overall performance in service? ________ points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association/Committee/Board Service</th>
<th>Office or Type of Service</th>
<th>Association/Committee/Board Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State / Community service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School / Agency in-service activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Other Service Activities**
**Overall Self-Rating**

Based on the worksheet below, how would you score your overall performance?

**Teaching Scores**

Total points \[ \text{__________} \times 60 = \text{______} \] points for Teaching

**Professional Achievement Scores**

Total points \[ \text{__________} \times 25 = \text{______} \] points for Professional Achievement

**Service Scores**

Total points \[ \text{__________} \times 15 = \text{______} \] points for Service

**Total Scaled Average Score**

Teaching \[ \text{___} + \] Professional Achievement \[ \text{___} + \] Service \[ \text{____} = \text{____} \]

**Annual Performance Score**

Total Scaled Average Score \[ \text{_____} / \text{3} = \text{____} \]

**CALCULATED ANNUAL PERFORMANCE SCORE**

\[ \text{______ POINTS} \]
PORTFOLIO SUMMARY:

The following are guidelines for organizing the contract renewal and tenure portfolios submitted by faculty of FGSE. Candidates should respond to or supply evidence for all categories that apply. If you have no information for a particular section, just leave it out and go on to the next. Include the outline designators (1.a., 1.b. etc.) in the vita to enable readers to easily find the appropriate information.

1. Letter of Intent
2. Departmental FEP (Flexible Workload Agreement)
3. Annual Evaluation Letters (and responses, if any)
   a. Year 5
   b. Year 4
   c. Year 3
   d. Year 2
   e. Year 1
4. (years of equivalent service granted)
5. Faculty 180 report of activities

Major tab: Full CV (Organization of Full CV follows this PORTFOLIO SUMMARY/VITA)

Minor tab: (Personal Data documentation)

Major tab: Teaching

1. Syllabi
   a. Year 5
   b. Year 4
   c. Year 3
   d. Year 2
   e. Year 1
2. Teacher ratings
   a. IDEA evaluations
      i. Year 5
      ii. Year 4
      iii. Year 3
      iv. Year 2
      v. Year 1
   b. Departmental evaluations
      i. Year 5
      ii. Year 4
      iii. Year 3
      iv. Year 2
      v. Year 1
   c. Chair/peer evaluations
      i. Year 5
      ii. Year 4
      iii. Year 3
c. Chair/peer evaluations (continued)
   iv. Year 4
   v. Year 5

d. Innovative instructional techniques
e. (Teaching awards/honors)
f. Course assessment materials
   i. (Exams)
   ii. (Assignments)
   iii. Feedback to students
g. (Other evidence of effective teaching)

Major tab: Professional Achievement

1. Scholarship
   a. Articles
   b. Books
   c. Reviews
d. Conference presentations
e. Work in Progress
f. Journal editorial work
g. Scholarly grants
h. Fellowships
   i. Scholarship awards
   j. Other evidence

2. Continuing education
   a. Workshop/seminars
   b. Professional conferences attended
e. Graduate study

3. Work experience/consulting
4. Other evidence of professional growth

Major tab: Service

1. Committees
   a. University
   b. College
   c. Department
2. Roles in academic organizations
3. Proposals to benefit MSU
4. Service awards/honors
5. Sponsorship/advising of MSU extracurricular activities
6. Official representative of MSU
7. Coordination/staffing of MSU events
8. Relations with professional groups
9. Other evidence of service

Outline for CV begins on following page.
CURRICULUM VITAE (CV) OUTLINE:

The following are guidelines for organizing the CV in contract renewal and tenure portfolios submitted by faculty of FGSE. Candidates should respond to or supply evidence for all categories that apply. If you have no information for a particular section, just leave it out and go on to the next. Include the outline designators (1.a., 1.b. etc.) in the CV to enable readers to easily find the appropriate information.

Whenever appropriate specific titles, dates, pages, and publishers should be included.

1. Personal Data
   a. Name
   b. Present rank, administrative title (if applicable), and department
   c. Field or fields of specialization
   d. Education completed: degrees, certifications, and/or licenses with institutions and dates awarded or granted
   e. Work experience at Morehead State University; teaching prior to Morehead State University; related work experience prior to Morehead State University
      (1) Institutions
      (2) Dates
      (3) Responsibilities
      (4) Rank changes and dates
   f. Memberships in academic honor organizations

2. Teaching -- Note whenever reassigned time was given.
   a. Teaching load each semester
      (1) Numbers and titles of courses taught
      (2) Number of students enrolled
      (3) Credit hours/workload
   b. Teaching evaluations summary
      (1) Student (e.g., nationally normed or university-accepted, supplemental, etc.)
      (2) Peer and/or Chair
      (3) Advising
   c. Innovative instructional techniques developed
   d. Teaching awards and honors
   e. Student contact activities
      (1) Number of advisees: graduate, undergraduate
      (2) Supervisor of internships
(3) Direction of theses and service on theses committees
(4) Direction of independent studies
(5) Service on oral examination committees
(6) Other
f. New courses and programs developed
g. Other evidence of effective teaching

3. Professional Achievement
   a. Scholarship
      (1) List of published articles
      (2) List of published books
      (3) List of published reviews
      (4) List of conference papers/posters/presentations
      (5) Work in progress
      (6) Editorship or service on editorial boards of Professional journals
      (7) List of scholarly grants
      (8) Sabbaticals
      (9) Fellowships awarded
      (10) Awards for scholarship
      (11) Other (for instance, blogs / wikis)
   b. Academic organizations
      (1) Memberships
      (2) Awards for professional service.
   c. Continuing education
      (1) Seminars/workshops attended and form of participation
      (2) Professional conferences attended
      (3) Graduate study
         (a) Institution
         (b) Degree being pursued and anticipated date of completion
         (c) Credit hours completed
   d. Relevant work experience and consulting
      (1) Institution/agency
      (2) Responsibilities
      (3) Dates
   e. Other evidence of professional growth
4. Service

a. List of University, college, department, and Faculty Senate ad hoc and standing committees with level indicated in each case

b. Service to academic organizations
   (1) Leadership roles
   (2) Participation at conferences

c. Development of proposals to benefit the University
   (1) Title of proposal
   (2) Date submitted
   (3) Accepted or rejected

d. Honors and awards for service

e. Sponsorship or advisor of University-approved extracurricular activities

f. Service as official representative of the University
   (1) Place
   (2) Responsibility
   (3) Date

g. Coordination/staffing of Morehead State University workshops, conferences, clinics, inservice, and special events
   (1) Title of event
   (2) Form of participation
   (3) Date

h. Development of relations with professional groups (business, industry, trade, education, and government)

i. Other service as a University representative
SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:
The supporting documents should be arranged in the following categories, with the outline designators on the tabs of the portfolio so readers can easily find the information:

1. Documents which support personal data (for example, copies of official letters of promotion at other institutions)

2. Documents which support effectiveness of teaching (for example)
   a. Course syllabi
   b. Copies of results of teacher ratings (e.g., student, peer and/or chair, advising) and letters reflecting teaching competence
   c. Copies of descriptions of innovative instructional techniques
   d. Copies of teaching awards and honors
   e. Course assessment materials (exams, assignments, evidence of feedback to students, etc.)

3. Documents which support evidence of professional achievement (for example)
   a. Scholarship
      1. Copies of published articles (or at least the first page, showing title and authors’ names)
      2. Title page of published books
      3. Copies of published reviews (or at least the first page, showing title and authors’ names)
      4. Copies of conference papers/posters/abstracts (or at least the first page, showing title and authors’ names); along with copies of relevant pages in conferences programs
      5. Copies or evidence of work in progress
      6. Evidence of editorship or service on editorial boards of Professional journals
      7. Copies of scholarly grants
      8. Evidence of work accomplished during Sabbatical
      9. Evidence of fellowships awarded
      10. Copies of awards for scholarship
      11. Other evidence of scholarship
   b. Evidence of continuing education
      1. Confirmation of workshops/seminars attended
      2. Professional conferences attended
      3. Transcripts from graduate study
   c. Evidence of relevant work experience and consulting
   d. Other evidence of professional growth
4. Documents which support service (for example)
   a. Evidence of membership and significant contributions on committees (copies of membership lists; minutes of meetings showing contributions; documents prepared for the committee)
   b. Evidence of roles in academic organizations
   c. Copies of proposals to benefit the University
   d. Copies of honors or awards for service
   e. Evidence of sponsorship or advising of University-approved extracurricular activities
   f. Documentation of service as official representative of the University
   g. Evidence of coordination/staffing of Morehead State University workshops, conferences, clinics, inservice, and special events
   h. Evidence of development of relations with professional groups (business, industry, trade, education, and government)
   i. Documentation of other service as a University representative
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Introduction

The Department of Public Management and Government believes that faculty members should be dedicated scholars committed to the preservation, transmission, and advancement of knowledge through excellence in teaching, continuous scholarly achievement, and service. We are committed to fostering an academic environment that encourages and supports faculty members in attaining their highest level of professional development.

To this end, the Department of Public Management and Government emphasizes a balance between teaching, scholarship, and service. The objective of the Department of Public Management and Government is to conduct research and educate students in the liberal arts tradition of social science excellence and to become engaged in community and regional education as well as outreach and service. To achieve these goals, the faculty is encouraged to focus not only on local and regional issues but also on state, national, and international issues. As such, the Department of Public Management and Government supports public engagement, “the collaboration between higher education institutions and their communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity” (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, n.d.).

The purpose of this document is to set forth performance expectations for the faculty in the Department of Public Management and Government. This document (I) discusses evaluation with reference to personnel decisions (reappointment, tenure, and promotion) and (II) provides an overview of the annual evaluation for performance-based merit compensation. This document provides guidelines as required by PAc-27 (Tenure and Reappointment Review), PAc-2 (Promotion Review), PAc-29 (Faculty Workload), PAc-30 (Performance-Based Compensation Plan for Faculty), and PAc-35 (Faculty Evaluation Plans). These and other appropriate policies, including the appeal process, will be observed. Submission dates and other particulars are set by the Provost, the Dean of the College, Chair of the Department, and university policies.

I. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

A. Reappointment of Probationary Faculty (contract renewal)

1. Procedure. Each untenured faculty member will receive an annual review of his/her academic and professional performance as specified in PAc-27.

2. Criteria. The criteria for reappointment in the Department of Public Management and Government include demonstration of expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and service to the University, profession, and community. (Definitions and criteria for evaluating components related to below expected, expected, meritorious, and outstanding performance in teaching, scholarship, and service are provided in Appendix A and Section II.D.) Both quantitative and qualitative aspects will be considered and weighted equally when evaluating a candidate’s performance in each of the three areas.
Candidates must also demonstrate consistent progress towards fulfilling the requirements for tenure and promotion to associate professor during the probationary period.

In the third year review, faculty will receive a preliminary tenure screen from the Department of Public Management and Government’s Tenure Committee, the Chair of the Department, and the Dean of the College. This review will be more detailed and specific than the “normal” annual review with the intent of providing the candidate with a detailed assessment and constructive criticism of three years of performance and its relationship to the tenure decision.

B. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

1. **Procedure.** Each untenured faculty member will be reviewed for tenure as specified in PAc-27.

2. **Criteria.** The criteria for tenure and promotion to associate professor in the Department of Public Management and Government include demonstration of outstanding achievement in one of the three areas (teaching, scholarship, and service) and meritorious achievement in the remaining two areas. However, tenure may be granted to candidates who demonstrate meritorious achievement in all three areas. Appropriate accommodation may be made in consideration of a faculty member’s workload across all three areas of evaluation. (Definitions and criteria for evaluating components related to below expected, expected, meritorious, and outstanding performance in teaching, scholarship, and service are provided in Appendix A and Section II.D.) Assistant professors who achieve tenure will be promoted automatically to associate professor.

Note: the procedures used for annual performance-based evaluations for merit compensation (Section II) are separate from those used for reappointment and tenure reviews (which are broader considerations of the candidate’s potential for future excellence.) Consequently, meeting or exceeding the criteria for *annual* performance-based evaluations for merit compensation does not automatically ensure a favorable *tenure* decision (which is based on a candidate’s cumulative performance over the probationary period.).
Expectations for tenure include:

- Clear evidence of meritorious or outstanding teaching, as well as evidence predictive of a commitment to continued development in this area, and
- Clear evidence of effective mentoring of MSU student scholarship (such as, but not limited to, posters, presentations, or articles with students as co-authors), and
- Clear evidence of meritorious or outstanding scholarship, including four significant scholarly works, such as, but not limited to, journal articles, book chapters, books (monographs or edited), government white papers, competitive grants and contracts, including:
  - peer-reviewed scholarly publication(s), and
  - substantial external grant(s), and
- Clear evidence of meritorious or outstanding service to the Department of Public Management and Government, the College of Business and Technology, and University-level committees, and
- Significant, ongoing, service related to the faculty member’s scholarly expertise, (such as, but not limited to, national or state level service to the discipline, regional engagement).
- Regular research presentations at quality disciplinary conferences.

Books, either monographs or edited, may constitute more than one significant scholarly work based upon the contributions, their length, and their quality, as discussed under “Behavioral Anchors” in section II.D below.

Both quantitative and qualitative aspects will be considered and weighted equally when evaluating a candidate’s performance in teaching, scholarship, and service.

C. Promotion to Professor

1. Procedure. Candidates for promotion to professor will be reviewed as specified in PAc-2.

2. Criteria. The criteria for promotion to professor in the Department of Public Management and Government are two-fold. First, this rank is reserved for persons of proven stature in their field in one or more areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Second, it is expected that candidates for promotion to professor meet academic and professional standards in teaching, scholarship, and service that significantly surpass those required of candidates who seek advancement in rank to associate professor. In particular, consistent with PAc-1 and PAc-2, candidates must show evidence of outstanding performance in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service since promotion to associate professor. (Definitions and criteria for evaluating components related to below expected, expected, meritorious, and outstanding performance in teaching, scholarship, and service are provided in Appendix A and Section II.D.) Appropriate accommodation may be made in consideration of a faculty member’s workload across all three areas of evaluation. Both quantitative and qualitative aspects will be considered and weighted equally when evaluating a candidate’s performance in teaching, scholarship, and service.
II. Annual Evaluation For Performance-Based Merit Compensation

A. Annual Deadline
In accord with PAC-30: Performance-Based Compensation Plan for Faculty, all Department of Public Management and Government faculty will report their accomplishments with respect to teaching, scholarship, and service activities during the evaluation period (calendar year) for the purpose of performance-based compensation. The Department Chair, on or before the first Friday in December of the year being evaluated, will distribute a copy of the department’s FEP to all faculty. Faculty (tenured, tenure-track, and fixed term) will submit evaluation materials by the second Friday in January of each year at the Department Chair’s written request and in accord with this FEP. Faculty members who do not submit a performance review portfolio meeting these requirements by the due date will not be eligible for a salary increase.

B. Evaluation Materials Required

All faculty shall submit a letter, vita, and supporting documentation for performance in teaching, scholarship, and service. The supporting documentation must be extensive enough to enable the Department Chair to determine the level of performance that the faculty member has attained with a view to performance-based compensation.

C. Allocation of Effort

Each faculty member has responsibilities in three categories (teaching, scholarship, and service) and is granted latitude in determining how much weight to attach to each category. The range of possible weights for each of the three categories for tenured and tenure-track faculty is defined as follows:

- Teaching: 50-70 percent
- Scholarship: 20-40 percent
- Service: 10-25 percent

Remaining current with the scholarship in one’s field and conducting research are essential for teaching excellence on an ongoing basis. As a result, full-time fixed-term faculty members are expected to maintain an active research agenda and remain current in their fields through regular scholarly activity, examples of which may be found in Section II.D. The range of possible weights for each of the three categories of responsibility for full-time fixed-term faculty is defined as follows:

- Teaching: 60-80 percent
- Scholarship: 0-30 percent
- Service: 5-20 percent

During review, the Department Chair may alter allocation of effort where it maximizes the evaluation score.
D. Evaluation

All faculty members are expected to work cooperatively with their colleagues in the department and the department chair, be receptive to constructive feedback, and attempt to follow suggestions for improvement. Evaluation in each of the three main categories is based on these and similar activities:

Teaching:

- Instructional load (number of courses, preparations, and students)
- Student evaluations
- Peer evaluations of teaching
- Review of teaching materials
- Curriculum development
- Observation by Department Chair
- Student grade distributions
- Teaching awards and honors
- Teaching innovations
- Advising load and effectiveness
- Mentoring student research
- Integration of community-based learning
- Other indicators of teaching effectiveness

Scholarship:

- Publications in peer-reviewed journals
- Books published and/or edited
- Funded research proposals
- Substantial research proposals (unfunded but favorably reviewed)
- Book chapters
- Book reviews
- White papers, technical reports, grant/contract reports
- Conference papers/presentations
- Applied community/regional research
- Works in progress
- Manuscripts reviewed
- Research presentations
- Other published works

Service:

- University, College, and/or Department committee assignments and level of participation
- Significant and effective efforts to recruit and retain students to the Department of Public Management and Government’s academic programs
● Service to professional societies
● Service to student organizations
● Pertinent civic and public relations activities
● Service to the region
● External grant awards that serve the institution or the region
● Providing teacher, workforce, or professional training
● Professional outreach to schools and other external organizations
● Activities related to promoting and improving the University
● Leadership activities with respect to service of any type

Behavioral Anchors

**Teaching:** Satisfactory student evaluation plus supportive evidence of effective teaching.

**Scholarship:** one publication per year (peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, funded external research proposals, edited book, authored book), or two works per year (broadly defined [e.g. presented conference papers, submitted research proposals, manuscripts under review, ongoing grant activity]). For full-time fixed-term faculty, one significant scholarly work and evidence of an active research agenda.

**Service:** Two committees with regular meetings throughout the year or more intense meetings in a compressed time frame or two other similar service responsibilities. Committee chairs may be invited to provide input regarding the service of committee members.

The quantitative evaluation is behaviorally anchored to deflect and diminish interpersonal competition. Qualitative rankings give consideration to the qualitative merit of the faculty member’s work. Articles published in national or regional academic journals would be more favorably evaluated than those published in non-peer-reviewed or state-wide venues. Discipline journal publication would likely be viewed as superior to law journal publication. Discipline journal publications will receive a higher qualitative evaluation in consideration of impact factor or national peer-reviewing ranking. With respect to awarded research grants, preference will be given to peer-reviewed grants. However, qualitative distinctions must be made within the full context of scholarship. For example, a paper may be presented at a prestigious international meeting thereby warranting a favorable qualitative evaluation. However, upon review the paper has typographic errors, writing problems, and an incomplete bibliography. Poorly crafted work is poorly crafted regardless of the outlet. With respect to teaching, qualitative considerations may include such things as substantive revisions/updates of a course, carefully crafted syllabi, assignments that foster the development of students’ knowledge and skills, challenging readings, detailed feedback on student work, development or use of innovative instructional techniques, use of regular and effective assessment instruments, and/or positive student evaluations. With respect to service, a leadership role on a committee or other type of service activity would also favorably impact the qualitative evaluation for service.
E. Computing the Performance Score

The Department Chair will review the faculty member’s portfolio and rate on a scale from 1-7 the quantity and quality of activities associated with each category as described in Section II.D: Evaluation. A rating of 7 is exceptional, a rating of 4 is average and a rating of 1 indicates the faculty member performed very poorly.

The quantity and quality scores for each category are added and divided by two to obtain an average ranking. The resulting number is then multiplied by the weight chosen by the faculty member. For example, a faculty member presented papers at two national conferences, published an article in a leading and respected national journal and was awarded a National Science Foundation (NSF) EPSCOR grant. The Department Chair rated the quantity of output as a 5. However, the faculty member’s article won a coveted “article of the year” award. Consequently, the Department Chair rated the quality of the work as a 7. The two scores were then added and divided by two which equaled 6.0. Since the faculty member selected 50 percent as the professional category weight, the total weighted score for the category equaled 3.00. The process is then repeated for the other two categories. The three weighted scores were then added together to produce a performance score. The performance score (5.30 in this example) is compared against the rating scale used earlier to determine how well the faculty member performed across all three categories considered as a group. The example cited above is illustrated in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of Effort</th>
<th>Quality/Quantity</th>
<th>Category Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>(5+5)/2=5.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Achievement</td>
<td>(5+7)/2=6.0</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>(4+4)/2=4.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Performance Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Feedback and Reporting

Faculty members will receive their performance scores including written justification/rationale by the Department Chair by the 3rd Friday in February. The feedback will include constructive criticism and suggestions that are intended to enable faculty members to improve their future performance.
G. Appeal Process for Annual Evaluation for Performance-Based Merit Compensation

The faculty member will be given the opportunity to discuss the evaluation and recommendation with the Department Chair by the 3rd Friday in February, as indicated in Section F above. This discussion shall include the opportunity to resolve any disagreement in regard to the evaluation and recommendation. As a result of this discussion, the Department Chair may alter the evaluation and recommendation.

If the differences are not resolved, the faculty member may submit a brief, written summary of his or her considerations for appeal to the Department Chair within three working days of receiving the written performance evaluation. The Department Chair will respond with a written statement justifying the decision to increase or maintain the faculty member’s performance score within three working days of receiving the written appeal.

If the differences are still not resolved, then the faculty member has until the 1st Friday in March to submit a simple written request to the Department Chair to have the Department’s Appeals Committee review his or her performance evaluation. The Appeals Committee shall consist of three senior, tenured faculty in the Department of Public Management and Government (one selected by the faculty member; two selected by the Department Chair). If a sufficient number of committee members is not available from within the department, selections will be made from senior, tenured faculty in the College of Business and Technology. The Appeals Committee will review the faculty member’s written appeal and portfolio, and the Department Chair’s evaluation, recommendation, and response. No new arguments, evidence, or documents may be introduced after the first written appeal to the Department Chair. The committee’s recommendation, which is final, must be completed before the 2nd Friday in March. A faculty member may appeal this decision on due process grounds only as described in the relevant MSU personnel policy documents.

H. Performance-Based Salary Increase

The Department Chair will make merit score and equity-adjustment recommendations for each faculty member to the Dean of the College in accord with UAR 137.01—Faculty Salary Plan.
Appendix A
Definitions and Criteria for Evaluating Faculty

TEACHING

**Below Expected Performance.** This category recognizes that the criteria for Expected Performance are not being met.

**Expected Performance.** This category recognizes the satisfactory fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in Department of Public Management and Government. It indicates progress toward meritorious teaching, but indicates specific areas that must be improved.

**Meritorious Performance.** This category recognizes general excellence both in classroom teaching and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the Department of Public Management and Government. Excellence in classroom teaching includes the presentation of comprehensive and current information in an interactive, challenging, and effective manner, the use of identifiable and effective strategies for motivating students, and the use of syllabi and assignments that promote student development.

**Outstanding Performance.** This category recognizes exemplary performance both in teaching classes and in the collective responsibilities of the Department of Public Management and Government, including comprehensive advising. It indicates that the faculty member has raised the level of student performance. While meritorious teaching describes the faculty member who focuses on both the quality of inputs to the learning process and the quality of learner outcomes, outstanding teaching describes the faculty member who demonstrates superior achievement in both.

SCHOLARSHIP

**Below Expected Performance.** This category recognizes that the criteria for Expected Performance are not being met.

**Expected Performance.** This category recognizes that a faculty member is engaged in a continuous program of professional achievement that results in completed scholarly works and the dissemination of findings.

**Meritorious Performance.** This category recognizes that a faculty member is engaged in an ongoing research program, has disseminated the findings, and is publishing the research outcomes.

**Outstanding Performance.** This category recognizes that the faculty member is making an original contribution to his/her field and is engaged in an active and continuous research agenda.
SERVICE

**Below Expected Performance.** This category recognizes that the criteria for Expected Performance are not being met.

**Expected Performance.** This category recognizes participation in significant service activities in the University (Department, College, and/or University level) and in the faculty member’s Discipline and/or the region.

**Meritorious Performance.** This category recognizes active participation in service activities in the University (Department, College, and/or University level) and in his or her profession and/or the region at a level appropriate for one’s rank, and that the faculty member serves on or beyond his or her equitable share of committees.

**Outstanding Performance.** This category recognizes that the faculty member provides leadership in the University (Department, College, and/or University level) and in his/her profession. This leadership might come in the form of holding official positions or in playing a role in program or policy development. In addition, outstanding service could include an active outreach program in the region, which applies the faculty’s expertise to regional problems and needs.
Appendix B  
Department of Public Management and Government  
Annual Evaluation for Performance-Based Merit Compensation  
Faculty Evaluation Form  
Year of Review: _______

Faculty Name, Appointment, & Rank:___________________________________

Teaching  
Quantitative: ___  Qualitative: ___  Weighting: ___

Comments:

Scholarship  
Quantitative: ___  Qualitative: ___  Weighting: ___

Comments:

Service  
Quantitative: ___  Qualitative: ___  Weighting: ___

Comments:

**SUMMARY EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Category</th>
<th>Weighted Score Calculation</th>
<th>Category Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>(Quantitative Score ___ + Qualitative Score <em><strong>)/2 x Weighting</strong></em>%  =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>(Quantitative Score ___ + Qualitative Score <em><strong>)/2 x Weighting</strong></em>%  = +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>(Quantitative Score ___ + Qualitative Score <em><strong>)/2 x Weighting</strong></em>%  = +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong> =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Suggestions and Comments:

Faculty Signature:____________________________   Department Chair Signature: ______________________________

Date:__________________
MOREHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES
FACULTY EVALUATION PLAN

Effective: June 8, 2013

I. Introduction

A. Philosophy

Consistent with the mission of Morehead State University, the Department of Agricultural Sciences (AS) strives to provide excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service.

B. Statement of Purpose

The AS Departmental Faculty Evaluation Plan (FEP) sets forth the expectations for re-appointment of tenure-track faculty, tenure, promotion from associate professor to professor, and annual evaluation.

C. Disclaimer Statements

The process of annual evaluation is a different process than those for tenure and promotion. Positive yearly evaluations for reappointment and/or annual evaluation are not a guarantee of tenure or promotion.

AS Departmental FEP requirements seek to follow all applicable university policies. If any discrepancies exist, approved university policies will prevail. University policies include, but are not limited to, PAc-2 Promotion, PAc-11 Faculty Scholarship, PAc-27 Tenure, PAc-29 Faculty Workload and PAc-35 Faculty Evaluation Plans.

D. Regional Engagement

Civic/regional Engagement is defined as active collaboration that builds on the resources, skills, expertise, and knowledge of the campus and community to improve the quality of life in communities in a manner that is consistent with the campus mission. The definition of civic engagement indicates that this work encompasses teaching, research, and service (including patient and client services) not only in but also with the community. Civic engagement includes university work in all sectors of society: nonprofit, government, and business. If regional engagement is involved in any faculty accomplishments, evidence shall be provided in the appropriate faculty activity reporting system. Evidence shall include a description of how knowledge and resources
of the University are being used to connect to the community, service region, and beyond. Evaluation criteria for the use of civic / regional engagement activities in the FEP shall be based on recommended evaluation criteria from the Clearinghouse & National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement. Additionally, the following MSU-CRE objectives will be considered when evaluating a faculty member’s involvement in civic / regional engagement:

- Partnership between MSU and an external agency/constituency.
- Addresses a mutual need, how to address the need, and accountability.
- Involves resources from all partners.
- Is tied to specific outcomes.
- Needs to be measurable.
- Should cut across the triad of teaching, research and service.

II. Point System

Each area (teaching, scholarship, and service) will be evaluated using a system that assigns points to different forms of accomplishments.

Charts that distinguish between meeting departmental expectations, not meeting departmental expectations, or exceeding departmental expectations of each area are included for tenure, promotion to full professor, and annual evaluation.

POINT VALUES

Note: Unless otherwise indicated, points listed are per each item in the category. Some categories have a maximum number of points that can be awarded for the calendar year.

TEACHING

1. Teaching Evaluations
   - For annual evaluation, an average or above average level must be met for at least one of the following types of evaluations.
   - For tenure or promotion to full professor, an average or above average level must be met for at least two of the following types of evaluations.
   - The score for each type of evaluation (student evaluations, peer, supervisor) is based on the average of all evaluations for that type of evaluation conducted
during the calendar year. The maximum number of points that can be awarded for any teaching evaluation type is 5 per calendar year.

- If a teaching activity is deemed to have a significant **service-learning or civic engagement component** as a part of that activity, the AS Department Chair will have the ability to apply an additional 1 point value to that activity.

Types of evaluations:

- **Student Evaluations**
  - University or departmentally-accepted teaching evaluation instrument completed by students
  - Above average = 5
  - Average = 3
  - If the IDEA form is used, IDEA adjusted scores for summary evaluation based on a 5.0 scale will receive points as follows
    - Above average (score of 4.0 – 5.0) = 5
    - Average (score of 3.0 – 3.9) = 3

- **Peer teaching evaluations**
  - Above average = 5
  - Average = 3

- **Supervisor teaching evaluations**
  - Above average = 5
  - Average = 3

2. **Course Development and Content**

- Developed a new course (type II curricular change) through the curriculum review process
  - Author = 3
  - Co-author = 1

- Taught a course for the first time
  - 1-2 points for each course

- Substantially restructured an existing course
  - 1-2 points for each course

- Implemented state-of-the-art technology or innovative teaching techniques in a course
- 1-2 points per each new technique
- Can only be counted for the first year used

- Had **unpaid** overload or course load not calculated in workload (per calendar year)
  - more than 3.0 hours = 4
  - 2.1-3.0 hours = 3
  - 1.1-2.0 hours = 2
  - 0.1-1 hour = 1

3. **Program Revision and Development**

- Substantially contributed to the revision of a program (type III curricular change) through the curriculum review process
  - Principal author = 5
  - Co-author = 3-4
  - Other contribution = 1-2

- Substantially contributed to the development of a new program (type IV curricular change) through the curriculum review process
  - Principal author = 5
  - Co-author = 3-4
  - Other contribution = 1-2

4. **Honors and Awards**

- Received an award or honor for teaching
  - International, national, or national regional = 4-5
  - State, state regional, MSU, or local = 2-3

- Documented exceptional mentoring of student(s)
  - 1-2 points for each student
  - Maximum of 4 points per calendar year

5. **Advising**

- Number of undergraduate advisees (average of spring and fall semesters)
  - 80 or more = 4
  - 60-79 = 3
  - 40-59 = 2
  - 10-39 = 1

- Rating on a student advising evaluation instrument completed by advisees
  - Scores is based on the average of all advising evaluations conducted during the calendar year


- Above average = 2
- Average = 1

- Received an award or honor for academic advising
  - International, national, or national regional = 3
  - State, state regional, MSU, or local = 2

- Advised graduate students
  - 5 or more = 3
  - 3-4 = 2
  - 1-2 = 1

- Directed theses
  - 2 points for each thesis directed

- Participation on student graduate committees
  - 1 point per graduate student

- Supervised undergraduate research
  - 5 or more = 3
  - 3-4 = 2
  - 1-2 = 1

6. **Other Instructional Activities**

- Arranged or supervised field trip(s)
  - 5 or more field trips = 3
  - 3-4 = 2
  - 1-2 = 1

- Team taught a course
  - 1 point per course
  - Maximum of 2 points per calendar year

- Guest lecturer in a course
  - 1 point per course
  - Maximum of 2 points per calendar year

- Supervised a co-op/internship/practicum (not included in teaching load and not paid)
  - 5 or more = 3
  - 3-4 = 2
  - 1-2 = 1

- Supervised special problem(s)/independent study course(s) or development of a co-op or internship site(s) (not included in teaching load and not paid)
5 or more = 3  
3-4 = 2  
1-2 = 1

- Arranged or supervised travel study tour(s)  
  - 5 or more student = 3  
  - 3-4 students = 2  
  - 1-2 students = 1

- Other evidence of effective teaching  
  - 1-2 points each  
  - Maximum of 5 points per calendar year

**SCHOLARSHIP**

- If a scholarship activity is deemed to have a significant **service-learning or civic engagement component** as a part of that activity, the AS Department Chair will have the ability to apply an additional 1 point value to that activity.

1. Published article(s) in a refereed journal  
   i. Principal author = 4-5  
   ii. Co-author = 3-4

2. Published book(s) and/or chapter(s)  
   a. Entire textbook  
      i. Principal author = 4-5  
      ii. Co-author = 3-4
   b. Chapter in a textbook  
      i. Principal author = 3-4  
      ii. Co-author = 2-3  
   c. Producer’s guide = 2-3

3. Published reviews  
   a. 2-3 points each

4. Publishable works in progress  
   a. 1 point each  
   b. Maximum of 2 points per calendar year  
   c. Each work can only be counted as “in progress” one year
5. Publication in popular press (extension, professional newsletters, industry publications, etc.)
   a. International, national, national regional = 2
   b. State, state regional, local = 1
   c. Maximum of 5 points per calendar year

6. Conference paper(s) and/or proceedings
   a. International, national, national regional
      i. Principal author = 3-4
      ii. Co-author = 2-3
   b. State, state regional, local
      i. Principal author = 2-3
      ii. Co-author = 1-2

7. Poster(s) and/or abstract(s) and/or oral presentation
   a. Principal author = 2-3
   b. Co-author = 1-2

8. White paper(s) and/or case study(s)
   a. Principal author = 2-3
   b. Co-author = 1-2

9. Research in progress
   a. 1 point per project per calendar year
   b. Projects may be counted for more than one year

10. Editorial board or editorship of a professional journal
    a. 2-3 points per journal

11. Served as a reviewer for grant(s), paper(s) or book(s) and/or chapter(s)
    a. International, national, national regional = 2 points per entity
    b. State, state regional, local = 1 point per entity

12. Submitted grant proposal(s)
    a. International, national, national regional = 3
    b. State, state regional, local = 2

13. Received funding of grant proposal(s)
    a. International, national, national regional = 4-5
    b. State, state regional, local = 3-4

14. Completed funded grant(s)
    a. International, national, national regional = 2
    b. State, state regional, local = 1
15. Gave a lecture presentation at a meeting/conference/workshop
   a. International, national, national regional = 3-4
   b. State, state regional, local = 2-3

16. Documented professional development other than MSU-sponsored events
   a. One point each
   b. Maximum of 5 points per calendar year

17. Attended a MSU in-service seminar or workshop
   a. One point each
   b. Maximum of 3 points per calendar year

18. Conducted consulting work (if for merit, unpaid only)
   a. One point for up to 10 clock hours
   b. One point for each additional 10 clock hours
   c. Maximum of 5 points per calendar year

19. Received honor(s)/award(s) for scholarship
   a. International, national, national regional = 4-5
   b. State, state regional, local = 2-3

20. Received a Fellowship
    a. International, national, national regional = 4-5
    b. State, state regional, local = 2-3

21. Member of professional organization(s)
    a. One point per membership
    b. Maximum of 3 points per calendar year

22. Other evidence of scholarship
    a. 1-2 points each
    b. Maximum of 5 points per calendar year

SERVICE

- If a service activity is deemed to have a significant service-learning or civic engagement component as a part of that activity, the AS Department Chair will have the ability to apply an additional 1 point value to that activity.

1. Member of departmental committee(s)
   a. Chair = 2
   b. Member = 1
   c. Maximum of 5 points per calendar year
2. Member of college committee(s)
   a. Chair = 2
   b. Member = 1

3. Member of university committee(s)
   a. Chair = 3
   b. Member = 1

4. Service on faculty senate
   a. Senator = 2
   b. Committee chair = 2

5. Service in registration events (SOARs)
   a. One point each
   b. Maximum of 5 points per calendar year

6. Service in recruiting events (Meet MSU night, Open Houses)
   a. One point each
   b. Maximum of 5 points per calendar year

7. Coordination of university-sponsored workshops, conferences, in-services, presentations, and special events.
   a. 1-2 points each
   b. Maximum of 5 points per calendar year

8. Hosted a meeting or conference of an external group on or off campus
   a. Multi-day meeting or conference
      i. Lead coordinator = 4-5
      ii. Co-worker = 2-3
   b. One-day meeting or conference
      i. Lead coordinator = 2-3
      ii. Co-worker = 1

9. Service as an official representative of the University
   a. International, national, national regional = 2-3
   b. State, state regional, local = 1-2
   c. Maximum of 5 points per calendar year
   d. Cannot be counted if used to receive other FEP points

10. Advisor/Sponsor of a university student organization
    a. Two points per organization
    b. Maximum of 5 points per calendar year

11. Involved in a university student organization other than as advisor/sponsor
    a. One point per organization
b. Maximum of 3 points per calendar year

12. Developed relationships/partnerships with professional groups in business, industry, education, and government
   a. 1-2 points each
   b. Maximum of 5 points per calendar year
   c. Cannot be counted if used to receive other FEP points

13. Obtained donations of material/supplies
   a. Up to $5,000 = 1 point
   b. Every additional $5,000 = 1 additional point
   c. Maximum of 5 points per calendar year

14. Developed a proposal to benefit the department/university
   a. 1-2 points per proposal
   b. Maximum of 3 points per calendar year

15. Received an honor or award for service
   a. International, national, national regional = 4-5
   b. State, state regional, local = 2-3

16. Acted as coordinator/administrator of a MSU program
    (received no reassigned time and was not paid)
   a. 5 points each

17. Leadership in a professional association
   a. International, national, national regional = 4-5
   b. State, state regional, local = 3-4

18. Mentored assigned faculty according to AS Departmental mentoring protocol
   a. One point per faculty mentored
   b. Maximum of 5 points per calendar year

19. Other service
   a. 1-2 points per item
   b. Maximum of 5 points per calendar year

III. Annual Evaluation

Table for rating teaching, scholarship, and service activities for ANNUAL EVALUATION.

<p>| Area                  | Below Expected | Expected | Above Expected |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------|----------------|-----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;10</th>
<th>10-20</th>
<th>&gt;20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>&gt;20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*An average or above average level **must** be met for at least one type of teaching evaluation to be considered at or above the expected rating for teaching.

A. Relative Weights of 3 Areas

Recognizing that each faculty member provides a unique combination of teaching, scholarship, and service to the AS Department and to MSU, each faculty member shall determine within the following restrictions the relative weights the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service count in the overall **annual** reviews.

Teaching shall count between 60% and 90% of the evaluation for faculty with 24 workload hours or more per academic year. Faculty with less than 24 workload hours per academic year, may prorate the percentage teaching counts to less than 60%. **In no case shall teaching count less than 50% of the overall annual evaluation.** The faculty member shall determine how the remaining percentage shall be divided between scholarship and service. No less than 5% shall be assigned to each area.

B. Additional AS FEP restrictions, if any, to Flexible Workload Agreements (FWAs)

If a faculty member has a FWA, the processes described in Pac-29 and Pac-35 shall be followed. There are no additional restrictions.

Pac-35 states: At the beginning of each calendar year, if a faculty member had a FWA for the prior year, that faculty member’s immediate supervisor will review the faculty member’s performance in accordance with the criteria specified in the FWA and the guidelines outlined in Pac-29. This review will be forwarded to the appropriate department committee to be considered as part of the standard review process. If a faculty member disagrees with his or her progress report, he or she may appeal, following the appeal procedure identified in Pac-29.
C. Chair’s Evaluation Form for Annual Evaluation

Faculty Member: ___________________________  Date of Evaluation: ____________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Total Points/Area</th>
<th>Percent* / Area</th>
<th>Adjusted Points/Area (Multiplier x Total Points x %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching <em>(60-90%)</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship <em>(Minimum 5%)</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service <em>(Minimum 5%)</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percentage is determined by the faculty member according to the restrictions included in this document. (Teaching shall count between 60% and 90% of the evaluation for faculty with 24 workload hours or more per academic year. Faculty with less than 24 workload hours per academic year, may prorate the percentage teaching counts to less than 60%. In no case shall teaching count less than 50% of the overall annual evaluation. No less than 5% shall be assigned to each area.)
Rating of sum of points achieved in all 3 areas and adjusted for percent designations and multiplier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL Adjusted Points</th>
<th>Below Expected</th>
<th>At Expected</th>
<th>Above Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>&gt;20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recipients of Distinguished Teacher, Researcher, or Service awards.

A faculty member who has received the Distinguished Teacher, Researcher, or Service award from MSU shall be considered as above expectation in that area for the year in which the award was made.

D. Annual Evaluation Appeal Process

To accomplish its goals and objectives, the departmental annual evaluation process must be perceived as objective, fair, and equitable. Each faculty member will receive a written evaluation of their performance and the opportunity to discuss the evaluation with the chair. As a result of this discussion, the Department Chair may modify the evaluation.

If there is a continuing disagreement between the Chair and the faculty member relating to the evaluation, then the faculty member may formally appeal the evaluation/recommendation to a Departmental Appeals Committee within seven working days of receiving the evaluation. The Departmental Appeals Committee will consist of three tenured faculty within the department: one chosen by the Chair, one chosen by the faculty member, and the third chosen by the two selected committee members. The Appeals Committee will then review the faculty member’s portfolio, the Chair’s evaluation, and the Chair’s evaluations of other departmental faculty.

Within five working days after receiving the appeal, the committee will make a recommendation, including a written justification, to the Chair to maintain or to change the Chair’s evaluation. The faculty member will receive a copy of the committee’s recommendation. The Chair may accept or reject the committee’s recommendation.

If the Chair reject’s the committee’s recommendation, the faculty member will have the option to withdraw his/her appeal. If the faculty member chooses to continue the
appeal, all materials will be forwarded to the Dean for a final determination. This final determination will be shared in writing with the Department Chair and faculty member.

IV. Tenure and Reappointment

A. Departmental Goals

The AS Department endeavors to provide support, encouragement and nurturing of tenure-track faculty with the goals of tenuring and retaining quality faculty.

B. Role of Faculty Mentor

Each tenure-track faculty will be assigned an AS faculty mentor who will, in accordance with the AS faculty mentoring protocol, assist the candidate in understanding MSU policies and procedures related to the tenure process.

C. Expectations

For reappointment and tenure, probationary faculty are expected to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and applicable service. Supporting documentation of accomplishments in each area will be provided annually by the faculty member to the Chair of the AS Department and will be available to any person involved in the reappointment/tenure process.

Consistent with the mission of the University, the AS Department maintains high expectations of its faculty in teaching, scholarship, and service. For tenure, the faculty member must meet the expected level or above expected level for each area (teaching, scholarship, and service) in the overall probationary period. Additionally, unless extenuating circumstances occur, after the first probationary year the faculty member must achieve the expected level as defined under the annual evaluation section in two or more areas each probationary year. The extenuating circumstance must be documented by the faculty member and recognized in writing by the AS chair.

Meeting departmental expectations indicates that an individual is meeting the requirements in an area of evaluation. The AS Department will encourage faculty to exceed the requirements of the position.

Table for rating teaching, scholarship, and service activities for TENURE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Below Expected</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Above Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Teaching</td>
<td>&lt;40</td>
<td>40-80</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Expectations for Reappointment

For reappointment tenure-track faculty members are expected to show evidence of a pattern of accomplishments that will ultimately meet requirements for tenure.

E. Additional AS FEP restrictions, if any, to Flexible Workload Agreements (FWAs)

If a faculty member has a FWA, the processes described in Pac-29 and Pac-35 shall be followed. There are no additional restrictions.

Pac-35 states: At the beginning of each calendar year, if a faculty member had a FWA for the prior year, that faculty member’s immediate supervisor will review the faculty member’s performance in accordance with the criteria specified in the FWA and the guidelines outlined in Pac-29. This review will be forwarded to the appropriate department committee to be considered as part of the standard review process. If a faculty member disagrees with his or her progress report, he or she may appeal, following the appeal procedure identified in Pac-29.

V. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

A. Departmental Goals and Objectives

The AS Department seeks to recognize and reward outstanding faculty through promotion from associate professor to professor.

B. Expectations

Expectations/requirements are based on accomplishments made after receiving the rank of associate professor. For promotion to professor, the faculty member must meet the expected level in all three areas (teaching, scholarship, and service) and be above the expected level in two of the three areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship</th>
<th>&lt;20</th>
<th>20-40</th>
<th>&gt;40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>&lt;40</td>
<td>40-80</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*An average or above average level must be met for at least two types of teaching evaluation to be considered at or above the expected rating for teaching.*
Table for rating teaching, scholarship, and service activities for PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Below Expected</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Above Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Teaching</td>
<td>&lt;50</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>&gt;100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>25-50</td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>&lt;50</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>&gt;100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*An average or above average level must be met for at least two types of teaching evaluation to be considered at or above the expected rating for teaching.

C. Additional AS FEP restrictions, if any, to Flexible Workload Agreements (FWAs)

If a faculty member has a FWA, the processes described in Pac-29 and Pac-35 shall be followed. There are no additional restrictions.

Pac-35 states: At the beginning of each calendar year, if a faculty member had a FWA for the prior year, that faculty member’s immediate supervisor will review the faculty member’s performance in accordance with the criteria specified in the FWA and the guidelines outlined in Pac-29. This review will be forwarded to the appropriate department committee to be considered as part of the standard review process. If a faculty member disagrees with his or her progress report, he or she may appeal, following the appeal procedure identified in Pac-29.
Department of Agricultural Sciences

Faculty Mentorship Program

(Developed 2013 by Dr. Kimberly Peterson)

Goal:

New faculty members are assigned a tenured faculty mentor by the Department Chair. The mentor’s role is to facilitate the nurturing of new faculty in the process of becoming a valued member of the academy. The mentor should guide the probationary faculty through their growth and development in the three primary areas of activity: Teaching, Scholarship and Service. The desired end result is a faculty member that meets or preferably exceeds the department and university expectations in the 3 key areas. A productive and successful faculty team functions synergistically to serve the mission of the department, college, university and region.

Timeline:

Year 1

- Meet with mentee during the first semester of employment to confirm the mentee has the current FEP and Pac-27 documents
  - Meeting date:___________
- Discuss individual short-term and long-term goals for excellence in Teaching, Scholarship and Service to meet or exceed the requirements for tenure.
- Discuss timeline for annual review and portfolio submission for the current year and future years. (follow Personnel Action Calendar)
Mentor, mentee and department chair meet to discuss the plan for teaching, scholarship and service over the course of the 5 year probationary period.
  - Meeting date:__________

Meet with mentee prior to end of fall semester to discuss progress toward goals and portfolio preparation (usually due early January of the first year of employment).
  - Meeting date:__________

Peer Teaching Evaluation – mentor to provide a written teaching evaluation each semester.
  - Fall Class period: ____________
  - Spring Class period: ____________

**Year 2**

Meet with mentee early in the fall to plan for portfolio submission for the annual review process (portfolio usually due in October). Discuss progress toward goals and results of previous year review.
  - Meeting Date:__________
  - Peer Teaching Evaluation – mentor to provide a written teaching evaluation each semester
    - Fall Class period: ____________
    - Spring Class period: ____________

**Year 3**

Meet with mentee in the fall to plan for portfolio submission for the annual review process (portfolio usually due in January). Discuss progress toward goals and results of previous year review.
  - Meeting Date:__________
  - Peer Teaching Evaluation – mentor to provide a written teaching evaluation each semester
    - Fall Class period: ____________
    - Spring Class period: ____________

**Year 4**

Meet with mentee in the fall to plan for portfolio submission for the annual review process (portfolio usually due in January)
  - Meeting Date: ____________
  - Discuss progress toward goals and results of previous year review.
- Peer Teaching Evaluation– mentor to provide a written teaching evaluation each semester
  - Fall Class Period: ____________
  - Spring Class Period: ____________

**Year 5**

- Meet with mentee in the fall to plan for portfolio submission for the annual review process (portfolio usually due in January)
  - Meeting Date: ______________
  - Discuss progress toward goals and results of previous year review.
- Peer Teaching Evaluation– mentor to provide a written teaching evaluation each semester
  - Fall Class Period: ____________
  - Spring Class Period: ____________

**Year 6**

- Meet with mentee in the first week of fall semester to plan for portfolio submission for the **Tenure review process** (portfolio usually due in September)
  - Meeting Date: ______________
  - Discuss progress toward goals and results of previous year review.
A. Introduction
The faculty of the Department of Biology & Chemistry (BIOC) believes that we should be dedicated scholars committed to the advancement of knowledge, both in our students as well as ourselves. We recognize that teaching excellence is our foremost responsibility; however, significant scholarly activities and effective service are inherent faculty responsibilities. The Department is committed to providing a collegial environment that encourages faculty to reach their potential in personal growth and professional development.

In accordance with University policies, the Department seeks to recognize and reward continual faculty development and excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service through recommendations for: 1) reappointment; 2) tenure; 3) promotion to associate professor or professor, and; 4) available merit-based compensation.

B. Purpose
The purpose for the departmental Faculty Evaluation Plan (FEP) is to provide descriptions of the criteria used to evaluate teaching, scholarship, and service. These criteria will be used for annual reviews that will determine merit-based compensation, reviews for reappointment, final tenure review, and promotions.

C. Policies for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty
Faculty members seeking reappointment, tenure, promotion, and merit-based compensation increases have a responsibility to understand the departmental FEP and the following university policies (located at the MSU Human Resources Web Site - Policies):

- PAc-1: Definition of Academic Titles
- PAc-2: Promotion Review
- PAc-11: Faculty Scholarship
- PAc-27: Tenure Review, Including Annual Review of Probationary Faculty
- PAc-29: Faculty Workload
- PAc-30: Performance-Based Compensation Plan for Faculty

Tenured, tenure-track faculty, and instructors must prepare appropriate documentation to meet the standards addressed in the university policies as well as the Departmental requirements presented in this FEP.
D. Policies for Instructors
Instructors are employed to address instructional needs of the department in which teaching demands for introductory and specialty courses exceed staffing capacity of Standing I faculty. Accordingly, these instructors are evaluated on teaching performance for available merit-based compensation and reappointment. However, the Department Chair can consider contributions in the area of service and professional achievement.

Instructors may have appointments renewed on an annual basis, provided there are instructional needs, adequate funds, and satisfactory evaluations according to the departmental FEP. All instructors have a responsibility to understand the departmental FEP and PAc-34 (“Alternative Career-Track Faculty/Instructors, Non-Tenure Track”).

E. Faculty Mentors
At the beginning of their academic appointment, tenure-track faculty members will be assigned, by the Department Chair, a mentor from the tenured faculty. Newly hired Instructors also will be assigned a mentor by the Department Chair for a period of five years. Mentors will assist tenure track faculty and instructors in regard to departmental, college, and university policies/procedures, and provide guidance on departmental expectations.

F. Reporting of Faculty Activities
Annually each faculty member shall document his or her teaching, scholarship, and service activities in Faculty 180 or the approved university faculty activity reporting system. Once documented the faculty member shall provide a report from Faculty180 or the approved university faculty reporting system.

G. Relative Weights of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service Activities in Evaluation
Although the evaluation process is not simply a quantitative accounting of faculty activities in teaching, scholarship, and service, relative weights will be in the general ranges of:

- Teaching: 50-70%
- Scholarship: 20-40%
- Service: 10-30%

These percentages should be determined in consultation with the Department Chair. The faculty member’s annual report shall include the recommended percentages for the following year. Flexible Workload Agreements may be negotiated by the faculty member with the Department Chair in accordance with PAc-29. Such an agreement will prescribe the relative weights of faculty activities to be used in evaluation of faculty performance for promotion, and expectations specific to the Flexible Workload Agreement, and will be used for all annual reviews. A specific report of actions, products and/or results following from reassigned time that end from such a flexible workload agreement shall be included in the faculty member’s regular review documents.

As cited in Pac-35: If a faculty member is involved in regional engagement, evidence should be provided of how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the
community, service region, and beyond. This is not a separate category of the FEP, but should be reflected in the faculty member’s teaching, scholarship, and service as appropriate.

Section II. Annual Review for Probationary Faculty - Reappointment and Final Tenure Review

Because the tenure decision has long-term implications on the department’s ability to fulfill its mission, tenure must be awarded only after a careful assessment over a period of time sufficient to judge the faculty member’s documented accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service, as well as the individual’s probable future productivity. In addition, collegiality and departmental citizenship are considered an integral part of faculty performance. For annual reappointment, it is anticipated that the tenure-track faculty member will demonstrate satisfactory progress in teaching, scholarship, and service. For a favorable tenure decision, the Departmental Committee (consisting of all tenured faculty within the Department) and Department Chair must be convinced, based upon the candidate’s cumulative portfolio, that the candidate’s record represents a pattern indicative of a career of continued accomplishments and productivity.

A. Annual Reviews for Reappointment of Faculty during the Probationary Period (Contract Renewal)

Each annual review is a step toward meeting the Department’s standards for tenure. Annual reviews address the strengths and weaknesses in regard to tenure. A summary evaluation at the below expected level may result in contract non-renewal. If a below expected summary evaluation is given, satisfactory improvement must be demonstrated in the subsequent evaluation.

A departmental teaching evaluation committee (appointed by the Departmental Reappointment and Tenure Committee; DRT) consisting of three tenured faculty members, including at least one member of the Chemistry program (for a Biology faculty member) or one member of the Biology program (for a Chemistry faculty member) will assess the in-class/laboratory teaching performance of each tenure-track, untenured faculty member yearly. The term of service on this committee will be for one academic calendar year, with service rotating through the department. Each committee member (or department chair) will attend one full hour of class or laboratory of the probationary faculty member, per year (not to exceed two visits from committee members per semester), in a mutually-agreed upon, announced visit that shall occur after mid-term of the semester. These teaching assessments will contribute to the teaching evaluation of the probationary faculty member, and may evaluate their organization, delivery, use of appropriate instructional strategies, fostering of an open and equitable learning environment, use of metaphors, clarity, methodology, critical thinking, interactive environment, etc. A sample rubric that may be used by this committee and departmental chair, which will be uniformly used by all evaluators and developed by the department, is found in Appendix A. A summary report of the committee’s observations will be given to the faculty member before portfolio submission for inclusion in their reappointment and/or tenure portfolios. Teaching evaluations by the department chair will follow these same guidelines, e.g. they will use the same rubric as the teaching evaluation committee, and will attend one full hour of class or laboratory per tenure-track, untenured faculty member, per year.
In addition to the specific review of teaching performance in the classroom or laboratory, the faculty member will receive a copy of the review letter produced by the DRT committee that accompanies the faculty portfolio throughout the annual review process.

B. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Review
The final tenure portfolio shall include a compilation of components from the annual reviews for reappointment portfolios and documentation. However, regular faculty reviews and tenure evaluations are separate processes, and consequently, meeting the minimal expectations for reappointment will not guarantee tenure.

A faculty member who holds tenure-eligible rank must be reviewed for the awarding of tenure as per PAc-27. The evaluation of cumulative performance (assessed by annual reviews for reappointment) must culminate in meeting the standards for tenure and show potential for continued growth.

The performance of the applicant shall be evaluated as meeting the standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or as not meeting the standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

The following specific activities are required to be documented for tenure:

Teaching (all of the following):

- At least one Department Chair/peer evaluation per year.
- At least two IDEA student evaluations per year.

Scholarship (all of the following):

- Demonstrated grant writing activity including submissions to external agencies with the faculty member’s contribution in detail.
- Evidence of continued research productivity as documented by peer-reviewed products, grant-sponsored products, peer-reviewed publications, scientific patents, or scientific contracts awarded.
- Demonstrated, ongoing involvement of student(s) in research endeavors where appropriate/possible.

- Service (all of the following):
  - Service to the Department.
  - Demonstrated service to MSU beyond the department level.
  - External service to one’s profession, and/or as a representative of MSU.

Note: Additional Departmental requirements may be included.

In addition, the following specific activities are required to be documented for tenure: Teaching (all of the below):

- Positive evaluations of in-class and/or in-lab performance, by DRT committee and chair
• Positive and/or improving student evaluations over time

Scholarship (all of the below):
• 1 funded external grant or (1 funded internal (MSU) grant AND 1 unfunded external grant with high reviews)
• 1 peer-reviewed publication (in print or accepted) in an appropriate journal with the contribution detailed by the faculty member.
• 1 peer-reviewed product OR grant-sponsored product OR peer reviewed publication
  OR scientific patent OR scientific contract awarded
• Demonstrated, ongoing involvement of student(s) in research endeavors where appropriate/possible
• 1 additional example of scholarship from the Above Expected activities list (Section V- B)

Service (all of the below):
• Demonstrated, continuing service to the department on a functioning committee, SOARs and student advising
• Demonstrated service to MSU on Faculty Senate, or a functioning committee beyond the department level, for two or more years
• External service either as a representative of MSU, or as a professional in your academic field, in two or more activities

C. Tenure Review Process
The candidate is referred to PAc 27 for the specific processes regarding tenure and reappointment review.

Section III. Promotion to Professor

The major objective of the promotion process is to recognize the long-term commitment for excellence as a faculty member. This process leads to the ultimate level, that of a Professor, with all the rights and privileges thereof. Because regular review and promotion evaluations are separate processes, meeting or exceeding regular review criteria does not guarantee a favorable promotion decision. Promotion evaluations are based on cumulative performance.

Associate professors will have to petition for promotion to the rank of Professor. Candidates for promotion must be outstanding teachers with a sustained record of scholarship, and be a recognized leader in service. In accordance with PAc-2, the review for promotion will include an evaluation of the cumulative record since the last promotion, and will assess the ability and motivation of the candidate to sustain this level of expertise and proficiency throughout their career.

The candidate must provide evidence of excellence, leadership, and maturity in teaching, a program of significant scholarship resulting from projects conducted while employed at MSU, and leadership in service to the department, college, or university, or professional organizations.
The candidate must demonstrate qualities that are recognized by their peers as meeting the highest standards set by the Department and providing leadership at all university levels. Effort in excess of the minimum standards used for the tenure assessments shall be expected for the promotion to Professor.

The performance of the applicant shall be evaluated as meeting the standards for promotion to Professor or as not meeting the standards for promotion to Professor.

The following specific activities are required to be documented for promotion to Professor:

**Teaching:**
- High level of sustained performance as evidenced by Department Chair/peer and student course evaluations.

**Scholarship (all of the following):**
- High level of sustained performance as evidenced by grant writing activity, patents, and/or peer-reviewed publications (in print and accepted) in appropriate journals with details of faculty contribution (if multiple authors).
- Demonstrated, ongoing involvement of student(s) in research activities.

**Service (all of the following):**
- Service to the Department.
- Demonstrated service to MSU beyond the department level.
- External service to one’s profession, and/or as a representative of MSU.

Note: Additional Departmental requirements may be included.

The following specific activities are required to be documented for promotion to Professor:

**Teaching:**
- Positive evaluations of in-class and/or in-lab performance.

**Scholarship (all of the below):**
- 1 funded external grant
- 2 patents or peer-reviewed publications (in print or accepted) in an appropriate journal with details of faculty contribution OR one patent and one peer-reviewed publication
- 4 additional examples of scholarship from the Above Expected activities list (Section V-B)

**Service (all of the below):**
- Demonstrated, continuing service to the department on a functioning committee, SOARs and advising
• Demonstrated service to MSU on a functioning committee beyond the department level for at least three years
• Service on one University committee
• External service either as a representative of MSU, or as a professional in your academic field, in two or more activities.
Section IV: Annual Review/Merit Compensation

All faculty members and instructors will undergo regular annual evaluations; when funds are available, merit compensation may be awarded. Faculty performance will be evaluated both for quantity and quality, as well as the faculty member’s effective contributions to the department. Instructors will be evaluated on teaching performance.

Regular review documents (tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, and instructors) are limited to a report/list, no more than three pages long, of documentable academic activities.

This list should include the following:

- Teaching evaluations (Department Chair/Peer and Student for at least two courses).
- Research activities resulting in research products (presentations, publications, grant proposals, grant awards).
- Service activities – include committee, role, number of times committee met and the number of times the faculty member was present, and actions that resulted.
- Any other items the faculty member wishes to include.

Should the faculty member disagree with the outcome of the annual review, the faculty member should schedule an appointment with the Department Chair. The appointment and subsequent discussion of the annual review must be within 7 business days from the date of the evaluation letter. If the Department Chair agrees with the faculty member’s appeal, an amendment will be made to the document and forwarded to the Dean’s office within 14 business days from the date of the evaluation letter. If an agreement is not reached between the Department Chair and the faculty member, the faculty member may submit a letter of appeal to the Dean of the College within 21 business days from the date of the evaluation letter. The Dean’s decision on the appeal will be final and will be communicated to both the faculty member and the Department Chair within 14 business days from the date on the appeal letter.
Section V: Evaluation Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Annual Review

A. Teaching
Effective teaching requires a deep understanding of the principles and concepts within the subjects taught, the ability to clearly communicate that knowledge to the students through variety of pedagogical methods, and the fostering of an environment in which students learn stated course objectives and skills.

Departmental teaching responsibilities include classroom, laboratory and research instruction, as well as academic program maintenance and development, advising, and professional development as a teacher. Faculty will also be evaluated on effectiveness in their helping meet the department’s undergraduate and graduate needs.

Expected activities
- Effective delivery of current content.
- Fulfillment of university policies on teaching, such as submitting assessment data for general education courses, holding regular office hours (5 hours per week during each semester), turning in mid-term and final grades on time, attempting to arrange substitute instruction/activities for all absences from the classroom or lab, where possible.
- Engagement in advising duties as assigned (instructors are exempt).
- Overall satisfactory teaching evaluations.
- Participation in departmental curricular initiatives as needed.

Above expected activities
Any of the “expected” or additional activities performed at a meritorious level as determined by the Department Chair. See Appendix A for list of “Above Expected Activities”.

Documentation for teaching must include:
- Department Chair/Peer Classroom/Lab Observation Summary Report.
- Quantitative and qualitative student evaluations, either university approved or instructor-designed. (Student evaluations will not comprise more than 25% of the total evaluation for the teaching component).

Additional teaching documentation may include (but is not limited to as specified by the department):
- Representative examinations to be evaluated for their clarity, relevance, application of knowledge, critical thinking requirements, inquiry of science, quantitative use of skills, etc.
- Syllabi and/or online learning materials provided for student learning.
- Teaching awards and honors.
- Listing of undergraduate and/or graduate students mentored in research, including any presentations/products/awards of those students.
- Curriculum development materials (teaching of new and innovative courses or exercises).
- Professional development materials (technology, assessment, pedagogy) demonstrating the art of teaching and the incorporation of new teaching techniques into the classroom.
- Qualitative and/or quantitative evidence of advising activities.
- Program development/revision materials.
B. Scholarship
All faculty members should show an ongoing and active research agenda that involves students and has recognized outputs (for example, refereed publications, presentations and abstracts at state, regional, or national meetings, and the submission of grant proposals to external organizations).

Expected Activities
Faculty members are expected as a matter of scholarship to participate in activities that keep them updated in their field of expertise.

• Submitting grant proposals.
• Conducting research resulting in publications or presentations within the quantity and timeframe determined by the Department.

NOTE: Additional items may be added by the department.

1. Conducting research
2. Reasonable attendance at departmental and/or other MSU research seminars (greater than 50% of the time unless departmental activities preclude attendance).
3. Membership in appropriate professional research organization(s)
4. Supervising student research such as theses, honors and/or capstone projects (each year after 1st year)
5. Presenting a paper or presentation at a local, state, or regional** scientific meeting as funding permits.
6. Attending professional seminars/workshops/meetings/conferences to enhance (non-teaching) research skills when funding allows

Above Expected Activities
Any of the “expected” or additional activities performed at a meritorious level as determined by the Department Chair. See Appendix A for list of “Above Expected Activities”.

C. Service
• Demonstrated, continuing service and leadership to the Department, college, and university. Including the following:
  o Meeting with prospective students and parents for the purposes of recruiting new students.
  o Representing the Department outside of “normal” hours, such as SOARs, open houses, Meet MSU Nights, etc.
• External service to one’s profession, and /or as a representative of MSU.

Above Expected Activities
Any of the “expected” or additional activities performed at a meritorious level as determined by the Department Chair. See Appendix A for list of “Above Expected Activities”.

D. Tenure Review Process
The candidate is referred to PAe 27 for the specific processes regarding tenure and reappointment review.

Summary Evaluation

Recognizing that teaching should be the primary focus of every faculty member, the annual evaluation of each faculty member will be weighted toward teaching.

Summary Evaluation Rubric

The determination of a faculty member’s overall annual evaluation rating is a holistic effort but in general, the following guidelines apply.

- Any faculty member rated below expected in teaching will receive a below expected overall evaluation.

- Any faculty member rated below expected in both scholarship and service will receive a below expected overall evaluation.

- The summary evaluation at the above expected level will be determined by the Department Chair.

- The following rubric guides the overall summary evaluation at the expected level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Evaluation</th>
<th>Teaching Area Evaluation</th>
<th>Scholarship Area Evaluation</th>
<th>Service Area Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A.

Teaching:

**Above expected activities**

1. Any of the “expected” activities performed at a level that clearly identifies the faculty member as performing above the university norms, such as carrying an exceptional advising load.
2. Development and/or publishing innovative/excellent materials for classroom or laboratory
3. Implementation of effective new teaching strategies
4. Winning a teaching award
5. Exceptional commitment to teaching outside the classroom (tutor and review sessions)
6. Ongoing and/or multiple methods of course assessment beyond departmental or university-required (e.g. IDEA) forms
7. Involving undergraduate and/or graduate students in research activities
8. Other activities as defined by agreement with the chair of the department

Documentation for teaching must include:

- DRT Committee (for tenure-track faculty) and Chair Classroom/Lab Observation Summary Report
- Quantitative and qualitative student evaluations, either university approved or instructor-designed. (Student evaluations will not comprise more than 25 % of the total evaluation for the teaching component)
- Representative examinations to be evaluated for their clarity, relevance, application of knowledge, critical thinking requirements, inquiry of science, quantitative use of skills, etc.
- Syllabi and/or online learning materials provided for student learning

Scholarship:

**Above Expected Activities**

1. Any of the “expected” activities performed at a level that clearly identifies the faculty member as performing above the university norms, such as conducting research at a very high level.
2. Proposal and/or funding of sabbatical research project
3. Presenting a research seminar at another institution of higher learning. (peer presentation)
4. Significant consulting on other faculty members’ research
5. Consulting work in field of professional or research expertise
6. Receiving an honor/award for research from an institution or organization
7. Presentation of discipline-related workshop
8. Having a research paper, book/book chapter published
9. Writing a competitive external grant proposal
10. Having a funded competitive external grant*
11. Having a significant research contract
12. Having an internal (MSU Research and Creative Productions Committee) grant proposal funded
13. Presenting a technical research workshop
14. Presenting a paper or poster at a national or international meeting if funding allows
15. Submitting a manuscript for review
16. Reviewing a book, grant proposal, or journal article
17. Passing a discipline-related course that involves a substantial investment of time (from an accredited institution or scientific organization)
18. Supervising student research in the first probationary year
19. Peer-reviewed publishing scholarship of teaching and learning
20. Visiting another (non-MSU) research laboratory for enhancement of research skills that involves a significant investment of time.
21. Supervising student research that is above the departmental norm
22. Presenting papers or presentations at a local, state, or regional scientific meetings at a level that is significantly above the departmental norm.
23. Being mentor of record for a capstone research project or graduate student’s master’s thesis.
24. Other activities as defined by agreement with the chair of the department.

* “External grant” is defined in this context as a research grant applied for involving a competitive process after the faculty member begins employment at MSU, e.g. not start-up funds.
**Regional is defined in this context as a sub-national geographic designation involving (parts of) more than one state.

Service:

**Above Expected Activities**
1. Any of the “expected” activities performed at a level that clearly identifies the faculty member as performing above the university norms, such as carrying an extensive committee load.

Internal Service
1. Being the chair of a department, college and university committee, task force, etc.
2. A single committee or endeavor that represents an inordinate investment of time.
3. Sponsorship/advisor of student campus organizations
4. Giving discipline-related presentations to schools/organizations/ coordination of special events
5. Teaching classes for overload without compensation
6. Serving as official Faculty Mentor for probationary faculty (untenured tenure-track, or instructor)
7. Equipment maintenance and/or maintenance of departmental plant and animal collections
8. Library liaison and acquisitions
9. Supplies inventory and acquisition beyond normal lab practice, e.g. for department/course
10. Laboratory supervision of multiple lab sections (involving other instructors’ sections)
11. Supervision of hazardous waste and waste disposal beyond normal lab practice
12. Supervision of safety practices and enforcement beyond normal lab practice
13. Coordination of, or preparation of instructional materials for, multiple sections of lab or lecture which is uncompensated by re-assign time.
14. Scheduling classes, rooms and instructional assignments
15. Development of activities with local schools for the purposes of advising or recruiting.
16. Coordination of the graduate program
17. Coordination of the departmental seminar series
18. Coordination of animal care
19. Other activities as defined by agreement with the chair of the department.
20. Mentoring dual credit courses

External Service
1. Evidence of participation in regional engagement as it relates to your discipline or as a representative of MSU
2. Service as officer in local, state and national professional organizations
3. Recruiting activities above the departmental norm.
4. Presenting training for teachers or other professionals
5. Directing a state or regional educational center
6. Judging at science fairs
7. Service on SACS, NCATE or other special accrediting committees
8. Consulting (mainly service)
9. Working with community, state, or federal agencies or organizations in professional capacity
10. Organizing or coordinating a professional meeting
A. Introduction

Consistent with the Mission of Morehead State University (MSU), the Department of Earth and Space Sciences (EASS) holds strongly to the belief that faculty members must be dedicated scholars committed to the advancement of knowledge and improvement of quality of life through teaching, research, community engagement, and life-long learning. Unlike most academic departments at Morehead State University, EASS has a broader mandate to achieve excellence in instruction and research, and to engage in economic development (including the commercialization of technologies), while also serving the needs of the university and the region.

The EASS faculty is composed of a unique combination of educators, scientists, engineers, and researchers. Some hold positions requiring little or no teaching (effectively research scientists and engineers) while others hold traditional faculty positions with full-time teaching loads. EASS’s goal is to allocate the time and effort of our faculty and staff such that we take full advantage of their diverse skill sets, the priorities imposed by the nature of their appointments and their individual interests. The EASS chair, faculty and staff agree to differentiate their workloads in a manner that most efficiently distributes the myriad tasks and responsibilities required to meet the needs of our academic programs, the university, the region, and the Commonwealth.

In accordance with University policies, the Department seeks to recognize and reward continual faculty development and excellence in teaching, professional achievement, and service through recommendations for: 1) reappointment; 2) tenure; 3) promotion to associate professor or professor, and; 4) available merit-based compensation.

B. Purpose

The purpose for the departmental Faculty Evaluation Plan (FEP) is to provide descriptions of the criteria used to evaluate teaching, professional achievement, and service. These criteria will be used for annual reviews that will determine merit-based compensation, reviews for reappointment, final tenure review, and promotions.

C. Policies for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty
Faculty members seeking reappointment, tenure, promotion, and merit-based compensation increases have a responsibility to understand the departmental FEP and the following university policies (located at the MSU Human Resources Web Site - Policies):

- **PAc-1**: Definition of Academic Titles
- **PAc-2**: Promotion Review
- **PAc-11**: Faculty Scholarship
- **PAc-27**: Tenure Review, Including Annual Review of Probationary Faculty
- **PAc-29**: Faculty Workload
- **PAc-30**: Performance-Based Compensation Plan for Faculty

Tenured, tenure-track faculty, and instructors must prepare appropriate documentation to meet the standards addressed in the university policies as well as the Departmental requirements presented in this FEP.

**D. Policies for Instructors**
Instructors are employed to address instructional needs of the department in which teaching demands for introductory and specialty courses exceed staffing capacity of Standing I faculty. Accordingly, these instructors are evaluated on teaching performance for available merit-based compensation and reappointment. However, the Department Chair can consider contributions in the area of service and professional achievement.

Instructors may have appointments renewed on an annual basis, provided there are instructional needs, adequate funds, and satisfactory evaluations according to the departmental FEP. All instructors have a responsibility to understand the departmental FEP and PAc-34 (“Alternative Career-Track Faculty/Instructors, Non-Tenure Track”).

**E. Faculty Mentors**
At the beginning of their academic appointment, tenure-track faculty members will be assigned, by the Department Chair, a mentor from the tenured faculty. Newly hired Instructors also will be assigned a mentor by the Department Chair for a period of five years. Tenure track faculty and instructors will meet regularly with their mentors to discuss departmental, college, and university policies/procedures, and provide guidance on departmental expectations, progress toward goals. Faculty Mentors fill a crucial role in helping tenure-track faculty prepare for the tenure review process, which is largely outside the Department.

**F. Reporting of Faculty Activities**
Annually each faculty member shall document his or her teaching, professional achievement, and service activities in Faculty 180 or the approved university faculty activity reporting system. Once documented the faculty member shall provide a report from Faculty180 or the approved university faculty reporting system.
G. Relative Weights of Teaching, Professional Achievement, and Service Activities in Evaluation

Although the evaluation process is not simply a quantitative accounting of faculty activities in teaching, professional achievement, and service, relative weights will be in the general ranges of:

1. Teaching: 0 – 75 percent* (weights of less than 25% must be approved via a Flexible Workload Agreement [FWA])
2. Professional Achievement: 15 – 75 percent (weights may not be less than 15%, and weights above 50% must be approved via a FWA)
3. Service: 10 – 40 percent (weights may not be less than 10%)

These percentages should be determined in consultation with the Department Chair. The faculty member’s annual report shall include the recommended percentages for the following year. Flexible Workload Agreements may be negotiated by the faculty member with the Department Chair in accordance with PAc-29. Such an agreement will prescribe the relative weights of faculty activities to be used in evaluation of faculty performance for promotion, and expectations specific to the Flexible Workload Agreement, and will be used for all annual reviews. A specific report of actions, products and/or results following from reassigned time that end from such a flexible workload agreement shall be included in the faculty member’s regular review documents.

As cited in Pac-35: If a faculty member is involved in regional engagement, evidence should be provided of how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond. This is not a separate category of the FEP, but should be reflected in the faculty member’s teaching, professional achievement, and service as appropriate.
Section II. Annual Review for Probationary Faculty - Reappointment and Final Tenure Review

Because the tenure decision has long-term implications on the department’s ability to fulfill its mission, tenure must be awarded only after a careful assessment over a period of time sufficient to judge the faculty member’s documented accomplishments in teaching, professional achievement, and service, as well as the individual’s probable future productivity. In addition, collegiality and departmental citizenship are considered an integral part of faculty performance. For annual reappointment, it is anticipated that the tenure-track faculty member will demonstrate satisfactory progress in teaching, professional achievement, and service. To this end, the portfolio must include a copy of the faculty member’s five-year plan (for guidelines see Appendix 1 below) showing evidence of meetings with their faculty mentor. For a favorable tenure decision, the Departmental Committee (consisting of all tenured faculty within the Department) and Department Chair must be convinced, based upon the candidate’s cumulative portfolio, that the candidate’s record represents a pattern indicative of a career of continued accomplishments and productivity.

A. Annual Reviews for Reappointment of Faculty during the Probationary Period (Contract Renewal)

Each annual review is a step toward meeting the Department’s standards for tenure. Annual reviews address the strengths and weaknesses in regard to tenure. A summary evaluation at the below expected level may result in contract non-renewal. If a below expected summary evaluation is given, satisfactory improvement must be demonstrated in the subsequent evaluation.

B. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Review

The final tenure portfolio shall include a compilation of components from the annual reviews for reappointment portfolios and documentation (see Appendix 2 for guidelines). However, regular faculty reviews and tenure evaluations are separate processes, and consequently, meeting the minimal expectations for reappointment will not guarantee tenure.

A faculty member who holds tenure-eligible rank must be reviewed for the awarding of tenure as per PAC-27. The evaluation of cumulative performance (assessed by annual reviews for reappointment) must culminate in meeting the standards for tenure and show potential for continued growth.

The following specific activities are required to be documented for tenure:

Teaching

Evaluation of teaching must be based upon multiple criteria, and no more than 50% of that evaluation may be based upon student evaluations of teaching, with the bulk of the remainder of the score based upon 1) quality of instructional materials; 2) involvement of students in research outside of the structured classroom (Undergraduate Research Fellows (URFs), senior theses, directed studies, etc.); and 3) peer or chair evaluations. On-line courses will be evaluated by the chair, who shall be added to the course as a teaching assistant thereby allowing him to view course materials and collaborative sessions. Quality teaching also includes mentoring or advising
students as appropriate, and contributing to the collective duties of the instructional programs in EASS.

(at a minimum, the following documentation is required):

- At least one Department Chair/peer evaluation per year.
- At least two IDEA student evaluations per year.

Additional evidence that may be submitted to demonstrate teaching quality includes:

- Teaching Load (especially that in excess of 12 load hours per semester)
- Student Credit Hours (SCHs) produced (especially that in excess of 450 for faculty in Space Science/Astrophysics or 600 for faculty in Earth Systems Science)
- Syllabi (must include all MSU required parts)
- New teaching materials (e.g., lecture notes/PowderPoint presentations you developed, not obtained from the textbook vendor or colleagues; sample coursework that you developed; graded student work showing feedback; etc.)
- Maintenance, ordering, and inventory of teaching materials
- Curriculum development (e.g., type I – type VI proposals originated)
- Teaching awards and honors
- Newly developed teaching innovations (e.g., incorporation of inquiry pedagogy, incorporation of practices in support of Senate Bill 1, examples of significant disability accommodations, development of field work/observing time opportunities, development of field trip/observing time guidebooks)
- Advising
- Directing student research or special projects (e.g., senior thesis supervision, grant-supported or URF student researchers, independent/volunteer research students, etc.)
- Instructional materials revised (presentations, lab manuals, etc.)
- Other relevant activities related to Teaching that are not applicable to your Professional Achievement or Service.

Professional Achievement

Given the range of disciplines in EASS, and the variety of professional endeavors that are undertaken, variation in the nature and type of professional achievements among faculty is to be expected. All faculty members, however, are expected to have an active record of professional activity, and must achieve at least two items of professional achievement (defined below) per year. Tenure-track faculty can be defined as either primarily teaching (Teaching weight >50%) or primarily research (Professional Achievement weight >50%, as defined by an appropriate Flexible Workload Agreement). Works (publications, presentations, funding or equipment proposals, and so on) requiring peer review are viewed more favorably than those requiring editorial or no review. Publications as first author are viewed more favorably than those as a co-author. Publication in top journals in the field (e.g., as determined by their current ScienceWatch rating, or impact factor) are viewed more favorably than publication in local or regional work or than publication in popular magazines. Works in international or national venues are viewed
more favorably than those in regional or local venues. Research works are viewed more favorably than works for the general public (i.e., newspaper or magazine articles, self- or MSU-published field guides) and textbooks that contain no in-chapter citations (and/or lack ISBN numbers). Research presentations (oral or poster) that are based on faculty scholarship are viewed more favorably than public presentations or presentations aimed to demonstrate capacity. External funding is viewed more favorably than internal funding. Published or accepted works are viewed more favorably than those that are in progress or submitted. In the event of collaborative work, the faculty member should specify his or her contribution both in the portfolio and in comments section of the Faculty180 (or similar) database entry for that work.

(at a minimum, documentation of the following is required):

**Primarily Teaching Faculty**

- One peer-reviewed publication.
- Two presentations (oral or poster).
- One grant received (of any size).
- Demonstrated, ongoing involvement of student(s) in research endeavors where appropriate/possible.

**Primarily Research Faculty**

- Four peer-reviewed publications.
- Four presentations (oral or poster).
- Two substantial grants or several smaller grants received.
- Demonstrated, ongoing involvement of student(s) in research endeavors where appropriate/possible.

**Additional evidence that may be submitted to demonstrate Professional Achievement quality includes:**

a. Attending MSU, non-teaching seminars/workshops
b. Attending professional meetings or seminars
c. Out-of-State Professional development courses taken (e.g., Chautauqua courses, SERC workshops, On the Cutting Edge workshops, NASA workshops, etc.)
d. Statewide workshops or Professional Development courses attended or taken
e. Passing a discipline-related graduate-level course (from an accredited institution)
f. Earning disciplinary accreditation or re-accreditation (i.e., PG licensure, ICCP accreditation, PE licensure, etc.)
g. Submitting a MSU-funding proposal
h. Submitting an external-funding proposal
i. Having a MSU proposal funded, regardless of size or source
j. Having an external proposal funded
k. Presenting a non-technical workshop (e.g., KSTA workshop)
l. Presenting a technical workshop (e.g., GSA workshop; AAAS workshop; ASP workshop; IEEE workshop), mostly original activities
m. Presenting a poster or paper at a meeting
n. Giving an invited talk or seminar at a university or other venue (not a meeting)
o. Submitting a research paper
p. Publishing a research paper in a
   i. Non-reviewed journal
   ii. Editorially reviewed journal
   iii. Peer-reviewed journal
q. Revising a book for commercial publication (new edition)
r. Submitting a book for commercial publication
s. Publishing a book or lab manual (mostly original experiments)
t. Submitting a patent application
u. Patent awarded
v. Map drafted
w. Map published
x. Professional awards/recognitions/honors
y. Reports to funding agencies submitted
z. Data analysis software for Astrophysical, Space Sciences, or Geological applications written, not patented
aa. Hardware construction for Astrophysical, Space Sciences, or Geological applications completed, not patented
bb. Professional Consulting approved by MSU
cc. Other relevant activities related to Professional Achievement that are not applicable to your Teaching or Service.

Service

All EASS faculty members are expected to contribute to the collective work of the department, college, and university. The basic expectation is participation in at least two committees at MSU in any given year, unless other valuable service to the department, university or region replaces it as assigned by the chair or as agreed upon by peers in each discipline. Faculty members should state their role and contribution for each committee, organization, or activity included.

(at a minimum, the following are required):

   o  Service to the Department.
   o  Demonstrated service to MSU beyond the department level.
   o  External service to one’s profession, and/or as a representative of MSU.

Additional evidence that may be submitted to demonstrate quality in Service includes:

a. Mentoring junior faculty as demonstrated by inclusion of a copy of the mentee’s five-year plan showing evidence of annual meetings, including signatures of all parties
b. University committee assignments and level of participation
c. College committee assignments and level of participation
d. Department committee assignments and level of participation
e. Serving as an officer or meeting coordinator/host in a professional organization
f. Work with student organizations

h. Service to the region and/or economic development activities (e.g., non-university-sponsored public service, such as rescue squad, disaster relief efforts, volunteerism at research institutes etc.)

i. Student recruitment and retention activities (e.g., SOAR, Open House, visits to local/regional schools, etc.)

j. Reviewing grant or other proposals

k. Reviewing a book chapter or research paper as a peer reviewer or editor (textbook chapters count)

l. Service on a journal editorial board

m. Service as editor-in-chief of a journal

n. Miscellaneous activities related to promoting and improving the quality of life at the University and/or region (KY Volcano Observatory does not count)

o. Regional Engagement activities as defined by the Morehead State University Center for Regional Engagement (CRE)

p. Other relevant activities related to service that are not applicable to your Teaching or Professional Achievement.

C. Tenure Review Process
The candidate is referred to PAc 27 for the specific processes regarding tenure and reappointment review.
Section III. Promotion to Professor

The major objective of the promotion process is to recognize the long-term commitment for excellence as a faculty member. This process leads to the ultimate level, that of a Professor, with all the rights and privileges thereof. Because regular review and promotion evaluations are separate processes, meeting or exceeding regular review criteria does not guarantee a favorable promotion decision. Promotion evaluations are based on cumulative performance.

Associate professors will have to petition for promotion to the rank of Professor. Candidates for promotion must be outstanding teachers with a sustained record of professional achievement, and be a recognized leader in service. In accordance with PAc-2, the review for promotion will include an evaluation of the cumulative record since the last promotion, and will assess the ability and motivation of the candidate to sustain this level of expertise and proficiency throughout their career.

The candidate must provide evidence of excellence, leadership, and maturity in teaching, a program of significant professional achievement resulting from projects conducted while employed at MSU (unless this component is reduced via a FWA as per PAc-29), and leadership in service to the department, college, or university, or professional organizations.

The candidate must demonstrate qualities that are recognized by their peers as meeting the highest standards set by the Department and providing leadership at all university levels. Effort in excess of the minimum standards used for the tenure assessments shall be expected for the promotion to Professor.

The performance of the applicant shall be evaluated as meeting the standards for promotion to Professor or as not meeting the standards for promotion to Professor.

The following specific activities are required to be documented for promotion to Professor:

Teaching:
- High level of sustained performance as evidenced by Department Chair/peer and student course evaluations.

Professional Achievement (all of the following, unless modified by an FWA as per PAc-29):
- High level of sustained performance as evidenced by grant writing activity, patents, and/or peer-reviewed publications (in print and accepted) in appropriate journals with details of faculty contribution (if multiple authors).
- Demonstrated, ongoing involvement of student(s) in research activities.

Service (all of the following):
- Service to the Department.
- Demonstrated service to MSU beyond the department level.
- External service to one’s profession, and/or as a representative of MSU.

Note: The additional items listed in Section II for the three areas are applicable here as well.
Section IV: Annual Review/Merit Compensation

All faculty members and instructors will undergo regular annual evaluations; when funds are available, merit compensation may be awarded. Faculty performance will be evaluated both for quantity and quality, as well as the faculty member’s effective contributions to the department. Instructors will be evaluated on teaching performance.

Regular review documents (tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, and instructors) are limited to a report/list, no more than three pages long, of documentable academic activities.

This list should include the following:

- Teaching evaluations (Department Chair/Peer and Student for at least two courses).
- Research activities resulting in research products (presentations, publications, grant proposals, grant awards).
- Service activities – include committee, role, number of times committee met and the number of times the faculty member was present, and actions that resulted.
- Any other items the faculty member wishes to include.

Should the faculty member disagree with the outcome of the annual review, the faculty member should schedule an appointment with the Department Chair. The appointment and subsequent discussion of the annual review must be within 7 business days from the date of the evaluation letter. If the Department Chair agrees with the faculty member’s appeal, an amendment will be made to the document and forwarded to the Dean’s office within 14 business days from the date of the evaluation letter. If an agreement is not reached between the Department Chair and the faculty member, the faculty member may submit a letter of appeal to the Dean of the College within 21 business days from the date of the evaluation letter. The Dean’s decision on the appeal will be final and will be communicated to both the faculty member and the Department Chair within 14 business days from the date on the appeal letter.
Section V: Evaluation Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Annual Review

A. Teaching
Effective teaching requires a deep understanding of the principles and concepts within the subjects taught, the ability to clearly communicate that knowledge to the students through variety of pedagogical methods, and the fostering of an environment in which students learn stated course objectives and skills.

Departmental teaching responsibilities include classroom, laboratory and research instruction, as well as academic program maintenance and development, advising, and professional development as a teacher. Faculty will also be evaluated on effectiveness in their helping meet the department’s undergraduate and graduate needs.

Expected activities
- Effective delivery of current content.
- Fulfillment of university policies on teaching, such as submitting assessment data for general education courses, holding regular office hours (5 hours per week during each semester), turning in mid-term and final grades on time, attempting to arrange substitute instruction/activities for all absences from the classroom or lab, where possible.
- Engagement in advising duties as assigned (instructors are exempt).
- Overall satisfactory teaching evaluations.
- Participation in departmental curricular initiatives as needed.

Above expected activities
Any of the “expected” or additional activities performed at a meritorious level as determined by the Department Chair.

Documentation for teaching must include:
- Department Chair/Peer Classroom/Lab Observation Summary Report.
- Quantitative and qualitative student evaluations, either university approved or instructor-designed.

Additional teaching documentation may include (but is not limited to – see listing in Section II):
- Representative examinations to be evaluated for their clarity, relevance, application of knowledge, critical thinking requirements, inquiry of science, quantitative use of skills, etc.
- Syllabi and/or online learning materials provided for student learning.
- Teaching awards and honors.
- Listing of undergraduate and/or graduate students mentored in research, including any presentations/products/awards of those students.
- Curriculum development materials (teaching of new and innovative courses or exercises).
- Professional development materials (technology, assessment, pedagogy) demonstrating the art of teaching and the incorporation of new teaching techniques into the classroom.
- Qualitative and/or quantitative evidence of advising activities.
- Program development/revision materials.
B. Professional Achievement
All faculty members should show an ongoing and active research agenda that involves students and has recognized outputs (for example, refereed publications, presentations and abstracts at state, regional, or national meetings, and the submission of grant proposals to external organizations).

**Expected Activities**
Faculty members are expected as a matter of scholarship to participate in activities that keep them updated in their field of expertise.

- Submitting grant proposals.
- Conducting research resulting in publications or presentations within the quantity and timeframe determined by the Department.

**Note:** The additional items listed in Section II for professional achievement apply here as well.

**Above Expected Activities**
Any of the “expected” or additional activities performed at a meritorious level as determined by the Department Chair.

C. Service
- Demonstrated, continuing service and leadership to the Department, college, and university. Including the following:
  - Meeting with prospective students and parents for the purposes of recruiting new students.
  - Representing the Department outside of “normal” hours, such as SOARs, open houses, Meet MSU Nights, etc.
- External service to one’s profession, and/or as a representative of MSU.

**Note:** The additional items listed in Section II for service apply here as well.

**Above Expected Activities**
Any of the “expected” or additional activities performed at a meritorious level as determined by the Department Chair.

D. Tenure Review Process
The candidate is referred to PAc 27 for the specific processes regarding tenure and reappointment review.
Summary Evaluation

Recognizing that teaching should be the primary focus of every faculty member, the annual evaluation of each faculty member will be weighted toward teaching.

Summary Evaluation Rubric

The determination of a faculty member’s overall annual evaluation rating is a holistic effort but in general, the following guidelines apply.

- Any faculty member rated below expected in teaching will receive a below expected overall evaluation.

- Any faculty member rated below expected in both professional achievement and service will receive a below expected overall evaluation.

- The summary evaluation at the above expected level will be determined by the Department Chair.

- The following rubric guides the overall summary evaluation at the expected level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Evaluation</th>
<th>Teaching Area Evaluation</th>
<th>Prof. Ach. Area Evaluation</th>
<th>Service Area Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1: Suggested Five-Year Plan Format

(NAME)

FIVE-YEAR PLAN,

In Fulfillment of (appropriate section of plan), (Department Name)

Mentor – Dr. (Name)

Date –

Section (insert appropriate section #) of the Department of (Insert Department Name) Faculty Evaluation Plan

The minimum standards for tenure are:
Section (insert appropriate section # that pertains to the full description of expectations for tenure) of the Department of (Insert Department Name) Faculty Evaluation Plan

1. Teaching. (copy appropriate section of FEP here)

2. Professional Achievement. (copy appropriate section of FEP here)

3. Service. (copy appropriate section of FEP here)

The following plan has been designed to meet the requirements as listed in sections (list appropriate sections) of the Department of (department name) Faculty Evaluation Plan, resulting in evidence toward meeting section (give appropriate section). (If your plan is for less than 5 years, give reasoning here).

Ongoing goals throughout the probationary period

Teaching Goals
Insert bulleted list of goals

Scholarly Productivity Goals
Insert bulleted list of goals

Service Goals
Insert bulleted list of goals

Specific yearly goals during the probationary period

1X/IX Academic Year
Scholarly Productivity – Insert specific goals
Service – Insert specific goals

1X/IX Academic Year
Scholarly Productivity – Insert specific goals
Service – Insert specific goals
1X Academic Year
Scholarly Productivity – Insert specific goals
Service – Insert specific goals

1X/1X Academic Year
Scholarly Productivity – Insert specific goals
Service – Insert specific goals

1X/1X Academic Year
Scholarly Productivity – Insert specific goals
Service – Insert specific goals

1X/1X Academic Year (Tenure Year)
After following the above 5-year plan, Dr. (name) will be able to:

- demonstrate and document a continual willingness to improve (his/her) teaching;
- demonstrate evidence of teaching effectiveness and a commitment to continued development in this area;
- demonstrate evidence of professional achievement, including presentations at meetings, publications, and/or funded grants; and
- document that (she/he) has provided service to the department, college, and university at expected levels according to the (department name) Faculty Evaluation Plan.

________________________________________  __________________________  __________________________  ____________
Dr. (Name)  Dr. (Name)  Dr. (Name)  Date
Faculty  Mentor  Department Chair

Annual Meeting I: ________________________
(date)

Amendments/changes to the five-year plan:

________________________________________  __________________________  __________________________  ____________
Dr. (Name)  Dr. (Name)  Dr. (Name)  Date
Faculty  Mentor  Department Chair

Annual Meeting II: ________________________
(date)

Amendments/changes to the five-year plan:

________________________________________  __________________________  __________________________  ____________
Dr. (Name)  Dr. (Name)  Dr. (Name)  Date
Faculty  Mentor  Department Chair
Annual Meeting III: _______________
(date)

Amendments/changes to the five-year plan:

__________________       ________________       __________________          ____________
Dr. (Name)            Dr. (Name)          Dr. (Name)            Date
Faculty               Mentor             Department Chair

Annual Meeting IV: _______________
(date)

Amendments/changes to the five-year plan:

__________________       ________________       __________________          ____________
Dr. (Name)            Dr. (Name)          Dr. (Name)            Date
Faculty               Mentor             Department Chair

Annual Meeting V: _______________
(date)

Amendments/changes to the five-year plan:

__________________       ________________       __________________          ____________
Dr. (Name)            Dr. (Name)          Dr. (Name)            Date
Faculty               Mentor             Department Chair
Appendix 2: Tenure Portfolio Content Guide

The faculty members of the Department of Earth and Space Sciences expect the tenure portfolio and pre-tenure review portfolios to be organized as follows, unless directed otherwise during the pre-tenure portfolio session offered yearly by the provost’s office.

Inside the front cover: Departmental FEP(s) used during the pre-tenure evaluations and for the tenure evaluation.

Within the binder(s) (Limit: TWO 2.5” D-ring binders; use of one 5” D-Ring binder is discouraged because it is too difficult to turn the pages):

1. Letter to the chair of EASS. This letter is to contain an overview of the portfolio documentation and highlight teaching, professional achievement, and service activities. It is to be no more than 4 pages long. It may be, but does not have to be, written on departmental letterhead.

2. Table of Contents Cover Page with tab
   a. Table of contents should follow that outlined in PAc-27
   b. Be sure to label what is in binder 1 and what is in binder 2

3. Evaluation Letters Cover Page with tab
   a. Be sure to include all pre-tenure review letters, in order from oldest to newest, from the committee, the chair, and the dean.

4. PAc-27 Vita Cover Page with tab
   a. Be sure to use the format for the vita outlined in the Provost’s pre-tenure meeting.

5. Personal Data Cover Page with tab
   a. Academic Transcripts Cover Page with tab
      i. Be sure to include academic transcripts from all institutions attended, beginning with the first and ending with the last.
   b. Letters for Reduction of Probationary Period Cover Page with tab (if applicable)
      i. Include letters indicating a reduction in the probationary period here, with the one from the College Dean to the Provost on top.
   c. Five Year Plan Cover Page with tab
      i. Insert your original, signed five year plan.
      ii. Insert any revisions to the five year plan.

6. Teaching Cover Page with tab
   a. Insert a no more than 3 page description of your teaching here, highlighting each course you have taught, the evidence for effective teaching contained in the portfolio, and interactions with students in learning experiences outside of the formal classroom (advising, URF’s, etc.).
   b. Teaching Philosophy Cover Page with Tab
      i. Insert your teaching philosophy here, 2 pages maximum
   c. Syllabi Cover Page with tab
      i. On the cover page, print no more than ½ page summary of the features of the syllabi section (what makes each level syllabus different, major revisions to courses, etc.)
      ii. Insert one or two example syllabi for each “level” course you have taught.
d. Example Exams Cover Page with tab
   i. On the cover page, print no more than ½ page summary of the features of the exams section (what makes different level exams different, your examination philosophy, etc.)
   ii. Insert 1-2 example exams from each course.

e. Example Assignments Cover Page with tab
   i. On the cover page, print no more than ½ page summary of the features of this section.
   ii. Insert 1-2 example assignments from each course.

f. Examples of Graded Student Work Cover Page with tab
   i. On the cover page, print no more than ½ page summary of the features of this section.
   ii. Insert 1-2 examples of graded student work from each course. Be sure to choose examples that show the use of rubrics, feedback, etc. Graded multiple-choice exams/quizzes are insufficient.

g. Teaching Evaluations Cover Page with tab
   i. Insert your IDEA forms and departmental or other course evaluations here in order from oldest to newest.

h. Chair Teaching Evaluations Cover Page with tab
   i. Insert your yearly teaching evaluations by the chair here in order from oldest to newest.

i. Peer Teaching Evaluations Cover Page with tab
   i. Insert your yearly teaching evaluations by your peers here in order from oldest to newest.

j. Graduate Faculty Status Cover Page with tab
   i. On the cover page, list when you were awarded each type of graduate faculty status.
   ii. Insert your letters from the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs (or similar) here.

k. Advising Cover Page with tab
   i. Insert a list of your number of advisees each year here.

l. Supervision of Students Cover Page with tab
   i. For each type of student supervised (teacher intern, undergraduate research fellow, grant-funded undergraduate research students, senior thesis students, etc.) insert a page listing the students supervised each academic year or semester and the title of their project(s), and any faculty collaborators in the research project or supervisory endeavor. If you are supervising teacher interns, include the EDSE 416 syllabus following the teacher intern page.

m. New Courses and Programs Developed Cover Page with tab
   i. Include the approval e-mail chain for each new course or program developed. Staple each new course or new program's chain into a single packet.

n. Other material with tab
   i. If you have other evidence for excellent teaching (NOT student testimonials!) to insert, do so here.

7. Professional Achievement Cover Page with tab
   a. Insert a no-more than four page summary of your professional achievement here. Things to include are a description of what your research is, how you involve students, what you have published, what and where you have presented your work, your continuing education (seminars & workshops attended, courses taken, etc.), professional society membership and leadership, consulting, etc.
b. Published Articles Cover page and Tab
   i. Internationally Peer-Reviewed Cover Page and Tab (if applicable)
      - Insert copies (preferably double-sided) of your internationally peer-reviewed papers published during your probationary period here. If you were not the sole author, insert a page at the beginning of this section giving a brief description of your contribution to each paper.

   ii. Nationally Peer-Reviewed Cover Page and Tab (if applicable)
      - Insert copies (preferably double-sided) of your nationally peer-reviewed papers published during your probationary period here. If you were not the sole author, insert a page at the beginning of this section giving a brief description of your contribution to each paper.

   iii. Regionally and Locally Peer-Reviewed Cover Page and Tab (if applicable)
      - Insert copies (preferably double-sided) of your regionally and locally peer-reviewed papers published during your probationary period here. If you were not the sole author, insert a page at the beginning of this section giving a brief description of your contribution to each paper.

   iv. Editorially Reviewed Cover Page and Tab (if applicable)
      - Insert copies (preferably double-sided) of your editorially reviewed papers published during your probationary period here. If you were not the sole author, insert a page at the beginning of this section giving a brief description of your contribution to each paper.

c. Works in Progress Cover Page and Tab
   i. Accepted Works Cover Page and Tab (if Applicable)
      - Insert copies of pre-prints of your accepted works.

   ii. Submitted Works Cover Page and Tab
      - Insert copies of submissions here, including the submissions notice from the journal.

   iii. Works to be Submitted Cover Page and Tab
      - Insert nearly-completed drafts of work here. Do not include research projects in the early stages, only those that have significant writing and/or analyses completed.

d. Abstracts of Conference Presentations Cover Page and Tab
   i. Insert the title, authors, abstract, and where/when presented for every presentation (poster or oral) given during your probationary period. Note whether you were the presenter or if the presenter was a student of yours.

e. Workshops presented Cover Page and Tab (if applicable)
   i. Insert evidence of workshops you were a presenter/organizer of and denote your role.

f. Invited Talks Cover Page and Tab
   i. If you gave an invited talk, include the talk flier/e-mail/other evidence here.

g. Scholarly Grants Cover Page and Tab
   i. Insert the Acceptance Letter and the project description page for each funded grant.
      - Be sure that these materials show the title of the grant, co-investigators, and amount funded.

   ii. Insert the list of grants applied for and not received from the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (they can run a report for you!).

h. Patents Cover Page and Tab
   i. If you applied for or received a patent, insert that information here.

i. Professional Service Cover Page and Tab
   i. Insert evidence of your professional service here, including leadership roles in academic organizations, memberships on editorial boards, formal peer-reviews completed, consulting, etc.
j. Other Evidence of Professional Achievement Cover Page and Tab
   i. Insert all other evidence of professional achievement here.

8. Service Cover Page and Tab
   a. Insert a 4-page maximum description of your Service Activities at MSU. Be sure to include a
description of the committees you have served on and your role on those committees, other
significant departmental/college/university service such as NCATE, SACS, WEAVE, etc., and
non-MSU service.
   b. MSU Committee Service Cover Page and Tab
      i. Detail your committee service in table form from the beginning of your appointment
to present.
   c. MSU Faculty Senate Service Cover Page and Tab (if applicable)
      i. Detail your service on Faculty Senate here.
   d. Other MSU Service Cover Page and Tab
      i. Detail other service, such as serving as Library Liaison, being an NCATE, SACS, or
WEAVE writer, etc. here.
   e. Non-MSU Service Cover Page and Tab
      i. Detail your local, regional, national, or international service as a representative of
MSU here.
         - Examples include serving as a Science Olympiad judge, giving a “Science
Night” at a regional school, serving on a panel or focus group for new science
standards or a funding agency, serving on an agency program review board,
volunteering at a laboratory, etc. Do NOT include service as a private citizen.
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Faculty Evaluation Plan
Department of Early Childhood, Elementary, and Special Education
Morehead State University

This document provides the policies and information that govern the following in the Department of Early Childhood, Elementary, and Special Education: annual evaluation, Performance-Based Compensation Increase (PBCI) procedures, tenure, promotion, and evaluation of fixed term faculty.

Morehead State University PAc-30: Performance-Based Compensation Plan for Faculty states:

It shall be the policy of Morehead State University to systematically evaluate individual faculty performance by means of a departmental faculty evaluation process, which specifies performance expectations in teaching, professional achievement, and service and which is consistent with University guidelines for faculty evaluation. All returning tenured and tenure-track faculty are required to participate in the process of evaluation as specified in their departmental Faculty Evaluation Plan.

Performance-based compensation will be based on the concept that criteria exist in the areas of teaching, professional achievement, and service against which the performance of individual faculty will be compared for evaluation. These criteria will not be a set of fixed universally-applied standards, but a set of flexible standards which will accommodate the unique nature of the disciplines in which faculty teach, engage in professional achievement activities, and serve. The application of the standards should accommodate the specific role of the individual within the department and should recognize the variables which affect opportunities for professional achievement and service.

Morehead State University Pac-35: Faculty Evaluation Plans states:

The FEP shall include: A description of other requirements (if any) of the department not already stated in University, college, or school policy for faculty seeking reappointment, tenure, or promotion and for performance-based compensation increases.

Framework for Evaluation

Evaluation of faculty in a college of education is a complex multi-dimensional undertaking. It cannot take a one-size-fits-all approach. It must have the flexibility to respond to the following considerations.

1) It must be applicable to individuals at various stages in their careers in a manner that encourages them to make meaningful decisions. Within the context created by some of the other factors outlined here, individual faculty members must be able to decide how to use their time and energy without being penalized because they deviate from some arbitrary standard.

2) The basis for evaluation needs to be responsive to the long-term mission and the current priorities of the academic department. Faculty members in a college of education must be aware that they are part of a collaborative enterprise, which requires them to balance their personal agendas against the needs of the organization.

3) While we are all part of a college of education, we represent a wide array of disciplines. Each of these disciplines has its own set of opportunities and expectations related to professional practice, scholarly productivity, and service to the discipline.

4) Finally, this framework for evaluation must articulate consistent standards of quality that, while responding to the diversity of the faculty, are recognized within the college and across the University.

The framework presented in this document attempts to provide a practical structure for meeting this challenge.
Central to the process outlined in this document is the annual self-evaluation document and the Flexible Workload Agreement (FWA) if applicable developed by each faculty member. In this annual presentation of their activities, faculty members are required to concisely make the case that during the last year they have spent their time in activities that have contributed to their students, their discipline, and the University. In this presentation they should demonstrate a rational decision making process about where they put their time and energy. Based on this, administrators and peers can, within a collegial relationship, evaluate and provide constructive feedback on these efforts. In addition to reviewing activities of the past year, this documents calls for the development of a personal growth plan for the next year. Thus, it is that the annual review provides each faculty member with an opportunity to identify benchmarks in an ongoing process of continuous improvement.

The Department’s Faculty Evaluation Plan and/or the FWA provides the basic statements of the standards and criteria for evaluating an individual's academic work and as such has direct implications for a number of other processes beyond the annual Performance Based Salary Increase (PBCI) process. However, PBCI is separate from these other processes; and, consequently, meeting or exceeding PBCI criteria does not automatically ensure a favorable tenure or promotion decision. PBCI evaluations are based on annual performance whereas tenure and promotion evaluations are based on the cumulative performance. Importantly the criteria for annual evaluation ratings and the criteria for those used to determine PBCI eligibility should be markedly similar.

The University processes for granting of tenure and promotion to professor uses the criteria outlined within this document as the basis for decision-making. In a similar light, this document provides the criteria and process for post tenure review and evaluation of instructors.

**Tenure**

The process for progress towards tenure is defined in PAc-27. The Department evaluation process is based on the criteria defined in PAc-27 and reflects growth in the criteria identified for annual performance review.

1) The Department Tenure Review Committee will annually evaluate all non-tenured faculty. In compliance with PAc - 27 the Department Tenure Review Committee shall consist of all eligible tenured faculty members in the department.

2) All non-tenured faculty must submit a cumulative contract renewal portfolio annually, as outlined in PAc-27. (Contract renewal is based on the academic year rather than the calendar year.

3) All probationary faculty members must be observed teaching at least once annually by the chair and/or senior colleagues (as designated and initiated by the chair or the immediate supervisor). The results of these observations must be included in the annual portfolio and in the final application for tenure.

4) As noted below under the discussion of evaluation of teaching (page 11), faculty members are strongly encouraged to seek formal student feedback on the quality of instruction for every course. At the minimum, probationary faculty must provide documentation of this feedback for at least two courses a semester during the probationary period. All course evaluations submitted for annual reviews must likewise be included in the final application for tenure.

5) Over the course of his/her probationary period, a candidate for tenure should have:

a) Consistently earned above average ratings on evaluation of teaching and have observations by the chair and/or department colleagues that demonstrate high achievement in teaching,

b) Been active as a scholar as reflected in multiple scholarly presentations at least at the regional level and should have some publications, and

c) Served on a variety of committees across campus, served in leadership roles, and/or provided significant service to an area school, school district, or other appropriate professional settings.
6) In addition to these achievements non-tenured faculty should have fulfilled basic duties and expectations, which include attending faculty meetings regularly, meeting and starting classes on time, maintaining regular availability to students, advising regularly, and fulfilling various departmental service functions (participating in TEP interviews and assisting in schedule development, for example). Faculty who do not fulfill these duties may not qualify for tenure even if the quantity of work in the annual PBCI portfolio earns them high ratings.

7) All non-tenured faculty shall be allocated one mentor from within or outside the home department. The mentor may or may not be within the discipline area but should be from within the College of Education unless otherwise specified in the FWA. The non-tenured faculty shall retain a mentor until the non-tenured faculty submits their final tenure portfolio. The mentor may be reviewed and/or re-assigned at the request of either the mentor or the non-tenured faculty.

8) The faculty mentor should assist the non-tenured faculty member in the compilation of tenure portfolios. They should meet with the non-tenured faculty before submission of the tenure portfolio and discuss the annual review.

9) The mentor must make written recommendations to the Department Tenure Review Committee based on their discussions with the non-tenured faculty member. The recommendations of the mentor should be available to the non-tenured faculty member before submission to the Department Tenure Review Committee.

10) The Department Tenure Review Committee will review non-tenured faculty portfolios and the recommendations of the Department mentor. They will make one of the following recommendations to the Chair.

   a) The candidate's contract should be renewed and the non-tenured faculty member is on the correct course for consideration of tenure.

   b) The candidate's contract should be renewed, but the candidate is not performing to the level commensurate for consideration of tenure.

   c) The candidate's contract should not be renewed.

11) The Chair will write his/her evaluation of the non-tenured faculty member (per PAC 27) and, prior to submitting the report, will meet with each non-tenured faculty member to discuss the evaluation. The Chair’s written evaluation will be made available to the faculty member. After meeting with the faculty member, the chair’s written report will be sent to the Dean along with the portfolio and the recommendation of the Department Tenure Review Committee.

12) The Dean of the College will submit a recommendation to the Provost and Executive Vice-President for Academic Affairs based on the recommendations of the Department Tenure Review Committee and the Chair. (PAC 27)

13) If the non-tenured faculty member disagrees with the recommendation of the Department Tenure Review Committee, the Department Chair, and/or the Dean of the college, he/she may submit a letter of response at any point in the process to any of the administrators involved. (Pac 27)

**Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor**

1) The Promotion Process is guided by PAC-2 -Promotion Review. The criteria for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor are the same as those for Tenure.

2) Therefore, in compliance with PAC 27, all faculty members awarded tenure by the University Tenure Committee shall automatically be promoted to associate professor.

3) PAC – 1 Academic Titles.
Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

1) The Promotion Process is guided by PAc – 2: Promotion Review.

2) PAc- 1: Academic Titles

Department Promotion Committee. All faculty applying for promotion must submit a portfolio to the Department Promotion Committee. After reviewing the candidate's portfolio the Department Promotion Committee will make a recommendation to the Chair to support or decline the application for promotion.

Criteria for Promotion. Although successful annual evaluation cannot be the sole determining factor in the decision of the Department’s Promotion Committee to support or decline an application, the criteria defined under the heading of “performance expectations” of this Faculty Evaluation Plan should be used in determining successful professional growth in the areas of teaching, professional achievement, and service as defined in Pac 2. While the faculty member’s cumulative record of performance may be considered, the focus for this review will be placed on the period since the last promotion.

The College of Education provides a unique service to the schools within the region and collaborates across the University in relation to both curriculum and administrative functions. Given this mission, these services should be reflected in the promotion process. To be promoted to the rank of Professor, a faculty member should have a consistent record (i.e., across at least a 5 year period after promotion to associate professor) of

- Above expected evaluations of teaching,
- Above expected service at the local, state, regional and/or national levels, and
- Professional achievement at the regional and/or state levels with some recognition of his/her scholarship at the national level.

- These standards for promotion should correlate to regular recognition as performing at above expected or outstanding level during time in rank.

Faculty applying for promotion to professor should have fulfilled basic duties and expectations which include fulfilling appropriate classroom responsibilities (i.e. online, face-to-face, etc.), maintaining appropriate availability to students, advising of students, participating in departmental and/or college service, and regularly attending faculty meetings.

Annual Evaluation Procedures

The following sections outline the procedures for submission, review, and appeal of annual Performance Based Salary Increase (PBCI) reviews within the College of Education.

The sole exception to the review process will be faculty on sabbatical leave. They will receive the same PBCI rating as awarded at the departmental level the previous year. They will not be eligible for a fourth share for the year in which they took a sabbatical. (If the previous year’s award was a fourth share, only a three will be received for the sabbatical year.)

Annual Self-Evaluation

In accordance with University guidelines (PAc: 27), all tenured and tenure track faculty members will prepare and submit the items outlined below by the date designated by the Provost on the annual academic calendar. The annual review is for the calendar year.

Annual Goals. Each faculty member should include his or her goals for the previous year on the form provided and indicate if each goal was met. The faculty member may briefly explain the reasons for not meeting any goals in the narrative section of the Annual Productivity Report. The faculty member should indicate goals for the next year on the bottom of the form.
**Annual Productivity Report.** Complete the attached Annual Productivity Report. Each faculty member is required to complete the self-evaluation located at the top of each section as well as the overall self rating at the end of the Annual Productivity Report. The faculty member should provide a short justification for their self-evaluation following the listing of activities. The justification should be provided for each of the three sections on teaching, professional achievement and service.

Faculty should have supporting evidence (i.e. proposals, syllabi, publications, etc.) available for review upon request.

**Departmental Review**

This section outlines two options for annual review at the departmental level: peer and chair review or chair only review. Each department in the college shall determine by majority vote of all tenured and tenure-track faculty which option to use. A department may elect to switch their annual review procedure option as long as any change is approved before the beginning of the calendar year for which that option will apply.

**Peer and Chair Review Option.**

1) All eligible tenured and tenure track faculty will use the guidelines below and their best professional judgment to evaluate each faculty member’s annual self-evaluation portfolio.

2) If any faculty member deems a colleague's professional activity as below expected in any of the three categories (teaching, scholarship, and service) he/she must accompany this assessment with a concise rationale. The rationale may be anonymous, but must only address the criteria as outlined in this document. These rationales will be available to the Chair and the faculty member concerned.

3) Recommendations for merit shares will be determined by averaging overall performance evaluation ratings awarded by the peer review process. A committee appointed by the Chair will conduct this summary.

4) A summary of the results and original evaluation forms will be submitted to the Chair.

5) The chair will prepare a written confirmation and rationale of the merit share awarded for each tenured and tenure track faculty by the date designated by the Provost. This report should summarize the material from the peer review. If the chair is aware of information unavailable to the faculty that either will positively or negatively influence the final rating, he or she may consider that. When the chair elects to award a merit rating different from that recommended by the faculty he or she must specifically address this discrepancy in the notice to the individual faculty member.

6) Any faculty member may request a face-to-face meeting with the chair to obtain clarification of the rationale for the assigned rating.

7) Each faculty member who receives an overall rating of “less than expected performance” (see page 20) will meet with the departmental chair to identify areas for professional growth during the next year. The actions identified to address areas of deficiency shall be integrated into the faculty member’s individual plan for professional development (see annual self evaluation, page 5) and should be explicitly addressed in the next year’s self-evaluation. Regardless of other ratings, faculty members who receive a rating of less than expected in any area should target that area for professional growth in their goals for the coming year.

8) If a faculty member disagrees with his/her Performance Based Salary Increase award, he/she may initiate the Appeal Process outlined on pages 10-11.
9) All materials related to this review, including faculty self-evaluation portfolios, original evaluation forms, and evaluation summaries will remain in the possession of the chair until after the final date for appeal.

Chair Review Option

1) The departmental chair will review the self-evaluation portfolio for all eligible tenured and tenure-track faculty using the guidelines below and his/her best professional judgment.

2) This evaluation should use a format similar to that found in the Overall Levels of Performance.

3) Faculty overall performance evaluation ratings will be determined using the criteria outlined under “Overall Levels of Performance” on page 20 of this document.

4) The chair will prepare a notice and rationale of the rating awarded for each tenured and tenure-track faculty by the date designated by the Provost.

5) Any faculty member may request a face-to-face meeting with the chair to obtain clarification of the rationale for the assigned rating.

6) Each faculty member who receives an overall rating of “less than expected performance” will meet with the departmental chair to identify areas for professional growth during the next year. The actions identified to address areas of deficiency shall be integrated into the faculty member’s individual plan for professional development and should be explicitly addressed in the next year’s self-evaluation. Regardless of other ratings, faculty members who receive a rating of less than expected in any area should target that area for professional growth in their goals for the coming year.

7) If a faculty member disagrees with his/her overall rating, he/she may initiate the Appeal Process found on pages 10-11.

8) All materials related to this review, including faculty self-evaluation portfolios, will remain in the possession of the chair until after the final date for appeal.

College Level Review

1) The chairs and the Dean will constitute the College PBCI Review Committee.

2) Upon recommendation by the department for a fourth share, a faculty member’s annual evaluation portfolio will be forwarded to the Dean for consideration. Nominated portfolios will remain in the Dean’s office until the period for reviews and appeals has elapsed.

3) No additional material will be required for review at the College level unless requested by the committee. However, faculty members are advised to have supporting material available so that it can be delivered in a timely fashion.

4) The College review process will occur within the time frame announced for PBCI process on an annual basis by the Provost.

5) Each member of the committee should review the portfolio of every nominated faculty member. This review should follow the criteria outlined below and use the framework provided in this document.

6) After initial review, the committee may elect to request submission of supporting material from any faculty member.

7) After all committee members have reviewed all portfolios and any requested supporting material has been submitted and reviewed, the committee will meet to make its determination of rankings of overall ratings. In general this judgment will reflect the affirmation that the nominated faculty member has
truly achieved an outstanding level of performance as described under “Overall Levels of Performance” on page 22 of this document.

8) The Dean will prepare a memorandum for each nominated faculty informing them of the committee’s action by the date designated by the Provost. If the judgment of the lower level review that a faculty member’s performance was at the distinguished level is not affirmed, the Dean’s memorandum must give specific rationale for this action.

**College Faculty Evaluation Committee**

**Membership.** The College Faculty Evaluation Committee (CFEC) shall consist of two faculty members elected from and by each department in the college in the fall of the academic year for a one-year term. All voting members of the Committee shall: (1) be full-time faculty; (2) be tenured or in a tenure-track position; and (3) have served at least one full year at the University. Chairs and the Dean shall not serve on this committee.

The Committee shall elect their chair from the membership of the Committee by September 15 of the academic year at a first meeting convened by the college Dean.

**Duties/Responsibilities.** This committee is to provide on-going faculty oversight to the PBCI process by fulfilling the following responsibility:

1) Annually the committee shall review this document and respond to any other authorities such as the President, the Provost, the Dean, or various committees of the Faculty Senate calling for updating or revising this FEP. In this process, it shall be responsible for revising and submitting proposed revisions to the faculty, chairs, Dean, Faculty Senate, and other administrators as necessary, for approval.

**Appeals**

1) The College of Education PBCI Appeals Committee shall be composed of six elected tenured faculty, two representing each of the departments in the College of Education. Each department shall elect their representatives by October 1 of each academic year. Members of the College Faculty Evaluation and the PBCI Appeals Committee may not serve on both committees at the same time. The term of service for each member of the PBCI Appeals Committee shall be one year, starting October 1 and ending September 30. There will be no limit on the number of terms a faculty member may serve. Each year the committee shall elect one member as chair. A quorum shall be five members in attendance with at least one representative from each department in attendance. Decisions shall be based upon a majority vote of the committee members in attendance at a committee meeting. Voting shall be by secret ballot. All information will be confidential.

2) If a faculty member disagrees with his/her department PBCI evaluation, he/she may request a meeting with the department chair (or next level supervisor) to discuss the evaluation. The purpose of the meeting will be to determine if a satisfactory resolution can be reached through informal discussion. If the appellant and the department chair reach agreement, the chair will within five working days provide for the appellant and the Dean a written description of the agreement.

3) If the disagreement is not satisfactorily resolved, the department chair (or next level supervisor) will indicate within five working days the reasons for not changing the evaluation. Only after this process is complete may the appellant appeal to the COE PBCI Appeals Committee. To file an appeal, the faculty member must succinctly state in writing the reasons he/she believes the evaluation should be changed. The statement must be filed with the Dean of COE within five working days after receiving the department chair’s written rejection of the informal appeal. The appeal may be based upon procedural or substantive grounds.
4) The department chair will provide copies of the appellant’s PBCI portfolio, the original evaluation and the written rejection of the informal appeal to the PBCI Appeals Committee.

5) The PBCI Appeals Committee will meet separately with the appellant and the department chair within 7 working days after the Dean of COE receives a written appeal. The committee will review all pertinent written material and may request additional material if necessary. If the appellant requests a different rating, the committee will, by a majority vote, render a written decision. The decision shall be the final step of this appeal process.

6) If the appeal deals with the decision not to recommend for a higher rating, the same procedure will be followed as outlined in step 5. The PBCI Appeals Committee may decide to deny the appeal. A copy of the written denial with justification shall be made available to the appellant, department chair, college dean and the Provost.

If the PBCI Appeals Committee decides the appeal is justified, they shall report their recommendation to the Dean of COE. The Dean (or next level supervisor) and the two department chairs not involved in the appeal shall determine if a higher rating shall be awarded. The department chair involved in the appeal shall not be involved in the decision to award or not award a higher rating. The written PBCI Appeals Committee decision shall be made available to the appellant, the department chair, college dean and the provost.

7) A faculty member who is nominated for a PBCI outstanding rating by the department but is denied the outstanding award at the College of Education level shall have five working days from the date of notification to inform the Dean in writing of the intent to appeal the decision.

The Dean shall have five working days to meet with the faculty member. Both parties should make every effort to resolve the differences regarding the outstanding evaluation in an informal setting. The Dean shall advise the faculty member and the appropriate chair in writing regarding the results of this meeting within two working days following the date of the meeting.

If the Dean and the faculty member do not resolve their differences through informal discussion, the faculty member who decides to pursue the appeal shall file a letter of appeal with the chair of the PBCI Appeals Committee within five working days after receiving notification from the Dean. The letter of appeal must explicitly state the basis for the appeal.

The PBCI Appeals Committee Chair shall schedule a meeting within seven working days. The committee will review the written recommendations and meet with the faculty member, department chair and the Dean. The committee’s written decision shall be communicated to all parties. The committee’s decision shall be final and conclude the committee’s responsibilities in the appeals process.

Step 7 shall complete the PBCI appeals process for the College of Education. Appellants who do not accept the decision at the college level may have access to other reviews or appeals if provided by Morehead State University policy.
Performance Expectations

The following sections outline specific guidelines for the evaluation of teaching, professional achievement, and service. Each section contains the following three elements.

1) A narrative introduction that provides a context for the material provided in the related tables.

2) A matrix that provides a rubric for synthesizing each faculty member’s activities during the preceding year. The matrix describes the expectation for performance at each of three levels. These activities are intended to be descriptive not prescriptive. The listed activities simply try to capture the extra effort that is involved in bringing some projects to fruition.

This framework acknowledges various ways in which faculty can contribute to the mission of the college. Within each level, a number of relevant activities are listed which are increasingly more challenging and reflect a higher level of professionalism than those in the previous levels.

As per Pac-35 requirements, relative weighting of the categories for Teaching, Professional Achievement, and Service are as follows:

Teaching 60%; and

A combination of Scholarly Productivity and Service up to 40%.

The weighting of the latter two duties (scholarly productivity and service) shall be determined by the individual faculty, and agreed upon with the department Chair. The total percentage of all three areas must equal 100%.
Teaching

Teaching is central to the role of regional universities like Morehead State. Therefore, the evaluation of teaching is central to the overall evaluation of individual faculty members. The importance of this aspect of evaluation emphasizes that it is not a simple task. The extensive literature on evaluation of teaching makes it clear that this is one of the greatest challenges facing schools and colleges today. Factors such as student preparation, subject matter, teaching philosophy, level of course, and others make it very difficult to come up with a simple scheme for evaluating teaching.

There seems to be strong consensus that evaluation of effective teaching cannot be reduced to a single number on a form completed by students. Nonetheless, student perspective on the quality of instruction is a critical component in achieving this task. Faculty members are encouraged to systematically collect formal student feedback on every course.

The framework provided in this document tries to avoid the pitfall of reducing evaluation of teaching to a single number. The down side of this decision is that effective evaluation of teaching becomes a much more complex undertaking. Multiple factors have to be considered. These can include student perceptions, student outcomes, peer and administrative review, review of teaching activities and materials, review of tests and other assessments, and an understanding of the faculty member’s individual philosophy of teaching. Like all else in this document, this section is not prescriptive. However, for the sake of differentiation, an attempt has been made to be concerned with the “endorsed” evaluations for tenure-track faculty (IDEA) and for tenured faculty and instructors (ECESE Department Evaluation). For those faculty who supervise the clinical practices of student teachers, their specific evaluation forms will be utilized.

In addition to what goes on in the classroom, a variety of other factors are directly related to quality of teaching. These can include time and effort devoted to advising, supervising field experience, supervising clinical practice candidates, supervising practica candidates, efforts at program revision, pursuit of external funds to improve program resources or student opportunities, variety of courses taught, the development of expertise related to instruction, efforts at recruitment, and other evidence of commitment to students and teaching. These factors merit serious consideration.

In this college, the task is further complicated by the fact that for many of us pedagogy is our subject matter. This means that for some faculty members the boundary between teaching and professional achievement is less than clear. However, it also means that the modeling of effective pedagogical practice is intrinsic to the role of faculty member in a teacher education program.
# ECESE FEP Compensation Plan

## Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Evaluation</th>
<th>Expected (1 quality point)</th>
<th>Above Expected (2 quality points)</th>
<th>Outstanding (3 quality points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Teaching Evaluations</strong></td>
<td>TENURE TRACK FACULTY: Low average/midrange to average/midrange scores on a student evaluation instrument <em>(For example: average raw T-score of 37-44 on IDEA form)</em>  Effective teaching based upon at least two formal observations by peers or administration; overall level: Good level</td>
<td>TENURE TRACK FACULTY: Average/midrange to high average/midrange scores on student evaluation instrument <em>(For example: average raw T-score of 45-55 on IDEA form)</em>  Effective teaching based upon at least two formal observations by peers or administration; overall level: Very Good level</td>
<td>TENURE TRACK FACULTY: High average/midrange to high/upper range scores on student evaluation instrument <em>(For example: average raw T-score of 56-63 on IDEA form)</em>  Effective teaching based upon at least two formal observations by peers or administration Excellent or Exceptional levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENURED FACULTY: Departmental evaluation scores at 6-30 points (possible 80 points)</td>
<td>TENURED FACULTY: Departmental evaluation scores at 30.5-53 points (possible 80 points)</td>
<td>TENURED FACULTY: Departmental evaluation scores at 54-80 points (possible 80 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTORS: Departmental evaluation scores at 6-30 points (possible 80 points)</td>
<td>INSTRUCTORS: Departmental evaluation scores at 30.5-53 points (possible 80 points)</td>
<td>INSTRUCTORS: Departmental evaluation scores at 54-80 points (possible 80 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINICAL PRACTICE SUPERVISORS: As determined by the Department Chair</td>
<td>CLINICAL PRACTICE SUPERVISORS: As determined by the Department Chair</td>
<td>CLINICAL PRACTICE SUPERVISORS: As determined by the Department Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Teaching Evaluations</strong></td>
<td>TENURED FACULTY / INSTRUCTORS: Other evidence of effective teaching based upon one formal observation by peers or administration; overall level: Good level</td>
<td>TENURED FACULTY / INSTRUCTORS: Other evidence of effective teaching based upon one formal observation by peers or administration: overall level: Very Good level  Earn a teaching award at school, district, or local level</td>
<td>TENURED FACULTY / INSTRUCTORS: Other evidence of effective teaching based upon one formal observation by peers or administration; Overall level: Excellent or Exceptional levels  Earn a teaching award at University, state, or national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advising / Availability to students</strong></td>
<td>Consistently available and accessible to students and advisees  Serve as an academic advisor for students (Registrar’s Record)</td>
<td>More than 50 advisees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course creation, development, revision</strong></td>
<td>Consistently deliver effective instruction by using good pedagogical practices.  Maintain skills and knowledge needed to stay current in field and delivery of instruction.  Plan regional engagement activities in support of teaching , i.e. clinical and/or field experiences as part of course requirements.</td>
<td>Show evidence of quality supervision of clinical practice, field experience candidates or other clinical practica candidates through use of surveys or other evaluations  Embed service learning activities within a course, e.g. school improvement plan, family literacy night, transition fair, etc.  Include pre-test/post test info showing significant student improvement over the course of a semester  Teach a course new to faculty member  Use innovative techniques in existing course, first time being implemented  Design and deliver a course in collaboration with community agency personnel or faculty at another institution</td>
<td>Create a new course, e.g. first year seminar, study abroad  Author a major program revision  Develop a designated regional engagement courses. i.e. Z Course  Develop teaching software / apps  Create a new program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Evaluation</td>
<td>Expected (1 quality point)</td>
<td>Above Expected (2 quality points)</td>
<td>Outstanding (3 quality points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revise a course in terms of delivery (e.g. F2F to online; non-PPN to PPN)</td>
<td>Revise an existing program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond the classroom/course student</td>
<td>Provide student workshop on teaching, i.e. PRAXIS</td>
<td>Support extended effort to improve student success, i.e. dispositions remediation, mentoring. (This support may extend beyond a course and/or semester.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaboration/involvement</td>
<td>Mentor students involved in school-based action research projects beyond regular course requirement.</td>
<td>Write and obtain a grant to support student attendance at conferences</td>
<td>Supervise students on study abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional Achievement

The area of professional achievement has traditionally been the most clearly defined area in the evaluation of University faculty. Often viewed as synonymous with scholarship, this area of activity is seen as the contribution of the individual to their primary discipline. This typically includes continuing professional development, research, grant writing and administration, publications, and presentations. One ongoing source of difficulty for faculty members in colleges of education has been the fact that their area of professional achievement often entails pedagogy. This has led to some difficulty when colleagues from areas other than education review their achievement. As noted above this evaluation can be further complicated because a legitimate area of professional achievement for education faculty can involve working directly with practitioners in public schools. The College of Education defines professional achievement broadly to include a number of activities in which the faculty member is involved. This may include extending academic discourse through original research, communicating scholarly discourse to other professionals through writing and formal scholarly presentations, contributing to public discourse and public education through creative productions and publications, and extending their own expertise through professional development. When the nature of professional association leadership is linked to conference or workshop development for the purpose of contributing to the on-going education of peers, professional association leadership may be included in this category.
## ECESE FEP Compensation Plan
### Professional Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Evaluation</th>
<th>Expected (1 quality point)</th>
<th>Above Expected (2 quality points)</th>
<th>Outstanding (3 quality points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>Current member in a local, state, regional, or national professional organization</td>
<td>Complete professional development / continuing education experiences (one to five days)</td>
<td>Complete a graduate or undergraduate course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development attended</td>
<td>Attend one professional meeting at the local, state, regional, national, or international level Complete required CEUs from MSU or other faculty workshops Complete professional development / continuing education experiences (less than a day)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete professional development / continuing education experiences (more than a week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>Make a presentation at the local or service area level OR</td>
<td>Make a professional presentation to a professional meeting at or beyond the University (May be counted here OR in Service, but not in both) Deliver an original, formal presentation of applied research to professional educators (May be counted here OR in Service, but not in both) Submit and have accepted a presentation but unable to attend due to lack of funding</td>
<td>Deliver a refereed, or invited presentation at a local, state, regional, national or international professional organization meeting (includes departmental meeting, workshop for schools, or faculty symposium for MSU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>Have a publication in progress or submitted to a professional journal or ‘in press’ at the refereed level</td>
<td>Author or co-author publication in a local, state, or regional refereed publication (includes conference proceedings) Submit articles for publication, abstracts submitted for grants, or completed grant applications- internal or external (all must contain date of submission and estimated turn-around-time from source);</td>
<td>Author or co-author a chapter in an edited text Author or co-author publication in national, international refereed journals or refereed conference proceedings. Edit, co-edit, author, and/or co-author a book Publish a monograph, textbook, video, or CD-ROM as author or co-author Write an invited chapter in a book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants, Fellowships</td>
<td>Write and submit a grant proposal Obtain an internally funded grant (include dollar value) Obtain an externally funded grant (include dollar value) Work as a consultant / content area expert on a grant (May be counted here OR in Service, but not in both)</td>
<td>Administrator a grant with or without course release time Receive a fellowship or faculty research award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor / Reviewer</td>
<td>Serve as reviewer for local, state, regional, national, or international refereed conference abstracts, grants, journal articles, chapters, or textbooks in your field (May be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Evaluation</td>
<td>Expected (1 quality point)</td>
<td>Above Expected (2 quality points)</td>
<td>Outstanding (3 quality points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>counted here OR in Service, but not in both)</td>
<td>Serve on an editorial board of a publication in your discipline (May be counted here OR in Service, but not in both)</td>
<td>Organize and administer a week long (or more) non-course camp/workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with schools, agencies</td>
<td>Provide one time technical assistance to a school or district</td>
<td>Provide <strong>ongoing</strong> technical assistance to a school or district (May be counted here OR in Service, but not in both)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(May be counted here OR in Service, but not in both)</td>
<td>Undertake a collaborative project with schools which results in applied research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engage in professional dialogue in discipline through presentation, small projects, and/or writing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborate with community agency personnel to design and deliver professional development activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide community agencies with technical assistance (May be counted here OR in Service, but not in both)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present a workshop on research-based practices to community agency personnel (May be counted here OR in Service, but not in both)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Obtain professional licensure</td>
<td><strong>Obtain award for outstanding professional achievement</strong> from MSU, service region, state, or professional organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course release activities that extend beyond the expected level of effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service

The area of service allows faculty members to demonstrate how they are meeting their responsibilities as professionals to contribute to the institution, their discipline, and the community. As a member of the University community, every faculty member has an obligation to contribute to the effective running of the institution. This document sees this as an important role, but one not limited to what occurs on campus. Traditionally, universities have acknowledged the obligation of faculty as professionals with specialized expertise to contribute to the community beyond the institution. As noted throughout this document, this college places high priority on the need for faculty to be involved with and contribute to the successful running the public schools in our region. So while service cannot overshadow teaching and professional achievement, it plays an important part in how faculty members fulfill their responsibilities. The framework in this document attempts to give faculty members flexibility in determining how they will meet this obligation.
**ECESE FEP Compensation Plan**

**Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Evaluation</th>
<th>Expected (1 quality point)</th>
<th>Above Expected (2 quality points)</th>
<th>Outstanding (3 quality points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committees</strong></td>
<td>Serve on at least one department, college, or university committee (ad hoc or standing)</td>
<td>Serve on college or university committee (ad hoc or standing) beyond the expected level&lt;br&gt;Serve as chair or secretary of a committee at department or college level&lt;br&gt;Serve on one off-campus center committee;&lt;br&gt;Serve as chair of committees for professional organizations;&lt;br&gt;Serve on a high demand committee&lt;br&gt;Provide leadership in one or more university activities&lt;br&gt;Serve as chair or secretary of a committee at university level&lt;br&gt;Serve on a state committee; KDE, EPSB, etc.&lt;br&gt;Serve on committees for professional organizations;</td>
<td>Serve in leadership role on a major institutional or external committee&lt;br&gt;Serve on a state or national committee related to the profession; (May be counted here OR in Professional Achievement but not in both)&lt;br&gt;Participate on a committee that was exceptionally demanding of time and effort (e.g. TEC subcommittee, Executive council of faculty senate; etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Departmental, college, or University functions</strong></td>
<td>Participate in 2 rounds of TEP interviews&lt;br&gt;Participate in official University functions such as graduation, etc.; (A MAXIMUM OF 3 ACTIVITIES CAN BE COUNTED)</td>
<td>Work at a SOAR, open house, Meet MSU night, or career day&lt;br&gt;Participate in other comparable university service, e.g. off-campus recruiting,&lt;br&gt;Serve as advisor of a student organization;&lt;br&gt;Conduct a workshop or PD in department, college, or university&lt;br&gt;Serve as program coordinator;&lt;br&gt;Organize / Chair a university activity (SOAR, recruiting, etc.)&lt;br&gt;Mentor faculty during tenure and/or promotion process.&lt;br&gt;Mentor Undergraduate Research Fellow or Honors Students</td>
<td>Direct / Administer / Maintain a grant; (May be counted here OR in Professional Achievement but not in both)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community, service area, or state service</strong></td>
<td>Participate in community or state service;</td>
<td>Hold an office in a local professional organization,&lt;br&gt;Work with student groups (not formal organization) to develop community service projects.&lt;br&gt;Assist community agencies, such as libraries, to conduct a</td>
<td>Serve as an officer or program chair for a state professional organization;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Evaluation</td>
<td>Expected (1 quality point)</td>
<td>Above Expected (2 quality points)</td>
<td>Outstanding (3 quality points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>community service project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participate on a local, service region, or state curriculum committee,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide professional development for schools or community agencies (May be counted here OR in Professional Achievement but not in both)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide a content specific workshop for the community (May be counted here OR in Professional Achievement but not in both)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide PD or consulting at local or state level (May be counted here OR in Professional Achievement but not in both)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present an in-service activity (May be counted here OR in Professional Achievement but not in both)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organize and implement PD, symposia, conference at service region or state level that may not require expertise;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide community service or consultation related to professional discipline (May be counted here OR in Professional Achievement but not in both)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perform service activities in support of regional engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work with an intern in the KTIP or KPIP programs;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organize and implement a workshop, symposium, or conference,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional, national, or international service</td>
<td>Do an accreditation visit;</td>
<td>Serve as an officer or program chair for a national professional organization;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hold office in a regional professional organization;</td>
<td>Serve as an officer or program chair for a regional professional organization;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serve in leadership role in national, regional, or state professional organization (May be counted here OR in Professional Achievement but not in both)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participate in national service;</td>
<td>Obtain award for outstanding service from MSU, service region, or state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Levels of Performance

The following FEP Compensation Scoring guide provides a framework for determining each individual’s overall level of performance, according to the FEP. Essentially, it allows for quantification of performances to decide how each department faculty member ranks in comparison to each other. This, in turn, allows for discrimination among faculty members for purposes of compensation allowances in any given year, per availability.
**ECESE FEP Compensation Plan Scoring Guide**

In each area of evaluation, a 33.3% scale is used to determine levels of performance. In other words, the top 33.3% are considered Outstanding, the next 33.3% are considered Above Expected, and so forth. Both QUANTITY and QUALITY of all activities are considered in each area.

**Teaching – Evaluation.** If more than 1 evaluation source is used, average the scores and determine the evaluation level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Level 1 (Below 0)</th>
<th>Level 2 (.33)</th>
<th>Level 3 (.66)</th>
<th>Level 4 (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDEA for tenure track faculty</td>
<td>Below low-average</td>
<td>Low average/midrange</td>
<td>Average-midrange/high</td>
<td>High average/midrange/high/upper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Evaluation (using 33.3% scale)</td>
<td>Below 8</td>
<td>8-31</td>
<td>32-55</td>
<td>56-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer/Chair evaluation</td>
<td>Poor, Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent, Exceptional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teaching – Quantity of Merit Activities.** Count the number of activities that have been performed in this area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 (Below 0)</th>
<th>Level 2 (.33)</th>
<th>Level 3 (.66)</th>
<th>Level 4 (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Using 33.3% scale, 24 total quantity points possible x 33.3%=8 point scale)</td>
<td>Below 1</td>
<td>1-6.99</td>
<td>7-15.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teaching – Quality of Merit Activities.** Using the 3-2-1 point quality scale (Expected, Above Expected, Outstanding), add the number of quality points for each activity to determine evaluation level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 (Below 0)</th>
<th>Level 2 (.33)</th>
<th>Level 3 (.66)</th>
<th>Level 4 (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Using 33.3% scale, 50 total quality points possible x 33.3%= approx. 17 point scale)</td>
<td>Below 1</td>
<td>1-15.99</td>
<td>16-32.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Teaching Rating = Level of Teaching Evaluation + level of Teaching Quantity of Merit Activities + level of Teaching Quality of Merit Activities. The total should be no more than 3.

**Professional Achievement – Quantity of Merit Activities.** Count the number of activities that have been performed in this area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 (Below 0)</th>
<th>Level 2 (.5)</th>
<th>Level 3 (1)</th>
<th>Level 4 (1.5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Using 33.3% scale, 38 total activities x 33.3%= approx. 13 point scale)</td>
<td>Below 1</td>
<td>1-11.99</td>
<td>12-24.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional Achievement – Quality of Merit Activities. Using the 3-2-1 point quality scale (Expected, Above Expected, Outstanding), add the number of quality points for each activity to determine evaluation level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Points</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 1</td>
<td>1-27.99</td>
<td>28-55.99</td>
<td>55-82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Using 33.3% scale, 82 total quality points possible x 33.3% = approx. 27 point scale)

Overall Professional Achievement Rating = Level of Professional Achievement Quantity of Merit Activities + Level of Professional Achievement Quality of Merit Activities. The total should be no more than 3.

Service – Quantity of Merit Activities. Count the number of activities that have been performed in this area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity Points</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 1</td>
<td>1-15.99</td>
<td>16-31.99</td>
<td>32-48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Using a 33.3% scale, 48 quantity points possible x 33.3% = 16 point scale)

Service– Quality of Merit Activities. Using the 3-2-1 point quality scale (Expected, Above Expected, Outstanding), add the number of quality points for each activity to determine evaluation level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Points</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 1</td>
<td>1-33.99</td>
<td>34-66.99</td>
<td>67-100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Using a 33.3% scale, 100 total quality points possible x 33.3% = approx. 33 point scale)

Overall Service Rating = Level of Service Quantity of Merit Activities + Level of Service Quality of Merit Activities. The total should be no more than 3.

**Final Scoring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Fill in scores and weights below</th>
<th>Overall Area Rating</th>
<th>Weight (must add to 100%)</th>
<th>Area Weighted Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0-40%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0-40%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. *Add the Area Weighted Ratings to compute overall score:*
Related Processes

**Post Tenure Review**

In compliance with PAC30 all tenured faculty must participate in an annual review. The criteria and the procedures outlined in this document provide a framework for ongoing evaluation of all faculty members after the granting of tenure. Further, this process provides for the development of a personal plan of correction if the tenured faculty member shall receive a less than expected rating in any area of professional activity.

**Instructor Evaluation**

As defined in PAC 34, “Instructors (formerly referred to as fixed-term instructors) are full-time employees contracted with full benefits for a one-year term with a teaching load of no more than 27 credit hours recommended. With the approval of the department chair and college dean, Instructors may have appointments renewed on an annual basis provided there are continued/justified instructional needs, adequate funds, and satisfactory evaluations according to departmental faculty evaluation plans (FEP). While Instructors will be evaluated primarily on teaching, they may provide service on departmental committees.”

Instructors will be evaluated primarily on their teaching by the department Chair (or Chair designee. The Chair (or Chair designee) will observe the instructor’s teaching, examine the teaching portfolio submitted by the instructor (including forms for student feedback on teaching, syllabi, tests and other material providing support for quality teaching) and evaluate his/her performance based upon the same criteria for teaching used in the evaluation of tenure track faculty. A written evaluation will be completed and submitted to the faculty member according to the time schedule set by the University.

Evaluation of Clinical Faculty will be based primarily upon mentorship and teaching, when applicable. The evaluation instrument will be approved by the Department. Evaluation of Clinical Faculty will be completed by the Program Coordinator or Department Chair (or Chair designee).
Teaching is central to the role of regional universities like Morehead State. Therefore, the evaluation of teaching is central to the overall evaluation of individual faculty members. The importance of this aspect of evaluation emphasizes that it is not a simple task. The extensive literature on evaluation of teaching makes it clear that this is one of the greatest challenges facing schools and colleges today. Factors such as student preparation, subject matter, teaching philosophy, level of course, and others make it very difficult to come up with a simple scheme for evaluating teaching.

There seems to be strong consensus that evaluation of effective teaching cannot be reduced to a single number on a form completed by students. Nonetheless, student perspective on the quality of instruction is a critical component in achieving this task. Faculty members are encouraged to systematically collect formal student feedback on every course.

The framework provided in this document tries to avoid the pitfall of reducing evaluation of teaching to a single number. The down side of this decision is that effective evaluation of teaching becomes a much more complex undertaking. Multiple factors have to be considered. These can include student perceptions, student outcomes, peer and administrative review, review of teaching activities and materials, review of tests and other assessments, and an understanding of the faculty member’s individual philosophy of teaching. Like all else in this document, this section is not prescriptive. Individual faculty and departments need to explore innovative ways of effectively evaluating instruction. (Please note: In the examples used in this section reference is made to a T-score on the IDEA evaluation form. This is only an example. It does not imply that this instrument or this score is the standard for evaluation of teaching in the Department of Foundational and Graduate Studies.)

In addition to what goes on in the classroom, a variety of other factors are directly related to quality of teaching. These can include time and effort devoted to advising, supervising field experience, supervising clinical practice candidates, supervising practicum candidates, efforts at program revision, pursuit of external funds to improve program resources or student opportunities, variety of courses taught, the development of expertise related to instruction, efforts at recruitment, and other evidence of commitment to students and teaching. These factors merit serious consideration. For example, an extensive commitment of time and energy to advising 50 or more advisees makes a substantial contribution to individual and program success.

In this college, the task is further complicated by the fact that for many of us pedagogy is our subject matter. This means that for some faculty members the boundary between teaching and scholarship is less than clear.

Levels of performance for teaching are described more fully in the table that follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Activities</th>
<th>Expected (1 point total): [Cannot advance to Above Expected or Outstanding unless Expected criterion is met.]</th>
<th>Above Expected (1.5 points EACH):</th>
<th>Outstanding (2 points EACH):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Each semester, every faculty member will solicit student evaluations of every course section</td>
<td>• Teaching Evaluations. Average/midrange to high average/midrange scores on student evaluation</td>
<td>• Teaching Evaluations. High average/midrange to high/upper range scores on student evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
taught (with the exception of directed studies, directed research, or capstone research courses), using IDEA and/or the departmentally-approved course evaluation. Tenure-track faculty members must also have a chair or chair-appointed peer evaluation of one of their courses each year.

- Course evaluation results must be in the average range for numeric scales (average T-score of 37-44 for IDEA; at least 3.0 average for the departmentally-approved course evaluation) and acceptable for narrative evaluations (chair/peer evaluation).
- Faculty members will be available to their students on a regular basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument (For example: average T-score of 45-55 on IDEA form; at least 3.75 average for the departmentally approved course evaluation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-required formal course observation by tenured peers or administrators (can be counted up to twice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop instructional materials (videos, multimedia, supplements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantially revise a course (more than just a change of textbook)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach a new course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use innovative techniques in existing course, first time being implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include pre-test/posttest information showing significant student improvement over the course of a semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor student research (co-author, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comparable teaching activities…or outstanding achievement in teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument (For example: average T-score of 56-63 on IDEA form; at least 4.25 average for the departmentally approved course evaluation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant research (applied instructional research)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a new course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create new program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earn a teaching award (from MSU entity or professional association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve on an Ed.D or Ed.S committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching in overload without pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comparable teaching activities…or outstanding achievement in teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Relevant research (applied instructional research)
Department of Middle Grades and Secondary Education:

Teaching is central to the role of regional comprehensive universities like Morehead State, and therefore the evaluation of teaching is central to the overall evaluation of individual faculty members. The MGSE faculty support the regular administration of course evaluations by students, but they recognize that effective teaching cannot be reduced to a quantitative measure only. Teaching evaluations represent students’ perceptions and feelings they hold at a particular moment in time. Qualitative factors can also affect the faculty’s ratings, such as student interest, demographics (e.g., traditional or non-traditional student), and students’ preparation levels for advanced study. Although MGSE faculty uniformly agree that teaching evaluations should promote reflection on those outcomes in order refine instructional practice, they also believe significant weight should be given to integrating best practices and current research into instruction as part of a faculty’s overall teaching effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPECTED [Fulfills 1 item from each area below]</th>
<th>ABOVE EXPECTED [Fulfills “Expected” plus any 2 below]</th>
<th>OUTSTANDING [Fulfills “Above Expected” plus 1 from below, or “Expected” plus 2 or more below]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DELIVERY</th>
<th>EVALUATION/ASSESSMENT</th>
<th>ADVISING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Delivers classes regularly</td>
<td>For Students:</td>
<td>1. Fulfills advising responsibilities assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Uses class time effectively</td>
<td>1. Demonstrates an understanding of class assessment data</td>
<td>2. Develops an effective/creative/unique method for advising students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Uses appropriate activities</td>
<td>2. Uses the results of classroom assessment data to modify teaching</td>
<td>3. Uses an effective/creative/unique method for advising students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Engages students in learning</td>
<td>3. Gives useful feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Develops a safe, comfortable environment for learning</td>
<td>For Faculty Member:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Evaluation by departmental Chair or peer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. IDEA (for tenure track candidates) or other departmental evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. For tenured professors, either of the above is sufficient. If student evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evaluation scores are unsatisfactory, see Faculty Handbook for protocol.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Faculty Member:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Evaluation by departmental Chair or peer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. IDEA (for tenure track candidates) or other departmental evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADVISING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Makes/has substantive contact with students each semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONTENT/PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Uses student feedback to make significant improvements and/or changes in teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Attends a second or additional 1+ hour, or webinar teaching/content workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR OTHER EQUIVALENT ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>OR OTHER EQUIVALENT ACTIVITIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Develops an international or interstate course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DELIVERY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Teaches or co-teaches an international or interstate face-to-face course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Teaches or co-teaches a massively open online course (MOOC) or comparable online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EVALUATION/ASSESSMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Students:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Gives detailed, useful feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Uses pre- and post-assessments to demonstrate clear and significant improvements in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>student higher order thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Faculty Member:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Evaluation by departmental Chair or peer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. IDEA (for tenure track candidates) or other departmental evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADVISING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Makes/has substantive contact with students each semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONTENT/PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Satisfactorily completes a 3 day or longer course, professional development [workshop], webinar in pedagogy or related content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AWARDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Receives Outstanding Teacher Award (MSU tenured faculty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Receives external teaching award (open to tenure - track and tenured faculty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR OTHER EQUIVALENT ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>OR OTHER EQUIVALENT ACTIVITIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teaching is central to the role of regional universities like Morehead State. Therefore, the evaluation of teaching is central to the overall evaluation of individual faculty members. The importance of this aspect of evaluation emphasizes that it is not a simple task. The extensive literature on evaluation of teaching makes it clear that this is one of the greatest challenges facing schools and colleges today. Factors such as student preparation, subject matter, teaching philosophy, level of course, and others make it very difficult to come up with a simple scheme for evaluating teaching.

There seems to be strong consensus that evaluation of effective teaching cannot be reduced to a single number on a form completed by students. Nonetheless, student perspective on the quality of instruction is a critical component in achieving this task. Faculty members are encouraged to systematically collect formal student feedback on every course.

The framework provided in this document tries to avoid the pitfall of reducing evaluation of teaching to a single number. The down side of this decision is that effective evaluation of teaching becomes a much more complex undertaking. Multiple factors have to be considered. These can include student perceptions, student outcomes, peer and administrative review, review of teaching activities and materials, review of tests and other assessments, and an understanding of the faculty member’s individual philosophy of teaching. Like all else in this document, this section is not prescriptive. However, for the sake of differentiation, an attempt has been made to be concerned with the “endorsed” evaluations for tenure-track faculty (IDEA) and for tenured faculty and instructors (ECESE Department Evaluation). For those faculty who supervise the clinical practices of student teachers, their specific evaluation forms will be utilized.

In addition to what goes on in the classroom, a variety of other factors are directly related to quality of teaching. These can include time and effort devoted to advising, supervising field experience, supervising clinical practice candidates, supervising practica candidates, efforts at program revision, pursuit of external funds to improve program resources or student opportunities, variety of courses taught, the development of expertise related to instruction, efforts at recruitment, and other evidence of commitment to students and teaching. These factors merit serious consideration.

In this college, the task is further complicated by the fact that for many of us pedagogy is our subject matter. This means that for some faculty members the boundary between teaching and professional achievement is less than clear. However, it also means that the modeling of effective pedagogical practice is intrinsic to the role of faculty member in a teacher education program.
## ECESE FEP Compensation Plan
### Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Evaluation</th>
<th>Expected (1 quality point)</th>
<th>Above Expected (2 quality points)</th>
<th>Other evidence of effective teaching based upon one formal observation by peers or administration; overall level: Exceptional levels...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Required Teaching Evaluations**       | TENURE TRACK FACULTY: Low average/midrange scores on a student evaluation instrument. (For example: average raw T-score of 37-44 on IDEA form)  
Effective teaching based upon at least two formal observations by peers or administration; overall level: Good level | TENURE TRACK FACULTY: Average/midrange to high average/midrange scores on student evaluation instrument  
(For example: average raw T-score of 45-55 on IDEA form)  
Effective teaching based upon at least two formal observations by peers or administration; overall level: Very Good level | TENURE TRACK FACULTY: Average/midrange scores on student evaluation instrument  
Effective teaching based upon at least two formal observations by peers or administration; overall level: Exceptional levels... |
| TENURED FACULTY: Departmental evaluation scores at 6-30 points (possible 80 points) | TENURED FACULTY: Departmental evaluation scores at 30.5-53 points (possible 80 points) | TENURED FACULTY: Departmental evaluation scores at 54-80 points (possible 80 points) | TENURED FACULTY: Departmental evaluation scores at 54-80 points (possible 80 points) |
| INSTRUCTORS: Departmental evaluation scores at 6-30 points (possible 80 points) | CLINICAL PRACTICE SUPERVISORS: As determined by the Department Chair | CLINICAL PRACTICE SUPERVISORS: As determined by the Department Chair | CLINICAL PRACTICE SUPERVISORS: As determined by the Department Chair |
| **Other Teaching Evaluations**          | TENURED FACULTY / INSTRUCTORS: Other evidence of effective teaching based upon one formal observation by peers or administration; overall level: Good level | TENURED FACULTY / INSTRUCTORS: Other evidence of effective teaching based upon one formal observation by peers or administration; overall level: Very Good level  
Earn a teaching award at school, district, or local level | TENURE TRACK FACULTY: Average/midrange scores on student evaluation instrument  
Effective teaching based upon at least two formal observations by peers or administration; overall level: Exceptional levels... |

### Advising / Availability to students
- Consistently available and accessible to students and advisees  
Serve as an academic advisor for students (Registrar’s Record)

### Course creation, development, revision
- Consistently deliver effective instruction by using good pedagogical practices.
  - Maintain skills and knowledge needed to stay current in field and delivery of instruction.
  - Plan regional engagement activities in support of teaching, i.e. clinical and/or field experiences as part of course requirements.
  - Embed service learning activities within a course, e.g. school improvement plan, family literacy night, transition fair, etc.
  - Include pre-test/post test info showing significant student improvement over the course of a semester
  - Teach a course new to faculty member
  - Use innovative techniques in existing course, first time being implemented
  - Design and deliver a course in collaboration with community agency personnel or faculty at another institution
  - Revise a course in terms of delivery (e.g. F2F to online; non-PPN to PPN)
  - Revise an existing program

### Beyond the classroom/course student collaboration/ involvement
- Provide student workshop on teaching, i.e. PRAXIS
  - Support extended effort to improve student success, i.e. dispositions remediation, mentoring. (This support may extend beyond a course and/or semester.)
  - Mentor students involved in school-based action research projects beyond regular course requirement.
  - Write and obtain a grant to support student attendance at conferences

### Other
Section I. Introduction

A. Introduction

DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:
The mission of Morehead State University Department of Nursing is to promote health and well-being among the people of northeastern and eastern Kentucky, the greater Commonwealth, and extending to those whom our graduates serve in our global community. In an academic environment that is responsive to health care changes situated within respective cultures, it is through excellence in nursing education in all programs, service, and commitment to scholarly activities that this mission is accomplished.

In accordance with University policies, the Department seeks to recognize and reward continual faculty development and excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service through recommendations for: 1) reappointment; 2) tenure; 3) promotion to associate professor or professor, and; 4) available merit-based compensation.

B. Purpose

The purpose for the departmental Faculty Evaluation Plan (FEP) is to provide descriptions of the criteria used to evaluate teaching, scholarship, and service. These criteria will be used for annual reviews that will determine merit-based compensation, reviews for reappointment, final tenure review, and promotions.

C. Policies for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Faculty members seeking reappointment, tenure, promotion, and merit-based compensation increases have a responsibility to understand the departmental FEP and the following university policies (located at the MSU Human Resources Web Site - Policies):

- PAc-1 Definition of Academic Titles
- PAc-2 Promotion Review
- PAc-11 Faculty Scholarship
- PAc-27 Tenure Review, Including Annual Review of Probationary Faculty
Tenured, tenure-track faculty, and instructors must prepare appropriate documentation to meet the standards addressed in the university policies as well as the Departmental requirements presented in this FEP.
D. Policies for Instructors

Instructors are employed to address instructional needs of the department in which teaching demands for introductory and specialty courses exceed staffing capacity of Standing I faculty. Accordingly, these instructors are evaluated on teaching performance for available merit-based compensation and reappointment. However, the Department Chair can consider contributions in the area of service and professional achievement.

Instructors may have appointments renewed on an annual basis, provided there are instructional needs, adequate funds, and satisfactory evaluations according to the departmental FEP. All instructors have a responsibility to understand the departmental FEP and PAc-34 (“Alternative Career-Track Faculty/Instructors, Non-Tenure Track”).

E. Faculty Mentors

At the beginning of their academic appointment, tenure-track faculty members will be assigned, by the Department Chair, a mentor from the tenured faculty. Newly hired Instructors also will be assigned a mentor by the Department Chair for a period of five years. Mentors will assist tenure track faculty and instructors in regard to departmental, college, and university policies/procedures, and provide guidance on departmental expectations.

F. Reporting of Faculty Activities

Annually each faculty member shall document his or her teaching, scholarship, and service activities in Faculty 180 or the approved university faculty activity reporting system. Once documented the faculty member shall provide a report from Faculty180 or the approved university faculty reporting system.

G. Relative Weights of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service Activities in Evaluation

Although the evaluation process is not simply a quantitative accounting of faculty activities in teaching, scholarship, and service, relative weights will be in the general ranges of:

- Teaching: 50%
- Scholarship: 25%
- Service: 25%

These percentages should be determined in consultation with the Department Chair. The faculty member’s annual report shall include the recommended percentages for the following year. Flexible Workload Agreements may be negotiated by the faculty member with the Department Chair in accordance with PAc-29. Such an agreement will prescribe the relative weights of faculty activities to be used in evaluation of faculty performance for promotion, and expectations specific to the Flexible Workload Agreement, and will be used for all annual reviews. A specific report of actions, products and/or results following from reassigned time that end from such a
flexible workload agreement shall be included in the faculty member’s regular review documents.

As cited in Pac-35: If a faculty member is involved in regional engagement, evidence should be provided of how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond. This is not a separate category of the FEP, but should be reflected in the faculty member’s teaching, scholarship, and service as appropriate.
Section II. Annual Review for Probationary Faculty - Reappointment and Final Tenure Review

Because the tenure decision has long-term implications on the department’s ability to fulfill its mission, tenure must be awarded only after a careful assessment over a period of time sufficient to judge the faculty member’s documented accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service, as well as the individual’s probable future productivity. In addition, *collegiality and departmental citizenship are considered an integral part of faculty performance.* For annual reappointment, it is anticipated that the tenure-track faculty member will demonstrate satisfactory progress in teaching, scholarship, and service. For a favorable tenure decision, the Departmental Committee (consisting of all tenured faculty within the Department) and Department Chair must be convinced, based upon the candidate’s cumulative portfolio, *that the candidate’s record represents a pattern indicative of a career of continued accomplishments and productivity.*

A. Annual Reviews for Reappointment of Faculty during the Probationary Period (Contract Renewal)

Each annual review is a step toward meeting the Department’s standards for tenure. Annual reviews address the strengths and weaknesses in regard to tenure. A summary evaluation at the below expected level may result in contract non-renewal. If a below expected summary evaluation is given, satisfactory improvement must be demonstrated in the subsequent evaluation.

B. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Review

The final tenure portfolio shall include a compilation of components from the annual reviews for reappointment portfolios and documentation. However, regular faculty reviews and tenure evaluations are separate processes, and consequently, *meeting the minimal expectations for reappointment will not guarantee tenure.*

A faculty member who holds tenure-eligible rank must be reviewed for the awarding of tenure as per PAC-27. The evaluation of cumulative performance (assessed by annual reviews for reappointment) must culminate in meeting the standards for tenure and show potential for continued growth.

The following specific activities are required to be documented for tenure:

Teaching (all of the following):

- Department Chair/peer evaluation twice per year.
- At least two IDEA student evaluations per year.
- The Department of Nursing uses the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) paper titled, Defining Scholarship for the Discipline of Nursing to guide validation and documentation for scholarly/teaching productivity. [http://www.aacn.nche.edu/publications/position/defining-scholarship](http://www.aacn.nche.edu/publications/position/defining-scholarship)  * (attached to this document)
Scholarship (all of the following):

- Evidence of continued scholarly productivity as documented by peer-reviewed products, grant-sponsored products, peer-reviewed publications, clinical practice applications (examples include consultations reports, peer reviews of practice, reports of clinical demonstration projects – see url under dept specific activities related to scholarship), scientific patents, funded grant proposals, advanced certification or scientific contracts awarded.
- Demonstrated, ongoing involvement of student(s) in research endeavors where appropriate/possible.
- Demonstrated grant writing activity including submissions to external agencies with the faculty member’s contribution in detail during the probationary period.
- The Department of Nursing uses the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) paper titled, Defining Scholarship for the Discipline of Nursing to guide validation and documentation for scholarly productivity. http://www.aacn.nche.edu/publications/position/defining-scholarship *(attached to this document)
- Clinical practice up to 8 hours/week.

Service (all of the following):

- Service to the Department.
- Demonstrated service to MSU beyond the department level.
- External service to one’s profession, and/or as a representative of MSU.
- Active involvement in health/nurse related professional organization at the regional, national or international levels. Activities will include serving on task forces, committees, board of directors or officer. Membership does not constitute service.

C. Tenure Review Process

The candidate is referred to PAc 27 for the specific processes regarding tenure and reappointment review.
Section III. Promotion to Professor

The major objective of the promotion process is to recognize the long-term commitment for excellence as a faculty member. This process leads to the ultimate level, that of a Professor, with all the rights and privileges thereof. Because regular review and promotion evaluations are separate processes, meeting or exceeding regular review criteria does not guarantee a favorable promotion decision. Promotion evaluations are based on cumulative performance.

Associate professors will have to petition for promotion to the rank of Professor. Candidates for promotion must be outstanding teachers with a sustained record of scholarship, and be a recognized leader in service. In accordance with PAC-2, the review for promotion will include an evaluation of the cumulative record since the last promotion, and will assess the ability and motivation of the candidate to sustain this level of expertise and proficiency throughout their career.

The candidate must provide evidence of excellence, leadership, and maturity in teaching, a program of significant scholarship resulting from projects conducted while employed at MSU, and leadership in service to the department, college, or university, or professional organizations.

The candidate must demonstrate qualities that are recognized by their peers as meeting the highest standards set by the Department and providing leadership at all university levels. Effort in excess of the minimum standards used for the tenure assessments shall be expected for the promotion to Professor.

The performance of the applicant shall be evaluated as meeting the standards for promotion to Professor or as not meeting the standards for promotion to Professor.

The following specific activities are required to be documented for promotion to Professor:

Teaching:
- High level of sustained performance as evidenced by Department Chair/peer and student course evaluations.
- Chair Evaluations are to be done annually in one course; didactic, clinic/lab in the previous 2 years before applying for promotion to Professor.

Scholarship (all of the following):
- High level of sustained performance as evidenced by grant writing activity, patents, clinical practice applications (examples include consultations reports, peer reviews of practice, reports of clinical demonstration projects), advanced certification and/or peer-reviewed publications (in print and accepted) in appropriate journals with details of faculty contribution (if multiple authors).
- Demonstrated, ongoing involvement of student(s) in research activities.
- Anecdotal: The Department of Nursing uses the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) paper titled, Defining Scholarship for the Discipline of Nursing to guide validation and documentation for scholarly productivity. [http://www.aacn.nche.edu/publications/position/defining-scholarship](http://www.aacn.nche.edu/publications/position/defining-scholarship)
Service (all of the following):

- Service to the Department.
- Demonstrated service to MSU beyond the department level.
- External service to one’s profession, and/or as a representative of MSU.
- Active involvement in health/nurse related professional organization at the regional, national or international levels. Activities will include serving on task forces, committees, board of directors or officer. Membership does not constitute service.
Section IV: Annual Review/Merit Compensation

All faculty members and instructors will undergo regular annual evaluations; when funds are available, merit compensation may be awarded. Faculty performance will be evaluated both for quantity and quality, as well as the faculty member’s effective contributions to the department. Instructors will be evaluated on teaching performance.

Regular review documents (tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, and instructors) are limited to a report/list, no more than three pages long, of documentable academic activities.

This list should include the following:

- Teaching evaluations (Department Chair/Peer and Student for at least two courses).
- Research activities resulting in research products (presentations, publications, grant proposals, grant awards).
- Service activities – include committee, role, number of times committee met and the number of times the faculty member was present, and actions that resulted.
- Any other items the faculty member wishes to include.

Should the faculty member disagree with the outcome of the annual review, the faculty member should schedule an appointment with the Department Chair. The appointment and subsequent discussion of the annual review must be within 7 business days from the date of the evaluation letter. If the Department Chair agrees with the faculty member’s appeal, an amendment will be made to the document and forwarded to the Dean’s office within 14 business days from the date of the evaluation letter. If an agreement is not reached between the Department Chair and the faculty member, the faculty member may submit a letter of appeal to the Dean of the College within 21 business days from the date of the evaluation letter. The Dean’s decision on the appeal will be final and will be communicated to both the faculty member and the Department Chair within 14 business days from the date on the appeal letter.
Section V: Evaluation Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Annual Review

A. Teaching

Effective teaching requires a deep understanding of the principles and concepts within the subjects taught, the ability to clearly communicate that knowledge to the students through variety of pedagogical methods, and the fostering of an environment in which students learn stated course objectives and skills.

Departmental teaching responsibilities include classroom, laboratory and research instruction, as well as academic program maintenance and development, advising, and professional development as a teacher. Faculty will also be evaluated on effectiveness in their helping meet the department’s undergraduate and graduate needs.

Expected activities

- Effective delivery of current content.
- Fulfillment of university policies on teaching, such as submitting assessment data for general education courses, holding regular office hours (5 hours per week during each semester), turning in mid-term and final grades on time, attempting to arrange substitute instruction/activities for all absences from the classroom or lab, where possible.
- Engagement in advising duties as assigned (instructors are exempt).
- Overall satisfactory teaching evaluations.
- Participation in departmental curricular initiatives as needed.

Above expected activities

Any of the “expected” or additional activities performed at a meritorious level as determined by the Department Chair.

Documentation for teaching must include:

- Department Chair/Peer Classroom/Lab Observation Summary Report.
- Quantitative and qualitative student evaluations, either university approved or instructor-designed. (Student evaluations will not comprise more than 25% of the total evaluation for the teaching component).

Additional teaching documentation may include (but is not limited to as specified by the department):

- Representative examinations to be evaluated for their clarity, relevance, application of knowledge, critical thinking requirements, inquiry of science, quantitative use of skills, etc.
- Syllabi and/or online learning materials provided for student learning.
- Teaching awards and honors.
- Listing of undergraduate and/or graduate students mentored in research, including any presentations/products/awards of those students.
- Curriculum development materials (teaching of new and innovative courses or exercises).
- Professional development materials (technology, assessment, pedagogy) demonstrating the art of teaching and the incorporation of new teaching techniques into the classroom.
• Qualitative and/or quantitative evidence of advising activities.
• Program development/revision materials.

B. Scholarship

All faculty members should show an ongoing and active research agenda that involves students and has recognized outputs (for example, refereed publications, presentations, clinical practice, advanced certifications and abstracts at state, regional, or national meetings, and the submission of grant proposals to external organizations).

**Expected Activities**
Faculty members are expected as a matter of scholarship to participate in activities that keep them updated in their field of expertise.

• Conducting scholarly activities throughout the academic year that result in publications, presentations or funded grants.

NOTE: Additional items may be added by the department.

**Above Expected Activities**
Any of the “expected” or additional activities performed at a meritorious level as determined by the Department Chair.

C. Service

• Demonstrated, continuing service and leadership to the Department, college, and university. Including the following:
  o Meeting with prospective students and parents for the purposes of recruiting new students.
  o Representing the Department outside of “normal” hours, such as SOARs, open houses, Meet MSU Nights, etc.
• External service to one’s profession, and /or as a representative of MSU.

**Above Expected Activities**
Any of the “expected” or additional activities performed at a meritorious level as determined by the Department Chair.

D. Tenure Review Process

The candidate is referred to PAc 27 for the specific processes regarding tenure and reappointment review.
Summary Evaluation

Recognizing that teaching should be the primary focus of every faculty member, the annual evaluation of each faculty member will be weighted toward teaching.

Summary Evaluation Rubric

The determination of a faculty member’s overall annual evaluation rating is a holistic effort but in general, the following guidelines apply:

- Any faculty member rated below expected in teaching will received a below expected overall evaluation.
- Any faculty member rated below expected in both scholarship and service will receive a below expected overall evaluation.
- The summary evaluation at the above expected level will be determined by the Department Chair.
- The following rubric guides the overall summary evaluation at the expected level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Evaluation</th>
<th>Teaching Area Evaluation</th>
<th>Scholarship Area Evaluation</th>
<th>Service Area Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Defining Scholarship for the Discipline of Nursing

Purpose: This document provides standards that clarify and describe a full range of scholarship within the discipline of nursing. In particular, this statement focuses on four aspects of scholarship that are salient to academic nursing—discovery, teaching, applications in clinical practice, and integration of ideas from nursing and other disciplines. These areas support the values of a profession committed to both social relevance and scientific advancement. This document is not intended as prescriptive, or as exclusive of other considerations. It is a descriptive tool, and may be used to guide promotion, tenure, and merit reviews in a way that is appropriate to the profession; expand the scope of recognized scholarly activities; guide individual career planning; and demonstrate the growth of the profession over time. The unique culture and context of each academic institution, and the priorities of each nursing unit, will determine the relevance and value of the proposed standards within its own setting.

Background

Colleges and universities across the nation are striving to meet the challenges of rapidly changing educational systems, and are reconsidering the role of the faculty in an increasingly complex learning environment. An important part of that role is the creation of scholarship pertinent to the discipline of the individual faculty member. Many academic disciplines such as history, engineering, social work, psychology, business, education, and many others are in the process of redefining the traditional boundaries of scholarship, and are examining the faculty reward system that perpetuates these boundaries (Diamond & Adam, 1995; Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997). Nowhere is this dialogue more pertinent than in nursing, where rigorous scholarly inquiry must be applied in the realities and demands of practice. Nursing faculty, like others whose discipline brings together scientific investigation and application through professional services, often function in a system designed to reward and promote a narrow definition of academic success. Nursing, however, may have priorities for teaching, scholarship, and service that are linked directly to the goals of the profession.
Rationale

Boyer (1990) challenged all disciplines to embrace the full scope of academic work, moving beyond an exclusive focus on traditional and narrowly defined research as the only legitimate avenue to further the knowledge of the discipline, and to obtain rewards for professorial performance. He proposed that scholarship involves four areas that are critical to academic work. These are the scholarship of ...discovery, where new and unique knowledge is generated; ...teaching, where the teacher creatively builds bridges between his or her own understanding and the students' learning; ...application, where the emphasis is on the use of new knowledge in solving society's problems; and ...integration, where new relationships among disciplines are discovered.

These four aspects of scholarship are salient to academic nursing, where each specified area supports the values of a profession committed to both social relevance and scientific advancement. This document builds upon the work of Boyer (1990) and Diamond & Adam (1995); the rich history of nursing scholarship (Donaldson & Crowley, 1978; Stevenson, 1988); and statements by members of the profession that clarify the beliefs and values of academic leadership on interdisciplinary collaboration (AACN, 1995), research (AACN, 1998), faculty practice (AACN, 1993), and education (AACN, 1997).

Definition of Scholarship in Nursing

Scholarship in nursing can be defined as those activities that systematically advance the teaching, research, and practice of nursing through rigorous inquiry that 1) is significant to the profession, 2) is creative, 3) can be documented, 4) can be replicated or elaborated, and 5) can be peer-reviewed through various methods. This definition is applied in the following standards that describe scholarship in nursing.
Standards

Scholarship of Discovery
The scholarship of discovery is inquiry that produces the disciplinary and professional knowledge that is at the very heart of academic pursuits (Boyer, 1990). Within nursing, the scholarship of discovery reflects the unique perspective of nursing that "takes an expanded view of health by emphasizing health promotion, restoration, and rehabilitation, as well as a commitment to caring and comfort (AACN, 1998, p.1)." The scholarship of discovery takes the form of primary empirical research, historical research, theory development and testing, methodological studies, and philosophical inquiry and analysis. It increasingly is interdisciplinary and collaborative in nature, across professional groups and within nursing itself.

Primary empirical research is the systematic collection of data to answer an empirical question or test an hypothesis. A variety of qualitative and quantitative designs is used, including experimental, quasi-experimental, descriptive, exploratory, case studies, and ethnography. Source materials include primary empirical measurements, observations and specimens, databases created for other purposes, and published reports of research.

Historical research includes original investigations using manuscripts, documents, oral narrative, and other printed and non-printed materials.

Theory development is the process of drawing together scientific and experiential knowledge, assumptions, and principles into a systematic set of statements that have explanatory and predictive power with respect to an area of experience. Scientific theories suggest explanations for phenomena that may be subjected to empirical tests.

Methodological studies include the development and testing of new or revised methods of inquiry that have utility in generating knowledge.

Philosophical inquiry in nursing is metaphysical, epistemological, and ethical and involves critical reasoning and argument that is systematic, rational, and critical. It seeks to answer
questions related to the meaning of health and illness in the context of human life, how we acquire and evaluate knowledge, and the standards of conduct of life. Whether arguments are inductive or deductive in nature, assumptions are thoroughly examined and principles of logical thought and proof are followed.

Examples of Documentation of the Quality of the Scholarship of Discovery

- peer-reviewed publications of research, theory, or philosophical essays;
- presentations of research, theory, or philosophical essays;
- grant awards in support of research or scholarship;
- mentorship of junior colleagues in research or scholarship;
- state, regional, national, or international recognition as a scholar in an identified area; and
- positive peer evaluations of the body of work.

Scholarship of Teaching

The scholarship of teaching is inquiry that produces knowledge to support the transfer of the science and art of nursing from the expert to the novice, building bridges between the teacher's understanding and the student's learning (Boyer, 1990). This scholarly approach supports the development of educational environments that embrace diverse learning styles, and increasingly, places the focus of education on the learner (Edgerton, 1997). Within nursing, the scholarship of teaching increases the effectiveness of the transfer of discipline-specific knowledge, and adds to deeper understanding of both the discipline and pedagogy. The scholarship of teaching is conducted through application of knowledge of the discipline or specialty area in the teaching-learning process, the development of innovative teaching and evaluation methods, program development, learning outcome evaluation, and professional role modeling.

Knowledge of the discipline or specialty applied in teaching-learning includes innovations that demonstrate the knowledge of the faculty member in relation to teaching (such as authorship of textbooks or other learning aids), technology application, and theory building in the teaching-learning assessment context.
Development of innovative teaching and evaluation methods includes research in teaching strategies, course development and outcome evaluation, curricular and faculty evaluation innovations, research related to the knowledge and pedagogy of nursing, and creation of innovative learning environments that support diverse groups of students.

Program development and learning outcome evaluation includes the development of outcomes assessment programs, accreditation reports, grant proposals for educational programs, disciplinary and interdisciplinary programs, and educational evaluation models.

Professional role modeling includes the mentoring of students and novice faculty, leadership roles in curriculum and instruction, development of programs for lifelong learning, and leadership in shaping educational policy.

Examples of Documentation of the Quality of Scholarship of Teaching

- peer-reviewed publications of research related to teaching methodology or learning outcomes, case studies related to teaching-learning, learning theory development, and development or testing of educational models or theories;
- accreditation or other comprehensive program reports;
- successful applications of technology to teaching and learning;
- positive peer assessments of innovations in teaching;
- state, regional, national, or international recognition as a master teacher;
- published textbooks or other learning aids;
- grant awards in support of teaching and learning;
- design of outcome studies or evaluation/assessment programs; and
- presentations related to teaching and learning.

Scholarship of Practice (Application)

The scholarship of practice has emerged in nursing as a critical component in the maintenance of clinical competency of faculty in a university setting and the advancement
of clinical knowledge in the discipline (Norbeck & Taylor, 1998; Rudy et al., 1995; and Wright, 1993). Practice scholarship encompasses all aspects of the delivery of nursing service where evidence of direct impact in solving health care problems or in defining the health problems of a community is presented. Competence in practice is the method by which knowledge in the profession is both advanced and applied. Practice roles for faculty in health care delivery systems may include direct caregiver, educator, consultant, and administrator (Brown, et al., 1995; Norbeck & Taylor, 1998; Wright, 1993).

Models through which the scholarship of practice may be accomplished are varied (Norbeck & Taylor, 1998). These models may include structural typologies for practice, such as nursing centers, joint appointments with external agencies, and faculty development; faculty role approaches, such as teacher, practitioner, administrator, and consultant; specialty practice arrangements, encompassing all types of clinical expertise in nursing, including community health, primary care, anesthesia services, midwifery services, clinical specialties, and others; and administrative approaches, such as volunteer, collaborative, revenue-generating, and contractual service models. In all models, the focus is on the scholarship generated through practice. Practice is conducted through the application of nursing and related knowledge to the assessment and validation of patient care outcomes, the measurement of quality of life indicators, the development and refinement of practice protocols/strategies, the evaluation of systems of care, and the analysis of innovative health care delivery models.

**Components of the scholarship of practice include:**

*Development of clinical knowledge*, which entails systematic development and application of theoretical formulations and conduct of clinically applicable research and evaluation studies in clinical areas of expertise;

*Professional development*, which includes self-development to improve competency beyond the basic practice of professional nursing and research in specialty practice arrangements and faculty role concepts (Brown et al., 1995);
application of technical or research skills that promote the testing of clinical knowledge and new practice strategies, evaluation of systems of care, development of quality indicators, the development of innovative health care delivery models, and others; and

service, where scholarship is directly related to the clinical specialty of the faculty member and flows directly from professional activity, includes the mentoring of professional staff and students, leadership roles in developing practice and the public health, the development of practice standards, and the initiation of grant proposals for the creation of delivery system models to improve access to health care (Boyer, 1990).

**Examples of Documentation of the Quality of Practice Scholarship**

- peer-reviewed publications of research, case studies, technical applications, or other practice issues;
- presentations related to practice;
- consultation reports;
- reports compiling and analyzing patient or health services outcomes;
- products, patents, license copyrights;
- peer reviews of practice;
- grant awards in support of practice;
- state, regional, national, or international recognition as a master practitioner;
- professional certifications, degrees, and other specialty credentials;
- reports of meta-analyses related to practice problems;
- reports of clinical demonstration projects; and
- policy papers related to practice.

**Scholarship of Integration**

The scholarship of integration refers to writings and other products that use concepts and original works from nursing and other disciplines in creating new patterns, placing knowledge in a larger context, or illuminating the data in a more meaningful way. The scholarship of integration emphasizes the interconnection of ideas, and brings new insight
to bear on original concepts and research. Critical analysis and interpretation are two common methodologies, but interdisciplinary work may take place through any medium for scholarship such as those described as discovery, teaching, or practice (Boyer, 1990). Original work in the scholarship of integration takes place at the margins, or interface, between two disciplines. It serves to respond to both intellectual questions and pressing human problems by creating knowledge or combining knowledge in applications that offer new paradigms and insights.

*Integrative scholarship* requires participation from two or more disciplines in inquiry that advances knowledge across a wide range of techniques and methodologies. Works that would be recognized in the scholarship of integration in nursing include interfaces between nursing and a variety of disciplines. Integrative reviews of the literature, analysis of health policy, development of interdisciplinary educational programs and service projects, studies of systems in health care, original interdisciplinary research, and integrative models or paradigms across disciplines are examples of the scholarship of integration.

*Examples of Documentation of the Quality of Integrative Scholarship*

- peer-reviewed publications of research, policy analysis, case studies, integrative reviews of the literature, and others;
- copyrights, licenses, patents, or products for sale;
- published books;
- positive peer evaluations of contributions to integrative scholarship;
- reports of interdisciplinary programs or service projects;
- interdisciplinary grant awards;
- presentations; and
- policy papers designed to influence organizations or governments.

*Summary*

While the mission of institutions of higher learning is unique in each setting, the commitment to scholarly approaches to education, practice, and research creates common bonds across the academic nursing community. This document is intended to clarify,
extend, and enhance the scholarly work of nursing in academic settings. The application of the standards proposed in this document will differ by institution, yet will provide a framework for the advancement of nursing knowledge that will ultimately improve the health of people.
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I. INTRODUCTION

A. Statement of Purpose

The purpose of the Faculty Evaluation Plan (FEP) is to define criteria, procedures and conditions for the granting of tenure and reappointment, promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, promotion from Associate to Professor, and annual performance–based evaluations and adjunct faculty assessment as required by PAc–1, PAc–2, PAc–35, PAc–27 and PAc–30.

The FEP shall be reviewed annually by a committee made up of Art Faculty representing Art History, Studio Art, Graphic Design/Computer Art, and Art Education.

B. Philosophy

The Department of Art & Design review and promotion process involves the application of academic and professional judgments in a framework of shared authority among various levels of review between faculty and academic administrators.
C. Department Goals and Objectives

The review and promotion process are directly related to the diverse roles faculty members play in all aspects of the Department of Art & Design’s Goals and objectives. The department offers a range of baccalaureate and graduate programs that support the personal and professional goals of students, consistent with the resources of the department and in accordance with national standards in art, design and teaching. The department provides an inclusive environment where respect for diversity of peoples, cultures, world views and thought are integral to the pursuit of intellectual inquiry and creative exploration. Teaching and learning in the visual arts and design are enhanced by faculty who engage in scholarly and creative research and production. The department contributes to meeting the cultural, educational and social needs of the campus and service region through collaborations with schools and community partners, enriching cultural activities, visual art and design exhibitions and art programming. Elective experiences are offered to all university students to enrich their lives and develop an understanding of and life-long appreciation for the visual arts, design and creativity.

1. Strengthen Academic Programs

   a. Provide a high quality program that will enable students to:

      (I) Understand and skillfully apply various media, techniques and technology in the production and presentation of work

      (II) Work creatively with materials, media, symbols and ideas

      (III) Understand visual art and design in historical, philosophical and cultural contexts

      (IV) Reflect upon and assess the characteristics and merits of their work and the work of others

      (V) Communicate about art effectively in written
and oral form

(VI) Develop competencies in preparation for work as artists, designers, teachers and creative workers in the 21st century

b. Provide opportunities for undergraduate research, exhibitions, commissions, internships, field experiences, service learning, field trips and international experiences

c. Promote faculty scholarship through support of creative productions, exhibitions, research, publications, presentations, workshops and specialized training

d. Improve the quality of life in the Eastern Kentucky service region through collaborations with community, curricular offerings and diverse programming

e. Promote and encourage diversity of ideas, perspectives, cultures and backgrounds

f. Develop and maintain current technologies in studios and labs, including the Apple computer labs, multi-media room and visual resource center

g. Strengthen the curriculum and provide community arts programming through juried regional and national exhibitions, and guest artists and lecturers

h. Enhance gallery programming through student exhibitions, national juried exhibitions and visiting artists and lecturers

2. Recruit, Advise and Retain Students

a. Increase enrollment, retention, and graduation rates, including through academic advising and departmental recruitment activities.

b. Develop strategies for outreach and enhance department’s visibility. Cultivate art teacher and alumni relationships with the department
c. Improve service to students/region through curricular offerings

3. Assess Programs to Ensure Quality Improvement

a. Evaluate assessment strategies for determining overall quality of student work and programmatic strengths and weaknesses

b. Formulate assessment strategies to determine adequacy of program technologies and physical plant

c. Involve all art faculty in the program assessment process

D. PAc–29

A Faculty Member’s performance shall be reviewed in accordance with criteria specified in the Flexible Workload Agreement (FWA) and the guidelines outlined in PAc–29. No additional restrictions are expected beyond Pac–29.

II. REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE/PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

A. Probationary Review and Tenure/Promotion to Associate Professor Review Procedures

Standards for promotion from Assistant to Associate professor are the same as those for tenure. Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor must adhere to the definition of Associate Professor outlined in PAc–1, #4. In addition to meeting the Tenure/Promotion to Associate Professor, applicants must adhere to the University–mandated guidelines and procedures outlined in PAc–27 for faculty with less than one year of service, faculty with more than one year but less than two years of service, and faculty with more than two years of service, and must comply with the guidelines outlined in PAc–2 for promotion.

All supporting materials documenting the probationary period for tenure–track faculty must be submitted by the deadline. If a
faculty member applies previous service to the probationary period, significant accomplishments from MSU or other institutions for all three categories (teaching, scholarship, and service) must be documented and must be consistent with the department’s current FEP standards for the awarding of tenure.

Performance–based evaluations and promotion evaluations are separate processes, and consequently, meeting or exceeding performance–based evaluation criteria does not automatically ensure a favorable tenure/promotion decision. Although tenure track candidates are allowed to elect different distributions between scholarship and service for annual performance review, the distribution requirements for tenure/promotion for scholarship and service is fixed at 25%/25%. Moreover, performance–based evaluations are based on annual performance, whereas promotion evaluations are based on cumulative performance. As the university strives to recruit and maintain an outstanding faculty, meeting the minimal expectations of performance will not be sufficient for promotion to Associate Professor.

Tenured assistant professors seeking promotion to associate professor must satisfy the same criteria for promotion as untenured assistant professors seeking promotion to associate professor and tenure. All procedures specified in PAc–2 apply to the promotion process for such faculty, except that standards for promotion are specified in PAc–27.

1. Departmental Tenure/Promotion to Associate Professor Committee

The committee is constituted of all tenured faculty in the Art & Design Department. If insufficient tenured faculty are available, reference PAc –27 for procedures. The committee evaluates the portfolio, adds their written evaluation to the portfolio, delivers a copy to the candidate, and forwards the portfolio to the department chair as specified by PAc–27.

2. Department Chair

The department chair evaluates the portfolio, adds his/her written evaluation to the portfolio, delivers a copy to the candidate, and forwards the portfolio to the college dean as specified by PAc–27.
3. Role of Faculty Mentor

Faculty mentors assigned by the department chair are available for guidance. Given reasonable notice, mentors can meet with the probationary faculty member to supply information, comments and/or suggestions. It is important that both the mentor and the candidate retain documentation of advice and assistance given during mentoring opportunities.

B. Expectations

All candidates for promotion to Associate Professor must meet the minimum requirements outlined in PAc-1 General Academic Ranks #4.

Teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty and is more heavily weighted in the review process; 50% of a faculty’s activities should be in Teaching, with the remaining 50% distributed evenly between Scholarship and Service.

Failure to meet “Expected Basic” activities will adversely affect an application for tenure/promotion to Associate Professor. It will be assumed that the applicant has met them unless determined by the department chair to have not done so. For a list of “Expected Basic” activities see the Rubric.

In addition a faculty member must meet all “Expected” criteria and some “Above Expected” levels of performance in Teaching, Scholarship and Service during the cumulative tenure review process:

1. Teaching

For “Expected” and “Above Expected” teaching activities, as well as specific examples of applicable teaching activities, see Appendix A

2. Scholarship

Faculty should follow guidelines specific to their particular area:
Art History Faculty:
For “Expected” and “Above Expected” scholarship activities, as well as specific examples of applicable scholarship activities, see Appendix B: 1.

Studio Art Faculty:
For “Expected” and “Above Expected” scholarship activities, as well as specific examples of applicable scholarship activities, see Appendix B: 2.

Graphic Design/Computer Art Faculty:
For “Expected” and “Above Expected” scholarship activities, as well as specific examples of applicable scholarship activities, see Appendix B: 3.

Art Education Faculty:
For “Expected” and “Above Expected” scholarship activities, as well as specific examples of applicable scholarship activities, see Appendix B: 4.

3. Service

For “Expected” and “Above Expected” service activities, as well as specific examples of applicable service activities, see Appendix C

See Appendix D for guidelines on preparing the portfolio.

C. Annual Review of Instructors

Fixed Term Instructors will be evaluated based on Teaching Evaluation Criteria in Appendix A.

Adjunct instructors will be reviewed annually by the department chair.

D. Faculty on Leave

Faculty on leave will be evaluated based on the period of the school calendar during which they were active. The time spent on leave will not adversely affect faculty evaluation.
III. APPOINTMENT TO PROFESSOR

A. Promotion to Professor Review Procedures

Candidates for promotion to Professor must adhere to the definition of Professor outlined in PAc-1, #5, in addition to meeting the University-mandated guidelines and procedures outlined in PAc-2.

Performance-based and promotion evaluations are separate processes, and consequently, meeting or exceeding performance-based evaluation criteria does not automatically ensure a favorable promotion decision. Although candidates applying for promotion are allowed to elect different distributions between scholarship and service for annual performance review, the distribution requirements for promotion for scholarship and service is fixed at 25%/25%. Moreover, performance-based evaluations are based on annual performance, whereas promotion evaluations are based on cumulative performance. As the Department of Art and Design strives to recruit and maintain an outstanding faculty, meeting the minimal expectations of performance will not be sufficient for promotion to Professor. Promotion to the rank of Professor represents recognition of sustained, outstanding contributions to teaching, scholarship, and service.

1. Departmental Promotion to Professor Committee

Constituted of all full-time tenured (full) Professors in the Department of Art and Design. If fewer than 5 full-time Professors are available, reference PAc-2 Section IV #7 for procedures. The committee evaluates the portfolio, adds their written evaluation to the portfolio, delivers a copy to the candidate, and forwards the portfolio to the department chair as specified by PAc-2.

2. Department Chair

The department chair evaluates the portfolio, adds his/her written evaluation to the portfolio, delivers a copy to the candidate, and forwards the portfolio to the college dean as specified by PAc-2.
B. Expectations

All candidates for promotion to Professor must meet the minimum requirements outlined in PAc-1 General Academic Ranks #5 and PAc-2. Promotion to the rank of Professor is not related to years of service, but rather to sustained, outstanding contributions to teaching, scholarship, and service. All supporting materials that demonstrate a record of excellence and accomplishment in all three areas for the years in rank must be submitted by the deadline. If a faculty member applies previous service to promotion, significant accomplishments from MSU or other institutions for all three categories (teaching, scholarship, and service) must be documented and must be consistent with the department’s current FEP standards for the awarding of promotion.

Teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty and is more heavily weighted in the review process; 50% of a faculty’s activities should be in Teaching, with the remaining 50% evenly distributed between Scholarship and Service.

Failure to meet “Expected Basic” activities will adversely affect an application for promotion to Professor. It will be assumed that the applicant has met them unless determined by the department chair to have not done so. For a list of “Expected Basic” activities see the Rubric.

In addition, a faculty member must meet all “Expected” criteria and some “Above Expected” levels of performance in Teaching, Scholarship and Service during the cumulative review process.

1. Teaching

   For “Expected” and “Above Expected” teaching activities, as well as specific examples of applicable teaching activities, see Appendix A

2. Scholarship

   Faculty should follow guidelines specific to their particular area:
Art History Faculty:
For “Expected” and “Above Expected” scholarship activities, as well as specific examples of applicable scholarship activities, see Appendix B: 1.

Studio Art Faculty:
For “Expected” and “Above Expected” scholarship activities, as well as specific examples of applicable scholarship activities, see Appendix B: 2.

Graphic Design/Computer Art Faculty:
For “Expected” and “Above Expected” scholarship activities, as well as specific examples of applicable scholarship activities, see Appendix B: 3.

Art Education Faculty:
For “Expected” and “Above Expected” scholarship activities, as well as specific examples of applicable scholarship activities, see Appendix B: 4.

3. Service

For “Expected” and “Above Expected” service activities, as well as specific examples of applicable service activities, see Appendix C

See Appendix E for guidelines on preparing the portfolio.

IV. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE–BASED EVALUATIONS AND MERIT SCORING

A. Annual Performance Review Process

1. Departmental faculty performance will be evaluated on an annual basis. The guidelines for this review are outlined in PAC–30. The period evaluated will be the previous calendar year, January 1 to December 31. Faculty on leaves of absence and sabbaticals are eligible to participate.
2. By the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Friday in January of each year, faculty are required to submit an annual performance review portfolio through Faculty 180 for the department chair to review. As Faculty 180 does not accommodate all of the department’s approved FEP activities, faculty can elect to supplement their on–line entries with a hard copy vita including all their activities for the year organized according to Appendices A, B & C. The chair has the option to request supporting documentation for any listed activity.

3. The portfolio or written reasonable grounds beyond a faculty person's control (i.e. serious illness or family emergency) for its late submission or notification of unavailability of specific documents must be given to the department chair by an annual date specified by the Provost. A faculty member shall have five working days to provide documents noted as unavailable at the time of initial submission.

4. By the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Friday in February, the Department Chair will meet with each faculty member and provide a written performance evaluation (including a performance/rubric score according to the guidelines established in the FEP to all faculty members). The chair will recommend a merit score for each faculty member to the Caudill College Dean based on a rank ordering of performance scores for all full–time Standing–I faculty members in the unit. Final merit scores are determined by the Caudill College Dean and shared with each faculty member after the completion of all FEP based appeals.

5. Faculty may appeal evaluations/performance scores at the department/school level by the 1\textsuperscript{st} Friday in March. Appeals at the unit level can address both procedural (due process) and substantive issues. Appeal decisions must be submitted to the Caudill College Dean by the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Friday in March.

**Appeals Process:**

If there is a disagreement, the Chair and the faculty member should first try to resolve it by more dialogue and exchange of information. If the disagreement persists, the Chair must refer the matter to the Art & Design Department's Appeals Committee. Membership
of the ad hoc Appeals Committee will be selected by and from within the ARDE Tenure Committee. When selecting an odd number of tenured faculty to serve on the Appeals Committee, diversity in area representation must play a factor. As the ARDE Tenure Committee membership is small in numbers, three members will be selected, and should the Tenure Committee increase its membership in the future, the Appeals Committee membership may be increased to five. Once formed, the Appeals Committee may request written statements and/or interviews, as it considers appropriate, and offer a recommendation to the Chair and the faculty member. This recommendation must be in writing and if an evaluation is changed there must be enough substance and documentation to withstand any legal issues. If the majority of the Appeals Committee recommends a change in the evaluation of the faculty member, and the faculty member finds the recommendation acceptable, the Chair will abide by the committee's decision, and the amended evaluation will be considered the evaluation of record. Any amendments and changes to the chair's evaluation will be noted and verified by the ARDE Appeals Committee members. The faculty member retains the right to appeal to the Caudill College Dean, but the Department hopes to resolve all disputes internally and amicably.

6. Also by the 2nd Friday in March, the Department Chair will provide the Caudill College Dean with a summary report including the performance score earned by each faculty member and their recommended merit score based on a rank ordering of performance scores for all faculty in the department. There is no appeal process associated with merit score rankings.

7. By the 4th Friday in March, the Caudill College Dean will provide written notification to each faculty member of her or his assigned merit score. Salary adjustments associated with merit scores as well as salary equity adjustment (if applicable), will be provided and each faculty member notified once the salary increase pool is determined. Assigned merit scores and associated salary adjustments may not be appealed.
B. Expectations and Guidelines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL POINTS</th>
<th>MERIT SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far Exceeds</td>
<td>8.6 - 10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above</td>
<td>6.6 – 8.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At</td>
<td>4.6 – 6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below</td>
<td>0 - 4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To earn a Merit Score of 2, all three categories (Teaching, Scholarship & Service) must receive, at minimum, an “At Expectations” rubric score. Receiving “Below Expected” in two categories will result in a “Below Expectations” score (a Merit Score of 0). Receiving a total score of 8.5 with an “Above Expected” score in Teaching and an “Above Expected” score in Scholarship or Service (if no score is below 7) will be considered “Far Exceeds.”

No more than the top 20% of faculty members in the unit may be assigned a merit score of 3. No more than the top 70% of faculty members in the unit may be assigned a merit score of 2 or 3. It is possible that every faculty member in a department/school may earn a merit-based salary increase. Faculty members assigned a 0 merit score fail to meet minimum performance expectations and are ineligible for a salary increase.

Faculty must adhere to the department–mandated Performance–based Evaluation Guidelines and Procedures.

Failure to meet “Expected Basic” activities will adversely affect an applicant’s performance evaluation. It will be assumed that the applicant has met them unless determined by the department chair to have not done so. For a list of “Expected Basic” activities see the Rubric.

In addition, teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty and is more heavily weighted in the review process at 50%. The applicant may choose a 25%/25% or 20%/30% distribution between the two remaining categories, Scholarship and Service, within the remaining 50%. The applicant will state in his or her cover letter how he or she chooses to distribute the percentages between scholarship and service. Even though tenure/promotion candidates are allowed to elect different distributions between scholarship and service for annual performance review, be aware that the distribution requirements for tenure/promotion for scholarship and service is fixed at 25%/25%.
1. Teaching

For “Expected” and “Above Expected” teaching activities, as well as specific examples of applicable teaching activities, see Appendix A

2. Scholarship:

Faculty should follow guidelines specific to their particular area.

**Art History Faculty:**
For “Expected” and “Above Expected” scholarship activities, as well as specific examples of applicable scholarship activities, see Appendix B: 1.

**Studio Art Faculty:**
For “Expected” and “Above Expected” scholarship activities, as well as specific examples of applicable scholarship activities, see Appendix B: 2.

**Graphic Design/Computer Art Faculty:**
For “Expected” and “Above Expected” scholarship activities, as well as specific examples of applicable scholarship activities, see Appendix B: 3.

**Art Education Faculty:**
For “Expected” and “Above Expected” scholarship activities, as well as specific examples of applicable scholarship activities, see Appendix B: 4.

3. Service

For “Expected” and “Above Expected” service activities, as well as specific examples of applicable service activities, see Appendix C
Reappointment, tenure and promotion candidates:
Appendices A, B and C provide clear statements of “Expected” and “Above Expected” activities. They should also be used, along with Appendices D or E, to organize supporting documentation in the portfolio. Supporting documentation can include correspondence (hard copy or electronic).

Annual performance-based evaluation: Appendices A, B and C provide clear statements of “Expected” and “Above Expected” activities. They should also be used to organize activities in the applicant’s vita.

APPENDIX A: TEACHING EVALUATION ACTIVITIES:

Documentation must demonstrate that teaching activities have met all “Expected” and some “Above Expected” levels of performance. Quality of teaching activities will be weighted more heavily than quantity of teaching activities. Qualifying factors used to evaluate teaching are provided.

1. **All Faculty members are “Expected” to:**

   a. Print and include workload forms from Faculty 180 to document credit hours/load. These forms will also document the following qualifying factors, which will be used to evaluate the candidate’s work:
      (I) Reassigned time
      (II) Number of preparations – Single vs. Nested courses – If a course is nested, & each tier provides different assignments &/or content, then each tier may count as a separate course prep based on certain factors:
         (A) Number of students taught in a tier
            a. Undergraduate
            b. Graduate
         (B) Advanced Studies (undergraduate individualized), &/or Individual Studies
(graduate individualized) students (if overload)
b. Distribute syllabi that include required university components during the first week of classes. Include the most recent syllabi for each course taught, with the exception of cases where the candidate’s previous review(s) indicated weaknesses to be corrected.
c. Provide basic instructional support
   (I) Instructional materials for assignments & projects
   (II) Digital Presentations
   (III) Multi–media Presentations
   (IV) Demonstrations
   (V) Basic Blackboard with Syllabus
d. Perform basic Management as necessary
   (I) Ordering of supplies and/or equipment
   (II) Training &/or supervision of work study students or models
e. Carry out the role of an advisor as appropriate, including:
   (I) Arranging appointments for student advising
   (II) Attending university training sessions related to advising when applicable
   (III) Initiating contact with advisees
   (IV) Assisting advisees with scheduling and degree completion issues
f. Serve as Graduate Faculty:
   (I) Serve on Graduate Mid–program Review and Oral Examination committees, indicate role
   (II) Review graduate admission portfolios
g. Mentor students for the Senior Show
h. Art Education Faculty are expected to:
   (I) Supervise student teachers as part of workload requirements
   (II) Maintain contacts with regional art teachers
i. Teach Advanced Studies (undergraduate individualized), &/or Individual Studies (graduate individualized) courses to meet workload requirements (up to 24 cr. hrs. a year; not applicable to Art History)
j. Art History Faculty are expected to use library resources in support of class assignments, including in conjunction with the CCL library liaison
k. If applicable per position description: Art History Faculty are expected to
   (I) Coordinate ART 160 courses
   (II) Coordinate digital image data base
I. Initiate peer and/or Chair review of teaching in the classroom
   (I) At least 1 per year are required for tenure-track faculty and recommended for tenured faculty. Peer and/or chair will submit teaching observations listing strengths and areas for improvement to the faculty member.

m. Demonstrate satisfactory student evaluations
   (I) Use student evaluations of teaching to allow for student input and provide evidence of teaching effectiveness (will account for no more than 50% of Teaching Evaluation Criteria). These evaluations may include:
      (A) University approved instruments
      As IDEA evaluations provide both raw and adjusted scores, the higher of the two scores will be used for purposes of evaluation, in keeping with the most recent IDEA best practices recommendations.
      (B) Departmentally drafted and approved instruments
      (C) Applicant initiated and drafted questionnaires

Tenure-track faculty are required to conduct university approved instrument student evaluations in at least two classes per semester.

Tenured faculty applying for promotion are required to conduct university approved instrument student evaluations in at least two classes per year.

Tenured Full Professors are required to conduct student evaluations in at least one class per semester.

n. Document satisfactory student work samples:

**Reappointment, tenure and promotion candidates** must include multiple examples from each course taught.

(I) Digital reproductions of art, projects and/or presentations:
   (A) Still art & projects:
i. Images should be organized within a digital viewing format (ex. PowerPoint, Adobe PDF) and placed on a jump drive

ii. Ensure that jpegs loaded into PPT or PDF are first reduced in size (no larger than 1920 x 1200 pixels) to allow for quick opening and reviewing of files

iii. Each PPT or PDF file should be labeled, for example: Course_semester_year.ppt

(B) Motion graphics, animation, and Performance art:

i. Should be burned to a DVD and examples from the same class placed into one folder

ii. Each folder &/or file should be labeled by course_semester_year

(C) Presentations

i. Should include, for example, a copy of a student PPT presentation (placed on a jump drive) or a recording of a live presentation (burned on to a DVD)

ii. Multiple presentations from one class should be placed in one folder. Each folder &/or file should be labeled by course_semester_year

(II) Papers

(A) Hard copy or if scanned as a PDF
   Then placed on a jump drive

i. Each scanned example should be grouped into one pdf file per class

(B) Each hard copy example or digital file should be labeled to identify course_semester_year

(III) Exhibitions

(A) Sophomore Show

(B) Art Building displays

(C) Other Shows

2. All faculty members are encouraged to participate in teaching activities at the “Above Expected” level of performance. The suggested activities listed below are considered “meritorious” and may strengthen the portfolio. This list is not
comprehensive, and in no way limits other activities from being included that may be considered as meritorious.

**Teaching activities at the “Above “Expected” level of Performance:**

a. Above expected student evaluations
   (I) University approved instruments
   (II) Departmentally drafted and approved instruments
   (III) Applicant initiated and drafted questionnaires

b. Above expected student work (indicate role faculty member played):
   (I) Exhibitions
      (A) Juried Senior Show
      (B) Juried Annual Mount Sterling Show
      (C) Juried Inscape
      (D) Other Shows
   (II) Presentations &/or publications at external venues
   (III) Awards
   (IV) Other student achievements and honors

c. Extensive use of Blackboard and/or websites

d. Extensive Management
   (I) Repair and maintenance of equipment and labs
   (II) Training &/or supervision of graduate students

e. Field Experiences (including organizing, overseeing, and recording/reporting of hours required before student teaching)

f. Art Education Faculty: Clinical Practice Supervision as overload

g. Service Learning

h. Graduate Program Coordinator

i. Supervision of internships

j. Direction of theses

k. Direction of exhibitions (beyond Senior Show mentoring)

l. Supervision of Undergraduate Fellows

m. Private Applied Advanced Studies (undergraduate individualized), &/or Individual Studies (graduate individualized) courses taught as overload (beyond the expected 24 cr. hrs. a year; Art History only: all Advanced Studies (undergraduate individualized), &/or Individual Studies (graduate individualized) credits are considered “Above Expected” due to overload)
n. Mentoring students who are preparing for conferences or graduate school
o. Field trips or taking classes to work on location
p. Initiation and organization of visits by speakers & presenters
q. Studio, Graphic Design/Computer, and Art Education Faculty: Use of library resources in support of class assignments, including in conjunction with the CCL library liaison
r. Innovative teaching techniques
s. Teaching Abroad
t. Teaching beyond expected curriculum (i.e. Summer Academy, Governor’s Scholars, Governor’s School for the Arts)
u. On–going research & retraining to remain current in field
v. New courses and programs developed and the improvement of existing courses and programs (Type I, II, III, IV and/or V)
w. Participation in department assessment
x. General Education course assessment
y. WEAVE coordination
z. Teaching awards and honors
aa. Grants related to teaching
bb. Art Education Faculty: Collaborate with regional art teachers. This may include special projects and/or collaborations with schools and/or professional organizations
cc. Art Education Faculty: Advising more than 20 art education students a semester, due to the nature of advising in art education, which includes: assisting students with the Teacher Education Program admission process; TEP interview preparation; student teaching applications; testing requirements (Praxis I and II); as well as writing disposition reports, prior to and during clinical practice.
dd. If overload: Teaching Graduate Topics Course
ee. Serving as the Early College Faculty Mentor for ART 160 teachers in the region
ff. Chair Graduate Mid–program Review and Oral Examination committees, indicate role
gg. Other

Appendix B: SCHOLARSHIP EVALUATION ACTIVITIES
Scholarship is defined by the academic discipline and is the use, application, or synthesis of existing knowledge and methodologies with the aim of: establishing a new understanding and knowledge; developing new technologies, methodologies, or materials; creating or rendering artistic works; or solving discipline-related problems or general societal problems.

Documentation must reflect that the faculty member has met all “Expected” and some “Above Expected” levels of performance. Quality of scholarship will be weighted more heavily than quantity. Qualifying factors used to evaluate these activities are provided. **Faculty should follow guidelines specific to their particular area, B1–B4:**

1. **Art History Faculty:**

   To achieve **tenure/promotion to Associate Professor**, an applicant must demonstrate what others in their field judge to be significant scholarship in their field of expertise. This must include publishing research in book and/or article form (and may include publishing material derived from their dissertation research), and/or presentations of research beyond the local level. In addition, samples of scholarly work completed during the review period must be included in the portfolio.

   To achieve **promotion to Professor**, an applicant must demonstrate a record of sustained outstanding scholarship evidenced by: publishing research in book and/or article form, and/or presentations of research beyond the local level. Samples of scholarly work completed during the review period must be included in the portfolio.

   **A. Qualifying Factors:** it is the candidate’s responsibility to convey and document the nature and reputation of venues and the degree of difficulty to be accepted

   (I) Publications and/or presentations shall be qualified in each case by certain factors:

   (A) The nature and reputation of the journal, publisher, or presentation venue

   (B) The difficulty of acceptance (refereed vs. non-refereed)

   (C) The number of publications and/or presentations
B. Each faculty member is “Expected” to:
   (I) Maintain an active scholarship agenda as evidenced by researching topics of interest. This research must be presented at professional meetings and/or submitted and accepted for publication in a scholarly/refereed journal or book, and/or disseminated in a venue designed to benefit society/community. Presentation &/or publication of scholarship in at least one venue beyond the local level is expected each year, or an average of one each year over the review period. Evidence of attempted publications, presentations, &/or grants/fellowships will be taken into consideration for “Expected.” Quantity of venues may vary and will be determined by the quality (see qualifiers listed in Appendix B: 1 A).
   (II) Remain current in the faculty member’s area of expertise by conducting ongoing research and staying informed about new work and literature
   (III) Include samples of scholarly work

C. All faculty members are encouraged to participate in Scholarship at the “Above Expected” level of performance. The suggested activities listed below are considered “meritorious” and may strengthen the portfolio. This list is not comprehensive, and in no way limits other activities from being included that may be considered meritorious.

   (I) Presentation of scholarship in regional, national or international venues beyond the expected
   (II) Scholarship that has been submitted and accepted for publication in a scholarly/refereed journal or book beyond the expected
   (III) Editorship of, or service on, editorial boards of professional journals
   (IV) Scholarship Grants &/or Fellowships awarded (qualified by the internal or external source of grant)
   (V) Sabbaticals
   (VI) Visiting scholar appointments
   (VII) Awards for scholarship
   (VIII) Leadership roles
   (IX) Awards for professional service
   (X) Continuing education
       (A) Attendance at conferences
       (B) Seminars attended
       (C) Workshops attended
       (D) Course work beyond the terminal degree
required for the applicant's position

(1) Institution
(2) Credit hours completed
(3) Degree being pursued and anticipated date of completion

(XI) Facilitating Workshops/Seminars
(XII) Lectures/Presentations
(XIII) Curating of exhibitions

(XIV) Consulting and relevant work experience
   (A) Institution/agency
   (B) Responsibilities
   (C) Dates

(XV) Published references to work (including print or digital)
   (A) Articles
   (B) Books
   (C) Reviews
   (D) Other

(XVI) Community and regional collaboration: Information shall be provided of how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond and how this is reflected in scholarship, for example community building, economic/entrepreneurial development, education, or health & wellness

(XVII) Residencies
(XVIII) Other evidence of scholarship

2. Studio Art Faculty:

To achieve **tenure/promotion to Associate Professor**, an applicant must demonstrate what others in their field judge to be significant scholarship in their field of expertise. This must include production of art and exhibition of work beyond the local level (the annual Faculty Exhibition shall be considered a local exhibition). Samples of creative work completed during the review period must be included in the portfolio.

To achieve **promotion to Professor**, an applicant must demonstrate a record of sustained outstanding scholarship as evidenced by the production of art and exhibition of work beyond the local level (the annual Faculty Exhibition shall be considered a local exhibition). Samples of creative work completed during the review period must be included in the portfolio.
A. Qualifying Factors: it is the candidate’s responsibility to convey and document the nature and reputation of venues and the degree of difficulty to be accepted

(I) Exhibitions (physical or electronic): shall be qualified in each case by certain factors:

(A) The quality of the venue
(B) The scope of the audience
(C) Invitational
   (1) Type of exhibition
      (a) One-person
      (b) Two-person
      (c) Small group
      (d) Large group
   (2) Professional reputation of the curator
   (3) Geographical scope of participating artists
   (4) Number of pieces exhibited
(D) Competitive
   (1) Type of exhibition
      (a) One-person
      (b) Two-person
      (c) Small group
      (d) Large group
   (2) Professional reputation of the juror(s)
   (3) Difficulty of acceptance
   (4) Geographical scope of the competition’s entrants
   (5) Number of pieces exhibited
(E) The number of exhibitions

B. Each faculty member is “Expected” to:

(I) Maintain an active art production agenda as evidenced by pursuing topics and/or working with media of interest. This work must be presented at exhibition venues, and/or disseminated in a venue designed to benefit society/community. Presentation of art in at least one venue beyond the local level is expected each year, or an average of one each year over the review period. Evidence of attempted exhibitions, presentations, &/or grants/fellowships will be taken into consideration for “Expected.” Quantity of venues may vary and will be
determined by the quality (see qualifiers listed in Appendix B: 2 A).

(I) Remain current in the faculty member’s area of expertise by conducting ongoing research and staying informed about new work and literature.

(II) Include samples of scholarly work.

C. All faculty members are encouraged to participate in Scholarship at the “Above Expected” level of performance. The suggested activities listed below are considered “meritorious” and may strengthen the portfolio. This list is not comprehensive, and in no way limits other activities from being included that may be considered meritorious.

(I) Presentation of scholarship in regional, national, or international venues beyond the expected

(II) Commissions

(IV) Collections

(V) Artistic performances

(VI) Scholarship Grants &/or Fellowships awarded (qualified by the internal or external source of grant)

(VII) Sabbaticals

(VIII) Residencies

(IX) Awards for Creative productions

(X) Continuing education
   (A) Attendance at conferences
   (B) Seminars attended
   (C) Workshops attended
   (D) Course work beyond the terminal degree required for the applicant’s position
      (1) Institution
      (2) Credit hours completed
      (3) Degree being pursued and anticipated date of completion

(XI) Leadership Roles

(XII) Awards for Professional Service

(XIII) Facilitating Workshops/Seminars

(XIV) Lectures/Presentations/Conference Papers

(XV) Consulting and relevant work experience
   (A) Institution/agency
   (B) Responsibilities
   (C) Dates

(XVI) Published reproductions of or references to
work (including print or digital)
(A) Articles
(B) Books
(C) Exhibition Catalogs
(D) Reviews
(E) Other

(XVII) Community and regional collaboration:
Information shall be provided of how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond and how this is reflected in scholarship, for example community building, economic/entrepreneurial development, education, or health & wellness

(XVIII) Curating of exhibitions

(XIX) Other evidence of scholarship

3. Graphic Design/Computer Art Faculty:

To achieve tenure/promotion to Associate Professor, an applicant must demonstrate what others in their field judge to be significant scholarship in their field of expertise. This must include production of art and exhibition of work beyond the local level (the annual faculty show shall be considered a local exhibition) and/or production of graphic, web, and/or multimedia design for clients beyond the local level (in–house design production shall be considered local). Samples of creative &/or design work completed during the review period must be included in the portfolio.

To achieve promotion to Professor, an applicant must demonstrate a record of sustained outstanding scholarship as evidenced by: the production of art and exhibition of work beyond the local level (the annual faculty show shall be considered a local exhibition), and/or production of graphic, web, and/or multimedia design for clients beyond the local level (in–house design production shall be considered local). Samples of creative &/or design work completed during the review period must be included in the portfolio.

A. Qualifying Factors: it is the candidate’s responsibility to convey and document the nature and reputation of venues/clients and the degree of difficulty to be accepted

(I). Exhibitions (physical or electronic): shall be qualified in
each case by certain factors:

(A) The quality of the venue
(B) The scope of the audience
(C) Invitational
   (1) Type of exhibition
      (a) One–person
      (b) Two–person
      (c) Small group
      (d) Large group
   (2) Professional reputation of the curator
   (3) Geographical scope of participating artists
   (4) Number of pieces exhibited
(D) Competitive
   (1) Type of exhibition
      (a) One–person
      (b) Two–person
      (c) Small group
      (d) Large group
   (2) Professional reputation of the juror(s)
   (3) Difficulty of acceptance
   (4) Geographical scope of the competition’s entrants
   (5) Number of pieces exhibited
(E) The number of exhibitions

(II). Graphic, web, and/or multimedia design: shall be
qualified in each case by certain factors:
(A) Stature of client
(B) The scope of the audience
(C) Individual or team nature of production
(D) Extent and importance of work for client
(E) The number of design projects

B. Each faculty member is “Expected” to:
   (I) Maintain an active art and/or design production agenda as
       evidenced by pursuing topics and/or working with media or clients of interest. This work must be
       presented in exhibition, print and/or web venues, and/or disseminated in a venue designed to benefit
       society/community. Presentation of art and/or design in at least one venue beyond the local level is expected
       each year, or an average of one each year over the review period. Evidence of attempted presentations,
&/or grants/fellowships will be taken into consideration for “Expected.” Quantity of venues may vary and will be determined by the quality (see qualifiers listed in Appendix B: 3 A).

(II) Remain current in the faculty member’s area of expertise by conducting ongoing research and staying informed about new work and literature

(III) Include samples of scholarly work

C. All faculty members are encouraged to participate in Scholarship at the “Above Expected” level of performance. The suggested activities listed below are considered “meritorious” and may strengthen the portfolio. This list is not comprehensive, and in no way limits other activities from being included that may be considered meritorious.

(I) Presentation of scholarship in regional, national, or international venues beyond the expected

(II) Commissions

(III) Collections

(IV) Artistic performances

(V) Scholarship Grants &/or Fellowships awarded (qualified by the internal or external source of grant)

(VI) Sabbaticals

(VII) Residencies

(VIII) Awards for creative productions

(IX) Continuing education

(A) Attendance at conferences

(B) Seminars attended

(C) Workshops attended

(D) Course work beyond the terminal degree required for the applicant's position

   (1) Institution

   (2) Credit hours completed

   (3) Degree being pursued and anticipated date of completion

(X) Leadership roles

(XI) Awards for professional service

(XII) Facilitating workshops/seminars

(XIII) Lectures/presentations/conference papers

(XIV) Consulting

(A) Institution/agency

(B) Responsibilities

(C) Dates

(XV) Published reproductions of or references to work (including print or digital)
(A) Articles
(B) Books
(C) Exhibition catalogs
(D) Reviews
(E) Other

(XVI) Design competitions
(XVII) Community and regional collaboration: Information shall be provided of how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond and how this is reflected in scholarship, for example community building, economic/entrepreneurial development, education, or health & wellness

(XVIII) Curating of exhibitions
(XIX) Other evidence of scholarship

4. Art Education Faculty:

To achieve tenure/promotion to Associate Professor, an applicant must demonstrate what others in their field judge to be significant scholarship in their field of expertise. This must include production of art and exhibition of work beyond the local level (the annual faculty show shall be considered a local exhibition), and/or publishing of research in book and/or article form (and may include publishing and presenting material derived from their dissertation research), and/or presentation of research beyond the local level. Samples of scholarly &/or creative work completed during the review period must be included in the portfolio.

To achieve promotion to Professor, an applicant must demonstrate a record of sustained outstanding scholarship as evidenced by: the production of art and exhibition of work beyond the local level (the annual faculty show shall be considered a local exhibition), and/or publishing research in book and/or article form, and/or presentations of research beyond the local level venues. Samples of scholarly &/or creative work completed during the review period must be included in the portfolio.

A. Qualifying Factors: it is the candidate’s responsibility to convey and document the nature and reputation of venues and the degree of difficulty to be accepted

   (I) Publications and/or presentations: shall be qualified in each case by certain factors:
(A) The nature and reputation of the journal, publisher, or presentation venue
(B) The difficulty of acceptance (refereed vs. non-refereed)
(C) The number of publications and/or presentations

(II) Exhibitions: (physical or electronic): shall be qualified in each case by certain factors:
(A) The quality of the venue
(B) The scope of the audience
(C) Invitational
   (1) Type of exhibition
      (a) One-person
      (b) Two-person
      (c) Small group
      (d) Large group
   (2) Professional reputation of the curator
   (3) Geographical scope of participating artists
   (4) Number of pieces exhibited
(D) Competitive
   (1) Type of exhibition
      (a) One-person
      (b) Two-person
      (c) Small group
      (d) Large group
   (2) Professional reputation of the juror(s)
   (3) Difficulty of acceptance
   (4) Geographical scope of the competition’s entrants
   (5) Number of pieces exhibited
(E) The number of exhibitions

B. Each faculty member is “Expected” to:
(I) Maintain an active scholarship and/or art production agenda as evidenced by researching or pursuing topics and/or working with media of interest. This research or artwork must be presented at professional meetings or exhibition venues and/or submitted and accepted for publication in a scholarly/refereed journal or book, and/or disseminated in a venue designed to benefit society/community. Presentation &/or publication of scholarship in at least one venue beyond the local level is expected each year, or an average of one each year over the review period. Evidence of attempted publications,
presentations, exhibitions, &/or grants/fellowships will be taken into consideration for “Expected.” Quantity of venues may vary and will be determined by the quality (see qualifiers listed in Appendix B: 4 A).

(II) Remain current in the faculty member’s area of expertise by conducting ongoing research and staying informed about new work and literature
(III) Include samples of scholarly work

C. All faculty members are encouraged to participate in Scholarship at the “Above Expected” level of performance. The suggested activities listed below are considered “meritorious” and may strengthen the portfolio. This list is not comprehensive, and in no way limits other activities from being included that may be considered meritorious.

(I) Presentation of scholarship in regional, national, or international venues beyond the expected
(II) Scholarship that has been submitted and accepted for publication in a scholarly/refereed journal or book beyond the expected
(III) Editorship of or service on editorial boards of professional journals
(IV) Scholarship Grants &/or Fellowships awarded (qualified by the internal or external source of grant)
(V) Sabbaticals
(VI) Visiting scholar appointments
(VII) Awards for scholarship
(VIII) Leadership roles
(IX) Awards for professional service
(X) Continuing education
   (A) Attendance at conferences
   (B) Seminars attended
   (C) Workshops attended
   (D) Course work beyond the terminal degree required for the applicant’s position
      (1) Institution
      (2) Credit hours completed
      (3) Degree being pursued and anticipated date of completion
(XI) Facilitating workshops/seminars
(XII) Lectures/Presentations
(XIII) Curating of exhibitions
(XIV) Consulting and relevant work experience
(A) Institution/agency
(B) Responsibilities
(C) Dates

(XV) Published reproductions of or references to work
including print or digital
(A) Articles
(B) Books
(C) Exhibition Catalogs
(D) Reviews
(E) Other

(XVI) Community and regional collaboration: Information shall be provided of how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond and how this is reflected in scholarship, for example community building, economic/entrepreneurial development, education, or health & wellness

(XVII) Commissions
(XVIII) Collections
(XIX) Artistic performances
(XX) Residencies
(XXI) Awards for creative productions
(XXII) Other evidence of scholarship

Appendix C: SERVICE EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

Each faculty member is expected to contribute meaningful service to the department, college, and university. Documentation must demonstrate that service reflects all “Expected” and some “Above Expected” levels of performance. Quality of service will be weighted more heavily than quantity; it is the candidate’s responsibility to convey and document the quality of service, for example, in terms of impact, time commitment, special expertise, and/or coordination of multiple factors.

To achieve tenure/promotion to Associate Professor an applicant must be involved in University, College and/or Departmental service activity, and/or community/regional collaboration that furthers the University mission. This must include a reasonable committee workload given the amount of work to be completed at all levels in any given year.

To achieve promotion to Professor an applicant must demonstrate sustained, outstanding contributions in University, College and/or Departmental service activity, and/or community collaboration that
furthers the University mission. This must include a reasonable committee workload given the amount of work to be completed at all levels in any given year.

1. **All Faculty members are “Expected” to:**
   (a) Attend all departmental faculty meetings
   (b) Contribute one’s equitable share of committee work in any given year.
      (I) Actively participate in department committee tasks as assigned by committee chairs and/or department chair
      (II) In a year where department committee work is light, and as such no service is listed under “Expected,” “Above Expected” service activities will be regarded as “Expected”
   (c) Candidates may document their attempt to participate in campus committees (such as printing out their completed Senate call for willingness to serve before submission).
   (d) In addition Art Education Faculty shall maintain contacts with area schools

2. **All faculty members are encouraged to participate in service activities at the “Above Expected” level of performance.**
The activities listed below are suggestions of those considered “meritorious” which may strengthen the portfolio. This list is not comprehensive, and in no way limits other activities from being included that may be considered as meritorious.

   (a) Leadership on Departmental committees.
   (b) Membership on University, and/or College, and/or Faculty Senate committees, both standing and ad hoc, with level indicated in each case.
   (c) Sponsorship or advising of University approved extracurricular activities
   (d) Service as official representative of the University, College, and/or Department
      (I) Place
      (II) Responsibility
      (III) Date
   (e) Coordination of and/or assistance in Morehead State University workshops, conferences, clinics, in service and special events
      a. Title
b. Form of Participation
c. Date
(f) Development of proposals to benefit the University, College, and/or Department
   a. Title of proposal
   b. Date submitted
   c. Accepted, rejected
(g) Development of relations with professional groups (business, industry, trade, education, cultural, and government), which will directly benefit the University, College, and/or Department
(h) Honors and awards for service
(i) Recruitment and/or retention of students beyond the expected responsibilities of classroom teaching and advising
(j) Community and regional collaboration that demonstrably furthers the mission of the University. Information shall be provided of how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond and how this is reflected in service, for example community building, economic/entrepreneurial development, education, or health & wellness.
(k) In–house service which demonstrably furthers the mission of the University
(l) Establish contacts and coordinate partnerships with area schools and teachers
(m) Grants related to service
(n) Commissions for the university

Appendix D: Preparing the Portfolio (for Reappointment & Tenure/Promotion to Associate Professor)

1. All supporting materials documenting the probationary period for tenure–track faculty (including any service credit toward tenure) must be submitted by the deadline communicated by the Department of Art & Design Chair

2. Place items a–g in the sequence described below, before documentation corresponding to the activities listed in Appendices A–C
a. Include a Letter of Intent which summarizes the most important achievements for Teaching, Scholarship, & Service

(I) These summaries should be limited to the year under review, with the exception of the final year preceding tenure, in which case the summaries should be an overview of most important, cumulative accomplishments

b. A copy of the Department of Art and Design Faculty Evaluation Plan (FEP)

c. All previous years’ annual reviews while at MSU by the Tenure Committee, chair, and dean as well as any responses to those evaluations. These should be placed in the portfolio in reverse chronological order.

(I) Noted weaknesses and recommendations by the department Tenure Committee, chair &/or dean must be addressed by the applicant in their Letter of Intent by the next review cycle and include supporting documentation

d. If the candidate was awarded service credit hours toward tenure, include a statement documenting the number of years awarded.

e. A removable CV/Vita, arranged in a sequence that follows the FEP APPENDICES A, B, & C outline. The CV/Vita will include a cumulative summary of achievements for all years being considered for tenure, including significant accomplishments from previous institutions that are being applied toward service credit years. Entries should be listed in reverse chronological order. It is the applicant’s responsibility to succinctly convey the importance/significance of individual achievements in consultation with the faculty mentor.

f. A sheet with the following information should be placed at the beginning of the portfolio at the time of application for tenure/promotion to Associate Professor

• Name
• Present rank, administrative title (if applicable), and department
• Dates of initial rank assignment and promotions at Morehead State University
• Field or fields of specialization
• Education completed: degrees, certifications, and/or licenses with institutions and dates awarded or granted
• Teaching prior to Morehead State University or related work experience prior to Morehead State University
  o Institutions
  o Dates
  o Responsibilities
  o Rank changes and dates

g. Documentation supporting the most important achievements in Teaching, Scholarship and Service should be placed in the portfolio in a sequence that follows the APPENDICES A, B & C outline and in reverse chronological order

(I) For annual portfolios submitted in years leading up to final application for tenure, legible tabs labeling sections are permissible, but for the final portfolio submission typed tab labels should be used

(II) Applicants should avoid listing achievements in more than one location that are duplicated

(III) If the candidate was awarded service credit years toward tenure, documentation must include the most significant accomplishments from previous institutions for all three categories (teaching, scholarship, and service), and the cumulative past performance in all three categories must be consistent with the department’s current FEP standards for the awarding of tenure.
• A divider sheet should be placed within each category to distinguish MSU achievement documents from those at previous institutions

3. For the final portfolio submission:

  a. Candidates are strongly encouraged to maintain in their possession copies of portfolio contents in an electronic or paper copy plus any supporting documents for reference until the tenure process has been completed and a decision for tenure or non-tenure has been made by the Board of Regents, as portfolios will not be returned by the university in the event of non-reappointment.

  b. The candidate will submit to the Department Chair a set of
documents, or appropriately presented digital materials organized in accordance with the FEP appendices, supporting the request for reappointment/tenure. These supporting documents will remain with the Department Chair and must be made available, upon request, to any person involved in the review of the reappointment/tenure portfolio.

Appendix E: Preparing the Portfolio (for Appointment to Professor)

1. All supporting materials documenting activities for the years in rank (including any service credit toward promotion to full) must be submitted by the deadline communicated by the Department of Art & Design Chair.

2. Place items a–g in the sequence described below, before documentation corresponding to the activities listed in Appendices A–C:
   a. Include a Letter of Intent which summarizes the most important cumulative achievements for Teaching, Scholarship, & Service
   b. A copy of the Department of Art and Design Faculty Evaluation Plan (FEP)
   c. The annual reviews while at MSU during the time in rank of Associate Professor by the Department Chair, and the College Dean (if applicable) as well as any responses to those evaluations. These should be placed in the portfolio in reverse chronological order.
   d. If years of equivalent service were granted, include a statement documenting the number of years.
   e. A removable CV/Vita, arranged in a sequence that follows the FEP APPENDICES A, B, & C outline. The CV/Vita will include a cumulative summary of achievements for all years being considered for promotion, including significant accomplishments from previous institutions that are being applied toward equivalent service. Entries should be listed in reverse chronological order. It is the applicant’s responsibility to succinctly convey the importance/significance of individual
achievements.

(I) A candidate's activities and accomplishments that occurred between initiation of tenure and the granting of tenure and that were not documented in the tenure portfolio will be treated as if they had occurred during the candidate's time in rank at Associate Professor.

f. A sheet with the following information should be placed at the beginning of the portfolio at the time of application for promotion to Professor

- Name
- Present rank, administrative title (if applicable), department
- Dates of initial rank assignment and promotions at Morehead State University
- Field or fields of specialization
- Education completed: degrees, certifications, and/or licenses with institutions and dates awarded or granted
- Teaching prior to Morehead State University or related work experience prior to Morehead State University
  - Institutions
  - Dates
  - Responsibilities
  - Rank changes and dates

g. Documentation supporting the most important achievements in Teaching, Scholarship and Service should be placed in the portfolio in a sequence that aligns with the APPENDICES A, B & C outline in reverse chronological order

(I) Typed tabs should be used to label separate categories
(II) Applicants should avoid listing achievements in more than one location that are duplicated
(III) In addition to documenting achievements while at MSU, if the candidate was awarded equivalent service years, documentation must also include the most significant accomplishments from previous institutions for all three categories (teaching, scholarship, and service), and the cumulative past performance in all three categories should be consistent with the department’s current FEP standards for the awarding of promotion.
• A divider sheet should be placed within each category to distinguish MSU achievement documents from those at previous institutions

3. The candidate will submit to the Department Chair a set of documents, or appropriately presented digital materials in accordance with the FEP appendices, supporting the request for promotion. These supporting documents will remain with the Department Chair and must be made available, upon request, to any person involved in the review of the promotion portfolio.
RUBRIC: (FINAL 5/10/17)

Failure to meet "Expected Basic" activities will adversely affect an application for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and/or performance evaluation. It will be assumed that the applicant has met them unless determined by the Department Chair to have not done so.

REAPPOINTMENT/TENURE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>BASIC EXPECTATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30% Service (0.30 x rubric points for service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30% Scholarship (0.30 x rubric points for scholarship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25% Service (0.25 x rubric points for service)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above expectations: 6.6 - 10 Total points
At expectations: 4.6 - 6.5 Total points
Below expectations: 0 - 4.5 Total points

Two years of "Below Expectations" in a single category will disqualify a candidate from receiving tenure or contract renewal. A consistent pattern of At Expectations or better for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service is required for the majority of the years under review. Continuous annual ratings of 4.6 - 6.5 total points will not ensure tenure/promotion, however. Documentation must reflect that a faculty member has met all "Expected" and some "Above Expected" levels of performance. For years where achievement is "Below Expectations," candidates must show improvement the following year. For achievements from MSU or other institutions that have been applied toward tenure (service credit years), the most significant past performance in all three categories (teaching, scholarship, and service) will be assessed cumulatively and must be consistent with the department's current FEP standards for the awarding of tenure. This rubric will only be applied to accomplishments while at MSU.

AFFECTATION TO PROFESSOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>BASIC EXPECTATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% Teaching (0.50 x rubric points for teaching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25% Scholarship (0.25 x rubric points for scholarship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25% Service (0.25 x rubric points for service)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above expectations: 6.6 - 10 Total points
At expectations: 4.6 - 6.5 Total points
Below expectations: 0 - 4.5 Total points

If "Below Expectations" scores in any single category exceed 20% during the years in rank the candidate will be disqualified from receiving promotion. A consistent pattern of "At Expectations" or better for Teaching, Scholarship and Service is expected for the majority of years under review. Documentation must reflect that a faculty member has met all "Expected" and some "Above Expected" levels of performance. If the candidate was granted equivalent service years, the most significant past performance in all three categories (teaching, scholarship, and service) will be assessed cumulatively and must be consistent with the department's current FEP standards for the awarding of promotion. This rubric will only be applied to accomplishments while at MSU.

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE BASED EVALUATION:

*Department chair recommends merit scores. Final merit scores determined by Caudill College Dean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>BASIC EXPECTATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% Teaching (0.50 x rubric points for teaching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25% Scholarship (0.25 x rubric points for scholarship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25% Service (0.25 x rubric points for service)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To earn a Merit Score of 2 (6.6 - 8.5 points), all three categories (Teaching, Scholarship & Service) must receive, at minimum, an "At Expectations" rubric score. Receiving "Below Expected" in two categories will result in a "Below Expectations" score (a Merit Score of 0). Receiving a total score of 8.5 with an "Above Expected" score in Teaching and an "Above Expected" score in Scholarship or Service (if no score is below 7) will be considered "Far Exceeds."

Teaching is weighted at 50%. The applicant may choose a 25%/25% or 20%/30% distribution between the two remaining categories, Scholarship and Service, within the remaining 50%. A minimum of 20% is required in each category (see possible weighting combinations listed below). The applicant will state in his or her cover letter how he or she chooses to distribute the percentages between scholarship and service. Even though tenure/promotion candidates are allowed to elect different distributions between scholarship and service for annual performance review, be aware that the distribution requirements for tenure/promotion for scholarship and service is fixed at 25%/25%.

50% Teaching (0.50 x rubric points for teaching)
25% Scholarship (0.25 x rubric points for scholarship)
25% Service (0.25 x rubric points for service)

-OR-
50% Teaching (0.50 x rubric points for teaching)
30% Scholarship (0.30 x rubric points for scholarship)
20% Service (0.20 x rubric points for service)

-OR-
50% Teaching (0.50 x rubric points for teaching)
20% Scholarship (0.20 x rubric points for scholarship)
30% Service (0.30 x rubric points for service)

EXPECTED

BASIC

ACTIVITIES

BELOW

EXPECTATIONS

AT

EXPECTATIONS

ABOVE

EXPECTATIONS

Did not:
- Adhere to all policies in PAc-29
- Fulfill Departmental tasks in a timely manner
- Responds regularly & promptly to written, electronic, & voice communications
- Complete tasks as outlined in job description
- Teach all classes as assigned by the Department Chair, meeting as scheduled in the Schedule of

- Adhered to all policies in PAc-29
- Fulfilled Departmental tasks in a timely manner
- Responded regularly & promptly to written, electronic, & voice communications
- Completed tasks as outlined in job description
- Teach all classes as assigned by the Department Chair, meeting as scheduled in the Schedule of

- N/A
### TEACHING ACTIVITIES

**BELOW EXPECTATIONS (0-3 points)**

- Lacking evidence of "Expected" criteria as outlined in Appendix A: a-i
- Unsatisfactory student evaluations of teaching as outlined in Appendix A: 1.m
- Did not provide evidence of student work or provided evidence of unsatisfactory student work as outlined in Appendix A: 1.n

**AT EXPECTATIONS (4-7 points)**

- Provided evidence of "Expected" criteria as outlined in Appendix A: 1.a-i
- Satisfactory student evaluations of teaching as outlined in Appendix A: 1.m
- Provided evidence of satisfactory student work as outlined in Appendix A: 1.n

**ABOVE EXPECTATIONS (8-10 points)**

- Provided evidence of "Expected" criteria as outlined in Appendix A: 1.a-i
- "Above Expected" student evaluations of teaching as outlined in Appendix A: 2.a
- Provided evidence of "Above Expected" student work as outlined in Appendix A: 2.b
- Provided evidence of meritorious teaching as outlined in Appendix A: 2.c-gg

### SCHOLARSHIP ACTIVITIES

**BELOW EXPECTATIONS (0-3 points)**

- Did not complete and/or disseminate scholarship as outlined in:
  - Art History Faculty - Appendix B: 1.A-B. See pages 21-22
  - Studio Art Faculty - Appendix B: 2.A-B. See pages 23-24
  - Graphic Design/Computer Art Faculty - Appendix B: 3.A-B. See pages 26-27
  - Art Education Faculty - Appendix B: 4.A-B. See pages 29-30

**AT EXPECTATIONS (4-7 points)**

- Completed and disseminated scholarship as outlined in:
  - Art History Faculty - Appendix B: 1.A-B. See pages 21-22
  - Studio Art Faculty - Appendix B: 2.A-B. See pages 23-24
  - Graphic Design/Computer Art Faculty - Appendix B: 3.A-B. See pages 26-27
  - Art Education Faculty - Appendix B: 4.A-B. See pages 29-30

**ABOVE EXPECTATIONS (8-10 points)**

- Completed and disseminated scholarship as outlined in:
  - Art History Faculty - Appendix B: 1.A-B. See pages 21-22
  - Studio Art Faculty - Appendix B: 2.A-B. See pages 23-24
  - Graphic Design/Computer Art Faculty - Appendix B: 3.A-B. See pages 26-27
  - Art Education Faculty - Appendix B: 4.A-B. See pages 29-30
- Provided evidence of "Above Expected" Scholarship activities as outlined in:
  - Art History Faculty - Appendix B: 1.C. See pages 22-23
  - Studio Art Faculty - Appendix B: 2.C. See pages 24-26
  - Graphic Design/Computer Art Faculty - Appendix B: 3.C. See pages 27-29
  - Art Education Faculty - Appendix B: 4.C.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>BELOW EXPECTATIONS (0-3 points)</th>
<th>AT EXPECTATIONS (4-7 points)</th>
<th>ABOVE EXPECTATIONS (8-10 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is the candidate's responsibility to convey and document the quality of service. (See pp. 32-34)</td>
<td>• Lack of evidence of &quot;Expected&quot; service activities as outlined in Appendix C: 1.</td>
<td>• Provided evidence of &quot;Expected&quot; service activities as outlined in Appendix C: 1.</td>
<td>• Provided evidence of &quot;Expected&quot; service activities as outlined in Appendix C: 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provided evidence of &quot;Above Expected&quot; service activities as outlined in Appendix C: 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section I: General Principles

The School of Business Administration (SBA) Faculty Evaluation Plan establishes standards for annual faculty performance evaluation, tenure, reappointment, and promotion decisions in accordance with University PAC-1, PAC-2, PAC-27, PAC-29, PAC-34, and PAC-35 standards. These standards are uniform for all departments within the School of Business Administration.

In addition to the guidelines and criteria established in the standards, faculty contributions toward meeting the objectives of the School of Business Administration Mission Statement and Strategic Plan will be considered throughout all aspects of all evaluations.

The School of Business Administration FEP must be approved by 51% or more of the tenured faculty of the SBA, the Associate Dean, the Dean of the College and the Provost. Although the FEP must be approved by the tenured faculty in the SBA, both tenured and tenure-track faculty shall contribute to the creation of the FEP.

As a critical portion of faculty personnel practices and consistent with university policy, the progress toward tenure of all tenure-track faculty members in the School of Business Administration will be evaluated annually according to Section II of this Faculty Evaluation Plan (FEP). Faculty member performance in each of the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service will be evaluated according to the processes defined in PAC-27. The review will be based on the cumulative record of the faculty member as presented in the portfolio that should include a vita, overall narrative discussion of its contents including a self-evaluation (maximum of four pages) and documented evidence of performance in all three areas. In addition, the reviewers will consider other documented evidence of the quality of performance. Reviews will specifically identify any source of additional documented evidence used in the evaluation. The purpose of the faculty review is to provide feedback to individual faculty members to help ensure continuous improvement in both the faculty and the School of Business Administration programs. As such, the tenure review process as defined in Section II will be used for personnel decisions including reappointment and tenure with promotion to associate professor. Faculty members must prepare a portfolio organized according to PAC-27.

Associate professors seeking promotion to full professor will be assessed by the standards presented in Section III of this document and must prepare a portfolio consisting of the items described in Section 3 of PAC-2.

In addition to tenure and promotion review, this FEP will be used as a guide to assess the meritorious performance of faculty through the Annual Performance Evaluation process described in Section IV of this document and consistent with the MSU Faculty Salary Plan described in UAR 137.01. By no later
than the 2nd Friday in January of each calendar year, all tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, and instructors are required to submit a portfolio to the Associate Dean of their yearly accomplishments relative to teaching, scholarship, and service as defined in this FEP. The performance review period will consist of one calendar year: January 1 through December 31. In these evaluations, the Associate Dean will assign performance scores in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. By the 3rd Friday in February, participating faculty will receive the annual performance review evaluation from the Associate Dean. A meeting will then be held at which the Associate Dean and the faculty member will discuss the current evaluation and to discuss the goals and evaluation weights relative to teaching, scholarship, and service for the following year's annual performance review process. Within one week of this meeting, the faculty member will submit a written statement of goals for the upcoming evaluation year along with the completed and signed "Annual Performance Faculty Evaluation Form" found in Appendix D of this document. Each full-time Standing-I faculty member in the School will be assigned a merit score on the basis of their placement in the overall ranking of performance scores for the unit. Final merit scores are determined and shared with faculty members after the completion of all FEP-based appeals.

**Flexible Workload Agreement:**

Tenured and tenure-track faculty are eligible to participate in or request a Flexible Workload Agreement (FWA) to provide time to allow them to pursue their strengths to the greatest extent possible in support of the University. At the beginning of each calendar year, if a faculty member had a Flexible Workload Agreement (FWA) for the prior year, that faculty member's immediate supervisor will review the faculty member's performance in accordance with the criteria specified in the FWA and the guidelines outlined in PAc-29. This review will be forwarded to the appropriate department/school committee to be considered as part of the standard review process.

**Regional Engagement:**

If a faculty member is involved in regional engagement, evidence should be provided of how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond. This is not a separate category of the FEP, but should be reflected in the faculty member’s teaching, scholarship and service as appropriate. Faculty teaching, research, and service activities that support regional engagement are provided in Appendix A, Appendix B, and Appendix C.

**EVALUATION IN THE CIRCUMSTANCE OF FEP MODIFICATION:**

Once implemented, the FEP shall remain in effect until a replacement FEP is approved and implemented. If a department/school does not have an approved FEP in effect, the College Dean shall specify the criteria that will hold until the FEP is approved.

When the FEP is modified, a tenure-track faculty member shall have the option of (1) being evaluated under the new FEP, or (2) being evaluated under the FEP which he/she is currently being evaluated under. The faculty member must choose option (1) or (2) shortly after the new FEP is approved by the Provost. This option shall exist for reappointment and tenure decisions only and the faculty member’s choice must be documented in writing. When the FEP is modified, a tenured associate professor shall for a limited period have the option of (1) applying for promotion to professor under the new FEP, or (2) being evaluated under the previous FEP; once the new FEP has been in effect for three years, a tenured associate professor must apply for promotion under the new FEP. For annual performance evaluations (for merit
salary increases) the most current FEP shall apply to all faculty members within the department/school. The FEP may be modified if 51% or more of the tenured faculty in a department/school agree to modification.
SECTION II: TENURE REVIEW/PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND REAPPOINTMENT

In order to receive a positive recommendation for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the following criteria must be met:

*The faculty member must maintain performance at a level that at least meets the described standards in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The performance assessment will be based on the faculty member’s cumulative documented record over the tenure period as defined by PAc-27. Annual performance review and tenure evaluations are separate processes; and consequently, meeting or exceeding annual performance criteria does not automatically ensure a favorable tenure decision. Annual performance evaluations are based on annual performance whereas tenure evaluations are based on the cumulative performance of six years."

The evaluation criteria presented in this section will also serve as the basis for the annual review of tenure-track faculty for the purposes of reappointment and promotion. Reviewers will utilize the evaluation criteria within the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service to assess the tenure-track faculty member’s annual progress toward meeting the tenure requirements.

---

TEACHING

Faculty members will be evaluated on their portfolio of teaching accomplishments during the tenure review period. Faculty members will submit documentation and an explanation of accomplishments in the four areas specified in the teaching standards below and described by the standard criteria in Appendix A. The assessment of teaching will be based on an overall evaluation of these criteria. The examples provided within each category are not intended to be inclusive, but are representative of the types of information that may be used. Faculty may use other supporting evidence in each area where appropriate. Student evaluations of teaching shall account for no more than 50% of the evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching.

Faculty must include a self-evaluation summarizing both the efforts and the results of such efforts of teaching for the tenure review period. In addition faculty must have a stated teaching philosophy as part of their narrative. The narrative should address how the faculty member’s teaching during the tenure review period fulfills the teaching criteria identified in Appendix A.

Teaching Standards (Details in Appendix A):

- **Scholarship and Leadership:** Faculty must demonstrate a scholarly and critical approach to teaching as well as ongoing faculty development.
- **Teaching Methods:** Faculty must include evidence to show a continuous effort to improve their teaching effectiveness. Faculty must show an effort to engage students through the use of a mix of instructional strategies in content delivery.
- **Student Contact:** Faculty must demonstrate active participation with students outside the classroom.
- **Teaching Assessment:** Faculty must demonstrate sustained concern for and knowledge about outcomes and feedback that flow from their teaching. Overall assessment of teaching will be based on peer, associate dean, tenure review committees, and student evaluations.
- Other documented evidence of quality teaching.
SCHOLARSHIP

Faculty will be evaluated on their scholarship portfolio during the tenure review period. Scholarship may include Teaching and Learning Scholarship, Applied or Integration/Application Scholarship, Basic or Discovery Scholarship, and/or Scholarship of Engagement (as defined in Appendix B). Evaluations will take into consideration both quantity and quality of achievements.

Faculty must include in their portfolio a reflective narrative summarizing both the quantity and quality of each contribution. In addition, the significance to the discipline for each contribution must be described in the portfolio. Refereed journal articles are considered to have the most rigorous review and acceptance criteria. Faculty must justify the quality of non-refereed works.

Scholarship Standards:

Author or co-author five quality scholarly works published, accepted for publication, presented, or published in proceedings; including receipt of new scholarly grants. At least two of these works must be refereed journal publications generally recognized by an authority such as Cabell’s Directory and as suggested by AACSB and/or COSMA standards. A scholarly grant must be external to the University and have research components.

Note: A paper counted as “accepted” may not also be counted as “published” in the same or a subsequent year. In addition, a paper counted as “presented” at a conference may not also be counted as “published in the conference proceedings”.

SERVICE

The service criteria presented in Appendix C is a general profile of possible service activities through which faculty members may demonstrate a commitment to service over the course of their tenure review period. Faculty members must include in their portfolio a reflective narrative summarizing the level, quality, and significance of the contribution for internal service, service to the profession, and service to the community.

Service Standards:

- Active and sustained service on at least three different committees, one of which must be a university-level committee AND
  - Participation in at least two other activities described as Internal Service OR
  - Active service on at least one service activity described as Service to the Profession or Service to the Community
SECTION III: PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

In order to receive a positive recommendation for promotion to Full Professor the following criteria must be met:

The faculty member must maintain performance at a level that at least meets the described standards in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The performance assessment will be based on the faculty member’s cumulative academic career with emphasis on recent performance (i.e. evidence of sustained results). SBA promotion evaluations will be consistent with PAc-2 that provides additional information regarding annual performance evaluations and promotion evaluations as separate processes.

According to PAc-1, promotion to full professor “should be reserved for persons of proven stature in their fields” (and not simply length of service). Candidates who have met the standards for promotion to full professor, stated in the School of Business Administration FEP, have met this requirement.

The evaluation criteria presented in this section will be used to evaluate faculty members within the area of teaching, scholarship, and service toward meeting the requirements for promotion to full professor.

TEACHING

Faculty will be evaluated on their portfolio of teaching accomplishments during the promotion review period. Faculty members will submit documentation and an explanation of accomplishments in the four areas specified in the teaching standards below and described by the standard criteria in Appendix A. The assessment of teaching will be based on an overall evaluation of these criteria. The examples provided within each category are not intended to be inclusive, but are representative of the types of information that may be used. Faculty may use other supporting evidence in each area where appropriate.

Faculty must include a self-evaluation summarizing both the efforts and the results of such efforts of teaching for the promotion review period. In addition faculty must have a stated teaching philosophy as part of their narrative. The narrative should address how the faculty member’s teaching during the promotion review period fulfills the teaching criteria identified in Appendix A.

Teaching Standards (Details in Appendix A):

- **Scholarship and Leadership:** Faculty must demonstrate a scholarly and critical approach to teaching as well as ongoing faculty development.
- **Teaching Methods:** Faculty must include evidence to show a continuous effort to improve their teaching effectiveness. Faculty must show an effort to engage students through the use of a mix of instructional strategies in content delivery.
- **Student Contact:** Faculty must demonstrate active participation with students outside the classroom.
- **Teaching Assessment:** Faculty must demonstrate sustained concern for and knowledge about outcomes and feedback that flow from their teaching. Overall assessment of teaching will be based on peer, associate dean, department review committees, and student evaluations.
- **Other documented evidence of quality teaching PAc-2.**
SCHOLARSHIP

Faculty members will be evaluated on their scholarship portfolio during the promotion review period. Scholarship may include Teaching and Learning Scholarship, Applied or Integration/Application Scholarship, Basic or Discovery Scholarship, and/or Scholarship of Engagement (as defined in Appendix B). Evaluations will take into consideration both quantity and quality of achievements.

The scholarship portfolio should be organized in accordance with Section 3 of PAc-2 and identify the quality of the achievement and significance of contribution of all cited works to the discipline. Faculty members must include in their portfolio a reflective narrative summarizing both the quantity and quality of their scholarship. Refereed journal articles are considered to have the most rigorous review and acceptance criteria. Faculty members must justify the quality of non-refereed works.

Scholarship Standards:

Author or co-author ten quality scholarly works either published, accepted for publication, presented, or published in proceedings; including receipt of new scholarly grants. At least six of these scholarly works must be refereed journal publications (the individual discipline and the School will define the quality of the journals related to the standards of AACSB and COSMA). A scholarly grant must be external to the university and have research components.

Note: A paper counted as “accepted” may not also be counted as “published” in the same or a subsequent year. In addition, a paper counted as “presented” at a conference may not also be counted as “published in the conference proceedings”.

SERVICE

The service criteria presented in Appendix C is a general profile of possible service activities through which faculty members may demonstrate a commitment to service over the course of their promotion review period. Faculty members must include in their portfolio a reflective narrative summarizing the level and quality of internal service, service to the profession, and service to the community.

Service Standards:

- Active and sustained service on at least seven different committees, three of which must be at the university level AND
  - Participation in at least six other activities described as internal service, service to the profession, or service to the community
  - Faculty must present evidence of service leadership initiatives at the local, state, or national levels
IV: ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Faculty members will be evaluated in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service for the calendar year (January 1 through December 31) under review in accordance with the Faculty Salary Plan (UAR 137.01). The assessment of faculty performance in these areas will incorporate the same general criteria and documentation as outlined in the tenure and promotion sections of this FEP.

Each faculty member must submit a performance review portfolio by the 2nd Friday in January of each year. The portfolio must contain a narrative summary of both their efforts and the results of such efforts in teaching, scholarship, and service for the calendar year under evaluation. Additional portfolio contents in areas of teaching, scholarship, and service are provided in subsections below. In addition, based upon the criteria described within this document, faculty members must provide a self-evaluation. Faculty members who do not submit a performance review portfolio with the appropriate contents by the due date will not be reviewed and will not be eligible for a salary increase.

Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty: The overall evaluation for tenured and tenure-track faculty will be the weighted average of the scores received in teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty members’ performance in these areas will be based on the documented evidence in those three areas for the calendar year under review. A faculty member’s annual review evaluation will NOT be based on the faculty member’s cumulative record.

Instructors: The overall evaluation for instructors will be the weighted average of the scores received in teaching and service. Other contributions (such as scholarship) by instructors, however, may be considered in the overall performance evaluation by the associate dean. Instructors will be evaluated based on the standards for teaching and service and the criteria in Appendices A and C taking into consideration differences in expectations for instructors and tenure-track faculty. Since the annual review serves as the only yearly evaluation of instructors, the compilation of the reviews will help form the basis for the annual retention decisions. As such, along with annual performance information submitted for the annual review, instructors are required to submit a self-evaluation that chronicles their cumulative record in the School of Business Administration at Morehead State University.

TEACHING

The overall assessment of teaching will be based on an evaluation of the criteria described in Appendix A. However, for annual evaluations by the associate dean, reviews by departmental tenure review committee and the dean will not be required. The examples provided within each category are not intended to be exclusive, but are representative of the types of information that is typically used in the evaluation. Faculty members may use other supporting evidence in category areas where appropriate.

Faculty members will be evaluated on their portfolio of teaching accomplishments and must provide documentation and an explanation of accomplishments in the four areas specified in the teaching standards below and described by the standard criteria in Appendix A. The assessment of teaching will be based on an overall evaluation of these criteria. The examples provided within each category are not intended to be exclusive, but are representative of the types of information that may be used. Faculty may use other supporting evidence in each area where appropriate. Student evaluations of teaching are an assessment tool and one of the indicators of quality teaching. Given the wide variety of measures to assess quality teaching, however, student evaluations will account for no more than 50% of the overall evaluation.
Performance review scores for teaching will be based on a scale from 0 to 4 as defined below:

4 - Significantly exceeds standards:
- Teaching Assessment: Outstanding teaching as evidenced by an overall assessment of performance as reflected in the faculty member’s narrative. Faculty members show ample evidence of using evaluative processes and assessments to improve courses taught.
- Scholarship and Leadership:
  - Evidence that demonstrates a scholarly approach to teaching.
  - Faculty members must show leadership in departmental and/or discipline curriculum initiatives and program assessment.
  - Appropriate faculty development activities and other evidence of efforts to develop leadership in the field of teaching.
- Teaching Methods: Evidence to show course innovation and continuous improvement. Offers evidence to indicate a mix of instructional strategies in content delivery, such as use of technology, multi-media applications, community-based projects or learning experiences, simulations, case projects, etc.
- Student Contact: Quality student contact as described in the Appendix A criteria.
- Other evidence of quality teaching.

3 – Exceeds standards
- Teaching Assessment: Above average teaching as evidenced by an overall assessment of performance as reflected in the faculty member’s narrative. Faculty show effective evidence of using evaluative processes and assessments to improve the courses they teach.
- Scholarship and Leadership:
  - Faculty must show active participation in departmental and/or discipline curriculum initiatives and program assessments.
  - Appropriate faculty development activities and other evidence of efforts to remain current in the field of teaching.
- Teaching Methods: Course innovation and continuous improvement. Offers evidence to indicate a mix of instructional strategies in content delivery, such as technology, multi-media applications, community-based projects or learning experiences, simulations, case projects, etc.
- Student Contact: Quality student contact as described in the Appendix A.
- Other evidence of quality teaching.

2 - Meets standards
- Teaching Assessment: Average teaching as evidenced by an overall assessment of performance as reflected in the faculty member’s narrative. Faculty show adequate evidence of using evaluative processes and assessments to improve the courses they teach.
- Scholarship and Leadership:
  - Faculty must show active participation in departmental and/or discipline curriculum initiatives and program assessments.
- Teaching Methods: Course innovation and continuous improvement. Offers evidence to indicate a mix of instructional strategies in content delivery, such as technology, multi-media applications, community-based projects or learning experiences, simulations, case projects, etc.
- Student Contact: Quality student contact as described in the Appendix A.
- Other evidence of quality teaching.

1 – Below standards
- **Teaching Assessment**: Below average teaching as evidenced by an overall assessment of performance as reflected in the faculty member’s narrative. Faculty show little evidence of using evaluative processes and assessments to improve the courses they teach.
- **Student Contact**: Little or no evidence of quality student contact outside the classroom.
- **Teaching Methods**: Little or no documented evidence of course innovation or improvement.
- **Scholarship and Leadership**: Little or no documented evidence.
- Limited other evidence of quality teaching.

0 - Significantly below standards
- **Teaching Assessment**: Poor teaching as evidenced by an overall assessment of performance as reflected in the faculty member’s narrative.
- **Student Contact**: No evidence of quality student contact outside the classroom.
- **Teaching Methods**: No documented evidence of course innovation or improvement.
- **Scholarship and Leadership**: No documented evidence.
- Limited other evidence of quality teaching.

**SCHOLARSHIP**

Scholarship may include Teaching and Learning Scholarship, Applied or Integration/Application Scholarship, Basic or Discovery Scholarship, and/or Scholarship of Engagement (as defined in Appendix B). Evaluations will take into consideration both quantity and quality of achievements.

Faculty members must include in their portfolio a self-evaluation summarizing both the quality and quantity of their scholarship. The scholarship narrative should identify the quality of the achievement and significance of the contribution to the academic discipline for all cited works. Refereed journal articles are considered to have the most rigorous review and acceptance criteria. Faculty members must justify the quality of a non-refereed work.

**Note:** A paper counted as “accepted” may not also be counted as “published” in the same or a subsequent year. In addition, a paper counted as “presented” at a conference may not also be counted as “published in the conference proceedings”.

Performance review scores for scholarship will be based on a scale from 0 to 4 as defined below:

**4 – Significantly exceeds standard**
Accepted and/or published in one or more refereed journal articles (generally recognized by an authority such as Cabell’s Directory) OR publish two or more chapters in a peer-reviewed textbook within his/her discipline.

**3 – Exceeds standard**
Two or more scholarly works either published, accepted for publication or presented. At least one of these two works must be a refereed proceedings or journal publication – accepted or published. (The receipt of a new scholarly grant is the equivalent to one scholarly work. A scholarly grant must be external to the University and have research components.)
2 - Meets standard
One scholarly work either published, accepted for publication, presented, or published in proceedings. (The receipt of a new scholarly grant is the equivalent to one scholarly work. A scholarly grant must be external to the University and have research components.)

1 - Below standard
One scholarly work submitted for refereed presentation or publication consideration (with documented evidence to support)

0 – Significantly below standard
No documented evidence of scholarly activity
SERVICE

A general profile of possible service activities through which faculty may demonstrate a commitment to both internal and external service is presented in Appendix C. The examples provided within each category are not intended to be exclusive, but are representative of the types of information typically used in the evaluation. Other examples of professional service listed in Appendix C may be included in the service section of the portfolio.

Faculty must include in the service section of their portfolio a narrative summarizing the level and quality of internal service, service to the profession, and service to the community.

Performance Review scores for service will be based on a scale from 0 to 4 as defined below:

4 – **Significantly Exceeds Standard**
- Hold a leadership position at the university, state, regional, or national level.
- Chair one committee or provide documented evidence of leadership contributions to a significant initiative of the department, school, college, or university
- Document active membership on three other committees or other significant internal service activities
- Document participation in at least one service activity described as service to the profession or service to the community
- Conduct professional seminar and/or workshop

3 – **Exceeds Standard**
- Chair one committee or provide documented evidence of leadership contributions to a significant initiative of the department, school, or college.
- Document active membership on three other committees or other significant internal service activities
- Document participation in at least one service activity described as service to the profession or service to the community
- Conduct professional seminar and/or workshop

2 - **Meets Standard**
- Document active membership on three committees or other significant internal service activities
- Document participation in at least one service activity described as service to the profession or service to the community

1 - **Below Standard**
- Document active membership on two committees or other significant internal service activities
- No evidence of service activities described as service to the profession or service to the community

0 – **Significantly below standard**
- No evidence to support significant service activity
FACULTY WORKLOAD DISTRIBUTION FOR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

Tenured Faculty: Tenured faculty members must allocate their workload according to the following distribution:

Teaching: 50-60%
Research: 20-40%
Service: 10-30%

Tenure-Track Faculty: Tenure-track faculty members must allocate their workload according to the following distribution:

Teaching: 50-60%
Research: 30-40%
Service: 10-20%

Instructors: Instructors must allocate their workload according to the following distribution:

Teaching: 70-80%
Service: 20-30%
The following four areas are indicative of standard criteria within the teaching component.

1. **Scholarship and Leadership**

   Faculty members must demonstrate a scholarly and critical approach to teaching as well as ongoing faculty development. Supporting evidence may include:
   - Documentation of how current research and publishing applies to teaching
   - Evidence of faculty development activities/efforts to remain current in field
   - Active participation in teaching improvement opportunities (seminars, workshops, etc.)
   - Demonstrate participation in the development of college and/or departmental curriculum activities, such as
     - Curriculum review
     - New Course Proposals
     - New Program Proposals
     - Assessment activities
   - Teaching new courses
   - Using new methods of delivery (Web, DL, etc.)
   - Documentation of course improvements
   - Teaching Awards
   - Faculty mentoring

2. **Teaching Methods** – Faculty members must include evidence to show a continuous effort to improve their teaching effectiveness. Faculty members must show an effort to engage students through the use of a mix of instructional strategies in content delivery. The following are examples of such evidence that may be included.

   - Group projects
   - Use of case studies
   - Regional Engagement – community-based projects or learning experiences, internships and co-op experiences, involvement in community-based research
   - Simulation
   - Guest speakers – practitioners and professionals in the field
   - Reflective journals
   - Blackboard application, web pages, Internet resources
   - Use of appropriate technology
   - Multi-media applications and resources
   - Course syllabi, schedule of assignments and lesson plans
   - Samples of exams
   - Samples of assignments
3. **Student Contact** – Faculty members **must** demonstrate active participation with students outside the classroom. Examples **may** include:

- Advising responsibilities and associated evaluations
- Participation/leadership in student co-curricular activities
- Student participation in faculty research activities
- Teaching First Year Seminar (FYS 101)

4. **Teaching Assessment** – Faculty members **must** demonstrate sustained concern for and knowledge about outcomes and feedback that flow from their teaching. Overall assessment of teaching will be based on peer, associate dean, department review committee, and student evaluations.

- All faculty **must** include at least one peer evaluation per year. (For full professor promotion portfolios, this only applies since this version of the FEP was adopted.)
- Tenure track faculty and instructors **must** include annual written evaluations by the associate dean, and for the tenure portfolios **at least** one of these reviews **must include an in-class teaching review**.
- Tenure Track faculty **must** include at least two university approved student evaluations per semester during the tenure review period. Tenured faculty and instructors **must** include at least one university approved student evaluation per semester.
- Tenure track faculty **must** include annual written evaluations by the departmental review committee.
- Tenure track faculty **must** include annual written evaluations by the dean.

Other evidence of effective teaching assessment **may** include:

- Communication from students and employers
- Student performance on professional exams and/or certifications
- External reviews and letters of reference from other colleges, universities, or professional organizations

*These lists provided in Appendix A are not intended to be viewed as a complete listing of all supportive evidence or required documents. These items are merely representative of the activities faculty may use to show overall teaching effectiveness.*
APPENDIX B
Scholarship Categories
For
Tenure/Promotion to Associate Professor, Reappointment, Promotion to Full Professor, and
Annual Performance Evaluations

Due to the strong teaching mission and expected service to the region, faculty are encouraged to engage in all of the following scholarship categories. Thus, scholarship "works" reviewed by academics or practitioners may include Teaching and Learning Scholarship, Applied or Integration/Application Scholarship, Basic or Discovery Scholarship, and/or Scholarship of Engagement. Outputs from all forms of scholarship activities include publication in refereed journals, research monographs, scholarly books, chapters in scholarly books, proceedings from scholarly meetings, external scholarly grants, papers presented at academic meetings, publicly available research working papers, and papers presented at faculty research seminars.

Scholarship categories include:

**Teaching and Learning Scholarship** that develops and advances new understandings, insights, and teaching content and methods that impact learning behavior. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the teaching of business and management.

**Applied or Integration/Application Scholarship** that synthesizes new understandings or interpretations of knowledge or technology; develops new technologies, processes, tools, or uses; and/or refines, develops, or advances new methods based on existing knowledge. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the practice of business and management.

**Basic or Discovery Scholarship** that generates and communicates new knowledge and understanding and/or development of new methods. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the theory, knowledge, and/or practice of business and management.

**Scholarship of Engagement**, are works relating to the study or promotion of public engagement and includes community-based research, technical assistance, demonstration projects, impact assessment, and policy analysis.
APPENDIX C
Service Criteria
For
Tenure/Promotion to Associate Professor, Reappointment, Promotion to Full Professor and Annual Performance Evaluations

Individual faculty members will assume differing roles, which may change from time to time, to ensure that the University meets its mission of service. Faculty may engage in activities affiliated with Internal Service, Service to the Profession, and/or Service to the Community and are encouraged to engage in all service categories.

Internal Service

Internal service may include documented evidence of leadership and active participation in department, school, college, and university initiatives. Such initiatives may include the efforts of committees, the faculty senate, student recruitment and retention activities, SBDC, or student organizations. Faculty members may also demonstrate a commitment to internal service by conducting professional workshops and/or seminars on campus and in obtaining service grants.

Service to the Profession

Service to the profession relates to service contributions made to the advancement of one’s discipline and/or professional associations and may include evidence of leadership and active participation in the initiatives of local, state, regional, national, or international service organizations.

Service to the Community (Regional Engagement)

Service to the community extends beyond the University’s borders and should be related to the faculty member’s discipline or role at the University and may include providing service to a local, regional, or global community or governmental agency, facilitating/improving organizational development in the community, providing services to support/enhance economic development in the region, providing consulting services or technical assistance, or planning and/or implementing public events, or serving on boards, committees, or commissions in one’s disciplinary expertise.
APPENDIX D
Annual Performance Evaluations
Faculty Evaluation Form
Year of Review:_______

Faculty Name:___________________________________

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PERFORMANCE REVIEW SCORE</th>
<th>WEIGHT (%)</th>
<th>WEIGHTED SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOLARSHIP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty/Associate Dean Meeting and Appeals Process: The signatures below indicate that the faculty member and associate dean have met and discussed this evaluation. If agreement between the faculty member and the associate dean is not reached, the faculty member can appeal. Appeals at the unit level can address both procedural (due process) and substantive issues and evaluations/performance scores and must be filed by the 1st Friday in March. Appeals must be in written form and submitted to the departmental appeals committee with a copy of the written appeal also provided to the associate dean. The written appeal should discuss the reason(s) the faculty member disagrees with the associate dean’s evaluation and provide a suggested score (0 through 4) for each of the three sub-areas—teaching, research, and service. Along with the appeal letter, the faculty member must provide the associate dean’s written evaluation, the completed Faculty Evaluation Form, and the faculty member’s portfolio as evaluated by the associate dean. The associate dean cannot rebut the appeal letter.

The departmental appeals committee will consist of all tenured faculty members in the department and will evaluate appeals regarding the overall evaluation score. A tenured faculty member with a grievance shall not serve on the committee. Should there be less than three tenured faculty members within the department to serve, the tenured faculty members of that department will invite faculty from other departments within the SBA to serve on the committee until the committee size is three members.

The committee should discuss the teaching, scholarship, and service areas of the evaluation and determine an appropriate score for each. To better understand the performance score assigned to the faculty member filing the appeal, the appeals committee may choose to meet with the Associate Dean. The committee will then re-compute the overall performance score, thereby deciding to support: 1) the associate dean’s performance score, 2) the faculty member’s suggested performance score, or 3) a performance score between the associate dean’s and the faculty member’s. In no case can the committee recommend a performance score higher than either the associate dean’s or the faculty member’s. Likewise, the committee cannot recommend a performance score lower than either the associate dean’s or the faculty member’s. The decision by the department appeals committee is the final decision. Appeal decisions must be submitted to the Dean by the 2nd Friday in March.

Appeals based on procedural issues of due process may be made to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

Per UAR 137.01, there is no appeal process associated with merit score rankings (provided to the Dean by the Associate Dean), equity adjustments (as determined by the Dean), assigned merit scores (determined by the Dean) or the amount of the salary equity adjustments (determined by the Dean).

Faculty Member Signature:________________________ Date:________________________

Associate Dean Signature: ________________________ Date:________________________
I. Introduction

A. Philosophy

A strong evaluation process marks the deep commitment professionals share to the educational process. That process assumes a good-faith effort at honest, meaningful, and rigorous faculty development and evaluation on the part of all those involved: faculty, department chair, and other administrators. While the criteria for the evaluation reflect the expectations of the Department as a whole, the process should acknowledge the individuality of each faculty member, and the value of his or her diverse contributions to the department.

B. Statement of Purpose

The primary purpose of the Faculty Evaluation Process (FEP) within the department of International and Interdisciplinary Studies is the improvement of faculty performance, leading to a higher quality of instruction, professional achievement and service.

This document sets forth performance expectations for faculty in the Department of International and Interdisciplinary Studies (DIIS). To that end, it includes guidelines for tenure and promotion as required by and in accordance with PAc-27 (Tenure Review) and PAc-2 (Promotion Review), along with guidelines for annual review of faculty members.

II. Annual Evaluation of Faculty

A. Departmental Objective

The objective of the DIIS FEP is to provide all tenure-track and tenured full-time faculty with a clear understanding of departmental expectations and annual assessments that provide critical analysis of performance, especially as it relates to progress toward tenure or promotion.

B. Annual Evaluation Procedures

For tenure-track faculty the process is initiated when, in accordance with the timelines, a probationary faculty member submits an annual review portfolio, which is reviewed by the DIIS Tenure Committee and Department Chair. The guidelines for developing the portfolio and for the annual reviews are outlined in PAc-27. It is the responsibility of the candidate, the DIIS Tenure Committee members, the DIIS Department Chair, and the faculty mentor to understand and follow these procedures. Tenured faculty are to be evaluated mid-year, and will submit a letter highlighting achievements of note. Faculty en route to promotion should give the anticipated date for their promotion review. Evidence of accomplishments will be extracted from Faculty 180, and it is the faculty member’s responsibility to ensure that his or her records are complete, accurate, and entered/updated in the Faculty 180 System.
C. Expectations

As recorded in PAc-27, evaluations of tenure-track and probationary faculty involve three components: teaching (including advising), scholarship, and service. These same components are also used for evaluating tenured faculty. Each faculty member is granted latitude in determining how much weight to attach to each category. He or she should select appropriate values based upon his or her allocation of time and duties for the year under evaluation. Tenure-track faculty should choose weights for each category in consultation with their faculty mentors and the department chair. Weights should be specified annually for the period under review as the faculty member prepares review materials. Weights may vary over time with the range of a faculty member’s duties and assignments. If a Flexible Workload Agreement (as described in PAc-29) was in place for all or part of the year under review, weights should be chosen to reflect that. The total weights for all three categories must equal one hundred percent. The range of each of the three categories is defined as follows:

- **Teaching:** 25 – 75 percent
- **Scholarship:** 10 – 50 percent
- **Service:** 10 – 50 percent

A faculty member with a standard, full-time teaching load of 24 credit hours per year (4 courses per term) should normally select weights within the following ranges:

- **Teaching:** 40 – 60 percent
- **Scholarship:** 10 – 50 percent
- **Service:** 10 – 30 percent

D. Measurement

As the faculty member’s portfolio is reviewed, performance in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service will be rated on a scale from 1-3 in accordance with the following rubric, with ratings having the following meanings:

- **0-1 = Below Expectations**
- **2 = Meets Expectations**
- **3-4 = Exceeds Expectations**

Areas considered in the evaluation process (and for which faculty members should provide evidence) include the following:

1. **Teaching:** Evaluation of teaching should be based upon multiple criteria, and no more than 50% of that evaluation may be based upon student evaluations of teaching. The quality of instructional material, adequacy of syllabi, and peer or chair evaluations of teaching are also of great importance. Quality teaching also includes mentoring or advising students as appropriate, and contributing to the collective duties of the instructional programs in DIIS. Evidence that may be submitted to demonstrate teaching quality includes the following:

   a. Student evaluations of teaching
   b. Peer/chair evaluations of teaching
   c. Teaching Awards or Honors
   d. Innovative instructional techniques or course materials
e. Effective use of technology in one's teaching methods
f. Outstanding student work
g. Development of a new course or program
h. Working with an Undergraduate Research Fellow
i. Supervising student teachers
j. Supervising directed studies
k. Teaching in General Education
l. Teaching Graduate courses
m. Teaching an interdisciplinary course that is crosslisted between disciplines
n. Teaching a study abroad course that includes travel outside the US

o. Regional engagement activities, including but not limited to direction of student projects or service learning associated with government agencies and NGOs from global to local scales.
p. Scholarship of teaching and learning
q. Other indicators of teaching quality

2. Scholarship: Given the range of disciplines in DIIS, and the variety of professional endeavors that are undertaken, variation in the nature and type of professional achievements among faculty is to be expected. All faculty members, however, are expected to have an active record of scholarly activity, and are expected to achieve at least one work per year. Works (publications, presentations, funding or equipment proposals, and so on) requiring more peer review are viewed more favorably than those requiring less peer review. Works in international or national venues are viewed more favorably than those in regional or local venues. External funding is viewed more favorably than internal funding. Published or accepted works are viewed more favorably than those that are in progress or submitted. In the event of collaborative work, the faculty member should specify his or her contribution. Within the preceding parameters works are considered equivalent in value, and can include any of the following:

a. Publication of articles in scholarly journals or creative work in literary journals
b. Publication of book
c. Publication of book chapters
d. Presentation at professional meetings in field or discipline
e. Teaching in or directing a study abroad program
f. Awards or honors relating to professional achievement or scholarly productivity
g. Participation in research projects or research grant activities
h. Editorial duties associated with the publication of scholarly or literary journals
i. Leadership roles in professional organizations
j. Consulting in one's field of expertise or discipline
k. Recognized applied research
l. Collaboration with colleagues at other institutions
m. Received scholarly grant

n. Regional engagement activities, including but not limited to research in cooperation with or for the benefit of government agencies and NGOs from global to local scales.
o. Scholarship of teaching and learning
p. Extensive international experience/involvement
q. Other scholarly activities

3. Service: All DIIS faculty members are expected to contribute meaningfully to the collective work of the department, college, and university. A basic expectation is active participation in at least two committees at MSU in any given year, unless other valuable service (to the university or
region, for example) replaces it. Faculty members should state their role and contribution for each committee, organization, or activity included.

The candidate is responsible for reporting his or her service activities, which includes work on committees. It is the responsibility of the candidate to include documentation of activities for each committee that he or she would like to be recognized for service. Documentation of committee service should include the frequency or number of active sessions, actions conducted during sessions or between sessions, and any work on ad hoc or sub-committees. Committee membership that does not include documentation of active participation will not be counted toward service.

a. MSU committee assignments (department, college, university, or other; indicate role)
b. Coordination of academic programs
c. Sponsorship of approved co-curricular activities
d. Awards or honors relating to service
e. Student recruitment and retention
f. Advisor or co-advisor to university-recognized student organizations
g. Service to professional societies or organizations
h. Mentoring junior faculty
i. Coordination of and participation in university workshops, seminars, forums or conferences
j. Development of relationships with professional groups in business, industry, government, or education
k. Service on professional or corporate boards or panels
l. Service grant or proposal that benefits the University
m. Regional engagement activities, including but not limited to service for the benefit of government agencies and NGOs from global to local scales
n. Other service activities recognized by the University

E. Each faculty member shall be evaluated according to the following rubrics annually by the DIIS Chair (or his or her approved supervisor).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 0                         | This category recognizes the failure to fulfill basic instructional duties in the classroom. Evidence includes (but is not limited to) two or more of the following:  
  • unsatisfactory evaluations of teaching by students  
  • unsatisfactory peer and/or chair evaluations  
  • instructional materials are not provided or do not reflect effort of preparation  
  • syllabi are not provided or do not include university required components  
  • evidence that the faculty member does not fulfill expectations regarding mentoring and advising students, or a lack of evidence that he or she does meet these | This category recognizes unsatisfactory fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the Department of International and Interdisciplinary Studies. Evidence includes (but is not limited to):  
  • unsatisfactory evaluations of teaching by students  
  • unsatisfactory peer and/or chair evaluations  
  • instructional materials that are inappropriate or not relevant for courses taught  
  • syllabi do not include university required components  
  • evidence that the faculty member does not fulfill | This category recognizes above average fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the Department of International and Interdisciplinary Studies. Evidence includes (but is not limited to):  
  • above average evaluations of teaching by students  
  • above average peer and/or chair evaluations  
  • instructional materials that are appropriate and relevant for courses taught  
  • syllabi that include university required components  
  • documentation that the faculty member fulfills expectations regarding mentoring and advising students  
  • evidence of substantial |
| 1                         | This category recognizes unsatisfactory fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the Department of International and Interdisciplinary Studies. Evidence includes (but is not limited to):  
  • unsatisfactory evaluations of teaching by students  
  • unsatisfactory peer and/or chair evaluations  
  • instructional materials that are inappropriate or not relevant for courses taught  
  • syllabi do not include university required components  
  • evidence that the faculty member does not fulfill | This category recognizes satisfactory fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the Department of International and Interdisciplinary Studies. Evidence includes (but is not limited to):  
  • satisfactory evaluations of teaching by students  
  • satisfactory peer and/or chair evaluations  
  • instructional materials that are appropriate and relevant for courses taught  
  • syllabi that include university required components  
  • documentation that the faculty member fulfills expectations regarding mentoring and advising students  
  • evidence of | This category recognizes above average fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the Department of International and Interdisciplinary Studies. Evidence includes (but is not limited to):  
  • above average evaluations of teaching by students  
  • above average peer and/or chair evaluations  
  • instructional materials that are appropriate and relevant for courses taught  
  • syllabi that include university required components  
  • documentation that the faculty member fulfills expectations regarding mentoring and advising students  
  • evidence of substantial |
| 2                         | This category recognizes unsatisfactory fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the Department of International and Interdisciplinary Studies. Evidence includes (but is not limited to):  
  • unsatisfactory evaluations of teaching by students  
  • unsatisfactory peer and/or chair evaluations  
  • instructional materials that are inappropriate or not relevant for courses taught  
  • syllabi do not include university required components  
  • evidence that the faculty member does not fulfill | This category recognizes satisfactory fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the Department of International and Interdisciplinary Studies. Evidence includes (but is not limited to):  
  • satisfactory evaluations of teaching by students  
  • satisfactory peer and/or chair evaluations  
  • instructional materials that are appropriate and relevant for courses taught  
  • syllabi that include university required components  
  • documentation that the faculty member fulfills expectations regarding mentoring and advising students  
  • evidence of | This category recognizes above average fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the Department of International and Interdisciplinary Studies. Evidence includes (but is not limited to):  
  • above average evaluations of teaching by students  
  • above average peer and/or chair evaluations  
  • instructional materials that are appropriate and relevant for courses taught  
  • syllabi that include university required components  
  • documentation that the faculty member fulfills expectations regarding mentoring and advising students  
  • evidence of substantial |
| 3                         | This category recognizes unsatisfactory fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the Department of International and Interdisciplinary Studies. Evidence includes (but is not limited to):  
  • unsatisfactory evaluations of teaching by students  
  • unsatisfactory peer and/or chair evaluations  
  • instructional materials that are inappropriate or not relevant for courses taught  
  • syllabi do not include university required components  
  • evidence that the faculty member does not fulfill | This category recognizes satisfactory fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the Department of International and Interdisciplinary Studies. Evidence includes (but is not limited to):  
  • satisfactory evaluations of teaching by students  
  • satisfactory peer and/or chair evaluations  
  • instructional materials that are appropriate and relevant for courses taught  
  • syllabi that include university required components  
  • documentation that the faculty member fulfills expectations regarding mentoring and advising students  
  • evidence of | This category recognizes above average fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the Department of International and Interdisciplinary Studies. Evidence includes (but is not limited to):  
  • above average evaluations of teaching by students  
  • above average peer and/or chair evaluations  
  • instructional materials that are appropriate and relevant for courses taught  
  • syllabi that include university required components  
  • documentation that the faculty member fulfills expectations regarding mentoring and advising students  
  • evidence of substantial |
| 4                         | This category recognizes unsatisfactory fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the Department of International and Interdisciplinary Studies. Evidence includes (but is not limited to):  
  • unsatisfactory evaluations of teaching by students  
  • unsatisfactory peer and/or chair evaluations  
  • instructional materials that are inappropriate or not relevant for courses taught  
  • syllabi do not include university required components  
  • evidence that the faculty member does not fulfill | This category recognizes satisfactory fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the Department of International and Interdisciplinary Studies. Evidence includes (but is not limited to):  
  • satisfactory evaluations of teaching by students  
  • satisfactory peer and/or chair evaluations  
  • instructional materials that are appropriate and relevant for courses taught  
  • syllabi that include university required components  
  • documentation that the faculty member fulfills expectations regarding mentoring and advising students  
  • evidence of | This category recognizes above average fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the Department of International and Interdisciplinary Studies. Evidence includes (but is not limited to):  
  • above average evaluations of teaching by students  
  • above average peer and/or chair evaluations  
  • instructional materials that are appropriate and relevant for courses taught  
  • syllabi that include university required components  
  • documentation that the faculty member fulfills expectations regarding mentoring and advising students  
  • evidence of substantial |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>expectations</th>
<th>expectations regarding mentoring and advising students, or a lack of evidence that he or she does meet these expectations</th>
<th>contribution to the collective instructional responsibilities of the program and/or department</th>
<th>contribution to the collective instructional responsibilities of the program and/or department</th>
<th>substantial contribution to the collective instructional responsibilities of the program and/or department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• lack of evidence of contribution to the collective instructional responsibilities of the program and/or department</td>
<td>• evidence of reflection upon and refinement of instructional practices</td>
<td>• Evidence of instructional innovation</td>
<td>• evidence of reflection upon and refinement of instructional practices</td>
<td>• Evidence of instructional innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>This category recognizes that a faculty member is not engaged in a continuous program of professional achievement, as demonstrated by zero works per year (as described under “Scholarship” in section D.2, above). Further, there is no evidence of works in progress.</td>
<td>This category recognizes that a faculty member is engaged in a continuous program of professional achievement, as demonstrated by one peer- or editorially-reviewed academic works per year. Other contributions (as described under “Scholarship” in section D.2, above) at the local, state, regional, national or international level will be considered.</td>
<td>This category recognizes that a faculty member is engaged in a continuous and active program of professional achievement, as demonstrated by two peer- or editorially-reviewed academic works per year. Other contributions (as described under “Scholarship” in section D.2, above) at the state, regional, national or international level will be considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>This category recognizes that a faculty member is not engaged in a continuous program of professional achievement, as demonstrated by zero works per year (as described under “Scholarship” in section D.2, above). There is, however, evidence of works in progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>This category recognizes that a faculty member is engaged in a continuous program of professional achievement, as demonstrated by one peer- or editorially-reviewed academic works per year. Other contributions (as described under “Scholarship” in section D.2, above) at the local, state, regional, national or international level will be considered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>This category recognizes that a faculty member is engaged in a continuous and active program of professional achievement, as demonstrated by two peer- or editorially-reviewed academic works per year. Other contributions (as described under “Scholarship” in section D.2, above) at the state, regional, national or international level will be considered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>This category recognizes that a faculty member is engaged in an extremely active program of professional achievement, as demonstrated by three or more peer- or editorially-reviewed academic works per year. Other contributions (as described under “Scholarship” in section D.2, above) at the state, regional, national or international level will be considered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td>This category recognizes failure to provide evidence of any contribution to the</td>
<td>This category recognizes evidence of meaningful contribution to the collective work</td>
<td>This category recognizes evidence of leadership in the University (Departmental,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collective work of the department, college, and university, and the absence of</td>
<td>of the department, college, and university through active participation in at least</td>
<td>College, and/or University level) and/or in his/her profession. This leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other valuable service (to the university or region, for example) that would</td>
<td>two committees at MSU in any given year, unless other valuable service (to the</td>
<td>might come in the form of holding official positions or in playing a role in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>preclude it.</td>
<td>university or region, for example) that would preclude it.</td>
<td>program or policy development. In addition, outstanding service could include an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This category recognizes failure to provide evidence of meaningful contribution to</td>
<td></td>
<td>active outreach program in the region, which applies the faculty’s expertise to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the collective work of the department, college, and university through active</td>
<td></td>
<td>regional problems and needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participation in at least two committees at MSU in any given year, and the absence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of other valuable service (to the university or region, for example) that would</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>preclude it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Computing the Aggregate Score

The score for each category is multiplied by the weight chosen by the faculty member. The three weighted scores are then added together to produce an aggregate score. The aggregate score (2.75 in the example below) is compared against the rating scale used to determine how well the faculty member performed across all three categories considered as a group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of Effort (a)</th>
<th>Rating (b)</th>
<th>Category Score (a x b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching 55%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship 20%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service 25%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon review of a faculty member’s overall performance according to the preceding rubric, the aggregate score calculated corresponds to the following:

- 0.00-1.99 = Below Expectations
- 2.00-2.99 = Meets Expectations
- 3.00-4.00 = Exceeds Expectations

G. Feedback and Reporting

In accordance with PAc-27, faculty members will receive a written evaluation and will have an opportunity to discuss the assessment and ratings with the DIIS Department Chair (or his or her approved supervisor). The feedback will include constructive criticism and suggestions that are intended to enable faculty members to improve their future performance.

H. Annual Review of Instructors

Instructors will be evaluated according to the criteria set forth in PAc-34. Basic expectations include regular meeting of scheduled classes, the use of clear syllabi indicating course requirements and expectations, availability to meet with students outside of class, timely evaluation of and feedback on student work and progress, and prompt submission of course grades.

The Chair’s recommendations regarding renewal of contracts must be based on past teaching performance and areas of expertise as they relate to program needs. All other things being equal, seniority [as defined by Morehead State University] shall be a deciding factor if more than one instructor is eligible for renewal, and the department can employ only one. In reaching these decisions, the Chair should consult other faculty members, read student evaluations, observe classroom performance, and study the instructor’s portfolio. The portfolio must include the following materials, unless exceptions are specifically agreed on in consultation with the Chair.
1. Student evaluations

2. Representative evidence of teaching approaches

3. Reports from teaching observations by peers (one observation per semester during the first year of employment, and one observation per year thereafter)

4. A brief annual report. Instructors may choose the format, structure, and length of these reports, but the report must include a statement expressing the instructor’s own judgment about the quality and quantity of his or her activities during the calendar year.

In all cases, the Chair will discuss the evaluation one-on-one with the instructor, and inform the instructor of the decision and the reasons for it as soon as possible, but always by the deadline specified in PAc-34.

I. Appeals

If a faculty member disagrees with his or her annual review, the Chair (or approved supervisor) and the faculty member should first attempt to resolve it through more dialogue and exchange of information. If the disagreement persists, the Chair (or approved supervisor) must refer the matter to the faculty of the department. The faculty will request either written statements or interviews, as it considers more appropriate, and offer a recommendation to the Chair (or approved supervisor) and the faculty member. If the faculty recommends a change in the evaluation of the faculty member, and the faculty member finds the recommendation acceptable, the Chair (or approved supervisor) will abide by this decision. The faculty member retains the right to appeal to the Dean of the Caudill College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, but the department hopes to resolve all disputes internally and amicably.

III. Tenure and Reappointment

A. Minimum Expectations for Tenure

Candidates for tenure must demonstrate a consistent pattern of satisfactory (or better) performance according to annual evaluation procedure outlined above (attaining an average aggregate score of 2.4 or better). At the time of tenure review candidates should be able to document cumulative evidence of (at least) satisfactory performance in teaching, professional achievement, and service. Additionally, the following criteria should be met:

1. Teaching: Should demonstrate a consistent pattern of growth over time. The goal here is to demonstrate reflective engagement with teaching, always looking for ways to find what works and strengthen any areas of weakness. Evidence of this might include, but is not limited to, curriculum development and/or teaching new courses; revisions of existing courses; innovations in teaching approach, style, method, or technology; completion of professional development or international experience that leads to changes in teaching.

2. Scholarship: Tenure candidates should have
a. active participation in local, regional, national, or international professional conferences, as demonstrated by at least four conference presentations during the time under review and

b. three articles accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals or chapters published in peer-reviewed or editorially-reviewed books. (Having a significant external grant project funded or extensive international involvement such as directing in or teaching in a study abroad program is considered equivalent to an article publication in terms of merit.) or

c. a published book

In the event of collaborative work, the faculty member should specify his or her contribution.

3. Service: Should be at multiple levels within the university and professionally if at all possible.

B. Probationary/Tenure Review Process and Involved Parties

The Tenure Review Process for Probationary Faculty shall follow procedures outlined in PAC 27.

1. Departmental Committee

As stipulated in PAC-27, a Department Tenure Committee, consisting of all eligible tenured faculty members in the department, will annually review the portfolio of each probationary faculty member. When necessary, qualified faculty members from outside the department will be asked to serve on the Tenure Committee.

2. Department Chair

On the basis of that review the department chair will evaluate the portfolio, discuss the evaluation with the probationary faculty member, and submit the required materials to the Dean of the College, as specified in PAC-27. The department chair should make every effort to learn as much as possible about the probationary faculty member’s work, in the following ways, among others: classroom observations, review of published and presented work, and review of the portfolio.

3. Role of the Faculty Mentor

A mentor will work with each probationary faculty member. The mentor’s responsibilities include but are not limited to

a. arranging and carrying out classroom observations of the candidate at least once a semester

b. given reasonable notice, meeting with the probationary faculty member, the department chair, or the Department Tenure Committee to supply information, comments, and suggestions.

The mentor will document the work with the probationary faculty member as follows:
1. Memos or electronic records (ex: Evernote) detailing meetings between the junior faculty member (mentee) and mentor regarding improvement of renewal/tenure portfolios.
2. Copies of comments for classroom observations of the junior faculty member (mentee) by the mentor.

C. Reappointment/Non-reappointment

   Tenure-track (probationary) faculty who earn aggregate scores of 1.99 or lower in two consecutive years will not be reappointed.

III. Promotion Review

A. Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

   Ordinarily, promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor is concurrent with the granting of tenure, and the standards and procedures described above apply. Tenured and special-status assistant professors must meet the same promotion standards as those faculty members applying for tenure and promotion jointly.

B. Associate Professor to Professor

   This policy is based upon PAc-1 (“Definition of Academic Titles”) and PAc-2 (“Promotion Review”). The latter document sets forth general principles and criteria, outlines presentation of application materials as well as general procedures to be followed by the applicant and the University, and describes the promotion review process. PAc-1 includes the following standards for the rank of professor: that it “should be reserved for persons of proven stature in their fields,” and that applicants must “show evidence of outstanding teaching, professional achievement, and service to the University” during the period when applicants hold the rank of associate professor. We urge candidates for promotion to professor to review PAc-1 and PAc-2 carefully before initiating the application process.

   The Department of International and Interdisciplinary Studies reaffirms the University’s stance that yearly high performance-based evaluation ratings will not automatically translate into a successful promotion application, since the record for promotion must be cumulative. To aid in documenting this cumulative record, candidates shall include a written statement in which they reflect on their progress in teaching, professional achievement, and service in the years since attaining the rank of associate professor. We recommend that this statement also discuss how candidates see their work in these three areas to be mutually reinforcing.

C. Minimum Expectations for Promotion to Full Professor

   Candidates for promotion must demonstrate a consistent pattern of satisfactory (or better) performance according to annual evaluation procedure outlined above for the five year period prior to promotion review (attaining an average aggregate score of 2.7 or better). At the time of promotion review candidates should be able to document cumulative evidence of (at least) satisfactory performance in teaching, professional achievement, and service. If a candidate for promotion has fewer than five years of service in the department (due to entering the department with tenure), he or she must attain an average aggregate score of 2.7 or better for the years he or she has been evaluated in DIIS, and should present a portfolio documenting cumulative evidence
of satisfactory performance over the entire period being considered for promotion purposes (which shall be no less than five years). Additionally, the following criteria should be met:

1. Teaching: Should demonstrate a consistent pattern of effective instruction, and/or show improvement over time.

2. Scholarship: Promotion candidates should have

   a. active participation in local, regional, national, or international professional conferences, as demonstrated by at least four conference presentations during the time under review and
   b. four articles accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals or chapters published in peer-reviewed or editorially-reviewed books (Having a significant external grant project funded or extensive international involvement such as directing in or teaching in a study abroad program is considered equivalent to an article publication in terms of merit.) or
   c. a published book and a peer-reviewed article (or equivalent) or
   d. two or more published books

   Given that having a significant external grant project funded or extensive international involvement is considered equivalent to article publication in terms of merit, either of these professional achievements can substitute for a maximum of one required article.

   In the event of collaborative work, the faculty member should specify his or her contribution.

3. Service: Should be at multiple levels within the university and professionally.

D. Promotion Review Procedures

1. Departmental Committee

   The Department Promotion Committee will consider all applications for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, in accordance with the policies and procedures described in PAC-2. The Department Tenure Committee will consider all applications for promotion to Associate Professor, in accordance with the policies and procedures described in PAC-2, PAC-27, and this Faculty Evaluation Plan.

2. Department Chair

   The Department Chair (or approved supervisor) will review all recommendations of the Department Promotion Committee, add his or her own recommendation, and submit the appropriate materials to the Dean of the Caudill College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences.
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I. Introduction  
A. Philosophy  
A strong evaluation process marks the deep commitment professionals share to the educational process. That process assumes a good-faith effort at honest, meaningful, and rigorous faculty development and evaluation on the part of all those involved: faculty, department chair, other administrators, and the Faculty Evaluation and Adjudication Committee. While the criteria for the evaluation reflect the expectations of the Department as a whole, the process should acknowledge the individuality of each faculty member, and the value of his or her diverse contributions to the department. At the core of this process is the concept of peer review.

B. Statement of Purpose  
The primary purpose of the Faculty Evaluation Process (FEP) within the department of English is the improvement of faculty performance, leading to a higher quality of instruction, scholarship and service. This document sets forth performance expectations for faculty in the Department of English. To that end, it includes guidelines for tenure and promotion as required by and in accordance with the provisions of PAcS on promotion, tenure and reappointment, faculty workload, faculty compensation, faculty titles, academic freedom, and faculty evaluation. The candidate should become familiar with these PAcS.

II. Tenure and Reappointment  
A. Department Goals and Objectives  
The goal of the tenure review process is to help probationary faculty develop so that they will earn tenure and promotion at the end of the probationary period. Because the candidate who achieves tenure will be promoted automatically to associate professor (unless the candidate already holds that rank or higher), the quality of a successful candidate’s work must merit both tenure and promotion.

Because merit and tenure evaluations are separate processes, meeting or exceeding merit criteria does not automatically ensure a favorable tenure decision. Merit evaluations are based on annual performance, whereas promotion evaluations are based on the cumulative performance of six years. Continuous reappointment during the annual review process also does not guarantee the awarding of tenure at the end of the probationary period. The awarding of tenure is a holistic judgment based on the quality of a candidate’s overall performance.

B. Probationary/Tenure Review Process  
The Tenure Review Process for Probationary Faculty shall follow procedures outlined in PAc-27.
1. Departmental Committee
As stipulated in PAc-27, a Department Tenure Committee, consisting of all eligible tenured faculty members in the department, will annually review the portfolio of each probationary faculty member.

2. Department Chair
On the basis of that review the department chair will evaluate the portfolio, discuss the evaluation with the probationary faculty member, and submit the required materials to the Dean of the College, as specified in PAc-27. The department chair should make every effort to learn as much as possible about the probationary faculty member’s work, in the following ways, among others: classroom observations, review of published and presented work, and assessment of service contributions.

3. Role of the Faculty Mentor
Two mentors will work with each probationary faculty member. Meetings will be documented by all parties. The mentors’ responsibilities include but are not limited to
   a) assisting the candidate in arranging for faculty in the candidate’s discipline to conduct classroom observations of the candidate at least once a semester
   b) given reasonable notice, meeting with the probationary faculty member, the department chair, or the Department Tenure Committee to supply information, comments, and suggestions.
   c) advising the candidate regarding the organization and content of portfolios.

C. Expectations
Although fixed numbers for the weighting of the different aspects of a faculty member’s job are difficult to support, a general range of values may provide some guidance. Teaching should count for no more than 50% of a candidate’s evaluation; scholarship for no less than 30% of the evaluation; and service for between 10% and 20% of the evaluation (unless a Flexible Workload Agreement modifies this weighting (see section V and PAc-29)). The values chosen from these sliding scales should always sum to 100% (e.g., 50% teaching, 30% scholarship, and 20% service; 45% teaching, 45% scholarship, and 10% service; etc.). Teaching for tenure-track faculty should count for at least 40% in each year.

A candidate’s portfolio must include
a) reappointment letters from each year
b) a copy of the approved FEP for the department
c) annual documentation of meeting with mentors
d) annual reviews by department tenure committee, department chair, college dean, and university provost,
in addition to specific evidence in the three categories below.
1. Teaching Effectiveness

While wishing to allow for appropriate flexibility in standards in acknowledgment of differences among disciplines and in teaching styles, the department also recognizes a set of essential elements to effective teaching. Consistent with the concept of academic freedom and responsibility articulated in PAc-14 and with the guidelines for faculty workload articulated in PAc-29, these basic expectations include the following categories and items which are applicable to all teaching faculty:

**SUBJECT MATTER**
- Demonstrated knowledge of and competency in the course subject matter
- Course content consistent with the catalog description of the course

**LEARNER OUTCOMES**
- Clearly defined 1) course goals/objectives, 2) requirements, 3) a calendar, schedule, agenda, or dated teaching plan, and 4) student learner outcomes

**METHODOLOGY**
- Methodology appropriate to the subject matter, the objectives, the level of the course, and the course-delivery mode
- Regular meeting of all scheduled classes or timely completion of all online course-related tasks
- Thorough preparation and effective use of time in classroom or on-line venues

**ASSESSMENT**
- Assessment instruments, assignments, and grading appropriate to the subject matter, objectives, level, and delivery method of the course
- Application of clearly defined expectations and grading criteria in evaluating individual assignments
- Timely evaluation of and useful feedback on student work and progress
- Availability to communicate with students outside of class, virtually or face to face

**MATERIALS PROVIDED TO STUDENTS**
- Catalog description of the course printed in the course syllabus
- Course policies printed in the course syllabus
- Grading scale and weighting of assignments in computation of course grade printed in the course syllabus
- Clear instructions and articulation of expectations on individual assignments

Regular failure to perform any of the above and to correct any deficiencies of performance will adversely affect progress toward tenure.

Beyond providing evidence of meeting the basic expectations for teaching as outlined above, the faculty member must offer clear evidence of teaching effectiveness and of a commitment to continued development as a teacher. While some documentation may provide strong evidence on its own, it is the total picture of the faculty's teaching provided by the full collection of materials that will matter. For example, student evaluations are very important, but they can
never constitute more than half of the evidence of effective teaching. In order to present evidence of peer review of teaching, the candidate must solicit teaching observations (face to face, ITV, or on-line) and reviews of pertinent teaching materials from different colleagues within the department or field. Each observer will discuss the teaching performance with the candidate and generate a written evaluation letter to be included in the candidate’s portfolio. Peer observations must occur at least as frequently as every other year. The candidate is also encouraged to attend department and university advising workshops and to keep an advising log that documents advising sessions with students.

The candidate is expected to select documentation with care, present it effectively, and provide a coherent summary statement addressing his/her teaching philosophy and practice. The judgment is ultimately a qualitative holistic one and rests upon the professional judgment of the candidate’s peers. For a favorable rehiring, tenure, or promotion decision, the Departmental Tenure Committee (in the case of tenure and promotion) must be convinced, based upon the evidence in the portfolio, that the candidate is an effective teacher.

Required items to include in the portfolio related to teaching are
a) standardized and supplemental teaching evaluations for each semester
b) peer observations and statements from colleagues who have examined teaching materials (e.g., course syllabi, reading lists, assignments, tests, etc.)
c) selected teaching materials from courses at all levels taught, including representative syllabi, class calendars, exams, graded assignments, handouts, recordings of a typical class, etc.

Additional evidence may include but is not limited to
d) evidence of efforts to improve teaching (e.g., evidence of attendance at teaching workshops and conferences, evidence of collaborative endeavors with colleagues, written descriptions of attempts to improve one’s course content and methods of instruction based on assessment, evaluation, or new trends in the field)
e) evidence of innovative teaching techniques, including effective use of technology
f) evidence of development of new approved courses or programs
g) evidence of work with students outside of (and unconnected with) one’s regular classes—e.g., student advising, direction of independent studies, service on thesis committees, etc.
h) evidence of outstanding student work
i) evidence of significant contributions to academic programs for teaching and advising activities not covered under “Service” (e.g., teaching online courses, advising during SOAR sessions, serving as a peer reviewer for a colleague, etc.)
j) evidence of teaching awards and honors
k) evidence of regional engagement activities in teaching (with explanation of how those activities demonstrate appropriate connections between academic material and the community)

2. Scholarship

It is understood that faculty achievement in scholarship enhances the department and is integral in establishing a community of learners, as specified in MSU’s Mission. Faculty members have a responsibility to remain current and active within their area of specialization so that they can continue to refine their teaching and contribute to the academic excellence of MSU. Two broad areas will be considered as part of scholarship: (1) those activities which are essential to establish and maintain one's professional standing, and (2) those activities which are an active contribution to the state of the profession and through which a candidate may demonstrate that level of performance that will warrant the granting of tenure.

The first area reflects the conviction that tenure-track members are expected to demonstrate their awareness of current scholarship and research in their teaching fields through such activities as attendance at professional conferences and workshops, intensive independent exploration of a field or topic, application in the classroom of current scholarship, or completion of an additional terminal degree in a related field. Successful performance in these areas alone, however, will not be sufficient for the granting of tenure.

The second area includes those further professional activities by which a candidate will demonstrate a level of performance that will warrant tenure. In this category, scholarly contributions in the candidate’s specialization or related fields, or significant creative productions by creative writers, are essential. Scholarly contributions include such things as publications and conference presentations. The quality of particular contributions will also be taken into consideration. For example, although a fine paper presented at a non-refereed regional conference may stand on its own merits when included in the portfolio, the acceptance of a paper at a refereed national conference will be judged more favorably. Similarly, the standing of the publication in which a scholarly or creative work appears will be taken into account. Major accomplishments may count more individually (for example, a book as compared to an article), but it is the total contribution of the candidate to the profession that is to be evaluated in a tenure decision, with allowance for the different emphases among the various disciplines and fields in the department.

Publication is required for tenure. On average, the expectation is a minimum of three scholarly or creative peer-reviewed publications (depending on the candidate’s discipline) while at MSU. This requirement may be offset by the overall excellence, scope, or length of the candidate’s publications as well as by presentations in prestigious venues. Although all of a candidate’s publications will be considered for tenure, the publications from a candidate’s tenure-track
years at MSU provide the most convincing evidence of the candidate’s performance in scholarship.

Scholarly and creative publication includes the following in juried, invited, or peer-reviewed venues (print or electronic):

a) scholarly or creative books written solely by the candidate
b) textbooks or co-authored books
c) chapters or creative work in books
d) articles in scholarly journals or creative work in literary journals
e) extensive entries in scholarly dictionaries or encyclopedias
f) significant contributions to the above
g) editing of scholarly or literary journals, books, or other media
h) publication of scholarly book reviews, notes, short dictionary articles, and brief encyclopedia entries

(Publication of similar works in venues which are not peer-reviewed may be considered but will count to a lesser degree.)

Scholarly or Creative Presentations

a) papers for presentations given to one’s peers at professional meetings (including professional meetings conducted online)
b) professional papers or presentations invited by one’s peers

(Presentations should be evaluated on a sliding scale based on whether the venue is international, national, regional, or local (in descending order). Presentations that are peer-reviewed should count for more than non-juried presentations.)

Awards or Honors relating to professional achievement

a) external
b) internal

Grant-Writing Activities

a) external research/creative productions grants/fellowships awarded
b) internal research/creative productions grants/fellowships awarded
c) significant contributions to internal or external research/creative productions grant/fellowship activities

Scholarship in Field of Expertise

a) leadership roles in professional organizations
b) consulting in one's field of expertise
c) work as a referee for a press, journal, or professional conference
d) activities involving regional engagement

The candidate is expected to provide a coherent summary statement and documentation of his/her research or creative productions agenda. Awards and honors are indicators of the quality of the candidate’s creative and scholarly productions and will be considered in the evaluation of the portfolio. The probationary faculty member may provide evidence that s/he has made significant efforts to publish articles, creative pieces, and/or books. This evidence could include copies of works submitted and responses to such submissions.
3. Service

Service to the department and the university is required of all faculty. Of the three areas in which the candidate will be evaluated for tenure, service ranks third. Outstanding service will not compensate for a deficiency in either teaching or scholarship.

Expectations for all faculty:

a) active service as an elected member of one standing department committee, or as a member of one ad hoc departmental committee, on average per year; and

b) regular attendance at department meetings; active participation in departmental assessment including meetings to score exams and papers; and for tenure and tenure-track faculty, participation in meetings of the full undergraduate faculty and graduate faculty.

Additional Service. Significant achievement in the following areas may compensate for deficiencies in the basic expectations above. These kinds of additional service include but are not limited to the following:

a) leadership of active college or university level committee
b) leadership of active departmental level committee
c) active service as program coordinator (or in similar capacity)
d) sponsorship of university-recognized student organizations and co-curricular events
e) investigation of service grant or proposals to benefit to the university
f) recruitment of students for department and university programs;
g) assisting of students in gaining admission to graduate school and obtaining employment (writing letters of recommendation, advising students in the preparation of application materials, etc.)
h) coordination of and participation in non-local workshops, seminars, special events, or conferences
i) promotion of relationships between alumni and the university
j) development of relationships with professional groups in business, industry, trade, government, or education
k) service as official representative of the University
l) service to the community, region, state, nation, or international community (in order for service outside of the university to count toward tenure, the service must be related to the candidate's teaching, scholarship, or status as a professional)
m) awards or honors relating to service activities or service leadership roles.
n) coordination or facilitation of activities of electronic discussion groups in one's discipline.
o) service on non-University professional committees

The candidate shall include a statement of service in the tenure portfolio. The candidate is expected to maintain evidence of on-going service, such as
III. Promotion

A. Departmental Goals and Objectives
   The goal of the department is to help faculty develop so that they earn promotion.

B. Assistant Professor to Associate Professor
   Ordinarily promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor is concurrent with the granting of tenure, and the standards and procedures described in Part II of this document apply.

C. Associate Professor to Professor
   We urge the candidate for promotion to professor to review the PAs on academic titles and promotion carefully before initiating the application process.

   Positive annual merit evaluations will not automatically translate into a successful promotion application since the record for promotion must be cumulative. To aid in documenting this cumulative record, the candidate shall include a written statement in which s/he reflects on his/her progress in teaching, scholarship, and service in the years since attaining the rank of associate professor. We recommend that this statement also discuss how the candidate sees his/her work in these three areas to be mutually reinforcing and growing in the future.

D. Promotion Review Procedures, Associate Professor to Professor
   1. Departmental Committee
The Department Promotion Committee will consider all applications for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor in accordance with the policies and procedures described in this Faculty Evaluation Plan.

2. Department Chair
The Department Chair will review all recommendations of the Department Promotion Committee, add his or her own recommendation, and submit the appropriate materials to the Dean of the Caudill College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences.

E. Expectations
1. Teaching Effectiveness
Excellence in teaching includes strengthening course content in light of developments in the field; working to motivate students for success, especially in the development of their writing, reading, thinking, research, and related analytical skills; and appropriate advising of students outside of class. In evaluating an application for promotion to professor, the Department will expect to see concrete evidence of growth as a teacher since the last promotion. While one way of demonstrating growth may be higher scores on standardized, classroom evaluation forms, it is unrealistic to expect higher scores year after year, especially if the candidate has already received high scores during his/her probationary years. Other materials will figure importantly as well. These may include any or all of the items listed in II.C.1, though the candidate is not limited to these items. Whatever materials are presented, it will be to the candidate’s advantage to include reports covering every year since the last promotion, as well as reports covering courses of different levels and types.

2. Professional Achievement
Excellence in scholarship appropriate for the rank of professor includes engagement in an active, continuous agenda of scholarly and/or creative work. To establish the value of this work, the candidate may cite and include different kinds of evidence such as reviews by other recognized scholars and/or creative writers outside the University in addition to including in his/her portfolio any or all of the items listed in II.C.2. The Department does not set a precise number of expected publications, presentations, or other achievements as a minimum standard for promotion to professor, but the candidate will be expected to show a record of continuous activity and growth.

3. Service
Excellence in service appropriate for the rank of professor includes leadership within the department and the University, and service in other contexts as well. Candidates for promotion to professor shall demonstrate the ability and willingness to play a key role in program and policy development; thus, simply providing a list of committees on which one has served will not constitute such a demonstration, though membership on some (especially some University) committees will carry considerable weight. Further, while leadership begins in the department, such service...
only or chiefly within the department will be insufficient to earn recommendation for promotion from the Department Promotion Committee and the Department Chair. To establish the value of his/her service contributions, the candidate may cite and include but is not limited to evidence of any or all of the activities listed in II.C.3.

IV. Annual Merit Review

A. Departmental Goals and Objectives
The Department seeks to identify those faculty members most deserving of merit pay, if available, through a process involving the minimum of additional paperwork and the maximum of sensitivity to individual differences.

B. Guidelines for Merit Review and Appeals Process
By the established university deadline, faculty will upload an annual report of activity to the university approved faculty activity reporting system. It is the Chair’s responsibility to review all the relevant information, arrive at a recommendation, and discuss that recommendation with the faculty member. If there is a disagreement, the Chair and the faculty member should first try to resolve it by more dialogue and exchange of information. If the disagreement persists, the Chair must refer the matter to the Faculty Evaluation and Adjudication Committee; the Committee will request either written statements or interviews, as it considers more appropriate, and offer a recommendation to the Chair and the faculty member. If the Committee recommends a change in the evaluation of the faculty member, and the faculty member finds the recommendation acceptable, the Chair will abide by the committee’s decision. The faculty member retains the right to appeal to the Dean of the Caudill College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences, but the Department hopes to resolve all disputes internally and amicably.

The expectations on which annual evaluations will be based do not differ from those stated for tenure and promotion. It will be the responsibility of the chair to explain clearly the basis for each recommendation, and to refer to the language in this document in discussing performance in teaching, scholarly work, and service.

C. Expectations

1. Teaching Effectiveness
   Basic expectations include regular meeting of scheduled classes, the use of clear syllabi indicating course requirements and expectations, availability to meet with students outside of class, timely evaluation of and feedback on student work and progress, and prompt submission of course grades. As a measure of above expected performance, the faculty member must show evidence of teaching effectiveness. This may include any or all of the items listed in II.C.1, though the candidate is not limited to these items.

2. Scholarship
Basic expectations include attendance at professional conferences and workshops, intensive independent exploration of a field or topic, application in the classroom of current scholarship, and efforts toward publication. As a measure of above expected performance, the faculty member must show evidence of scholarship and scholarly and/or creative activity. This may include any or all of the items listed in II.C.2, though the candidate is not limited to these items.

3. Professional Service
Basic expectations include regular attendance and participation in department meetings, and a demonstrated willingness to serve in elected or appointed position on committees. As a measure of above expected performance, the faculty member must show evidence of service that includes but is not limited to any or all of the items listed in II.C.3.

D. Point-Based System for Annual Merit Review
1. Teaching
Points ranging from 1-3 will be assigned for each category of evidence for teaching effectiveness and improvement (evidence that may include, but is not limited to, the categories in II.C.1.a-j, repeated below). While no more than half of all points can stem from student evaluations of teaching (II.C.1.a), there is no limit to the number of points that can be earned from the remaining categories. Points within a category will vary according to the quality and amount of effort involved.

Ratings for teaching will be given according to the following scale:

- 0-3 points ............... below expected
- 4-6 points ................ expected
- 7-9 points ............... above expected
- 10 or more points ....... meritorious

- Standardized and/or supplemental teaching evaluations for each semester
  1-3
- Peer observations and statements from colleagues who have examined teaching materials (e.g., course syllabi, reading lists, assignments, tests, etc.)
  1-3
- Selected teaching materials from courses at all levels taught, including representative syllabi, class calendars, exams, graded assignments, handouts, recordings of a typical class, etc.
  1-3
- Evidence of efforts to improve teaching (e.g., evidence of attendance at teaching workshops and conferences, evidence of collaborative endeavors with colleagues, written descriptions of attempts to improve one’s course content and methods of instruction based on assessment, evaluation, or new trends in the field)
  1-3
- Evidence of innovative teaching techniques, including effective use of technology
  1-3
- Evidence of development of new approved courses or programs
  1-3
evidence of work with students outside of (and unconnected with) one's regular classes—e.g., student advising, direction of independent studies, service on thesis committees, etc. 1-3

evidence of outstanding student work 1-3

evidence of significant contributions to academic programs for teaching and advising activities not covered under “Service” (e.g., teaching online courses, advising during SOAR sessions, serving as a peer reviewer for a colleague, etc.) 1-3

evidence of teaching awards and honors 1-3

evidence of regional engagement activities in teaching (with explanation of how those activities demonstrate appropriate connections between academic material and the community) 1-3

2. Scholarship

Basic expectations correspond to those outlined in II.C.2.

Ratings for scholarship will be given according to the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>below expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>above expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>meritorious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarly and Creative Publication

Because criteria for levels of quality of scholarly and creative productions differ to a greater extent than do the criteria for service or teaching, the following multiplier-based formula will be used because it allows the relative quality of various artifacts to be weighted equitably.

For publications, regardless of the type, the same 1-3 scale is used to calculate the prestige of the venue and the scope and importance of the work. Distinctions between types of work are captured by differences in a multiplier which is applied to the result of the prestige/scope rating. Prestige and scope can be rated independently and added up to form a number between 1 and 3: high prestige venues count for 1.5 points, medium for 1 point, low for 0.5 points; high scope and importance publications count for 1.5 points, medium for 1 point, low for 0.5 points. Publication of similar works in venues which are not peer-reviewed may be considered but will count for a lesser number of points. No more than 2 points should be awarded for any such works.

The list of type of works in the table below is not meant to be exhaustive. A faculty member may suggest the multiplier appropriate to individual scholarly or creative contributions on a case-by-case basis following the guidelines suggested below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Work</th>
<th>Prestige/scope (1-3)</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Maximum Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarly or Creative Presentations</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>papers or presentations given to one’s peers at professional meetings (including professional meetings conducted online)</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional papers or presentations invited by one’s peers</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Presentations should receive points on a sliding scale based on whether the venue is international, national, regional, or local (in descending order). Presentations that are peer-reviewed should receive more points than non-juried presentations.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Awards or Honors Relating to Scholarship

| external | 1-5 |
| internal | 1-3 |

Grant-Writing Activities

| external research/creative productions grants/fellowships awarded | 1-10 |
| internal research/creative productions grants/fellowships awarded | 1-4 |
| significant contributions to internal or external research/creative productions grant/fellowship activities | 1-5 |

Professional Achievement Activities in Field of Expertise

| leadership roles in professional organizations | 1-4 |
| consulting in one's field of expertise | 1-3 |
| work as a referee for a press, journal, or professional conference | 1-3 |
| activities involving regional engagement | 1-3 |

3. Service

Ratings for service will be given according to the following scale:

0-3 points .......... below expected
4-6 points .................... expected
7-9 points.. .............. above expected
10 or more points .......... meritorious

Points for any category will vary in accordance with the nature of the service, the amount of time and effort it requires, and so on.

Points will be assigned as follows:
leadership position, active college or university level committee 1-8
leadership position, active departmental level committee 1-4
service on active college or university level committee 1-4
service on active departmental level committee 1-3
active service as program coordinator (or in similar capacity) 1-8
sponsorship of university-recognized student organizations and co-curricular events 1-3
investigation of service grants or proposals to benefit the University 1-9
recruitment of students for department and university programs 1-3
assisting of students in gaining admission to graduate school and obtaining employment (writing letters of recommendation, advising students in the preparation of application materials, etc.) 1-3
coordination of and participation in local workshops, seminars, special events, or conferences 1-3
coordination of and participation in non-local workshops, seminars, special events, or conferences (including online venues) 1-4
promotion of relationships between alumni and the university 1-3
development of relationships with professional groups in business, industry, trade, government, or education 1-3
service as official representative of the University 1-3
service to the community, region, state, nation, or international community [In order for service outside of the university to count toward merit, the service must be related to the candidate’s teaching, scholarship, or status as a professional.] 1-4
awards or honors relating to service activities or leadership roles 1-4
coordination or facilitation of activities of electronic discussion group in one’s discipline 1-5
service on non-University professional committees 1-3

V. Flexible Workload Agreements and Regional Engagement

A. Flexible Workload Agreements
In accordance with PAc-29 on Faculty Workload, faculty may be eligible to initiate a Flexible Workload Agreement (FWA) or may accept an administrative-initiated FWA. Such FWAs will clearly spell out the expectations for the faculty member’s evaluation. The PAc sets separate restrictions on faculty-initiated FWAs for tenured faculty vs. tenure-track faculty in order to ensure that tenure-track faculty focus appropriately on scholarship or creative productions.
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During any year in which a candidate has an FWA, this agreement must be used to evaluate the candidate's progress. A candidate for tenure or promotion must include copies of all relevant FWAs plus related annual reports and supervisor evaluations in the portfolio so that the candidate's peers and administrators have this information available. The candidate should also make clear in the portfolio materials what the product(s) of an FWA were and what expectations were superseded by the FWA. Candidates are encouraged to study PAc-29 and the departmental FEP closely, and consider their overall progress in all three areas of their job, before initiating or agreeing to an FWA.

B. Regional Engagement
When appropriate, an English faculty member may designate certain teaching, scholarly, and/or service activities as examples of engagement in regional development. Such activities may include (but are not limited to) organizing or participating in the organization of workshops related to English literature, writing, or linguistics for teachers, students, or the public; managing or arranging the sponsorship of presentations or readings by noted authors or scholars of English studies; reading creative or scholarly works in public venues; working with professional or governmental representatives to develop grant (or related types) projects that support regional needs and initiatives. In order for the activity to be considered Regional Engagement, it must occur within the Morehead State University Service Region. Meritorious Regional Engagement when awarded is not a separate category; credit for such activities may be granted in a faculty member's annual review based on what that member has identified as meriting credit for Regional Engagement. The faculty member must justify its importance and categorization (teaching, scholarship, or service) in relevant statements.
The overall rating of a faculty member should be derived from the individual scores following the weighting scheme described in II.C. In general, teaching should count for around 50% of a candidate's evaluation; scholarship for around 30% of the evaluation; and service for between 10% and 20% of the evaluation. In special cases, faculty may argue for different weightings.
based on special responsibilities in one area, such as a heavy service burden. The values chosen from these sliding scales should always sum to 100%. As noted above, teaching for tenure-track faculty should count for at least 40% in each year.

For example, a faculty member choosing 50% for teaching, 35% for scholarship, and 15% for service would have their overall merit score calculated by the following equation:

\[
(0.50 \times \text{TeachingPoints}) + (0.35 \times \text{ScholarshipPoints}) + (0.15 \times \text{ServicePoints}) = \text{Merit Score.}
\]
Faculty Evaluation Plan

I. Introduction

A. Philosophy

Faculty members have an important responsibility in providing evaluations of peers for contract renewal, tenure review, and promotion. In the limited manner prescribed in this document, they have a similar role in evaluating peers for Performance Based Compensation Increase (PBCI). University policy describes this responsibility as “the application of academic and professional judgments in a framework of shared authority among various levels of review and between faculty and academic administrators” (PAc-2, PAc-27). Faculty members in the department of History, Philosophy, Religion, and Legal Studies (HPRL) view teaching, professional achievement, and service in light of the standards and perspectives of their separate disciplines. The provisions of this document reflect that diversity.

In accordance with University policies, we seek to recognize and reward continual faculty development and excellence in teaching, professional achievement, and service. This will be accomplished through the evaluation processes related to tenure and reappointment, promotion, and annual evaluation.

B. Purpose

The purpose of this document is to outline the general departmental expectations for tenure and reappointment in accordance with the appropriate University policies. It also provides an overview of HPRL’s annual faculty evaluation process and addresses other issues of importance with regard to evaluation.

II. Annual Evaluation of Faculty

A. Departmental Objective

The objective of the HPRL FEP is to provide all full-time faculty with a clear understanding of departmental expectations and annual assessments that provide critical analysis of performance, especially as it relates to progress toward tenure or promotion.

B. Annual Evaluation Procedures

As stated in PAc-30, “all returning tenured and tenure-track faculty are required to participate in the process of evaluation as specified in their departmental Faculty
Evaluation Plan.” All faculty (including tenured, tenure-track, and full-time instructors) are to be evaluated at the beginning of each calendar year, and will submit a written summary of the previous year’s activity. Records of such activities will be uploaded to Faculty 180, and it is each faculty member’s responsibility to ensure that his or her records are complete, accurate, and entered/updated in the Faculty 180 System.

Full-time instructors, pursuant to PAc-34, will be primarily assessed on their teaching, and as permitted under the PAc, are encouraged to engage in departmental service. Consistent with PAc-34 “review will be based on the relative criteria for performance expectations as defined in the departmental FEP,” but it should be noted that a positive review does not guarantee contract renewal.

C. Expectations

As described in PAc-27, evaluations of tenured and tenure-track faculty involve three components: teaching, professional achievement, and service. The nature of the appropriate mix and balance of these categories is defined by each academic unit and shall take into account the faculty member’s contractual duties and responsibilities, including any flexible workload agreements negotiated in accordance with PAc-29. The HPRL department recognizes no restrictions on the creation of the Flexible Workload Agreements beyond those specified in PAc-29. Faculty working under the terms of a Flexible Work Agreement shall be reviewed in accordance with the criteria specified therein and the general guidelines for such agreements outlined in PAc-29. Faculty who are involved in regional engagement should demonstrate how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond, and how such engagement is reflected in teaching, scholarship and service, as appropriate.

D. Measurement

1. Teaching

This category recognizes the satisfactory fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the department. Excellence in carrying out collective responsibilities includes sharing in teaching the disciplinary introductory, general education and advanced service courses and contributing to the overall excellence of upper division disciplinary courses. It also includes a pattern of availability for advising and consulting with students and colleagues, commitment to the attainment of academic goals set within the discipline, and participation in Departmental activities necessary to the maintenance of a high quality instructional program. Evidence that may be submitted to demonstrate teaching quality includes the following:

- Instructional load (number of courses, preps, and students)
University approved student evaluations (these can count for no more than 50% of one’s teaching evaluation)
• Chair evaluations of teaching (at least 1 required per year)
• Peer evaluations of teaching
• Teaching materials (For example: syllabi, sample coursework, graded student work, etc.)
• Curriculum development
• Implementation of service learning into the curriculum
• Teaching innovations
• Mentoring of undergraduate research fellows (including a summary of the frequency of meetings and level of work done by the faculty mentor)
• Mentoring of other undergraduate students on issues that may include, but should not be seen as limited to, success in the students’ chosen major, overcoming obstacles to that success, retention in classes, post-baccalaureate work (academic or professional) (include a summary of activities that indicates frequency of meetings and type of help being offered)
• Teaching awards and honors
• Evidence of effective advising activities, including holding designated office hours for drop-in student advising, attending university training sessions related to advising, advising tools, retention issues, and changes in program certification/application requirements where applicable, initiating contact with advisees concerning deadlines, courses in sequence, etc., helping them with regard to scheduling, course substitutions, etc., connecting them to Career Services to explore internship and employment opportunities, and contacting them if issues require attention (such as unprotected schedules, canceled classes, etc.)
• Results of student surveys concerning advising
• Student success in applying for graduate or law school, or law related jobs
• Directing Independent Study
• Supervising and coordinating professional internships with the private sector
• Instructional materials developed
• Faculty who are involved in regional engagement should demonstrate how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond, and how such engagement is reflected in teaching, scholarship and service, as appropriate.
• Faculty who receive course releases as part of a faculty or administrative Flexible Workload Agreement (as per Pac-29) must document the tasks agreed to by the faculty member, chair, and dean. This work will figure proportionately into the annual performance evaluation, with each 3 credit hour release counting as one-eighth of his 2013 teaching evaluation (12.5%).
• Other indicators of teaching quality

2. Professional Achievement

As defined by PAc-11, scholarship consists of
(i) establishing new understanding and knowledge
(ii) developing new technologies, methodologies, or materials,
(iii) creating or rendering artistic works, or
(iv) solving discipline-related problems or general societal problems.
(v) Scholarly products must be communicated with peers through appropriate outlets.

Given the range of disciplines in HPRL, and the variety of professional endeavors that are undertaken, variation in the nature and type of professional achievements among faculty is to be expected. The factors to evaluate professional achievement shall be weighted consistent with the unique expectations and responsibilities of the faculty member within the specific discipline. All faculty members, however, are expected to have an active record of professional activity. The activity is evaluated for the level or degree that it contributes to or enhances the discipline or profession and program. In the event of collaborative work, the faculty member should specify his or her contribution. As part of the annual evaluation process, the Advisory Committee, which includes representation from each discipline in the department, will consider the impact and significance of professional achievements. Works requiring more peer review are viewed more favorably than those requiring less peer review. Works in international or national venues are viewed more favorably than those in regional or local venues. External funding is viewed more favorably than internal funding. Published or accepted works are viewed more favorably than those that are in progress or submitted. Works can include any of the following as most relevant to the applicant's discipline:

- Publications in peer reviewed journals or legal tribunals
- Books or textbooks published and/or edited
- Legal documents/works produced in the course of a law practice by a licensed lawyer
- For practicing attorneys, continuation of good standing with the Kentucky Bar Association
- For practicing attorneys, compliance with all ethical and professional standards
- Book chapters
- Reviews (books, manuscripts, grants, journal articles, legal pleadings and documents)
- Copyrightable works including materials created for on-line courses that have been peer reviewed or approved by an outside governing board.
- Grant or other funding proposals submitted
- Successful grant or other funding proposals
- Creative projects
- Faculty who are involved in regional engagement should demonstrate how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond, and how such engagement is reflected in teaching, scholarship and service, as appropriate.
• Research studies
• Development of new programs or activities within the relevant discipline
• Leadership roles and/or participation in professional organizations
• Work Experience
• Service on editorial boards
• Conference or workshop papers/presentations/speaking engagements
• Participation in professional meetings and CLE seminars
• Works in progress
• Professional consulting
• Professional work experience (including work performed and/or reports produced inside the university to obtain or maintain special accreditation, and work and/or reports produced outside the university) that are specific to one’s field of expertise
• Professional awards/recognitions/honors
• Other indicators of professional achievement

It is noted that the faculty member has the individual responsibility to seek out campus support for such things as grant writing, research guidance, professional development opportunities and any other activity that will enhance their ability to excel in their position;

3. Service

All HPRL faculty members are expected to contribute meaningful, quality service at the department, college or university level. A basic expectation is active participation on one’s equitable share of committees at MSU in any given year, unless other valuable service (to one’s profession or to the service region, for example) replaces it. “Equitable share” will be determined by the Advisory Committee based on several factors including the faculty member’s rank, his/her level of teaching and professional achievement, and the availability of service activities. Faculty members should state their role and contribution for each committee, organization, or activity included; they should also include the frequency with which meetings were held. As part of the annual evaluation process, the Advisory Committee, which includes representation from each discipline in the department, will consider the impact and significance of service. Service includes the following:

• MSU committee assignments and level of participation
• Faculty who are involved in regional engagement should demonstrate how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond, and how such engagement is reflected in teaching, scholarship and service, as appropriate.
• Service to professional societies at the local, state, or national level.
• Work with student organizations
• Student recruitment and retention activities
• Work/service on committees/boards within professional organizations
• Miscellaneous activities related to promoting and improving the quality of life at the University and/or region
• Mentoring junior faculty
• Other service activities

E. Evaluation

Each faculty member shall be evaluated annually by the HPRL Advisory Committee, which shall consist of three HPRL faculty members, one member each from History, Philosophy, and Legal Studies. The Advisory Committee shall assign each faculty a score for annual evaluation based on the departmental rubric (See Appendix A). On the basis of these scores, the Advisory Committee shall make a recommendation for merit pay increases in accordance with university guidelines, specifically the following:

No more than the top 70% of faculty members in the unit may be assigned a merit score of 2 or 3. There is no limit on the assignment of merit scores of 1 or 0. It is possible that every faculty member in a department/school may earn a merit-based salary increase. Faculty members assigned a 0 merit score fail to meet minimum performance expectations (according to their unit FEP) and are ineligible for a salary increase.

These scores shall be forwarded to the chair, who will decide whether to accept the recommendations or to assign different scores. If faculty members wish to appeal the chair's scores, then they may request that the Appeals Committee review their annual reports, together with the chair's evaluation, and the chair will reconsider the case if the Appeals Committee recommends different scores, and will include documentation of the Appeals Committee's decision as part of the documentation of the annual review.

All faculty who have a Standing I appointment in HPRL are eligible to serve on the HPRL Advisory Committee, and all tenured and tenure-track faculty are eligible to vote. Those who are elected to the Advisory Committee are eligible to serve two consecutive terms. After two consecutive terms, however, they will not be eligible for election in the subsequent year. Those faculty who are not eligible because of term limits will once again become eligible the following year. Voting will take place at the first departmental meeting of the year.

At the same time that the Advisory Committee members are elected by members of the HPRL faculty, the faculty shall also elect through the same process three members not elected to the Advisory Committee to serve on a Department Appeals Committee, to hear appeals, if any, of HPRL faculty members related to faculty evaluations. In addition to the three standing members of the Appeals Committee, two alternate members shall be elected to serve on the Appeals Committee in the event a standing member cannot review an appeal because of a conflict. All faculty members who have a Rank I appointment in HPRL are eligible to serve (except as specified below). All tenure-track faculty in HPRL are eligible to vote. Those who are elected to the Appeals Committee are eligible to serve two consecutive terms. After two consecutive terms, however, they will not be eligible for election in the subsequent year. Those faculty
members who are not eligible because of term limits will once again become eligible the following year. Voting will take place at the first departmental meeting of the year.

As stated in PAe-2, annual evaluations for the purpose of compensation increases and tenure/promotion evaluations are separate processes. Consequently, meeting or exceeding annual evaluation criteria does not automatically ensure a favorable tenure or promotion decision, since those evaluations are based on annual performance (whereas tenure or promotion evaluations are based on cumulative performance).

III. Tenure Review

A. Minimum Expectations for Tenure

At the time of tenure review, candidates should be able to document performance consistent with at least an average score of "expected" during the probationary period in each area (teaching, professional achievement, and service) and meet the discipline-specific criteria listed below. Tenure decisions shall take into account that there are accepted differences in professional achievement and service between the disciplines, and specifically, shall recognize that the Legal Studies faculty have different and unique responsibilities and expectations from other disciplines within the department which, are in part, due to program accreditation by the American Bar Association (ABA) as well as by professional licensing and regulatory requirements mandated by the Kentucky Bar Association and Kentucky Supreme Court.

History Tenure Candidates:

A published book or one peer-reviewed work in a journal or book published with regional or national significance plus at least one of the following:

- A research grant
- Work(s) published in lesser journal
- Three presentations at state, regional or national, international professional conferences
- Significant peer-reviewed contribution to a database, textbook, or encyclopedia

Philosophy and Religion Tenure Candidates:

Faculty members are expected to make scholarly contributions to the field through conference presentations and publications. Teaching and service, no matter how excellent, cannot compensate for a deficiency in professional achievement. In particular, a minimum of three peer-reviewed, scholarly publications during the probationary period at MSU are required for tenure. The overall quality, scope, and length of all publications will be considered.

Legal Studies Tenure Candidates:
Legal Studies entails unique responsibilities within the Department because the key mission of the program is to prepare students for either a direct vocation upon graduation (paralegals) or admittance into law school. Therefore, a successful candidate for tenure will hold student and graduate success as a primary responsibility. A successful candidate will integrate his/her teaching, professional achievement (scholarship and/or practice), and service in a way that is effectively student centered and that furthers the program mission. Therefore, a successful candidate for tenure will:

- demonstrate effective teaching of up to date legal knowledge, skills, and ethics,
- evidence the candidate’s unique expertise with respect to the profession/discipline; and, demonstrate how the expertise impacts the career field and/or contributes to further the success of the program and/or its students and graduates, and
- demonstrate a commitment to Professional Service. Service shall include active participation as a member on at least two committees of the University, college, department and/or Faculty Senate ad hoc and standing committees and/or other equivalent service activities that further the University’s mission.

B. Description of the Tenure/Contract Renewal Evaluation Process and Involved Parties

For tenure-track faculty the contract renewal evaluation process is initiated when a probationary faculty member submits an annual tenure portfolio, which is reviewed by the HPRL Tenure Committee and Department Chair. The guidelines for developing the tenure portfolio and for the annual reviews are outlined in PAc-27. It is the responsibility of the candidate, the HPRL Tenure Committee members, the HPRL Department Chair, and the faculty mentor to understand and follow these procedures.

Candidates for tenure will be evaluated in accordance with the procedures and criteria outlined in PAc-27 and the timeline stated in the Personnel Action Calendar Summary provided each academic year by the Office of the Provost.

1. Departmental Tenure Committee

In accordance with PAc-27, The HPRL Tenure Committee will consist of all eligible tenured faculty members in the department. In the event there are fewer than five eligible faculty members, the department will invite enough full-time tenured faculty from the Caudill College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences to form a five-member committee. The committee will meet annually to review and evaluate the probationary/tenure-track faculty’s tenure portfolio, vote by secret ballot as to whether the candidate’s contract should be renewed and/or tenure granted, and provide a written evaluation that includes a constructive assessment of the individual’s strengths and weaknesses as well as recommendations for enhancement as they relate to each area of
evaluation. This written assessment shall be placed in the candidate’s portfolio and a copy shall be delivered to the candidate.

2. Department Chair

As stated in PAc-27, The HPRL Department Chair will review and evaluate the candidate’s portfolio. The Chair’s written assessment and recommendation will be added to the portfolio, with a copy delivered to the candidate. The HPRL Department Chair will meet with the candidate to discuss the written evaluations and recommendations after each annual probationary review.

3. Role of Faculty Mentor

Although the Department Chair and all tenured faculty within the department share in the responsibility to guide and support tenure-track faculty toward tenure, each tenure-track candidate will be assigned a Faculty Mentor, who will assume primary responsibility in assisting the candidate in understanding University policies and procedures related to teaching, advising, research, service, PBCI and the like. In addition, the mentor should provide advice and assistance in understanding tenure and promotion expectations and in the preparation of probationary review and tenure portfolios. Mentors will also aid probationary faculty in establishing an equitable level of service appropriate to their rank. Mentors should work with new faculty members to develop a five year plan in accordance with established guidelines. Faculty members who serve as mentors are responsible for documenting the degree of assistance offered to those who are up for review. This should include, but not necessarily be limited to, a summary of duties performed in the mentor role and the frequency with which the mentor and mentee met. At a minimum, faculty mentors and mentees should fill out the Summary of Faculty Mentoring Activity form. See Appendix B.

IV. Promotion Review

A. Minimum Expectations for Promotion to Professor

PAc 1 states that the rank of professor

...should be reserved for persons of proven stature in their fields. When considered for promotion to this rank, in addition to meeting the above requirements, a faculty member must have been an Associate Professor for a minimum of five years, two of which must have been at Morehead State University, and must show evidence of outstanding teaching, professional achievement, and service to the University during that period, and meet the criteria required in PAc-2.

As stated in PAc-2, candidates for promotion to the rank of professor must submit a portfolio that demonstrates a consistent pattern of outstanding teaching, professional achievement, and service since having earned tenure and meet the discipline specific criteria outlined below. Promotion decisions shall take into account that there are
accepted differences in professional achievement and service between the disciplines, and specifically, shall recognize that the Legal Studies faculty have different and unique responsibilities and expectations from other disciplines within the department which, are in part, due to program accreditation by the American Bar Association (ABA) as well as by professional licensing and regulatory requirements mandated by the Kentucky Bar Association and Kentucky Supreme Court.

History: Demonstrate a continued active and productive research agenda or continued professional achievement with publications beyond the works for which tenure was awarded. The minimum expectation is:

- A published book or
- One published peer-reviewed work in a journal or book chapter with regional, national, or international significance or
- Two published peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters with regional, state, or local significance, and two presentations at professional conferences

Philosophy and Religion:

Professional achievement appropriate for the rank of professor includes engagement in an active, continuous agenda of scholarly work. A minimum number of publications cannot be set, since a significant single work may offset lower total numbers of publications. However, the collective total during a candidate’s career should be roughly equivalent to a book (or ten peer-reviewed and published articles). The overall quality, scope, and length of all publications will be considered.

Legal Studies:

Professional Achievement shall evidence the candidate’s unique expertise with respect to the profession/discipline, and demonstrate how the expertise impacts the career field and/or contributes to further the success of the program and/or its students and graduates.

B. Promotion Review Procedures

Candidates for promotion will be evaluated by the HPRL Promotion Committee as outlined in PAc-2 and the timeline stated in the Personnel Action Calendar Summary provided each academic year by the Office of the Provost.

As stated in PAc-2, annual evaluations for the purpose of compensation increases and tenure/promotion evaluations are separate processes. Consequently, meeting or exceeding annual evaluation criteria does not automatically ensure a favorable tenure or promotion decision, since those evaluations are based on annual
performance (whereas tenure or promotion evaluations are based on cumulative performance).
V. Appendix A

Departmental Rubric

The HPRL department weighs equally all three areas of faculty evaluation, so faculty performance will be rated on a scale from 3-9 in the following way, using scores generated by the departmental rubric (see table below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Below Expected</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Above Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-8</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the HPRL Department. Evidence includes: unsatisfactory evaluations of teaching by students; unsatisfactory peer and/or chair evaluations; instructional materials that are inappropriate or not relevant for courses taught; syllabi do not include university required components; evidence that the faculty member does not fulfill expectations regarding mentoring and advising students, or a lack of evidence that he or she does meet these expectations; lack of evidence of contribution to the collective instructional responsibilities of the program and/or department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-15</td>
<td>Satisfactory fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the HPRL Department. Evidence includes: satisfactory evaluations of teaching by students; satisfactory peer and/or chair evaluations; instructional materials that are appropriate and relevant for courses taught; syllabi that include university required components; documentation that the faculty member fulfills expectations regarding mentoring and advising students; evidence of contribution to the collective instructional responsibilities of the program and/or department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>Above expected fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the HPRL Department. Evidence includes: above expected evaluations of teaching by students; above expected peer and/or chair evaluations; instructional materials that are appropriate, relevant, and up to date for courses taught; syllabi that include university required components; documentation that the faculty member exceeds expectations regarding mentoring and advising students; evidence of substantial contribution to the collective instructional responsibilities of the program and/or department; evidence of reflection upon and refinement of instructional practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Professional Achievement</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0-2 points) This category recognizes that a faculty member did not engage in professional achievement as described under “Professional Achievement” in section D.2.</td>
<td>(0-2 points) This category recognizes the failure to provide evidence of active service in the university or in his/her profession at a level appropriate for his/her rank.</td>
<td>(0-2 points) This category recognizes evidence of active service in the university or in his/her profession at a level appropriate for his/her rank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3-5 points) This category recognizes that a faculty member engaged in professional achievement as described under “Professional Achievement” in section D.2 for which there was a positive identifiable or tangible result.</td>
<td>(3-5 points) This category recognizes evidence of active service in the university beyond his/her equitable share or outstanding service in his/her profession.</td>
<td>(6-8 points) This category recognizes evidence of active service in the university beyond his/her equitable share or outstanding service in his/her profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6-8 points) This category recognizes that a faculty member engaged in professional achievement as described under “Professional Achievement” in section D.2.</td>
<td>(6-8 points) This category recognizes professional achievement as described under “Professional Achievement” in section D.2.</td>
<td>(6-8 points) This category recognizes that a faculty member engaged in professional achievement as described under “Professional Achievement” in section D.2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. Appendix B

Summary of Faculty Mentoring Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Requested by:</th>
<th>Meeting Date: ____________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Topic(s)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Timeline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Opportunities-process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note/Summary:

Our signature below acknowledge and confirms the date and content of this meeting.

_________________________________________________________________________
Faculty Mentor                                          Faculty Mentee

Date: ____________________                                Date: ____________________
Faculty Evaluation Plan

The Department of Communication, Media & Leadership Studies

Morehead State University

B. Requirements

In general, teaching should account for no more than fifty percent of a candidate’s evaluation. The proportion between scholarship and service should equal fifty percent with scholarship rated no lower than twenty percent. Neither of those should be valued at lower than ten percent. PAc-29 outlines the Flexible Workload Agreements which may cause the values to change over the course of a year depending on the requests made by the candidate. The requests for a flexible work load must fall within the parameters of Pac-29. The candidate will meet with the Department Chair each January to present his/her plan for the upcoming calendar year in Teaching, Scholarship and Service. The values from the three areas, chosen from the sliding scales, should always sum up to one hundred percent. The candidate and department chair must agree to the Pac-29 requests on behalf of the candidate and agree to a final understanding as to how said requests will affect the candidate’s yearly evaluation process.

1. Teaching

The portfolio must include all the evidence requested in the appropriate PAc in order to offer clear evidence of teaching effectiveness. Some documentation may provide strong evidence, but the overall documentation will determine the candidate’s teaching effectiveness. Peer review of teaching effectiveness must occur once a semester in the first two years of the probationary period and once a year from there on. The peer reviewer will supply a written document citing strengths and weaknesses to be included in the portfolio. The candidate is also encouraged to attend appropriate workshops on teaching and advising. Candidates may include evidence (e.g. log, etc.) of advising sessions with students. The candidate must include a written statement of his/her teaching philosophy and practice in the portfolio.

For a favorable rehiring, tenure or promotion decision, the Departmental Tenure Committee must be convinced that the candidate is an effective teacher based on holistic evidence presented. Candidates may include additional evidence in their portfolio not listed in the appropriate PAc’s. However, the evidence is to be only for the years the candidate has been employed with MSU. For tenure consideration, the candidate must be ranked “Above Expectations” based on the overall teaching documentation in the portfolio.

1. To progress at each level of review, TEACHING must be rated as follows:

   a) Reappointment (1st 2 years): at expectations

   b) Reappointment (yrs 3, 4, 5) above expectations
b) Tenure: above expectations  
c) Promotion: above expectations  
d) Performance-based salary increase: above expectations

2. AT EXPECTATIONS IN TEACHING

Evidence to document that a faculty member is “AT EXPECTATIONS IN TEACHING” should establish that

- the faculty member is an effective teacher
- course designs have reasonable potential to help students learn effectively
- teaching is implemented in a manner that is effective and consistent

To be judged “AT EXPECTATIONS IN TEACHING,” a faculty member must provide evidence of satisfactorily achieving all 10 of these basic indicators of effective teaching:

___ syllabi for all courses conform with the University checklist and include student learning outcomes (SLOs)  
___ assignments are appropriate for the course content, purpose, level and SLOs  
___ student work is evaluated on the basis of clearly communicated criteria  
___ assignments are graded and returned in a timely manner, and with helpful feedback  
___ courses are designed or redesigned to meet the needs of our students and the curricular needs of the program  
___ student and peer evaluations of teaching are at least “average”  
___ courses are consistently met as scheduled, and there is regular communication with online students  
___ data for assessing SLOs is collected, archived and tabulated as requested  
___ instructor is available during stated office hours or by other means, and responds to students in a timely manner  
___ instructor participates in at least one professional development opportunity that promotes teaching effectiveness

3. ABOVE EXPECTATIONS IN TEACHING

To be judged “ABOVE EXPECTATIONS IN TEACHING,” a faculty member must achieve all 10 of the basic indicators AND present evidence of success in achieving at least 5 of these advanced indicators of effective teaching:
___ evidence of a continuing effort to improve one’s course design and implementation.
___ assignments that reflect creative and appropriate adaptation to the course level and purpose
___ community-based service-learning is integrated into course
___ the course incorporates effective use of instructional technology
___ new courses or course redesigns are prepared and submitted through the Type II review process
___ students are engaged in learning through various teaching strategies
___ student evaluations are consistently well above average
___ SLOs are consistently being met
___ peer review and recognition affirm that exemplary course implementation has occurred. (This may include teaching awards, well received conference presentations, peer reviewed journal articles, and other statements of pedagogical considerations regarding course implementation.)
___ students are mentored beyond the classroom through conferences, presentations, theses, directed studies, creative productions, research work, and/or engagement fellowships, service-learning projects, field trips, discipline-specific student organizations, and other activities.

4. BELOW EXPECTATIONS IN TEACHING

To be judged “BELOW EXPECTATIONS IN TEACHING,” a faculty member must fail to show satisfactory evidence of achieving the 10 basic indicators

MOREHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY
School of Music, Theatre and Dance

C. Expectations

As described in PAc-27, evaluations of tenured and tenure-track faculty involve three components: teaching, professional achievement, and service. The nature of the appropriate mix and balance of these categories is defined by each academic unit and shall take into account the faculty member’s contractual duties and responsibilities, including any flexible workload agreements negotiated in accordance with PAc-29. The Department of MTD has determined that
teaching will make up 50% of the evaluation with the balance divided between professional achievement and service. This division of professional achievement and service will be divided equally unless the faculty member and chair agree to a different balance at the beginning of the academic year. This balance may not go below 15% or above 35% in any one area for the year. Changes in the balance of percentages must be agreed to by both the faculty member and the chair. The faculty member will have no more than one semester prior to the start of next annual evaluation period to revise percentages. For promotion and tenure the faculty member should demonstrate sustained achievement in professional achievement and service. The MTD department recognizes no restrictions on the creation of the Flexible Workload Agreements beyond those specified in PAc-29. Faculty working under the terms of a Flexible Work Agreement shall be reviewed in accordance with the criteria specified therein and the general guidelines for such agreements outlined in PAc-29. All documentation of FWA must be included in the portfolio for reference.

1. **Teaching**

The chair and faculty member through analysis of data from peer/chair reviews, student evaluations, and items from the lists below pertinent to the teaching area, will review teaching performance. This review will take into account the scope and depth of the teaching activities through both quantitative and qualitative aspects. It will be the faculty member’s responsibility to provide clarity on the scope and depth of teaching activity. The FEP data analysis instrument devised by the chair will be used to in this analysis (see appendix I). The chair and faculty member will meet each year to discuss the data and analysis to guide future teaching.

Regardless of primary discipline, all faculty members are expected to:

1. Participate in the public schools as a mentor, clinician, etc.
2. Pursue the scholarship of teaching and learning.
3. Demonstrates effective use of technology in one’s teaching methods (providing the technology is available for use).
4. Make every effort to retain current students and guide the development of their performance ability.
a. All faculty members are expected to:

1. Distribute syllabi that include required university components during the first week of classes.
2. Teach all classes/lessons/ensembles as assigned by the Department Chair, meet them as scheduled in the Schedule of Classes, and begin and end them on time within the requirements of the appropriate teaching workload.
3. Adhere to the University Final Examination Schedule.
4. Provide for a substitute teacher, make-up lessons, and/or alternative assignment when professional activities necessitate the faculty member’s absence. The Department Chair must approve this absence.
5. Post and honor “office hours”
6. Attend Fall and Spring Commencements unless excused by the Chair.
7. Submit all midterm and final grades as required by the University.
8. Submit a copy of all final exams, if applicable, to the Department Office.
9. Use appropriate university approved teaching evaluation instruments as required by the department and university to allow for student input and evidence of teaching effectiveness, i.e., IDEA, department evaluation form. The student review accounts for no more than 50% of the teaching evaluation.
10. One annual Peer and one annual Chair (or representative approved by Chair) evaluation of teaching are required for tenure-track faculty. Peer and Chair (or representative approved by Chair) will submit teaching observations listing strengths and areas for improvement to the faculty member. Peer evaluations will be completed by tenured faculty. It is the responsibility of the tenure-track faculty member to identify the evaluator to complete the review.
11. Carry out the role of an advisor as appropriate, including: holding designated office hours for drop-in student advising, attending university training sessions related to advising, advising tools, retention issues, and changes in program certification/application requirements where applicable; initiating contact with advisees concerning deadlines, courses in sequence, etc., helping them with regard to scheduling, course substitutions, etc., and contacting them if issues require attention (such as unprotected schedules, canceled classes, etc.).
12. Serve on graduate oral exam committees (where applicable).
b. In addition to the above (C., 1., a.), apply the criteria below that best pertain to each individual faculty member’s area(s) of expertise:

(1) **Classroom.** Each faculty member is expected to:
   (a) Conduct class in an organized, efficient, and professional manner.
   (b) Grade and return assignments and examinations in a timely manner.
   (c) Stay current within his or her discipline.
   (d) Integrate, if possible, current trends, issues, and research regarding the discipline into the content of courses.
   (e) Maintain proper university formatting in all syllabi.

(2) **Music and/or Theatre Education.** Each faculty member is expected to:
   (a) Stay informed of local, state, and national issues relating to music and/or theatre education, and to disseminate this information to faculty and students.
   (b) Integrate, if possible, current trends, issues, and research into the content of music and theatre education courses.
   (c) Conduct class in an organized, efficient, and professional manner.
   (d) Grade and return assignments and examinations in a timely manner.
   (e) Maintain proper university formatting in all syllabi.

(3) **Applied Music.** Each faculty member is expected to:
   (a) Give each student the opportunity to have fourteen lessons per semester.
   (b) Conduct the lesson in an organized, efficient, and professional manner.
   (c) Keep students informed about their progress and academic standing in the course.
   (d) Participate in the final examination process (juries).
   (e) Stay current within his or her discipline.
   (f) Integrate, if possible, current trends, issues, and research regarding the discipline into the content of courses.
   (g) Maintain proper university formatting in all syllabi.

(4) **Music and Dance Ensembles.** Each faculty member is expected to:
   (a) Demonstrate effective rehearsal technique and conduct all rehearsals in an organized, efficient, and professional manner.
(b) Stay current within his or her discipline.
(c) Integrate, if possible, current trends, issues, and research regarding the discipline into the content of courses.
(d) Maintain proper university formatting in all syllabi.
(e) Present one formal on-campus concert per semester per ensemble.

(5) **Theatre and Dance.** Each faculty member is expected to:
   (a) Conduct class in an organized, efficient, and professional manner.
   (b) Grade and return assignments and examinations in a timely manner.
   (c) Stay current within his or her discipline.
   (d) Integrate, if possible, current trends, issues, and research regarding the discipline into the content of courses.
   (e) Maintain cleanliness in all shops, labs, and rehearsal spaces.
   (f) Teach safe practices when students are using equipment in shops.
   (g) Teach safe practices when students are involved in physical activity such as dancing and stage combat in classes and/or rehearsals.
   (h) Maintain proper university formatting in all syllabi.

c. All faculty members are encouraged to participate in teaching activities above the "expected" level of performance. The following activities are suggestions to be considered “outstanding”, which may strengthen the portfolio (provided they are not “expected” requirements within a specialty area). “Meritorious” ratings result from consistent excellence in multiple areas on this list or particularly prominent teaching achievements. This list is not comprehensive, and in no way limits other activities from being included that are considered outstanding.

   (1) Participate extensively in the public schools as a mentor, clinician, etc.
   (2) Pursue the scholarship of teaching and learning through extensive activity (research, workshops, etc).
   (3) Become involved in distance learning.
   (4) Take part in interdisciplinary collaboration.
   (5) Create new courses, significantly revise existing courses, develop curricular changes including online instruction and delivery.
   (6) Show evidence of student participation in solo competitions, ensembles, professional workshops, or professional auditions.
   (7) Show evidence of additional student performances (i.e. extra ensemble performances, extra solo performances, etc.).
(8) Receive a teaching-related grant.
(9) Receive a significant teaching award.
(10) Present expertise in a class taught by another faculty member. (11) Integrate service learning into the curriculum.
(12) Serve as faculty mentor for student Research/Creative Fellows. (13) Direct independent study.
(14) Serve as Event Managers for guest artists and ensembles. (15) Develop instructional materials.
(16) Receive acknowledgement for outstanding student work or accomplishments.
(17) Teach an uncompensated overload.
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APPENDIX A: TEACHING EVALUATION CRITERIA:

1. Evidence of successful learning outcomes
   a. Qualifying factors
      (I) Credit hours/ load
(II) Reassigned time
(III) Number of times courses taught
(IV) Number of preparations
(V) Number of students taught
   (A) Titled course enrollments
   (B) Independent students
   (C) Graduate students
(VI) Management
   (A) Ordering of supplies
   (B) Repair and maintenance of equipment and labs
   (C) Training of workshop students or models

b. Student evaluations of teaching
   (I) University recommended questionnaires
   (II) Departmentally drafted and approved questionnaires
   (III) Applicant initiated and drafted questionnaires

c. Student work
   (I) Exhibitions
      (A) Sophomore Show
      (B) Senior Show
      (C) Art Building displays
   (II) Slide or electronic reproductions
   (III) Papers, projects and/or demonstrations
   (IV) Other student achievements and honors

2. Documentation of successful teaching methods
   a. Curricular
      (I) Required basic Instruction support materials
         (A) Syllabi
         (B) Assignments/Projects
      (II) Supplements
      (III) Slides, Videos, etc.
      (IV) Multi-media Presentations
      (V) Computer Technologies
      (VI) Field Trips or Field Experiences
      (VII) Taking classes to work on location
      (VIII) Initiation and organization of visits by speakers and presenters
      (IX) Innovative teaching techniques
(X) Use of library resources in support of class assignments, including in conjunction with the CCL library liaison
(XI) Peer and/or Chair Review
(XII) Other

b. Non-curricular
   (I) Graduate advising: Advisors must achieve overall positive student evaluations or improvement in evaluations on the College Quality of Advisement form.
   (II) Supervision of apprenticeships and internships
   (III) Direction of theses
   (IV) Direction of exhibitions
   (V) Direction of independent studies
   (VI) Supervising of student fieldwork
   (VII) Supervising of student teachers
   (VIII) Evaluation of Graduate Student Admission Portfolios
   (IX) Other

c. Required student contact activities
   (I) Undergraduate advising: Advisors must achieve overall positive student evaluations or improvement in evaluations on the College Quality of Advisement form.
   (II) Service on Graduate Pre-Oral and Oral Examination committees

3. Additional evidence of successful teaching
   a. On-going research and retraining to remain current in field
   b. New courses and programs developed and the improvement of existing courses and programs (Type II, III, IV and/or V).
   c. Teaching awards and honors d.
   Other
I. Introduction

A. Philosophy

Faculty members have an important responsibility in providing evaluations of peers for contract renewal, tenure review, and promotion. In the limited manner prescribed in this document, they have a similar role in evaluating peers for Performance Based Compensation Increase (PBCI). University policy describes this responsibility as “the application of academic and professional judgments in a framework of shared authority among various levels of review and between faculty and academic administrators” (PAc-2, PAc-27). Faculty members in the department of History, Philosophy, Religion, and Legal Studies (HPRL) view teaching, professional achievement, and service in light of the standards and perspectives of their separate disciplines. The provisions of this document reflect that diversity.

In accordance with University policies, we seek to recognize and reward continual faculty development and excellence in teaching, professional achievement, and service. This will be accomplished through the evaluation processes related to tenure and reappointment, promotion, and annual evaluation.

B. Purpose

The purpose of this document is to outline the general departmental expectations for tenure and reappointment in accordance with the appropriate University policies. It also provides an overview of HPRL’s annual faculty evaluation process and addresses other issues of importance with regard to evaluation.

II. Annual Evaluation of Faculty

A. Departmental Objective

The objective of the HPRL FEP is to provide all full-time faculty with a clear understanding of departmental expectations and annual assessments that provide critical analysis of performance, especially as it relates to progress toward tenure or promotion.

B. Annual Evaluation Procedures

As stated in PAc-30, “all returning tenured and tenure-track faculty are required to participate in the process of evaluation as specified in their departmental Faculty
Evaluation Plan.” All faculty (including tenured, tenure-track, and full-time instructors) are to be evaluated at the beginning of each calendar year, and will submit a written summary of the previous year’s activity. Records of such activities will be uploaded to Faculty 180, and it is each faculty member’s responsibility to ensure that his or her records are complete, accurate, and entered/updated in the Faculty 180 System.

Full-time instructors, pursuant to PAc-34, will be primarily assessed on their teaching, and as permitted under the PAc, are encouraged to engage in departmental service. Consistent with Pac-34 “review will be based on the relative criteria for performance expectations as defined in the departmental FEP,” but it should be noted that a positive review does not guarantee contract renewal.

C. Expectations

As described in PAc-27, evaluations of tenured and tenure-track faculty involve three components: teaching, professional achievement, and service. The nature of the appropriate mix and balance of these categories is defined by each academic unit and shall take into account the faculty member’s contractual duties and responsibilities, including any flexible workload agreements negotiated in accordance with PAc-29. The HPRL department recognizes no restrictions on the creation of the Flexible Workload Agreements beyond those specified in PAc-29. Faculty working under the terms of a Flexible Work Agreement shall be reviewed in accordance with the criteria specified therein and the general guidelines for such agreements outlined in PAc-29. Faculty who are involved in regional engagement should demonstrate how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond, and how such engagement is reflected in teaching, scholarship and service, as appropriate.

D. Measurement

1. Teaching

This category recognizes the satisfactory fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the department. Excellence in carrying out collective responsibilities includes sharing in teaching the disciplinary introductory, general education and advanced service courses and contributing to the overall excellence of upper division disciplinary courses. It also includes a pattern of availability for advising and consulting with students and colleagues, commitment to the attainment of academic goals set within the discipline, and participation in Departmental activities necessary to the maintenance of a high quality instructional program. Evidence that may be submitted to demonstrate teaching quality includes the following:

- Instructional load (number of courses, preps, and students)
• University approved student evaluations (these can count for no more than 50% of one’s teaching evaluation)
• Chair evaluations of teaching (at least 1 required per year)
• Peer evaluations of teaching
• Teaching materials (For example: syllabi, sample coursework, graded student work, etc.)
• Curriculum development
• Implementation of service learning into the curriculum
• Teaching innovations
• Mentoring of undergraduate research fellows (including a summary of the frequency of meetings and level of work done by the faculty mentor)
• Mentoring of other undergraduate students on issues that may include, but should not be seen as limited to, success in the students’ chosen major, overcoming obstacles to that success, retention in classes, post-baccalaureate work (academic or professional) (include a summary of activities that indicates frequency of meetings and type of help being offered)
• Teaching awards and honors
• Evidence of effective advising activities, including holding designated office hours for drop-in student advising, attending university training sessions related to advising, advising tools, retention issues, and changes in program certification/application requirements where applicable, initiating contact with advisees concerning deadlines, courses in sequence, etc., helping them with regard to scheduling, course substitutions, etc., connecting them to Career Services to explore internship and employment opportunities, and contacting them if issues require attention (such as unprotected schedules, canceled classes, etc.)
• Results of student surveys concerning advising
• Student success in applying for graduate or law school, or law related jobs
• Directing Independent Study
• Supervising and coordinating professional internships with the private sector
• Instructional materials developed
• Faculty who are involved in regional engagement should demonstrate how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond, and how such engagement is reflected in teaching, scholarship and service, as appropriate.
• Faculty who receive course releases as part of a faculty or administrative Flexible Workload Agreement (as per Pac-29) must document the tasks agreed to by the faculty member, chair, and dean. This work will figure proportionately into the annual performance evaluation, with each 3 credit hour release counting as one-eighth of his 2013 teaching evaluation (12.5%).
• Other indicators of teaching quality

2. Professional Achievement

As defined by PAc-11, scholarship consists of
(i) establishing new understanding and knowledge
(ii) developing new technologies, methodologies, or materials,
(iii) creating or rendering artistic works, or
(iv) solving discipline-related problems or general societal problems.
(v) Scholarly products must be communicated with peers through appropriate outlets.

Given the range of disciplines in HPRL, and the variety of professional endeavors that are undertaken, variation in the nature and type of professional achievements among faculty is to be expected. The factors to evaluate professional achievement shall be weighted consistent with the unique expectations and responsibilities of the faculty member within the specific discipline. All faculty members, however, are expected to have an active record of professional activity. The activity is evaluated for the level or degree that it contributes to or enhances the discipline or profession and program. In the event of collaborative work, the faculty member should specify his or her contribution. As part of the annual evaluation process, the Advisory Committee, which includes representation from each discipline in the department, will consider the impact and significance of professional achievements. Works requiring more peer review are viewed more favorably than those requiring less peer review. Works in international or national venues are viewed more favorably than those in regional or local venues. External funding is viewed more favorably than internal funding. Published or accepted works are viewed more favorably than those that are in progress or submitted. Works can include any of the following as most relevant to the applicant’s discipline:

- Publications in peer reviewed journals or legal tribunals
- Books or textbooks published and/or edited
- Legal documents/works produced in the course of a law practice by a licensed lawyer
- For practicing attorneys, continuation of good standing with the Kentucky Bar Association
- For practicing attorneys, compliance with all ethical and professional standards
- Book chapters
- Reviews (books, manuscripts, grants, journal articles, legal pleadings and documents)
- Copyrightable works including materials created for on-line courses that have been peer reviewed or approved by an outside governing board.
- Grant or other funding proposals submitted
- Successful grant or other funding proposals
- Creative projects
- Faculty who are involved in regional engagement should demonstrate how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond, and how such engagement is reflected in teaching, scholarship and service, as appropriate.
• Research studies
• Development of new programs or activities within the relevant discipline
• Leadership roles and/or participation in professional organizations
• Work Experience
• Service on editorial boards
• Conference or workshop papers/presentations/speaking engagements
• Participation in professional meetings and CLE seminars
• Works in progress
• Professional consulting
• Professional work experience (including work performed and/or reports produced inside the university to obtain or maintain special accreditation, and work and/or reports produced outside the university) that are specific to one’s field of expertise
• Professional awards/recognitions/honors
• Other indicators of professional achievement

It is noted that the faculty member has the individual responsibility to seek out campus support for such things as grant writing, research guidance, professional development opportunities and any other activity that will enhance their ability to excel in their position;

3. Service

All HPRL faculty members are expected to contribute meaningful, quality service at the department, college or university level. A basic expectation is active participation on one’s equitable share of committees at MSU in any given year, unless other valuable service (to one’s profession or to the service region, for example) replaces it. “Equitable share” will be determined by the Advisory Committee based on several factors including the faculty member’s rank, his/her level of teaching and professional achievement, and the availability of service activities. Faculty members should state their role and contribution for each committee, organization, or activity included; they should also include the frequency with which meetings were held. As part of the annual evaluation process, the Advisory Committee, which includes representation from each discipline in the department, will consider the impact and significance of service. Service includes the following:

• MSU committee assignments and level of participation
• Faculty who are involved in regional engagement should demonstrate how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond, and how such engagement is reflected in teaching, scholarship and service, as appropriate.
• Service to professional societies at the local, state, or national level.
• Work with student organizations
• Student recruitment and retention activities
• Work/service on committees/boards within professional organizations
• Miscellaneous activities related to promoting and improving the quality of life at the University and/or region
• Mentoring junior faculty
• Other service activities

E. Evaluation

Each faculty member shall be evaluated annually by the HPRL Advisory Committee, which shall consist of three HPRL faculty members, one member each from History, Philosophy, and Legal Studies. The Advisory Committee shall assign each faculty a score for annual evaluation based on the departmental rubric (See Appendix A). On the basis of these scores, the Advisory Committee shall make a recommendation for merit pay increases in accordance with university guidelines, specifically the following:

No more than the top 70% of faculty members in the unit may be assigned a merit score of 2 or 3. There is no limit on the assignment of merit scores of 1 or 0. It is possible that every faculty member in a department/school may earn a merit-based salary increase. Faculty members assigned a 0 merit score fail to meet minimum performance expectations (according to their unit FEP) and are ineligible for a salary increase.

These scores shall be forwarded to the chair, who will decide whether to accept the recommendations or to assign different scores. If faculty members wish to appeal the chair's scores, then they may request that the Appeals Committee review their annual reports, together with the chair's evaluation, and the chair will reconsider the case if the Appeals Committee recommends different scores, and will include documentation of the Appeals Committee's decision as part of the documentation of the annual review.

All faculty who have a Standing I appointment in HPRL are eligible to serve on the HPRL Advisory Committee, and all tenured and tenure-track faculty are eligible to vote. Those who are elected to the Advisory Committee are eligible to serve two consecutive terms. After two consecutive terms, however, they will not be eligible for election in the subsequent year. Those faculty who are not eligible because of term limits will once again become eligible the following year. Voting will take place at the first departmental meeting of the year.

At the same time that the Advisory Committee members are elected by members of the HPRL faculty, the faculty shall also elect through the same process three members not elected to the Advisory Committee to serve on a Department Appeals Committee, to hear appeals, if any, of HPRL faculty members related to faculty evaluations. In addition to the three standing members of the Appeals Committee, two alternate members shall be elected to serve on the Appeals Committee in the event a standing member cannot review an appeal because of a conflict. All faculty members who have a Rank I appointment in HPRL are eligible to serve (except as specified below). All tenure-track faculty in HPRL are eligible to vote. Those who are elected to the Appeals Committee are eligible to serve two consecutive terms. After two consecutive terms, however, they will not be eligible for election in the subsequent year. Those faculty
members who are not eligible because of term limits will once again become eligible the following year. Voting will take place at the first departmental meeting of the year.

As stated in PAc-2, annual evaluations for the purpose of compensation increases and tenure/ promotion evaluations are separate processes. Consequently, meeting or exceeding annual evaluation criteria does not automatically ensure a favorable tenure or promotion decision, since those evaluations are based on annual performance (whereas tenure or promotion evaluations are based on cumulative performance).

III. Tenure Review

A. Minimum Expectations for Tenure

At the time of tenure review, candidates should be able to document performance consistent with at least an average score of “expected” during the probationary period in each area (teaching, professional achievement, and service) and meet the discipline- specific criteria listed below. Tenure decisions shall take into account that there are accepted differences in professional achievement and service between the disciplines, and specifically, shall recognize that the Legal Studies faculty have different and unique responsibilities and expectations from other disciplines within the department which, are in part, due to program accreditation by the American Bar Association (ABA) as well as by professional licensing and regulatory requirements mandated by the Kentucky Bar Association and Kentucky Supreme Court.

History Tenure Candidates:

A published book or one peer-reviewed work in a journal or book published with regional or national significance plus at least one of the following:

- A research grant
- Work(s) published in lesser journal
- Three presentations at state, regional or national, international professional conferences
- Significant peer-reviewed contribution to a database, textbook, or encyclopedia

Philosophy and Religion Tenure Candidates:

Faculty members are expected to make scholarly contributions to the field through conference presentations and publications. Teaching and service, no matter how excellent, cannot compensate for a deficiency in professional achievement. In particular, a minimum of three peer-reviewed, scholarly publications during the probationary period at MSU are required for tenure. The overall quality, scope, and length of all publications will be considered.

Legal Studies Tenure Candidates:
Legal Studies entails unique responsibilities within the Department because the key mission of the program is to prepare students for either a direct vocation upon graduation (paralegals) or admittance into law school. Therefore, a successful candidate for tenure will hold student and graduate success as a primary responsibility. A successful candidate will integrate his/her teaching, professional achievement (scholarship and/or practice), and service in a way that is effectively student centered and that furthers the program mission. Therefore, a successful candidate for tenure will:

- demonstrate effective teaching of up to date legal knowledge, skills, and ethics,
- evidence the candidate’s unique expertise with respect to the profession/discipline; and, demonstrate how the expertise impacts the career field and/or contributes to further the success of the program and/or its students and graduates, and
- demonstrate a commitment to Professional Service. Service shall include active participation as a member on at least two committees of the University, college, department and/or Faculty Senate ad hoc and standing committees and/or other equivalent service activities that further the University’s mission.

B. Description of the Tenure/Contract Renewal Evaluation Process and Involved Parties

For tenure-track faculty the contract renewal evaluation process is initiated when a probationary faculty member submits an annual tenure portfolio, which is reviewed by the HPRL Tenure Committee and Department Chair. The guidelines for developing the tenure portfolio and for the annual reviews are outlined in PAc-27. It is the responsibility of the candidate, the HPRL Tenure Committee members, the HPRL Department Chair, and the faculty mentor to understand and follow these procedures.

Candidates for tenure will be evaluated in accordance with the procedures and criteria outlined in PAc-27 and the timeline stated in the Personnel Action Calendar Summary provided each academic year by the Office of the Provost.

1. Departmental Tenure Committee

In accordance with PAc-27, The HPRL Tenure Committee will consist of all eligible tenured faculty members in the department. In the event there are fewer than five eligible faculty members, the department will invite enough full-time tenured faculty from the Caudill College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences to form a five-member committee. The committee will meet annually to review and evaluate the probationary/tenure-track faculty’s tenure portfolio, vote by secret ballot as to whether the candidate’s contract should be renewed and/or tenure granted, and provide a written evaluation that includes a constructive assessment of the individual’s strengths and weaknesses as well as recommendations for enhancement as they relate to each area of
evaluation. This written assessment shall be placed in the candidate’s portfolio and a copy shall be delivered to the candidate.

2. Department Chair

As stated in PAc-27, The HPRL Department Chair will review and evaluate the candidate’s portfolio. The Chair’s written assessment and recommendation will be added to the portfolio, with a copy delivered to the candidate. The HPRL Department Chair will meet with the candidate to discuss the written evaluations and recommendations after each annual probationary review.

3. Role of Faculty Mentor

Although the Department Chair and all tenured faculty within the department share in the responsibility to guide and support tenure-track faculty toward tenure, each tenure-track candidate will be assigned a Faculty Mentor, who will assume primary responsibility in assisting the candidate in understanding University policies and procedures related to teaching, advising, research, service, PBC1 and the like. In addition, the mentor should provide advice and assistance in understanding tenure and promotion expectations and in the preparation of probationary review and tenure portfolios. Mentors will also aid probationary faculty in establishing an equitable level of service appropriate to their rank. Mentors should work with new faculty members to develop a five year plan in accordance with established guidelines. Faculty members who serve as mentors are responsible for documenting the degree of assistance offered to those who are up for review. This should include, but not necessarily be limited to, a summary of duties performed in the mentor role and the frequency with which the mentor and mentee met. At a minimum, faculty mentors and mentees should fill out the Summary of Faculty Mentoring Activity form. See Appendix B.

IV. Promotion Review

A. Minimum Expectations for Promotion to Professor

PAc 1 states that the rank of professor

…should be reserved for persons of proven stature in their fields. When considered for promotion to this rank, in addition to meeting the above requirements, a faculty member must have been an Associate Professor for a minimum of five years, two of which must have been at Morehead State University, and must show evidence of outstanding teaching, professional achievement, and service to the University during that period, and meet the criteria required in PAc-2.

As stated in PAc-2, candidates for promotion to the rank of professor must submit a portfolio that demonstrates a consistent pattern of outstanding teaching, professional achievement, and service since having earned tenure and meet the discipline specific criteria outlined below. Promotion decisions shall take into account that there are
accepted differences in professional achievement and service between the disciplines, and specifically, shall recognize that the Legal Studies faculty have different and unique responsibilities and expectations from other disciplines within the department which, are in part, due to program accreditation by the American Bar Association (ABA) as well as by professional licensing and regulatory requirements mandated by the Kentucky Bar Association and Kentucky Supreme Court.

History: Demonstrate a continued active and productive research agenda or continued professional achievement with publications beyond the works for which tenure was awarded. The minimum expectation is:

- A published book or
- One published peer-reviewed work in a journal or book chapter with regional, national, or international significance or
- Two published peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters with regional, state, or local significance, and two presentations at professional conferences

Philosophy and Religion:

Professional achievement appropriate for the rank of professor includes engagement in an active, continuous agenda of scholarly work. A minimum number of publications cannot be set, since a significant single work may offset lower total numbers of publications. However, the collective total during a candidate’s career should be roughly equivalent to a book (or ten peer-reviewed and published articles). The overall quality, scope, and length of all publications will be considered.

Legal Studies:

Professional Achievement shall evidence the candidate’s unique expertise with respect to the profession/discipline, and demonstrate how the expertise impacts the career field and/or contributes to further the success of the program and/or its students and graduates.

B. Promotion Review Procedures

Candidates for promotion will be evaluated by the HPRL Promotion Committee as outlined in PAc-2 and the timeline stated in the Personnel Action Calendar Summary provided each academic year by the Office of the Provost.

As stated in PAc-2, annual evaluations for the purpose of compensation increases and tenure/promotion evaluations are separate processes. Consequently, meeting or exceeding annual evaluation criteria does not automatically ensure a favorable tenure or promotion decision, since those evaluations are based on annual
performance (whereas tenure or promotion evaluations are based on cumulative performance).
V. Appendix A

Departmental Rubric

The HPRL department weighs equally all three areas of faculty evaluation, so faculty performance will be rated on a scale from 3-9 in the following way, using scores generated by the departmental rubric (see table below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-8 points</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-15 points</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24 points</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Below Expected</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Above Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>(0-2 points) This category recognizes unsatisfactory fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the HPRL Department. Evidence includes (but is not limited to):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• unsatisfactory evaluations of teaching by students</td>
<td>(3-5 points) This category recognizes satisfactory fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the HPRL Department. Evidence includes (but is not limited to):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• unsatisfactory peer and/or chair evaluations</td>
<td>• satisfactory evaluations of teaching by students</td>
<td>(6-8 points) This category recognizes above expected fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the HPRL Department. Evidence includes (but is not limited to):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• instructional materials that are inappropriate or not relevant for courses taught</td>
<td>• satisfactory peer and/or chair evaluations</td>
<td>• above expected evaluations of teaching by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• syllabi do not include university required components</td>
<td>• instructional materials that are appropriate and relevant for courses taught</td>
<td>• above expected peer and/or chair evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• evidence that the faculty member does not fulfill expectations regarding mentoring and advising students, or a lack of evidence that he or she does meet these expectations</td>
<td>• syllabi that include university required components</td>
<td>• instructional materials that are appropriate, relevant, and up to date for courses taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• lack of evidence of contribution to the collective instructional responsibilities of the program and/or department</td>
<td>• documentation that the faculty member fulfills expectations regarding mentoring and advising students</td>
<td>• syllabi that include university required components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• evidence of contribution to the collective instructional responsibilities of the program and/or department</td>
<td>• documentation that the faculty member exceeds expectations regarding mentoring and advising students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• evidence of reflection upon and refinement of instructional practices</td>
<td>• evidence of substantial contribution to the collective instructional responsibilities of the program and/or department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Achievement</td>
<td>(0-2 points) This category recognizes that a faculty member did not engage in professional achievement as described under “Professional Achievement” in section D.2.</td>
<td>(3-5 points) This category recognizes that a faculty member engaged in professional achievement as described under “Professional Achievement” in section D.2.</td>
<td>(6-8 points) This category recognizes that a faculty member engaged in professional achievement as described under “Professional Achievement” in section D.2 for which there was a positive identifiable or tangible result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>(0-2 points) This category recognizes the failure to provide evidence of active service in the university or in his/her profession at a level appropriate for his/her rank.</td>
<td>(3-5 points) This category recognizes evidence of active service in the university or in his/her profession at a level appropriate for his/her rank.</td>
<td>(6-8 points) This category recognizes evidence of active service in the university beyond his/her equitable share or outstanding service in his/her profession.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I. Introduction

A. Philosophy

The Morehead State University Department of Music is dedicated to providing the highest quality of teaching to its students. The professional growth of a faculty member in the Department of Music Theatre and Dance is evidenced through the areas of teaching, professional achievement (creative/scholarly activity), and service. This plan of systematic review of all faculty in the Department of Music, Theatre, and Dance will help to provide a method to evaluate faculty development.

Faculty members have an important role in providing peer evaluation for contract renewal, tenure review, promotion and Performance Based Compensation Increase (PBCI). University policy describes this role as “the application of academic and professional judgments in a framework of shared authority among various levels of review and between faculty and academic administrators” (PAc-2, PAc-27). Faculty members in the Department of Music, Theatre, and Dance (MTD) view teaching, professional achievement, and service by the standards and perspectives of their separate disciplines.

In accordance with University policies, we seek to recognize and reward continual faculty development and excellence in teaching, professional achievement, and service. This will be accomplished through the evaluation processes related to tenure and reappointment, promotion, and annual evaluation.

B. Purpose

The purpose of this plan is to provide the fair and equitable annual evaluation of all Department of Music, Theatre, and Dance faculty to ensure that the self-imposed standards in the areas of teaching, professional achievement (creative/scholarly activity), and service are being attained and maintained at the highest levels. This plan will be utilized in the following review activities: annual tenure review, annual reappointment review, tenure consideration, promotion...
consideration, and annual Performance-Based Compensation Increase review. It is the intent of this plan to be consistent with all Morehead State University policies.

II. Annual Evaluation of Faculty

A. Departmental Objective

The objective of the MTD FEP is to provide all full-time faculty with a clear understanding of departmental expectations and annual assessments that provide critical analysis of performance, especially as it relates to progress toward tenure or promotion.

B. Annual Evaluation Procedures

As stated in PAc-30, “all returning tenured and tenure-track faculty are required to participate in the process of evaluation as specified in their departmental Faculty Evaluation Plan.” All faculty (including tenured, tenure-track, and full-time instructors) are to be evaluated at the beginning of each calendar year, and will submit a written summary of the previous year’s activity. Records of such activities will be uploaded to Faculty 180, and it is each faculty member’s responsibility to ensure that his or her records are complete, accurate, and entered/updated in the Faculty 180 System. All faculty members must submit an additional document of no longer than two pages, 12 point font, detailing all meritorious work above the expected level in addition to the usual documents. No faculty member may receive the highest merit score who has not been rated “Above Expected” in all three areas (Teaching, Professional Achievement and Service).

Full-time instructors, pursuant to PAc-34, will be primarily assessed on their teaching, and as permitted under the PAc, “may provide service on departmental committees.” Additional service and professional achievement activities will be considered outstanding. Consistent with Pac-34 “review will be based on the relative criteria for performance expectations as defined in the departmental FEP,” but it should be noted that a positive review does not guarantee contract renewal.

C. Expectations

As described in PAc-27, evaluations of tenured and tenure-track faculty involve three components: teaching, professional achievement, and service. The nature of the appropriate mix and balance of these categories is defined by each academic unit and shall take into account the faculty member’s contractual duties and responsibilities, including any flexible workload agreements negotiated in accordance with PAc-29. The Department of MTD has determined that
teaching will make up 50% of the evaluation with the balance divided between professional achievement and service. This division of professional achievement and service will be divided equally unless the faculty member and chair agree to a different balance at the beginning of the academic year. This balance may not go below 15% or above 35% in any one area for the year. Changes in the balance of percentages must be agreed to by both the faculty member and the chair. The faculty member will have no more than one semester prior to the start of next annual evaluation period to revise percentages. For promotion and tenure the faculty member should demonstrate sustained achievement in professional achievement and service. The MTD department recognizes no restrictions on the creation of the Flexible Workload Agreements beyond those specified in PAc-29. Faculty working under the terms of a Flexible Work Agreement shall be reviewed in accordance with the criteria specified therein and the general guidelines for such agreements outlined in PAc-29. All documentation of FWA must be included in the portfolio for reference.

1. **Teaching**

The chair and faculty member through analysis of data from peer/chair reviews, student evaluations, and items from the lists below pertinent to the teaching area, will review teaching performance. This review will take into account the scope and depth of the teaching activities through both quantitative and qualitative aspects. It will be the faculty member’s responsibility to provide clarity on the scope and depth of teaching activity. The FEP data analysis instrument devised by the chair will be used to a in this analysis (see appendix 1). The chair and faculty member will meet each year to discuss the data and analysis to guide future teaching.

Regardless of primary discipline, all faculty members are expected to:

1. Participate in the public schools as a mentor, clinician, etc.
2. Pursue the scholarship of teaching and learning.
3. Demonstrates effective use of technology in one’s teaching methods (providing the technology is available for use).
4. Make every effort to retain current students and guide the development of their performance ability.
a. All faculty members are expected to:

(1) Distribute syllabi that include required university components during the first week of classes.

(2) Teach all classes/lessons/ensembles as assigned by the Department Chair, meet them as scheduled in the Schedule of Classes, and begin and end them on time within the requirements of the appropriate teaching workload.

(3) Adhere to the University Final Examination Schedule.

(4) Provide for a substitute teacher, make-up lessons, and/or alternative assignment when professional activities necessitate the faculty member’s absence. The Department Chair must approve this absence.

(5) Post and honor “office hours”

(6) Attend Fall and Spring Commencements unless excused by the Chair

(7) Submit all midterm and final grades as required by the University.

(8) Submit a copy of all final exams, if applicable, to the Department Office.

(9) Use appropriate university approved teaching evaluation instruments as required by the department and university to allow for student input and evidence of teaching effectiveness, i.e., IDEA, department evaluation form. The student review accounts for no more than 50% of the teaching evaluation.

(10) One annual Peer and one annual Chair (or representative approved by Chair) evaluation of teaching are required for tenure-track faculty. Peer and Chair (or representative approved by Chair) will submit teaching observations listing strengths and areas for improvement to the faculty member. Peer evaluations will be completed by tenured faculty. It is the responsibility of the tenure-track faculty member to identify the evaluator to complete the review.

(11) Carry out the role of an advisor as appropriate, including: holding designated office hours for drop-in student advising, attending university training sessions related to advising, advising tools, retention issues, and changes in program certification/application requirements where applicable; initiating contact with advisees concerning deadlines, courses in sequence, etc., helping them with regard to scheduling, course substitutions, etc., and contacting them if issues require attention (such as unprotected schedules, canceled classes, etc.).

(12) Serve on graduate oral exam committees (where applicable).
b. In addition to the above (C., 1., a.), apply the criteria below that best pertain to each individual faculty member’s area(s) of expertise:

(1) **Classroom.** Each faculty member is expected to:
   (a) Conduct class in an organized, efficient, and professional manner.
   (b) Grade and return assignments and examinations in a timely manner.
   (c) Stay current within his or her discipline.
   (d) Integrate, if possible, current trends, issues, and research regarding the discipline into the content of courses.
   (e) Maintain proper university formatting in all syllabi.

(2) **Music and/or Theatre Education.** Each faculty member is expected to:
   (a) Stay informed of local, state, and national issues relating to music and/or theatre education, and to disseminate this information to faculty and students.
   (b) Integrate, if possible, current trends, issues, and research into the content of music and theatre education courses.
   (c) Conduct class in an organized, efficient, and professional manner.
   (d) Grade and return assignments and examinations in a timely manner.
   (e) Maintain proper university formatting in all syllabi.

(3) **Applied Music.** Each faculty member is expected to:
   (a) Give each student the opportunity to have fourteen lessons per semester.
   (b) Conduct the lesson in an organized, efficient, and professional manner.
   (c) Keep students informed about their progress and academic standing in the course.
   (d) Participate in the final examination process (juries).
   (e) Stay current within his or her discipline.
   (f) Integrate, if possible, current trends, issues, and research regarding the discipline into the content of courses.
   (g) Maintain proper university formatting in all syllabi.

(4) **Music and Dance Ensembles.** Each faculty member is expected to:
   (a) Demonstrate effective rehearsal technique and conduct all rehearsals in an organized, efficient, and professional manner.
(b) Stay current within his or her discipline.
(c) Integrate, if possible, current trends, issues, and research regarding the discipline into the content of courses.
(d) Maintain proper university formatting in all syllabi.
(e) Present one formal on-campus concert per semester per ensemble.

(5) **Theatre and Dance.** Each faculty member is expected to:
(a) Conduct class in an organized, efficient, and professional manner.
(b) Grade and return assignments and examinations in a timely manner.
(c) Stay current within his or her discipline.
(d) Integrate, if possible, current trends, issues, and research regarding the discipline into the content of courses.
(e) Maintain cleanliness in all shops, labs, and rehearsal spaces.
(f) Teach safe practices when students are using equipment in shops.
(g) Teach safe practices when students are involved in physical activity such as dancing and stage combat in classes and/or rehearsals.
(h) Maintain proper university formatting in all syllabi.

c. **All faculty members are encouraged to participate in teaching activities above the “expected” level of performance.** The following activities are suggestions to be considered “outstanding”, which may strengthen the portfolio (provided they are not “expected” requirements within a specialty area). “Meritorious” ratings result from consistent excellence in multiple areas on this list or particularly prominent teaching achievements. This list is not comprehensive, and in no way limits other activities from being included that are considered outstanding.

(1) Participate extensively in the public schools as a mentor, clinician, etc.
(2) Pursue the scholarship of teaching and learning through extensive activity (research, workshops, etc).
(3) Become involved in distance learning.
(4) Take part in interdisciplinary collaboration.
(5) Create new courses, significantly revise existing courses, develop curricular changes including online instruction and delivery.
(6) Show evidence of student participation in solo competitions, ensembles, professional workshops, or professional auditions.
(7) Show evidence of additional student performances (i.e. extra ensemble performances, extra solo performances, etc.).
(8) Receive a teaching-related grant.
(9) Receive a significant teaching award.
(10) Present expertise in a class taught by another faculty member.
(11) Integrate service learning into the curriculum.
(12) Serve as faculty mentor for student Research/Creative Fellows.
(13) Direct independent study.
(14) Serve as Event Managers for guest artists and ensembles.
(15) Develop instructional materials.
(16) Receive acknowledgement for outstanding student work or accomplishments.
(17) Teach an uncompensated overload. (Not recommended but outstanding)

2. Professional Achievement (Creative Activity/Scholarly Research)

The chair and faculty member using the above list, other indicators, and the FEP data analysis instrument will review professional achievement. This review will take into account the scope and depth of the professional achievement through both quantitative (activity, number of performances) and qualitative (depth, juried, invited, reviewed, etc.) aspects. It will be the faculty member’s responsibility to provide clarity on the scope and depth of professional activity. This clarity may also list the level of achievement, i.e., local, regional national and international. The chair and faculty member will meet each year to discuss the data and analysis to guide future professional achievement.

The Department of MTD defines professional achievement as creative activity and/or scholarly research. Creative activity and scholarly research by faculty enhance the understanding of the subjects within the faculty member’s discipline. The faculty member has the individual responsibility to seek out campus support for grant writing, research guidance, professional development opportunities and any other activity. Each faculty member will be expected to meet the criteria for his or her primary discipline as defined in his or her job description. Each faculty member, regardless of discipline, is expected to stay informed of new works, new editions, available literature, and materials pertaining to the faculty member’s primary discipline or area of expertise and incorporate, where applicable, into Professional Achievement activities and participate in creative and/or research projects. Additional achievements in other areas of discipline will be considered as above and beyond expected performance (i.e. a faculty member who is primarily a
private applied teacher would not be expected to compose, however, any compositions by said teacher could be used to strengthen the portfolio). Each faculty member should select one of the following sets of criteria based upon their primary discipline:

a. **Applied Music.** Each faculty member is expected to:
   (1) Serve as a role model for his or her applied studio by performing each academic year in one of the following capacities:
      (a) A minimum of one solo recital on campus, or one equivalent creative project or production.
      (b) A minimum of two formal recitals on campus as a member of a chamber ensemble.

b. **Ensemble Conducting.** Each faculty member is expected to:
   (1) Serve as a role model by conducting each academic year in one of the following capacities:
      (a) One formal individual engagement off campus with an ensemble not affiliated with MSU.
      (b) Serve as a consultant or adjudicator for an off campus musical organization.

c. **Music and Theatre Education.** Each faculty member is expected to:
   (1) Maintain an active research agenda as evidenced by researching a topic of interest. This research may be presented at professional meetings or submitted and accepted for publication in a scholarly/refereed journal.
   (2) Attend one state or national music or theatre education conference per academic year.

d. **Theatre Scholar.** Each faculty member is expected to
   (1) Stay informed of new works, new editions, available literature, and materials pertaining to the faculty member’s area of expertise.
   (2) Maintain an active research agenda as evidenced by researching a topic of interest. This research may be presented at professional meetings or submitted for publication in a scholarly/refereed journal.

e. **Theatre Practitioner**
   (1) At least once annually, serve as a consultant, respondent, or adjudicator to one formal production off-campus.
   (2) Participate in a formal production off-campus.
f. All faculty members are encouraged to participate in Creative/Scholarly activities beyond the “expected” level of performance. The following activities are suggestions to be considered “outstanding”, which may strengthen the portfolio (provided they are not “expected” requirements within a specialty area). “Meritorious” ratings result from consistent excellence in multiple areas on this list or particularly prominent professional achievement. This list is not comprehensive, and in no way limits other activities from being included that are considered outstanding.

(1) Participate in off-campus, professional level performances/productions, and juried, invited, adjudicated, and/or reviewed performances.
(2) Receive a grant for research/creative activity.
(3) Receive an award of high distinction by a professional organization or a university.
(4) Participate in recording projects and disseminate them.
(5) Publish, which may include:
   a. Publications in Peer reviewed journals.
   b. Books or Textbooks published and/or edited.
   c. Books or Textbooks published, authored, co-authored, compiled and/or edited.
   d. Chapters or included articles appearing in published books.
   e. Reviews (books, manuscripts, grants, journal articles).
   f. Copyrightable works including materials created for on-line courses that have been peer reviewed or approved by an outside governing board.
(6) Participate in creative projects.
(7) Participate in research studies.
(8) Develop new programs or activities within one’s relevant discipline.
(9) Participate in conferences or workshops through papers/presentations/speaking engagements/performances.
(10) Continue works in progress.
(11) Engage in professional consulting.
(12) Professional work experience (including work performed and/or reports produced inside the university to obtain or maintain special accreditation, and work and/or reports produced outside the university) that are specific to one’s field of expertise.
(13) Create choreography.
(14) Re-stage works.
(15) Reconstruct dance from notation or video, performances, lecture demonstrations, wiring, directing, performing, directing dance concerts, teaching as a guest artist in prestigious programs, serving as an adjudicator or evaluator, presentations at professional associations, invited lectures, design and execution and/or sets for dance, development of sound scores and/or texts for dances.

(16) Pursue continuing education.

(17) Obtain theatre reviews from peers who are affiliated with other universities in the region for productions on campus.

(18) Other indicators of professional achievement.

3. Service

The chair and faculty member using the list below, the FEP rubric, and other indicators will review service. This review will take into account the scope and depth of the service through both quantitative (activity, number of service engagements) and qualitative (depth of activity, leadership roles, type of service) aspects. It will be the faculty member’s responsibility to provide clarity on the scope and depth of service activity. The chair and faculty member will meet each year to discuss the data and analysis to guide future service.

a. All faculty members are expected to:
   (1) Attend all departmental faculty meetings as Teaching, Professional Achievement and other Service Activities allow.
   (2) Participate in committee assignments and official sponsored events at the departmental, college, and/or university levels appropriate to one’s teaching discipline, e.g., Choral Clinic, Jazz Clinic, Piano Day, Middle and HS Concert and Clinic, Gala, Madrigal Feast, and other Service Events, etc.
   (3) Pursue every avenue to identify and recruit quality students to the Department of Music, Theatre, and Dance.
   (4) Attend concerts and faculty recitals appropriate to one’s teaching discipline.
   (5) Make every effort to demonstrate professionalism and support in interaction with faculty and staff.
   (6) Assign players and equipment for MSU Ensemble performances (when applicable).
   (7) Mentor junior faculty (when applicable).
   (8) Participate in department workshops, seminars, events, or conferences.
b. All faculty members are encouraged to participate in

Service activities above and beyond the “expected” level of performance. The following activities are suggestions to be considered “outstanding,” which may strengthen the portfolio (provided they are not “expected” requirements within a specialty area). “Meritorious” ratings result from consistent excellence in multiple areas on this list or particularly prominent service roles. This list is not comprehensive, and in no way limits other activities from being included that are considered outstanding.

(1) Participate in numerous MSU committee assignments and note level of participation (i.e. leadership roles).
(2) Provide service to professional organizations at the local, state, or national level.
(3) Receive an award for outstanding service.
(4) Consult in a field related to the faculty member’s academic specialization.
(5) Receive a service-related grant.
(6) “Meet MSU Nights” or similar events.
(7) Maintain equipment as applicable to one’s position.
(8) Conduct off-campus master classes/clinics.
(9) Appear as a soloist/conductor with a middle school/high school ensemble.
(10) Assist with a theatrical production as designer, director, performer, choreographer etc.
(11) Participate in Faculty Ensembles.
(12) Faculty/Student tour/trip planning.
(13) Teach private lessons to high school music students.
(14) Arrange for MSU students to teach private lessons to non-University students.
(15) Student recruitment and retention activities.
(16) Work with student organizations.
(17) Cultivate relationships with instrument and theatrical equipment manufacturers, retailers, publishers, suppliers of lumber, fabric and similar businesses that provide support to Department programs.
(18) Participate in miscellaneous activities related to promoting and improving the quality of life at the University and/or region.
(19) Participate in the MSU Gala, Madrigal Feaste, and/or other service performances.
(20) Provide service to P-12 schools.
(21) Cultivate alumni relationships in a significant way (organizing a program or reunion, creating a newsletter, etc.).
(22) Teaching a study abroad course that includes travel outside the US.
(23) Organize and administrate/conduct an international concert tour or engagement that includes travel outside the US.
(24) Coordinate fund-raising events to support the academic and equipment needs of the department.
(25) Coordinate and participate in department workshops, seminars, events, or conferences.
(26) Sponsor university-recognized student organizations and co-curricular events, e.g., Phi Mu Alpha, Sigma Alpha Iota, National Association of Music Educators, KMTA, etc.
(27) Provide service as an official representative of the university, e.g., KMEA, OMEA, NAfME, JEN, ASTA, MTNA, SOAR, Open House, special recruiting events, etc.
(28) Serve as assigned Faculty Mentor for fixed-term or tenure-track faculty member.
(29) Other service activities.

D. Measurement

1. Teaching

Evidence that may be submitted to demonstrate Teaching Quality should reflect the expectations in C. 1 above and should clearly demonstrate expected and above expected levels of performance.

2. Professional Achievement

All faculty members are expected to have an active record of professional activity. The activity is evaluated for the level or degree that it contributes to or enhances the discipline or profession and program. In the event of collaborative work, the faculty member should specify his or her contribution. Evidence that may be submitted to demonstrate Professional Achievement should reflect the expectations in C. 2 above and should clearly demonstrate expected and above expected levels of performance.
Expected scholarly activities are consistent with definition in PAc-11: Scholarship is the use, application, or synthesis of existing knowledge and methodologies with the aim of:

a) establishing new understanding and knowledge,
b) developing new technologies, methodologies, or materials,
c) creating or rendering artistic works, or
d) solving discipline-related problems or general societal problems.

Scholarly products must be communicated with peers through appropriate outlets. The nature and relative importance of these outlets are to be determined by individual departments. However, outlets requiring greater peer review should be preferred over outlets requiring less peer review, and outlets with a larger audience should be preferred over outlets with a smaller audience.

3. Service

All MTD faculty members are expected to contribute meaningful, quality service at the department, college or university level. A basic expectation is active participation on one’s equitable share of committees at MSU in any given year, unless other valuable service (to one’s profession or to the service region, for example) replaces it. Faculty members should state their role and contribution to each committee, organization, or activity included. If the faculty member is involved in regional engagement, evidence should be provided of how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond and how it is reflected in teaching, scholarship and service, as appropriate. Evidence that may be submitted to demonstrate Service should reflect the expectations in C. 3 above and should clearly demonstrate expected and above expected levels of performance.
E. Evaluation

Each tenure-track faculty member shall be evaluated annually by the MTD Tenure Committee, which shall consist of all tenured MTD faculty members. The department mentor as assigned by the chair will guide new tenure-track faculty through this process.

The chair will meet with each faculty member on a yearly basis to review the FEP rubric and discuss ways to improve in all three areas. They will agree upon and sign the instrument. In cases of disagreement the case will be brought to the Governance Committee.

The Department of MTD has determined that teaching will make up 50% of the evaluation with the balance divided between professional achievement and service. This division of professional achievement and service will be divided equally unless the faculty member and chair agree to a different balance at the beginning of the academic year. This balance may not go below 15% or above 35% in any one area for the year. So faculty performance will be rated on a scale from 0-40 in the following way, using scores generated by the departmental rubric (see table below):

0-9 Below
10-21 Expected
22-33 Higher than Expected
34-40 Meritorious
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Below Expected</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Above Expected</th>
<th>Meritorious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0-5 points) This category recognizes unsatisfactory fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the MTD Department. Evidence includes (but is not limited to) unsatisfactory evaluations of teaching by students.</td>
<td>(6-11 points) This category recognizes satisfactory fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the MTD Department. Evidence includes (but is not limited to):</td>
<td>(12-17 Points) This category recognizes above expected fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the MTD Department. Evidence includes (but is not limited to):</td>
<td>(18-20 Points) This category recognizes exceptional fulfillment of instructional duties in the classroom and in carrying out the collective responsibilities of the instructional programs housed in the MTD Department. Evidence includes (but is not limited to):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • unsatisfactory peer and/or chair evaluations  
• instructional materials that are inappropriate or not relevant for courses taught  
• syllabi do not include university required components  
• evidence that the faculty member does not fulfill expectations regarding mentoring and advising students, or a lack of evidence that he or she does meet these expectations  
• lack of evidence of contribution to the collective instructional responsibilities of the program and/or department. | • satisfactory evaluations of teaching by students  
• satisfactory peer and/or chair evaluations  
• instructional materials that are appropriate and relevant for courses taught  
• syllabi that include university required components  
• department advising forms showing that the faculty member fulfills expectations regarding mentoring and advising students  
• evidence of contribution to the collective instructional responsibilities of the program and/or department. | • above expected evaluations of teaching by students  
• above expected peer and/or chair evaluations  
• evidence of substantial contribution to the collective instructional responsibilities of the program and/or department  
• evidence of above expected levels of performance in C. 1. c. | • exceptionally strong evaluations of teaching by students  
• exceptionally strong peer and/or chair evaluations  
• evidence of exceptionally strong contribution to the collective instructional responsibilities of the program and/or department  
• evidence of exceptionally high levels of performance in C. 1. c. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Achievement</th>
<th>Below Expected</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Above Expected</th>
<th>Meritorious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0-2 point) This category recognizes that a faculty member did not engage in professional achievement as described under “Professional Achievement” in section C.2.</td>
<td>(3 points) (3-5 points) This category recognizes that a faculty member engaged in professional achievement as described under “Professional Achievement” in section C.2.</td>
<td>(6-8 points)* This category recognizes that a faculty member engaged in professional achievement as described under “Professional Achievement” in section C.2. f for which was at the above-expected level.</td>
<td>(9-10)* This category recognizes that a faculty member engaged in professional achievement as described under “Professional Achievement” in section C.2. f for which was at an exceptionally high level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This category recognizes that a faculty member engaged in professional achievement as described under “Professional Achievement” in section C.2. f for which was at the above-expected level.
### Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0-2 points)</td>
<td>This category recognizes the failure to provide evidence of active service in the university or in his/her profession at a level appropriate for his/her rank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3-5 points)</td>
<td>This category recognizes evidence of active service as described in C. 3 in the university or in his/her profession at a level appropriate for his/her rank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6-8 points)*</td>
<td>This category recognizes evidence from C. 3. b. of active service in the university beyond his/her equitable share or outstanding service in his/her profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9-10)*</td>
<td>This category recognizes evidence from C. 3. b. of exceptionally active service in the university beyond his/her equitable share or exceptionally strong service in his/her profession.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Professional Achievement and service will be reviewed as 25%/25% (10 points each). If a faculty member has chosen another percentage distribution i.e., 35%/15% or 15%/35% then a second scale will be used in accordance with agreed upon percentages and the total for Professional Achievement and Service can add up to no higher than 20 within those percentages. No faculty member can receive higher than 40 total points in the rubric evaluation.

### III. Promotion

A. Departmental Goals and Objectives

The goal of the department is to help faculty develop so that they earn promotion.

B. Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Ordinarily promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor is concurrent with the granting of tenure, and the standards and procedures described in Part II of this document apply.

C. Associate Professor to Professor

We urge the candidate for promotion to professor to review PAc-1 and PAc-2 carefully before initiating the application process.

Positive annual merit evaluations will not automatically translate into a successful promotion application since the record for promotion must be cumulative. To aid in documenting this cumulative record, the candidate shall include a written statement in which s/he reflects on his/her progress in teaching, professional achievement, and service in the years since attaining the rank of associate professor. We recommend that this statement also discuss how the candidate sees his/her work in these three areas to be mutually reinforcing and growing in the future.
D. Promotion Review Procedures, **Associate Professor to Professor**

1. **Departmental Committee**

   The Department Promotion Committee will consider all applications for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor in accordance with the policies and procedures described in this Faculty Evaluation Plan.

2. **Department Chair**

   The Department Chair will review all recommendations of the Department Promotion Committee, add his or her own recommendation, and submit the appropriate materials to the Dean of the Caudill College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences.

E. **Expectations for promotion to full professor**

   All candidates for promotion to Professor must meet the minimum requirements outlined in PAc-1 General Academic Ranks #5 and PAc-2. Because promotion to the rank of Professor represents recognition of sustained, outstanding contributions to teaching, scholarship, and service, a candidate must demonstrate a record of excellence and accomplishment in all three areas. In evaluating candidates’ portfolios, emphasis will be placed upon the period since the last promotion. Promotion to the rank of Professor is not related to years of service, but rather to continued outstanding performance. Cumulative outstanding performance in MTD is defined as continuing to exceed yearly-expected performance for the time in rank.

1. **Teaching Effectiveness**

   To achieve promotion to the rank of Professor an applicant must demonstrate outstanding teaching as demonstrated by (1) evidence of successful learning outcomes achieved in their courses including a majority of positive student evaluations, and (2) documentation of teaching methods that have contributed to successful teaching, which must include required basic instruction support materials and evidence of required student contact activities, and (3) document student work – music, acting, dance, papers, projects &/or presentations. Music, Theatre and Dance Education faculty must also demonstrate successful collaborations with regional teachers. This may include special projects and/or collaborations with schools and/or professional organizations.
2. Scholarship/Creative Productions

To achieve promotion to Professor, an applicant must demonstrate a record of sustained outstanding creative productions using the list from C. 2. f. and other indicators where applicable.

Applied Music Faculty: Consideration of performance shall be qualified in each case by the professional nature of the performance:

(I)  The quality of the venue
(II) The scope of the audience
(III) Invitational
    (1) Type of performance
        (a) Solo
        (b) Chamber
        (c) Ensemble
    (2) Professional reputation of the invitation panel
    (3) Geographical scope of participating Artists
    (4) Number of compositions performed

(IV) Competitive/Juried
    (1) Type of performance
        (a) Solo
        (b) Chamber
        (c) Ensemble
    (2) Professional reputation of the Juror(s)
    (3) Difficulty of acceptance
    (4) Geographical scope of the Competition’s entrants
    (5) Number of pieces performed

(V) Recordings
(1) Type of recording
   (a) Solo
   (b) Chamber
   (c) Ensemble

(2) Review

(3) Number of pieces recorded

(4) Original compositions

(VI) The number of performances

In addition, samples of creative work completed during the review period must be included in the portfolio.

For specific examples of applicable scholarship/creative production activities, see C. 2.

Ensemble Faculty: To achieve promotion to Professor, an applicant must demonstrate a record of sustained outstanding creative productions as a conductor/clinician/adjudicator as evidenced by the performances of music beyond the local level. Consideration of performance shall be qualified in each case by the professional/artistic nature of the performance:

(I) The quality of the venue

(II) The scope of the audience

(III) Invitational – regional, state, national, and international

   (1) Type of performance
       (a) Guest Conductor
       (b) Clinician
       (c) Adjudicator

   (2) Professional reputation of the inviting panel.

   (3) Geographical scope of participating Artists

   (4) Number of compositions conducted
(IV) Competitive/Juried/Reviewed

(1) Type of performance
   (a) Solo
   (b) Chamber
   (c) Ensemble

(2) Professional reputation of the Juror(s)

(3) Difficulty of acceptance

(4) Geographical scope of the Competition’s entrants

(5) Number of pieces performed

(V) Recordings

(1) Type of recording
   (a) Solo
   (b) Chamber
   (c) Ensemble

(2) Review

(3) Number of pieces recorded

(4) Original compositions

(VI) The number of performances

Music, Theatre and Dance Education Faculty: To achieve promotion to Professor, an applicant must demonstrate a record of sustained outstanding scholarship as evidenced by: musical, dramatic, dance performances/conducting/directing/choreographing beyond the local level and/or publishing research in book and/or article form, and/or presentations of research beyond the local level venues. The candidate must also demonstrate participation and/or leadership in statewide and national education professional organizations.
Theatre: To achieve promotion to Professor, an applicant in Theatre must demonstrate sustained, outstanding scholarship or creative productivity as evidenced by:

1. Publishing research in a book or article form, and/or presentations of research at venues that are beyond the local level.
2. Performances, design, technical work, choreography, directing, vocal coaching, etc. beyond the local level.

A candidate for promotion may focus on one of the above or he/she may have an equitable combination of the two. The candidate must also demonstrate participation and/or leadership in professional organizations in statewide and/or national professional organizations.

Dance: To achieve promotion to Professor, an applicant in Dance must demonstrate sustained, outstanding scholarship and/or creative productivity. To aid in evaluation of the candidate for promotion in this discipline, outside peer evaluation may be sought.

3. Service Activities

The Department of Music, Theatre, and Dance takes a broad view of the viable avenues available through which faculty members may provide service to the university. Recognizing the wide spectrum of service opportunities available to faculty that both enriches the university, and promotes its mission, those pursuing promotion to full professor are given ample latitude by which they may demonstrate the depth and breadth of their service to Morehead State on as many levels as possible. Within this framework, consistent, outstanding service, which is valued by the department, can be demonstrated without limitations. All service is valued, and has its place.

To achieve promotion to Professor an applicant must demonstrate sustained contributions in University, College and/or Departmental service activities, recruitment and/or professional service and community collaboration that further advance the University’s mission. This must include a reasonable committee workload given the amount of work to be completed in any given year. Candidates for promotion to professor shall demonstrate the ability and willingness to play a key role in program and policy development; thus, simply providing a list of committees on which one has served will not constitute such a demonstration, though membership on some (especially some University) committees will carry considerable weight. Applicants must demonstrate active service contributions as evidence. Music, Theatre and
Dance Education faculty will be expected to maintain contacts with and provide service to area schools and teachers. To establish the value of his/her service contributions, the candidate may cite and include but is not limited to evidence of any or all of the activities listed in II.C.3.

IV. Annual Review

A. Departmental Goals and Objectives

The department seeks to identify, encourage, and reward the outstanding work of its valued faculty, through a process that is fair, equitable, and efficient with the maximum sensitivity and appreciation for the individual differences, and diversity found within the disciplines in our department.

B. Guidelines for Review and Appeals Process

By the established university deadline, faculty will upload an annual report of activity to the university approved faculty activity reporting system. It is the Chair’s responsibility to review all the relevant information, arrive at a recommendation, and discuss that recommendation with the faculty member. If there is a disagreement, the Chair and the faculty member should first try to resolve it by more dialogue and exchange of information. If the disagreement persists, the Chair must refer the matter to the MTD Faculty Governance Committee; the Committee will request either written statements or interviews, as it considers more appropriate, and offer a recommendation to the Chair and the faculty member. If the Committee recommends a change in the evaluation of the faculty member, and the faculty member finds the recommendation acceptable, the Chair will abide by the committee’s decision. The faculty member retains the right to appeal to the Dean of the Caudill College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences, but the Department hopes to resolve all disputes internally and amicably.

The expectations on which annual evaluations will be based do not differ from those stated for tenure and promotion. It will be the responsibility of the chair to explain clearly the basis for each recommendation, and to refer to the language in this document in discussing performance in teaching, scholarly work, and service.
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I. INTRODUCTION

A. Philosophy

The mission of Morehead State University Department of Sociology, Social Work and Criminology is to serve our students through teaching, research, and real-world experiences. In accordance with PAc-2 and other University policies named in this document, the Department seeks to recognize and reward continual faculty development and excellence in teaching, professional achievement, and service through recommendations for: 1) reappointment; 2) tenure; 3) promotion to associate professor or professor, and; 4) available performance-based compensation.

B. Statement of Purpose: Goals and Objectives of the Faculty Evaluation Plan.

The purpose of this Faculty Evaluation Plan (FEP) is to provide a description of the criteria used to evaluate faculty teaching, professional achievement, and service in regard to departmental and university standards and expectations for annual reviews for reappointment, final tenure review, promotions, and available performance-based compensation.

The goals and objectives of the Faculty Evaluation Plan are as follows:

1. To be “used by appropriate department, college, and university committees to evaluate faculty for reappointment, tenure, and promotion and for performance based compensation increases” (PAc-35).

2. To provide full-time faculty, including candidates, with criteria from which they can identify departmental/disciplinary expectations regarding teaching, scholarly productivity and professional achievement, and service endeavors, especially as it relates to progress toward tenure, promotion, and reappointment.

3. To provide full-time faculty, including candidates, with an understanding of the annual departmental/disciplinary assessments and procedures used to analyze work performance, especially as it relates to progress toward tenure, promotion, and reappointment.

4. To provide indicators determinate of whether the candidate’s performance level is commensurate with that of a tenurable member of faculty.

5. To provide indicators determinate of whether the candidate’s performance level warrants promotion.
C. Policies for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Faculty members seeking reappointment, tenure, promotion, and merit-based compensation increases have a responsibility to understand the departmental FEP and the following university policies (located at the MSU Human Resources Web Site-Policies):

- PAc - 1 Definition of Academic Titles
- PAc - 2 Promotion Review
- PAc - 11 Faculty Research
- PAc - 27 Tenure Review
- Pac - 29 Faculty Workload
- PAc - 30 Performance-Based Compensation Plan for Faculty
- PAc - 34 Alternative Career–Track Faculty

Tenured and tenure-track faculty must prepare appropriate documentation to meet the standards of these university policies. This documentation must also address the departmental requirements presented in this FEP.

D. Policies for Alternative Career-Track Faculty/Instructors, Non-Tenure Track

Non-tenure track and alternative career-track faculty are employed to address instructional and programmatic needs of the department. Accordingly, these individuals are evaluated for available performance-based compensation and reappointment according to their particular job description.

Non-tenure track and alternative career-track faculty may have appointments renewed on an annual basis, provided there are programmatic needs, adequate funds, and satisfactory evaluations according to the departmental FEP. These individuals have a responsibility to understand the departmental FEP and Pac-34.

E. Faculty Mentors

Although the Department Chair and all tenured faculty within the department share in the responsibility to guide and support tenure-track faculty toward tenure, each tenure-track candidate will be recommended a faculty mentor, who will assume primary responsibility in assisting the candidate in understanding university policies and procedures related to teaching, advising, research, service, performance-based compensation, and other relevant areas. The Department Chair will recommend a tenured faculty member to help facilitate the progression of the tenure-track faculty throughout the tenure-track process. Similarly, a tenure-track faculty also may suggest a tenured faculty mentor to the Department Chair. Once the mentor/mentee partnership has been established, the pair should agree to arrange meetings throughout the academic year to discuss and work toward their goals.
F. Reporting of Faculty Activities

Each faculty member shall provide an annual report of teaching, scholarship, and service activities to the department chair for her/his use in forming the faculty member’s progress report. This annual report will include activities documented in the approved university faculty activity reporting system, e.g. Faculty 180, but also may include additional information, activities, and details.

II. ASSESSMENT OF DEPARTMENT FACULTY

University PAc-30 requires that all returning tenured and tenure-track faculty participate in evaluation processes as specified in their departmental Faculty Evaluation Plan. The Personnel Action Calendar Summary (PACS), which documents the timeline of assessment, is provided each academic year by the Office of the Provost.

A. Assessment of Tenure-Track Faculty

In the case of tenure-track members of faculty, assessment procedures are initiated when the probationary faculty member submits his or her annual tenure portfolio in accordance with the University’s PACS timelines. Data presented in the annual tenure portfolio are expected to corroborate with those submitted to Faculty 180 account. Therefore, candidates must ensure that all records of accomplishment are complete, accurate, entered, and updated in the Faculty 180 system. Subsequently, the annual tenure portfolio and Faculty 180 documentation will be submitted by the candidate to the Tenure Committee and the Department Chair for review.

The specific guidelines for developing the tenure portfolio are outlined in PAc-27. The candidate, members of the SSWC Tenure Committee, and the Department Chair are required to learn, understand, and follow the annual review guidelines, which also are outlined in PAc-27.

B. Assessment of Tenured Faculty

Tenured members of faculty shall provide an annual report of their teaching, professional achievement, and service activities to the department chair for her/his use in forming the faculty member’s progress report. Tenured members of faculty in pursuit of promotion should provide the anticipated date for their promotion review. Evidence of accomplishments will be extracted from Faculty 180 (the approved faculty activity reporting system). As such, a faculty member must ensure that her or his records are complete, accurate, entered, and updated in the Faculty 180 System. The annual report provided by faculty will include activities documented in Faculty 180 and may also include additional information, activities and details.
C. Assessment of Non-tenure track and Alternative Career-Track Faculty

University PAc-34 describes instructors (formerly known as fixed-term instructors) as full-time employees, who are contracted for a one-year term with a teaching load of no more than 27 credit hours recommended. The policy further stipulates that instructors “may provide service on departmental committees”; however, “instructors will be evaluated primarily on teaching,” as evidenced by student, peer, and chair evaluations.

Fixed-Term Facilitators are considered faculty with a workload of five courses per year and a university awarded service release for the coordination of the regional campus Social Work Programs. Facilitators will be evaluated for performance-based compensation and reappointment according to their particular job description.

Non-tenure track and alternative career-track individuals who choose to submit evidence of scholarly productivity and professional achievement will follow the same procedures and timelines as tenured faculty. The review will be based on the relative criteria for performance expectations, as defined in the departmental Faculty Evaluation Plan. A positive review does not guarantee contract renewal.

III. PERFORMANCE BASED COMPENSATION

University PAc-2 states that annual faculty evaluations and tenure/promotion evaluations are separate processes. Annual evaluations, including performance-based compensation evaluations, are based on annual performance, whereas tenure or promotion evaluations are based on cumulative performance. Therefore, meeting or exceeding annual performance criteria does not automatically ensure a favorable tenure or promotion decision. See more at: http://www.moreheadstate.edu/content_template.aspx?id=2147487648#sthash.uy0ZI3qL.dpuf.

All faculty members will undergo regular evaluations for the purpose of awarding performance-based compensation. Faculty performance will be assessed for quantity and quality as well as the faculty member’s effective contributions to the department. The annual evaluations will be conducted by the Department Chair. The Chair will assign each individual a score for teaching, professional achievement, and service which will be translated into an overall score. The Chair, based on these scores, will select individuals to be considered for merit-based compensation.

At the beginning of each academic year, an Annual Evaluation Appeals Committee will be elected by all faculty members. Tenured faculty members are eligible to serve on the Appeals Committee. The Appeals Committee will consist of one social worker, one sociologist or criminologist, and a third member from either discipline. Individuals wishing to appeal their score or recommendation for performance-based compensation, should notify the Department Chair within five business days of receiving their scores. The Appeals Committee will hear the individual’s case and make recommendations to
the Chair. The Chair will reconsider the case based on the Appeals Committee recommendation and make a final decision. Documentation of the Appeals Committee’s decision will be included as part of the documentation of the annual review process. The individual may appeal the Department Chair’s decision to the Dean of the College.

Individuals approved for sabbatical or another university-approved developmental program and/or internship leave are eligible to receive performance-based salary increases. Tenured faculty members, whose sabbatical leave or university-approved development leave covers a period of performance-based evaluation, will submit mid-point progress reports to the appropriate College Dean (Pac-17: Sabbatical Leave of Absence) and the Department Chair. A final sabbatical report will be submitted by the faculty member to the Dean and Provost (Pac-17: Sabbatical Leave of Absence), in addition to his/her Department Chair at the end of the leave. Exclusively, these performance reports and other supporting documents shall be used to evaluate faculty performance during leave of absence and will be subjected to Chair assessment as described above, according to the departmental Faculty Evaluation Plan. Possible disparities in contributions toward teaching, scholarly production, and/or service during leave of absence are expected.

IV. Expectations of Department Faculty

The assessment of University probationary faculty for reappointment and the awarding of tenure and promotion engage three critical components: (1) effective teaching, which includes student advising, (2) scholarly productivity and professional achievement, and (3) service activity. Each academic unit will appropriate any nuances related to these categories and, in their provisions, will also take into account a candidate’s contractual duties and professional responsibilities. Each faculty bears the individual responsibility to seek campus support for opportunities regarding grant writing, research guidance, professional development options, and other activities that may enhance his or her ability to excel professionally.

1. Teaching Effectiveness

In addition to student evaluations and observations of teaching by the chair and department peers, a candidate must demonstrate teaching effectiveness by a pattern of availability for the academic or professional advisement of students. The supervision of student internships, student practicum experiences, and graduate theses are indicative of this category.

Teaching effectiveness may be evidenced by developing a new course, facilitating courses that require new preparations, curriculum evaluation, and/or revisions, facilitating large sections or classes, and facilitating required or core courses. Teaching effectiveness also may be evidenced by training for and integrating teaching and learning technologies, implementing innovative teaching strategies, integrating materials
that underscore global issues, facilitating graduate-level courses, and contributing to the overall excellence of upper-division disciplinary courses. In addition to teaching awards, demonstrating flexibility in meeting the needs of the department, college, university, and service region are also indicative of this category.

2. Scholarly Productivity and Professional Achievement

A candidate must demonstrate scholarly productivity and professional achievement by evidence of published books, book chapters, refereed and non-refereed research articles, research reports, and essays as well as awarded grants/contracts, grant proposals, research proposals, and book contracts. Additional indicators of scholarly productivity and professional achievement include presentations at professional conferences or other appropriate venues and completed evaluation reports or interim progress reports of a research project.

Contribution to a discipline’s knowledge base as well as qualitative or quantitative applied research, scholarly grant consultation, creating or evaluating programs, and work related to changing state, regional, or federal policy are also demonstrative of scholarly productivity and professional achievement. Refereed and non-refereed research articles and books that are published in venues where payment of publisher ensures publication are not as considered evidence of Scholarly Productivity and Professional Achievement, whether preliminary or non-preliminary in scope.

3. Service

A candidate must provide evidence of service to the program, department, college, university, academic profession, and community/region in a professional capacity. Service activities may include participation on university, department, college and/or program committees and participation in interdisciplinary collaborations and programs, in addition to grant writing for and service to community/regional agencies. The sponsorship of student organizations and the commission of administrative responsibilities, which may involve supplemental pay or reassigned time from teaching and research, are also demonstrative of service. Documentation assessing a faculty member’s committee contributions (i.e., committees regarding a unit, departmental, college, university, ad hoc, regional engagement, and Faculty Senate) will be acquired from the committee head (i.e., committee chair, co-chair, coordinator, co-coordinator) or from a member of the committee’s leadership body (i.e., an executive committee member). If the candidate acted as a committee head, he or she will seek
documentation from the administrator(s), who assigned or appointed his or her involvement in the committee.

Morehead State University through its Center of Regional Engagement advocates a mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources between the institution and its regional-community constituents, a form of partnership often identified as service. Likewise, SSWC faculty are encouraged to enrich their pedagogical and scholarly productivity via service-based learning and community engagement pathways, which are intended to advance or facilitate regional and/or community-based needs. Areas of regional engagement needs noted by the Center of Regional Engagement include Community Building, Economic/Entrepreneurial Development, Education, and Health and Wellness. While partnerships in such areas are important, the array of practices and disciplines represented in this department allows for multiple methods of regional engagement. Consequently, SSWC will acknowledge regional engagement needs, partnerships, and accomplishments that are separate from this list, in particular those outcomes shown to promote knowledge, advancement, and reciprocity between MSU and state, local, national, and global communities.

V. Department Faculty Types and Weight of Assessment

The evaluation of non-tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, and tenured faculty are weighted as demonstrated below. The weightings are flexible for tenure-track and tenured faculty who are NOT on sabbatical leave. The flexible percentage weightings should be determined in consultation with the Department Chair. The faculty member’s annual report shall include the recommended percentages for the following year:

Two important points associated with the aforementioned paradigm and its accompanying rubric includes the following:

1) Research and service course release conditions are negotiated by the faculty member and the SSWC Department Chair, whose approval is predicated on evidence of the following upon the completion of time released: (1) a major peer-reviewed or professionally-vetted product, which includes but is not limited to outcomes involving pedagogical or training implementation, a creative production, a modification of community, state, regional, or federal policy, a grant/contract award, a completed book or publication, etc. and (2) the advancement of professional knowledge, skills, and abilities relevant to disciplinary, institutional and/or regional-community development.

2) Faculty of the Department of Sociology, Social Work, and Criminology at Morehead State University established that the accompanying rubric appropriately addresses the requirements desired by all units and their respective candidates in the review of teaching, scholarly production, and service performance. Accordingly, all candidates from the units of Sociology, Social Work, and Criminology will be evaluated using the identical rubric attached at the end of this document.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Category</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Scholarly Productivity &amp; Professional Achievement</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track*</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track w/Service Release (i.e., Facilitators)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Section III, Item 3 for evaluation guidelines for instructors.

| Tenure-Track w/o Research or Service Release          | 50-70    | 20-40                                             | 10-30   |
| Tenure-Track w/ Research Release                     | 45-60    | 30-45                                             | 10-20   |
| Tenure-Track w/ Service Release                      | 45-60    | 20-35                                             | 20-30   |

(Note: Adjustments are made per course/per semester adding 5 weighted points to the release section (research or service) and subtracting 5 points from the teaching section).

| Tenured w/o Research or Service Release               | 50-70    | 20-40                                             | 10-30   |
| Tenured w/ Research Release                          | 45-60    | 30-45                                             | 10-20   |
| Tenured w/ Service Release                           | 45-60    | 20-35                                             | 20-30   |
| Tenured w/ 6 month Sabbatical                        | 25       | 65                                                | 10      |
| Tenured w/ 12 month Sabbatical                       | 0        | 100                                               | 0       |
(Note: Weight of assessments was derived based on scope of faculty responsibilities at Morehead State University. Given the heavy institutional emphasis on teaching, this category was given the heaviest weight of assessment. The remainder of the faculty assessment was based on scholarly productivity and service based on the time investment required to achieve proficiency in these areas. Weight of assessment is per academic year unless adjustments are made.

VI. Measurements of Faculty Performance

1. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

The category of Teaching recognizes the satisfactory fulfillment of instructional tasks in the classroom and a pattern of availability for the advisement of students, including the supervision of internships, practicum, and thesis experiences.

The category also entails participation in unit and departmental meetings as well as collective responsibilities intended to maintain the quality of the program and attain goals established by the disciplines therein. The level of unit and departmental involvement will be contingent upon the candidate’s faculty rank. If a faculty member is involved in regional engagement, evidence should be provided of how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond and how it is reflected in teaching, as appropriate. Section V, Item 3 describes regional engagement outcomes applicable to candidates in the Department of Sociology, Social Work, and Criminology.

The evaluation of a candidate’s teaching efforts will be based on the data compiled in the candidate's portfolio. Assessment will follow the criteria set forth in the rubric for evaluating teaching found at the end of this document. In compliance with University PAc-35 “Student evaluations of teaching shall account for no more than 50% of the evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching.” Evidence documenting a candidate’s (1a.) teaching effectiveness, (1b.) professional development in the area of teaching includes and (1c) academic advising, but is not limited to, the following:

1a. Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness

1. Documentation of course syllabi and learning objectives

2. Documentation of peer and chair evaluations of teaching
3. Documentation of student comments and testimonials

4. Documentation of students’ tests scores, showing evidence of learning and, possibly, pre- and post-test results

5. Documentation of students’ work showing evidence of learning which would include, but are not limited to, such items as workbooks, class logs, portfolios, essays, creative works, and projects

6. Documentation of students’ corrected work, showing suggestions for improvement and encouragement

7. Documentation of assistance to students outside of class with course-related problems, advisement, securing employment, letters of recommendation, workshops, and tutorial sessions.

8. Documentation of innovative teaching and/or general improvements in course development

9. Documentation of the use of student and professional feedback to improve teaching

10. Documentation of distance learning instruction and delivery (e.g., regional campus instruction, ITV instruction, off-campus instruction, online instruction, hybrid or blended instruction)

11. Documentation of special course materials prepared by the professor for students, such as workbooks, manuals, specialized instructional packets, collections of readings.

12. Documentation of special preparations or modifications made to accommodate students with special needs.

13. Videotape documentation of teaching that reflects overall teaching effectiveness.

14. Documentation of having created or evaluated academic programs

15. Documentation of Independent Study course instruction

16. Documentation of Honors section instruction

17. Documentation of First Year Seminar and Capstone course instruction

18. Documentation of integrating instruction on global issues

19. Documentation of teaching abroad
20. Documentation of teaching graduate-level courses

21. Documentation of graduate and undergraduate student research supervision

22. Documentation of Masters theses supervision or theses committee participation

23. Documentation of student practicum supervision

1b. Documentation of Professional Development in the Area of Teaching and Advising

1. Documentation of attendance at teaching workshops and conferences on pedagogy, professional practice, and discipline-related content

2. Documentation of attendance at workshops and conferences on the professional advisement or supervision of students

3. Documentation of the development of teaching materials for on-campus or online course delivery

4. Documentation of University-sponsored and/or external advising-related workshops/trainings including but not limited to: computer-based advising tools; University policies and procedures to enhance student recruitment/learning/retention; working with specific student populations, and best-practice advising methods.

5. Documentation of integrating professional development strategies or theories in teaching methodologies and/or initiatives

1c. Documentation of Academic Advising

1. Methods of advising performance can be documented in multiple ways to include, but not limited to: Advising Evaluation Forms; emails or other documents from students demonstrating advising outcomes; emails of contacts/coordination/referrals to assist students with financial aid, admissions, study labs, etc.; reference letters provided to students to graduate school, employment, scholarships, etc.; retention and academic probation reports; advising registration/sign-up sheets; program-specific admission screening summaries; evidence of development of student course schedules to graduation; and evidence of broader advising-related activities such as SOAR, cross-advising, and advising students referred by other academic departments/disciplines.
2. Evidence of Scholarly Productivity and Professional Achievement

The array of disciplines represented in the Department of Sociology, Social Work, and Criminology make it necessary to diversify what is viewed and assessed as scholarly productivity and professional achievement. As such, factors used to assess scholarly productivity and professional achievement shall be weighted consistent with the expectations and responsibilities that are unique to a candidate’s discipline. However, all faculty members are expected to maintain an active record of professional activity to the degree that their efforts contribute to or enhance the discipline, profession, and/or academic program. Assessment will follow the criteria set forth in the rubric for evaluating teaching found at the end of this document.

If the faculty member is involved in regional engagement, evidence should be provided of how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond and how it is reflected in scholarly productivity and professional achievement, as appropriate. Section V, Item 3 describes regional engagement outcomes applicable to candidates in the Department of Sociology, Social Work, and Criminology.

Indicators of Scholarly Productivity and Professional Achievement in SSWC are divided among five subcategories of work activities. A candidate’s performance in the area of Scholarly Productivity and Professional Achievement will be determined by evidence aligned with these classifications:

a. Preliminary Scholarly Productivity and Professional Achievement Work

b. Scholarly Productivity and Professional Achievement Work

c. Research and Scholarly Involvement at Professional Organizations and Meetings

d. Professional Development in Scholarly Productivity and Professional Achievement Work

e. Other Documentation of Scholarly Productivity and Professional Achievement Work

2a. Documentation of Preliminary Scholarly Productivity & Professional Achievement Work

Credit for properly documented and significant pre-publication activities is important, as it can provide incentives for faculty engagement in major research efforts, some of which may have duration of multiple years. Evidence documenting preliminary scholarly productivity and professional achievement activities include, but are not limited to, the following:
1. Documentation of drafts of grants submitted for funding
2. Documentation of the creation of research materials (e.g., survey instruments, questionnaires)
3. Documentation of data collection and analysis
4. Documentation of field and lab research activities
5. Documentation of drafts of papers in progress (e.g., reports, proposals, articles, books, and book chapters)
6. Documentation of preliminary work relating to a scholarly or professional exhibit or a scholarly or professional audio, visual, or media work
7. Documentation of interim progress reports of an applied research project
8. Documentation of book contract or letter of commitment regarding the publication of a book

2b. Documentation of Scholarly Productivity and Professional Achievement Work (Non-preliminary work category)

Evidence pertaining to the category of “Scholarly Productivity and Professional Achievement” includes, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Documentation of completed grant or research proposals, which have been approved for external funding
2. Documentation of completed evaluation reports
3. Documentation of compensated scholarly grant consultation
4. Documentation of having reviewed an article or book for a journal or publisher
5. Documentation of authorship of or participation in a scholarly and/or professional exhibit or scholarly and/or professional production
6. Documentation of authorship of an article in a refereed journal and/or book
7. Documentation of authorship of an article in a non-refereed journal and/or book
8. Documentation of authorship of a book
10. Documentation of authorship of a book chapter

11. Documentation of authorship of a book review

12. Documentation of authorship of a "Foreword" manuscript in a book or another form of publication

13. Documentation of authorship of a scholarly paper or other document published as part of a conference proceedings

14. Documentation of authorship of a research monograph published for distribution among affiliated professionals

15. Documentation of authorship of a research paper published for distribution among affiliated professionals

16. Documentation of authorship of a teaching syllabus, reference bibliography or teaching exercise published in a professional association’s resource manual

17. Documentation of authorship of software and patents

18. Documentation of authorship of website

19. Documentation of editorship of a book or journal

20. Documentation of editorship of a professional organization’s newsletter

21. Documentation of completed work relating to a scholarly or professional exhibit or a scholarly or professional audio, visual, or media work

22. Documentation of a completed book draft or manuscript in preparation for a book contract, book editor, or book publisher is evidence of non-preliminary Scholarly Productivity and Professional Achievement work towards tenure or promotion only in accordance with the provisions set forth in Section VII/"Tenure Review", Item 2/" Scholarly Productivity and Professional Achievement" of this FEP

2c. **Documentation of Research and Scholarly Involvement in Professional Organizations and Meetings**

Evidence demonstrating research and scholarly involvement in professional organizations and meetings include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Documentation of invited speaking engagement

2. Workshop, paper presentation, or poster at international or national conference
3. Workshop, paper presentation, or poster at a state or regional conference

4. Moderator or session chair at an international or national conference

5. Moderator or session chair at a regional or state conference

6. Discussant or respondent for a session at an international or national conference (e.g., panelist)

7. Discussant or respondent for a session at a state or regional conference (e.g., panelist)

2d. Documentation of Professional Development in the Areas of Scholarly Productivity and Professional Achievement Work

Evidence demonstrating professional development in the areas of scholarly productivity and professional achievement include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Documentation of attendance at international or national conference in area of expertise

2. Documentation of attendance at state or regional conference in area of expertise

2e. Other Documentation of Scholarly Productivity and Professional Achievement Work

1. Documentation of professional work having been related to changing state, regional, or federal policy

3. Evidence of Service

In general, the category of Service recognizes the expectation that all faculty members contribute both collectively and meaningfully to the work of the department, college, university, region/community as well as their academic profession. As needed documentation assessing a faculty member’s committee contributions (i.e., committees regarding a unit, departmental, college, university, ad hoc, regional engagement, and Faculty Senate) may be acquired from the committee head (i.e., committee chair, co-chair, coordinator, co-coordinator) or from a member of the committee’s leadership body (i.e., an executive committee member). If the candidate acted as a committee head, he or she may seek documentation from the administrator(s), who assigned or appointed his or her involvement in the committee.
If the faculty member is involved in regional engagement, evidence should be provided of how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond and how it is reflected in service, as appropriate. Section IV, Item 3 describes regional engagement outcomes applicable to candidates in the Department of Sociology, Social Work, and Criminology.

Service reflects a broad variety of obligations and tasks that may include, but are not limited to, the following:

**3a. Documentation of Service**

1. Documentation of service on departmental, college, and university committees, including membership or chair positions on either a standing, specially appointed, or ad hoc committee

2. Documentation of student enrollment, recruitment, and/or retention activities related to the department, college, or university, which includes but is not limited to participation in SOAR, open house, diversity activities as well as audio-visual or media-based promotional work (e.g., website or newsletter editorship, etc.)

3. Documentation of community service, including the supervision of non-mandatory student internships/projects benefitting a community organization, having created or evaluated a community-based programs, service on a community committee or board, service provided without compensation to the community, membership or chair positions in a community organization, and participation in the events of community organizations

4. Documentation of student service, including sponsorship of a student organization or honor society, supervision of a student field trip, and service on university committees relating to the Student Affairs unit

5. Documentation of professional service, including consulting services/workshops in the area of expertise, documentation of non-compensated scholarly grant consultation, participation in the planning of an international, national, state or regional conference, and participation as an officer or member of a professional organization. Documentation of service as an official university representative is also indicative of professional service

6. Documentation of the development of functioning relationships with professional groups in business, industry, trade, education, government, public schools, and the performance of public service within the faculty's field of expertise

7. Documentation of participation as a faculty mentor to junior faculty

8. Documentation of service on the following committees, to which special
consideration will be awarded: the Faculty Senate, the Academic Appeals Committee, the Institutional Review Board, the College and University Promotion and Tenure Committees, and the department, college, and/or university Curriculum Committees

9. Documentation of administrative responsibilities, which may involve supplemental pay or reassigned time from teaching and research

3b. Other Documentation of Service Activities

VII. Faculty Performance Rubric

The Rubric for evaluating faculty performance is attached at the end of this document

VIII. Tenure Review

A. Minimum Expectations for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Sociology, Social Work, and Criminology candidates seeking tenure must provide substantiation of effective teaching and active service, in addition to scholarly productivity and professional achievement that is based on a committed research agenda. The minimum expectations of these are as followed:

1. Effectiveness in Teaching

At the time of tenure review, Sociology, Social Work, and Criminology tenure-track candidates should be able to document cumulative evidence of at least a satisfactory performance in teaching, as evidenced by student, peer, and Department Chair evaluations.

2. Scholarly Productivity and Professional Achievement

At the time of tenure review, Sociology, Social Work, and Criminology tenure-track candidates should be able to document:

   a. One published book

   OR

   Two peer-reviewed works accepted for publication in a journal

At the time of review, in addition to the aforementioned work(s), Sociology, Social Work, and Criminology tenure-track candidates must have evidence of at least one of the following:

   b. A completed book draft or manuscript in preparation for a book contract, a book editor, or a book publisher
c. A research grant or a research contract

d. Five presentations at state, regional, national, and/or international professional conferences

e. A significant, peer-reviewed contribution to a database, a textbook, or a professional encyclopedia

3. Service

In regards to the minimum requirements for Service at the time of tenure review:

a. Sociology, Social Work, and Criminology tenure-track candidates, during years 1-2, are required to perform and to document one department, college, university, regional, or community service obligation per academic year.

b. Sociology, Social Work, and Criminology tenure-track candidates, during years 3-5, are required to perform and to document two department, college, university, regional, and/or community service obligations per academic year. Service having a university standing is strongly encouraged. Candidates demonstrating university service credentials will be offered special consideration.

Documentation assessing a faculty member’s committee contributions (i.e., committees regarding a unit, departmental, college, university, ad hoc, regional engagement, and Faculty Senate) will be acquired from the committee head (i.e., committee chair, co-chair, coordinator, co-coordinator) or from a member of the committee’s leadership body (i.e., an executive committee member). If the candidate acted as a committee head, he or she will seek documentation from the administrator(s), who assigned or appointed his or her involvement in the committee.

B. Description of Tenure/Contract Renewal Process of Evaluation and Involved Participants

1. Departmental Tenure Committee

University PAc-27 reads, “The Assistant Professor who successfully gains tenure will be automatically promoted to the rank of Associate Professor without further review.” Thus, the PAc further stipulates, the standards for promotion from an Assistant Professor to an Associate Professor are the same as those for tenure. Candidates vying for tenure in the Department of Sociology, Social Work, and Criminology will be evaluated by the SSWC Tenure Committee in accordance with the guidelines outlined in PAc-27 and the timeline stated in the Personnel Action Calendar Summary provided each academic year by the Office of the Provost.
The Tenure Committee will consist of all eligible tenured faculty members in the department. In compliance with PAc-27, in the event that there are fewer than five eligible faculty members, the department will invite enough full-time tenured faculty from the Caudill College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences to form a five-member committee.

The committee will meet annually to review and evaluate the candidate’s tenure track portfolio and may ask the candidate for additional documentation of items and statements made in the portfolio. As part of the review and evaluation process, the committee will vote by secret ballot to recommend the tenure or non-tenure of the candidate. Following, the committee will produce a written evaluation that incorporates recommendations and a constructive appraisal of the portfolio's strengths and weaknesses, using the department’s Faculty Evaluation Plan as criteria for evaluation. The written evaluation will be placed in the candidate’s portfolio. A copy will be delivered to the candidate by the committee chair. The department Tenure Committee will forward the portfolio to the Department Chair, who will meet with the candidate to discuss the written evaluations and recommendations after each probationary review.

2. The Department Chair

University PAc-27 states that it is the Department Chair’s responsibility to certify the information contained in the portfolio. The policy adds that the chair must determine whether the performance level of the candidate is below, at, or above the performance level commensurate with that of a tenurable faculty member in the department, as based on the criteria in the department Faculty Evaluation Plan.

In so doing, the chair will conduct his or her evaluation of the portfolio and, pursuant of PAc-27, will produce a written evaluation of the candidate’s portfolio. The chair’s evaluation document, which will recommend the tenure or non-tenure of the candidate, will be added to the candidate’s portfolio. A copy will be delivered to the candidate. The candidate's portfolio, along with all written evaluations and vote tallies, will be forwarded to the College Tenure Committee. If there is an appeal, adjudication committees must state in writing whether an evaluation is to be changed.

IX. Promotion Review

A. Minimum Expectations for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Sociology, Social Work, and Criminology candidates seeking promotion must provide substantiation of effective teaching and active service, in addition to scholarly productivity and professional achievement that is based on a committed research agenda. The minimum expectations of these are as followed:
1. Effectiveness in Teaching

At the time of promotion review, promotion candidates should be able to document evidence of a consistent pattern of effective instruction, as evidenced by student, peer, and Department Chair evaluations.

2. Scholarly Productivity and Professional Achievement

Sociology, Social Work, and Criminology candidates seeking promotion to Professor should demonstrate continuous, active scholarship and professional achievement that is based on scholarship activities beyond those upon which tenure was awarded. The minimum expectation for scholarly productivity and professional achievement at the time of promotion review is:

a. One published book
   OR
   Three published, peer-reviewed works, which may include one book chapter. One of these works must be of local, state, regional, national, and/or international significance.
   OR
   At least one publication and Principal Investigator on at least two grants or contracts that enhance the department, university, region, state and profession.

At the time of promotion review, in addition to the aforementioned work(s), Sociology, Social Work, and Criminology promotion candidates must also have at least:

b. Five presentations at state, regional, national, and/or international professional conferences

3. Service

In regards to the minimum requirements for Service at the time of promotion review, candidates are required to perform and to document two service activities per academic year with the expectation of an increasing leadership, presence, and mentorship role within the department and the University. Documentation assessing a faculty member’s committee contributions (i.e., committees regarding a unit, departmental, college, university, ad hoc, regional engagement, and Faculty Senate) will be acquired from the committee head (i.e., committee chair, co-chair, coordinator, co-coordinator) or from a member of the committee’s leadership body (i.e., an executive committee member). If the candidate acted as a committee head, he or she will seek documentation from the administrator(s), who assigned or appointed his or her involvement in the committee.
B. Description of Promotion Process of Evaluation Involved Participants

1. Departmental Promotion Committee

University Pac-27 reads, “Associate Professors who obtain tenure will have to petition separately for promotion to Professor.” Candidates vying for promotion in the Department of Sociology, Social Work, and Criminology will be evaluated by the Department Promotion Committee in accordance with the procedures and criteria outlined in PAc-2 and the timeline stated in the Personnel Action Calendar Summary provided each academic year by the Office of the Provost. All full-time tenured professors in a department will serve on the department Promotion Committee. The committee will consist of a minimum of five members of faculty.

The Promotion Committee will review and evaluate the candidate’s promotion portfolio and may ask the candidate for additional documentation of items and statements made in the portfolio. Following, the committee will produce a written evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the portfolio, using the Department's Faculty Evaluation Plan as criteria for evaluation. The written evaluation will be signed by all committee members. As part of the review and evaluation process, the committee will conduct a vote by secret ballot to affirm or deny the support of the promotion portfolio. A copy of the evaluation and the vote tally will be delivered to the candidate. The promotion portfolio, written evaluation, and vote tally will be forwarded to the Department Chair.

2. The Department Chair

The University’s PAc-2 states that it is the Department Chair’s responsibility to evaluate and certify that the information contained in the portfolio is at or above the performance level specified by the departmental criteria for promotion to professor. The policy also states that this evaluation and certification must be part of the chair’s letter of evaluation. The chair will add his or her letter of evaluation to the candidate’s portfolio, and a copy of the evaluation document will be delivered to the promotion candidate. The candidate’s promotion portfolio, along with all written evaluations and vote tallies, will be forwarded to the College Promotion Committee. If there is an appeal, adjudication committees must state in writing whether an evaluation is to be changed.

X. Faculty Workload Agreement

Pursuant to University PAc-29, tenure and tenure-track faculty are eligible to participate in or request a Flexible Workload Agreement (FWA), which provides time to pursue their strengths to the greatest extent possible in support of the University. The FWA may be administrative –initiated or faculty-initiated. Under normal circumstances, instructors are not eligible to request a faculty-initiated FWA.

University PAc-29 reads that tenured and tenure-track faculty may submit to their immediate supervisor a request for a faculty-initiated FWA to support planned activities
in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship for the next calendar year. All support
documentation regarding a faculty member’s FWA will be placed in his or her portfolio
for reference. Tenured faculty may submit to their immediate supervisor a request to
increase or decrease their instructional responsibilities in exchange for a reduction or
increase, respectively, in the FEP performance expectations in the area of scholarship.
Tenured faculty may not request to reduce their FEP performance in the area of service.
If an agreement is not met between the supervisor and faculty for a faculty-initiated
FWA, then the supervisor’s immediate supervisor will negotiate an acceptable FWA,
which is consistent with the faculty member’s request and the program/department’s
needs.

Approved adjusted workloads derived from a Flexible Workload Agreement will be
conducted in accordance with the Faculty Evaluation Plan and will be calculated based
upon Section VI’s, “Department Faculty Types and Weights of Assessment.”
SSWC Annual Review Rubric

The SSWC faculty will submit a narrative document, overviewing productivity in each domain of the FEP, which will be used to provide data on teaching effectiveness, scholarly productivity and professional achievement, and service. This narrative data will help the chair in determining the faculty’s performance score. The weighted value used is the percentage of individual effort devoted to the domain per the FEP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Effectiveness</th>
<th>Below Expectations (0-2 points)</th>
<th>Meets Expectations (3-5 points)</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations (6-8 points)</th>
<th>Meritorious (9-11 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Quality of teaching is rated below 3.0 (average across submitted forms) on the IDEA adjusted score for Excellent Teacher.</td>
<td>• Quality of teaching is rated between 3.0 – 3.9 (average across submitted forms) on the IDEA adjusted score for Excellent Teacher.</td>
<td>• Quality of teaching is rated at 4.0 or 4.5 (average across submitted forms) on the IDEA adjusted score for Excellent Teacher.</td>
<td>• Quality of teaching is rated at 4.6 to 5.0 (average across submitted forms) on the IDEA adjusted score for Excellent Teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching is rated as below expectations through scheduled peer reviews.</td>
<td>• Teaching is rated as meeting expectations through scheduled peer reviews.</td>
<td>• Teaching is rated as above expectations through scheduled peer reviews.</td>
<td>• Performance in teaching duties in the classroom and in carrying out other responsibilities related to teaching effectiveness as outlined in the Department of SSWC FEP Section VI Subsection 1 are meritorious.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Performance in teaching duties in the classroom and in carrying out other responsibilities related to teaching effectiveness as outlined in the Department of SSWC FEP Section VI Subsection 1 are below expectations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching Score: _____ x _____ (weighted value) = _____. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(0-2 points)</th>
<th>(3-5 points)</th>
<th>(6-8 points)</th>
<th>(9-11 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The faculty member does not meet expectations by engaging in writing or publication as outlined in the Department of SSWC FEP Section VI Subsection 2.</td>
<td>- The faculty member meets expectations and has works in progress as outlined in the Department of SSWC FEP Section VI Subsection 2.</td>
<td>- The faculty member performs above expectations as outlined in the Department of SSWC FEP Section VI Subsection 2 and has published 1 refereed product or 1 funded grant/contract.</td>
<td>- The faculty member performs at a meritorious level as outlined in the Department of SSWC FEP Section VI Subsection 2 and has published 2 refereed products or 2 funded grant/contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The faculty member has not presented at scholarly meetings/organizations.</td>
<td>- The faculty member made 1 presentation at a scholarly organization meeting/conference.</td>
<td>- The faculty member made 2 presentations at scholarly organization meetings/conferences.</td>
<td>- The faculty member made 3 presentations at scholarly organization meetings/conferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Performance in the area of scholarly productivity and professional achievement as outlined in the Department of SSWC FEP Section VI Subsection 2 is below expectations.</td>
<td>- Performance in the area of scholarly productivity and professional achievement as outlined in the Department of SSWC FEP Section VI Subsection 2 meets expectations.</td>
<td>- Performance in the area of scholarly productivity and professional achievement as outlined in the Department of SSWC FEP Section VI Subsection 2 is above expectations.</td>
<td>- Performance in the area of scholarly productivity and professional achievement as outlined in the Department of SSWC FEP Section VI Subsection 2 is meritorious.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPPA Score:** ______ x ________ (weighted value) = ______
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>(0-2 points)</th>
<th>(3-5 points)</th>
<th>(6-8 points)</th>
<th>(9-11 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The faculty member does not participate in service through membership on committees for program, department, college, and/or university levels.</td>
<td>• The faculty member provides service through membership on two committees for program, department, college, and/or university levels.</td>
<td>• The faculty member exceeds service expectations through membership on three committees for program, department, college, and/or university levels.</td>
<td>• The faculty member performs at a meritorious level through membership on three committees for program, department, college, and/or university levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The faculty member does not participate in professional organizations.</td>
<td>• The faculty member demonstrates active membership in professional organizations.</td>
<td>• The faculty member actively engages in service to professional organizations through leadership activities.</td>
<td>• The faculty member actively engages in service to professional organizations through leadership activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Performance in the area of service as outlined in the Department of SSWC FEP Section VI Subsection 3 is below expectations.</td>
<td>• Performance in the area of service as outlined in the Department of SSWC FEP Section VI Subsection 3 meets expectations.</td>
<td>• Performance in the area of service as outlined in the Department of SSWC FEP Section VI Subsection 3 is above expectations.</td>
<td>• Performance in the area of service as outlined in the Department of SSWC FEP Section VI Subsection 3 is above expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Score: ______ x ______ (weighted value) = ______</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Total Weighted Value of all three sections: _________ |
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Morehead State University

I. Introduction

A. Philosophy

Consistent with the mission of Morehead State University (MSU), the Department of Engineering and Technology Management (ETM) believes that faculty members should be dedicated scholars committed to the advancement of knowledge through excellence in teaching, continuous professional development and achievement, and service. We are committed to providing an academic environment that encourages, supports, and allows faculty to reach their highest potential in professional development. In accordance with University policies, we seek to recognize and reward continual faculty development and excellence in teaching, professional achievement, and service through recommendations for tenure and reappointment, promotion, and merit-based salary increases.

B. Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this Faculty Evaluation Plan is to outline the general departmental expectations for tenure and reappointment, promotion, and merit pay in accordance with the appropriate University policies. In all cases, review and evaluation procedures will exactly follow those outlined in the appropriate University policy (i.e. PAc 27 Tenure Review, PAc 2 Promotion Review, PAc 35 Faculty Evaluation Plans). The faculty will be evaluated on performance by the faculty evaluation plan (FEP) with a professional development plan (PDP) established by each faculty member. The PDP will be a collaboratively established document developed by each individual faculty member and approved by the department chair by March 1 for the year of review. The PDP is intended to support both faculty and university professional needs. The PDP will thus establish review-period goals and objectives for each faculty member and must be approved by the department chair.

C. Disclaimer

Performance-based salary increase and evaluations for tenure (as per PAc 27) and/or promotion (as per PAc 2) are separate processes, and consequently, meeting or exceeding merit pay criteria does not automatically ensure a favorable tenure and/or promotion decision. Merit-based salary evaluations are based on annual performance whereas tenure and promotion evaluations are based on cumulative performance. As
the University strives to recruit and maintain an outstanding faculty, meeting the minimal expectations of performance will not be sufficient for tenure and/or promotion.

II. Tenure and Reappointment

A. Departmental Goals and Objectives

Consistent with the Departmental mission and philosophy, the overall goal of the tenure and reappointment process is to develop and retain faculty with outstanding academic credentials and training, and a life-long commitment to academic excellence in teaching, professional achievement, and service. The major objective of the FEP is to provide the necessary support, encouragement, and mentoring for tenure-track faculty to meet and exceed the high standards of excellence required for tenure at the departmental, college, and university levels. Important components of this faculty development program include a clear understanding of departmental expectations and annual probationary evaluations with constructive feedback. To provide clear lines of responsibility for the mentoring of probationary faculty, the Department Chair will select a faculty mentor for each tenure-track faculty member from among the tenured faculty members of the ETM Department.

B. Probationary/Tenure Review Procedures

It is the intent of the annual probationary reviews to provide candidates with an honest and constructive appraisal of their performance, and their potential to meet the expected standards of performance of a tenurable faculty member within the six-year timeframe of tenure review, as outlined in PAc-27. The process begins with the candidate’s submission of a Reappointment/Tenure Portfolio, which will be reviewed by the Department Tenure Committee and the Departmental Chair. The procedures for constructing the reappointment/tenure portfolio, and for conducting the probationary and tenure reviews are outlined in PAc-27. It is the responsibility of the departmental tenure committee, the department chair, the faculty mentor, and the candidate to understand and to follow these procedures.

1. Departmental Committee

In accordance with PAc-27, the Departmental Tenure Committee will consist of all eligible tenured faculty members within the department. The committee will meet annually to review and evaluate the tenure-track candidate’s reappointment/tenure portfolio, following exactly the prescribed procedures as outlined in PAc-27. Annual written reviews of probationary faculty shall include an evaluation of strengths and weaknesses in each area of evaluation with specific recommendation for improvement, where concerns or weaknesses are noted. In addition, as outlined in PAc-27, the committee will make a recommendation, in the form of a vote, as to whether the candidate’s contract should be renewed and/or tenure should be granted. This written evaluation shall be placed in the candidate’s portfolio, and a copy shall be delivered to the candidate.

2. Department Chair
In accordance with PAc-27, the Department Chair will review and evaluate the candidate’s portfolio and add his/her written recommendation/evaluation to the portfolio, with a copy delivered to the candidate. The Department Chair shall also seek the opinions of external reviewers, who normally will be faculty at other institutions comparable to MSU, as to the quality of the tenure candidate’s professional achievement. The Chair shall weigh these comments from external reviewers carefully when making his or her own evaluation of the candidate’s suitability for tenure. The Department Chair will meet with the candidate to discuss the written evaluations and recommendations after each annual probationary review.

3. Role of Faculty Mentor
The Department Chair and all tenured faculty within the department share in the responsibility to guide and support tenure-track faculty toward tenure. Each tenure-track candidate will be assigned a Faculty Mentor, who will assume primary responsibility in assisting the candidate in understanding University policies and procedures related to teaching, advising, research, service, travel, etc. In addition, the mentor should provide advice and assistance in understanding tenure and promotion expectations as well as with the preparation of probationary review and tenure portfolios. Prior to submission of the candidate’s portfolio for review, either for reappointment or for tenure, the tenure-track faculty member and the mentor shall be expected to look over the portfolio for overall quality. During formal reappointment reviews, the faculty mentor will be asked to provide, in writing, an assessment of the candidate’s progress since the last review. During the final tenure review, the mentor will again be asked to provide, in writing, an overall summation of the candidate’s progress toward tenure.

C. Expectations

Tenure and reappointment evaluations involve three components: Teaching (including advising), Professional Achievement, and Service. The tenure decision has long-term implications for the department’s ability to fulfill its mission. Thus, tenure must be awarded only as a result of a careful assessment over a period of time sufficient to judge the faculty member’s documented accomplishments in teaching effectiveness, professional achievement, and service, as well as the individual’s potential productivity. For annual reappointment, it is anticipated that the tenure-track faculty member will demonstrate consistent progress in the areas of teaching effectiveness, professional achievement, and service. That is, the candidate should demonstrate a gradual increase in productivity in terms of professional achievement, greater involvement in service-related activities, and continued development of teaching effectiveness. For a favorable tenure decision, the Departmental Committee and Department Chair must be convinced, based upon the candidate’s cumulative portfolio, that the candidate’s record represents a pattern indicative of a lifetime of continued accomplishments and productivity.

1. Teaching Effectiveness
The first step in the review process is an evaluation of teaching effectiveness. That is, unless a determination is made that the candidate is an effective teacher, tenure will not
be granted. At a minimum, effective teaching requires a thorough knowledge of the subject, the ability to present material in a clear fashion, the ability to work with, motivate, and serve as a role model for students. All faculty within the department are expected to be committed to continuous development and improvement of teaching. In accordance with PAc-27, the Department Tenure Committee and the Department Chair shall review multiple indices of teaching effectiveness including, but not limited to, student course evaluations, peer evaluations, in-class reviews of teaching by the Department Chair, student outcome measures, copies of written feedback on student assessment instruments, and course assessment materials (syllabi, examinations, assignments, lab activities and reports) as evidenced in faculty-generated course portfolios. The Tenure Committee and Chair shall consider, in addition to other factors, the rigorous nature of assessment instruments for the class level (i.e., 100, 200, 300,) being evaluated. In addition, evidence of effective advising, mentoring, and supervision of students, as well as general availability, shall be considered as important components of teaching. Although favorable student evaluations are expected, student evaluations alone shall not be considered as sufficient evidence of effective teaching. Given the qualitative nature of this assessment, it is important that probationary faculty be provided with clear and constructive feedback of their performance and progress in meeting departmental expectations in teaching effectiveness in their annual probationary reviews. For tenure, the candidate’s portfolio shall provide clear evidence of effective use of contemporary teaching methods and technology as well as evidence predictive of a commitment to continued development in this area.

In addition, the following specific activities are required to be documented for tenure in the area of Teaching (all of below):

- Positive evaluations of in-class and/or in-lab performance, by peer and chair
- Positive and/or improving student evaluations over time

2. Professional Achievement

All candidates for tenure in the ETM Department are expected to establish a research program in their academic discipline. The candidate is expected to seek both internal and external support for their research program through the submission of grant proposals. It is expected that these research activities shall involve undergraduate and/or graduate students, whenever possible. The research program should lead to presentations at state, regional, and national professional meetings and conferences, and to refereed publications. In addition, faculty are expected to attend and participate in discipline-based professional meetings, workshops, and where appropriate, continuing education activities. Service on editorial boards, grant review committees, and leadership positions in professional organizations at the state, regional, and national level are highly encouraged. Judgments will be made based upon both the quantity and quality of these activities. Probationary faculty should demonstrate a progressive increase in such activities. For tenure, the candidate’s record should provide evidence of professional achievement sufficient to predict, with a high degree of confidence, continuing productivity and achievement throughout the candidate’s career.
In addition, the following specific activities are required to be documented for tenure in the area of Professional Achievement (all of below):

- 1 funded external grant or (1 funded internal (MSU) grant AND 1 unfunded external grant with high reviews)
- 1 peer-reviewed publication (in print or accepted) in an appropriate journal with the contribution detailed by the faculty member.
- Either one deliverable, e.g., final report, prototype, or article, as a result of a sponsored grant OR a scientific patent OR a scientific contract awarded.
- Demonstrated, ongoing involvement of student(s) in research endeavors where appropriate/possible
- 1 additional example of scholarship from the “Above Expected” activities list (see page 15)

3. Service
All candidates for tenure in the ETM Department are expected to be committed to the mission of the Department, College, and University. This commitment requires a willingness to contribute one’s time and energy to a variety of service activities both within and outside the university community. Important service activities within the university include membership and active participation on departmental, college, and university committees, sponsorship of co-curricular activities, etc. External community service may include work for professional organizations and community, state, and federal agencies. External service activities should relate to the University’s mission and capitalize upon the faculty member’s special professional expertise. It is anticipated that an individual’s service activities will gradually increase during the probationary period. In recognition that service commitments involve varying degrees of time and effort, evaluation of service will address both the quantity and quality of activities. For tenure, the candidate’s record should provide evidence of service activities sufficient to predict the individual’s commitment and probable future productivity in this area.
In addition, the following specific activities are required to be documented for tenure in the area of Service (two of three items listed below):

- Demonstrated, continuing service to the department on a functioning committee, participation at SOAR sessions, and student advising.
- Demonstrated service to MSU on a functioning committee beyond the department level, for two or more years.
- External service either as a representative of MSU, or as a professional in your academic field, in one or more activities.
4. Annual Review of Instructors
In accordance with PAc-34, non-tenure track instructors shall be evaluated annually in a manner consistent with tenure-track faculty with the exception that Teaching Effectiveness will be the primary area of evaluation.

III. Promotion

A. Departmental Goals and Objectives

The ETM Department seeks to recruit and retain faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, professional achievement, and service. The major post-tenure objective of the promotion process is to recognize and reward faculty for their demonstration of continued excellence in their performance and accomplishments.

• Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

The performance standards used to evaluate promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor are the same standards as those used to evaluate for tenure (as per PAc-27). In accordance with PAc-27, the Assistant Professor (defined as per PAc-1) who successfully meets the performance standards for tenure will be automatically promoted to the rank of Associate Professor (defined as per PAc-1) without further review (p. 2 of 13, PAc-27).

• Associate Professor to Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor (defined as per PAc-1) is reserved for those faculty members who have demonstrated the highest level of achievement, competence, and dedication to their field through continued excellence in teaching, and outstanding accomplishments in professional achievement, and service. Promotion to the rank of Professor should be based upon an assessment that, since last promotion, the candidate has made contributions of the appropriate magnitude and quality in teaching, professional achievement, and service. Additionally, the candidate must demonstrate the ability and motivation to sustain contributions to the field and the department throughout their career. Although a minimum number of years of service is generally required (i.e. minimum of five years as Associate Professor, three of which must have been at Morehead State University as per PAc 1 Definition of Academic Titles), promotion to the rank of Professor is dependent upon outstanding performance and accomplishments, not years of service or annual merit pay evaluations.
● Promotion Review Procedures

1. **Departmental Committee**
   In accordance with PAc-2, the Department Promotion Committee will consist of all full-time tenured Professors in the Department. In the event that five tenured professors are unavailable, then additional committee members will be added to the committee from the College of Science and Technology in accordance with the guidelines in PAc-2. This committee will evaluate the candidate’s promotion portfolio and make a recommendation based on the procedures outlined in PAc-2.

2. **Department Chair**
   In accordance with PAc-2, the Department Chair will review and evaluate the candidate’s portfolio and add his/her written evaluation to the portfolio, with a copy delivered to the candidate. The Department Chair will meet with the candidate to discuss the written evaluation and provide recommendations for future improvement.

● **Expectations**

The ETM Department is committed to excellence in all areas of faculty achievement: Teaching, Professional Achievement, and Service. However, we recognize that equal excellence in all areas is unlikely, if not impossible. Consequently, for a favorable recommendation for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, the candidate must provide evidence of continued excellence and dedication to teaching, and truly outstanding accomplishments, since last promotion, in either professional achievement or service, with superior performance in both. A candidate that is judged to be weak in any area will not be recommended for promotion to Professor.

1. **Teaching Effectiveness**
   The evaluation of teaching effectiveness will be conducted in a manner similar to that for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor (see II. C. 1.) with emphasis on the time period since last promotion and/or tenure. Evidence must clearly indicate that the candidate is not only an effective teacher, but is also committed to contemporary teaching excellence.

   The following specific activities are required to be documented for promotion to Professor in the area of Teaching:

   ● Positive evaluations of in-class and/or in-lab performance, from both chair/peer evaluations and from student evaluations.
2. **Professional Achievement**

The evaluation of accomplishments in professional achievement will be conducted in a manner similar to that for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor (see II.C.2.), with emphasis on the time period since last promotion. All faculty in the Department of AET are expected to maintain an active research program. Candidates judged outstanding will have made significant contributions to their field through continued research productivity as evidenced by refereed publications, presentations at regional and national meetings, and funded intramural and extramural research grants. Other indices of significant accomplishments in this area may include leadership roles in state, regional, and national professional organizations related to the candidate’s discipline. In general, the designation of “outstanding” requires evidence of significant accomplishments in professional achievement from peer groups both within and external to Morehead State University.

The following specific activities are required to be documented for promotion to Professor in the area of Professional Achievement (all of below):

- 1 funded external grant OR several unfunded grants, with high reviews
- 2 patents or peer-reviewed publications (in print or accepted) in an appropriate journal with details of faculty contribution OR one patent and one peer-reviewed publication
- Demonstrated, ongoing involvement of student(s) in research endeavors
- 4 additional examples of scholarship from the Above Expected activities list (see page 15)

3. **Service Activities**

The evaluation of accomplishments in service will be conducted in a manner similar to that for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor (see II.C.3.), with emphasis on the time period since last promotion. All faculty are expected to serve actively on committees at the department, college, and university levels. Thus, merely serving on a large number of committees will not be considered as evidence of outstanding service. Candidates judged outstanding will have demonstrated exceptional competence in leadership roles on university committees, professional organizations, and/or in professional service to the community, state, region, or nation. Although quantity of service will be considered, the candidate’s demonstrated competence and productivity in service are considered most important. Like professional achievement, the designation of “outstanding” requires evidence of accomplishments in service from peer groups both within and external to the University.
The following specific activities are required to be documented for promotion to Professor in the area of Service (all of the below):

- Demonstrated, continuing service to the department on a functioning committee, SOAR sessions, and advising
- Demonstrated service to MSU on a functioning committee beyond the department level for at least three years
- Service on one University committee
- External service either as a representative of MSU, or as a professional in your academic field, in one or more activities.

IV. Merit-Based Salary Increases

A. Departmental Goals and Objectives

The Department of ETM seeks to support and retain faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, professional achievement, and service. The major objectives of the merit pay process are: 1) to evaluate faculty performance annually; 2) to recognize and reward faculty for their performance and accomplishments; and 3) to provide formative feedback for continued faculty development. In accordance with PAc-35, each faculty member within the department will be evaluated with respect to a flexible set of standards that accommodate the specific role of the individual within the department as well as opportunity, rank, and PDP objectives. For example, newly hired faculty will not be penalized for the lack of service opportunities within their first year. Similarly, expectations in teaching, professional achievement, and service shall increase with rank and years of service.

B. Guidelines for Merit Pay Review

In accordance with PAc-35, each full time faculty member will be reviewed on an annual basis through the ETM Faculty Evaluation Plan (FEP). The FEP shall evaluate the performance of each tenured and tenure-track faculty member in terms of the broad categories of teaching, professional achievement, and service. Instructors shall be evaluated similarly except expectations in professional achievement and service shall be limited and negotiated annually with the department chair. The FEP will serve as the basis for decisions regarding annual salary increases and provides a framework for the annual review of faculty. The faculty recognize the diversity of interests of its members and believe that such diversity serves to strengthen the department and its mission to the students of the university. Hence, evidence of expected performance in each general category can be demonstrated in a variety of ways.

The review shall be based on a portfolio submitted by the faculty member consisting of a one-page letter summarizing the evaluation year's activities and a vita (three page maximum length) outlining efforts in teaching, professional achievement, and service for the evaluation year before the THIRD Monday of January. The department chair will review teaching evaluations by the students, advisor ratings, and course portfolios for each faculty member and may request other pertinent supporting materials such as publications, papers, presentations, etc. as needed to make an informed evaluation of the past years'
activities. In addition, the Department chair is expected to directly observe the unannounced teaching performance of each faculty member at least once per academic year (twice for tenure-track faculty). The Department chair will share the results of his/her observation with the faculty member within ten (10) working days of the observation.

The Department chair will arrange a private conference with the faculty member prior to the THIRD Monday in February to discuss the results of the faculty member's performance for the evaluation year. The written assessment shall include the specifics of the faculty member's rating for each category of merit plus an overall rating. A discussion relative to strengths and potential areas for improvement shall be included in this conference so the faculty member can begin preparing his/her PDP objectives due on or before the FIRST Friday in March.

Each of the three major areas of effort will be evaluated in terms of the following rating scale:

- Performance at Expected level
- Performance Above Expected Level

In light of recent University-wide developments in faculty compensation, annual salary increases will be partially determined by performance in teaching, professional achievement, and service. It is understood that the evaluation of these areas will involve both quantitative and qualitative considerations. Alongside the Departmental evaluation of merit, the University system will determine pay levels consistent with market benchmarks and years at a given faculty rank. Therefore, an Overall Evaluation score will be calculated through the summation of the weighted rating scores in these three areas. The Overall Evaluation score will be used to determine whether a faculty member might be placed in the category of “top 20%” for the College. This designation will be used by Departmental and College administration to award increases for a given year above the benchmark salary.

C. Expectations

Consistent with the mission of the University, the Department of ETM maintains the highest expectations of its faculty in teaching, professional achievement, and service. Consequently, a distinction should be made between meeting “minimum” expectations and meeting “Departmental” expectations. “Minimum” expectations indicate that an individual is meeting the basic requirements in an area of evaluation. In contrast, the Department of ETM expects faculty performance to greatly exceed the minimum requirements of the position.
12. **Teaching Effectiveness**
Teaching activities shall comprise 60% of the total evaluation rating for tenured and tenure-track faculty and 75% of the evaluation for instructors. Teaching effectiveness will be assessed in terms of both quantitative and qualitative dimensions. As examples of qualitative differences, distinctions between serving as thesis or applied project director versus being a member of a thesis or applied project committee will be recognized. Also, effective use of technology in classes versus minimal or no use of technology will be recognized as a qualitative difference. Faculty are expected to develop and maintain, on a semester basis, a detailed course portfolio for all courses personally taught during the calendar year. While student evaluation of teaching is encouraged in all classes, the overall evaluation of effective teaching shall be based upon multiple indicators.

**Expected activities**
1. Fulfillment of university policies on teaching, such as submitting assessment data for general education courses, holding regular office hours (4-6 hours per week during each semester), posting a door schedule each semester, turning in mid-term and final grades on time, attempting to arrange substitute instruction/activities for all absences from the classroom or lab, where possible.

2. Engagement in advising duties as assigned (instructors are exempt).
3. Overall satisfactory teaching evaluations.
4. Inclusion of student engagement activities (e.g. clickers, in-class activities, inquiry, questioning strategies).
5. Participation in curricular initiatives such as development or alteration of courses, collaboration when teaching courses with multiple sections (e.g. IET 120, 123, 110, etc.), collaboration on teaching implementations with peers (helping someone implement something that you have originated), and technological innovations/implementations in labs. (e.g. setting up new teaching instrumentation/equipment).
6. Ongoing course development based on self-reflection and/or evidence-based data

**Above expected activities**
1. Any of the “expected” activities performed at a level that clearly identifies the faculty member as performing above the university norms, such as carrying an exceptional advising load.
2. Development and/or publishing innovative/excellent materials for classroom or laboratory.
3. Implementation of effective new teaching strategies
4. Winning a teaching award.
5. Exceptional commitment to teaching outside the classroom (tutor and review sessions).
6. Ongoing and/or multiple methods of course assessment beyond departmental or university- required (e.g. IDEA) forms.
7. Involving undergraduate and/or graduate students in research activities.
8. Other activities as defined by agreement with the chair of the department.
9. *Quality Matters* certification for online classes.

Documentation for teaching must include:
- Peer and Chair Classroom/Lab Observation Summary Report.
- Quantitative and qualitative student evaluations, either university approved or instructor-designed. (Student evaluations will not comprise more than 25% of the total evaluation for the teaching component).
- Representative examinations to be evaluated for their clarity, relevance, application of knowledge, critical thinking requirements, inquiry of science, quantitative use of skills, etc.
- Syllabi and/or online learning materials provided for student learning, PLUS creation and updating of course portfolios.

Additional teaching documentation may include (but is not limited to):
- Teaching awards and honors;
- Listing of undergraduate and/or graduate students mentored in research, including any presentations/papers/products/awards made by those students;
- Curriculum development materials (teaching of new and innovative courses or exercises);
- Professional development materials (technology, assessment, pedagogy) demonstrating the art of teaching and the incorporation of new teaching techniques into the classroom;
- Qualitative and/or quantitative evidence of advising activities;
- Program development/revision materials.
13. **Professional Achievement**

Efforts related to professional achievement may comprise a minimum of 30% to a maximum of 35% of the overall evaluation score for tenured and tenured-track faculty, and 5% to 20% for instructors. Rating scores in this area will be determined through an examination of both the quantity and quality of the achievements. Reflecting current views of scholarship within engineering and technology and the academic community, professional achievement is broadly defined. It includes both basic and applied research and activities involving the integration and/or the application of knowledge. Examples of professional achievement include publications in refereed professional journals (i.e. technical, engineering, scientific, or education journals), publications in reviewed proceedings, presentations at professional meetings, writing internal and/or external grant applications, and similar discipline-related activities such as consulting are considered forms of professional achievement.

**Expected Activities**

Faculty members are expected as a matter of professional development to participate in scholarly activities that keep them updated in their field of expertise.

1. Conducting research;
2. Reasonable attendance at departmental and/or other MSU research seminars (greater than 50% of the time unless departmental activities preclude attendance);
3. Membership in appropriate professional research organization(s);
4. Supervising student research such as thesis, honors and/or capstone projects (each year after 1st year);
5. Presenting a paper or presentation at a local, state, or regional** scientific meeting as funding permits;
6. Having a conference or proceedings paper published after review;
7. Attending professional seminars/workshops/meetings/conferences to enhance (non-teaching) research skills when funding allows.
**Above Expected Activities**

1. Any of the “expected” activities performed at a level that clearly identifies the faculty member as performing above the university norms, such as conducting research at a very high level, as judged by such measures as citation studies or other expert opinion in a discipline.

2. Proposal and/or funding of sabbatical research project;

3. Presenting a research seminar at another institution of higher learning. (peer presentation);

4. Having a peer-reviewed research paper, book/book chapter published;

5. Significant consulting on other faculty members’ research;

6. Consulting work in a field of professional or research expertise;

7. Presentation of a discipline-related workshop;

8. Receiving an honor/award for research from an institution or organization;

9. Writing a competitive (as determined by external reviewers) external grant proposal;

10. Having a funded competitive external grant;*

11. Having a significant research contract;

12. Having an internal (MSU Research and Creative Productions Committee) grant proposal funded;

13. Presenting a technical research workshop;

14. Presenting a paper or poster at a national or international meeting if funding allows;

15. Submitting a manuscript for review;

16. Reviewing a book, grant proposal, or journal article;

17. Passing a discipline-related course that involves a substantial investment of time (from an accredited institution or scientific organization);

18. Supervising student research in the first probationary year;

19. Peer-reviewed publishing scholarship of teaching and learning

20. Visiting another (non-MSU) research laboratory for enhancement of research skills that involves a significant investment of time;

21. Supervising mentoring of student research that is above the departmental norm;

22. Presenting papers or presentations at a local, state, or regional scientific meetings at a level or in quantity that is significantly above the departmental norm.

23. Being mentor of record for a capstone research project or graduate student’s master’s thesis.

24. Other activities as defined by agreement with the chair of the department.

* “External grant” is defined in this context as a research grant applied for involving a competitive process after the faculty member begins employment at MSU, e.g. not start-up funds.
Regional is defined in this context as a sub-national geographic designation involving (parts of) more than one state.
4. **Service Activities**

Service-related activities will constitute a minimum of 5% to a maximum of 10% of the Overall Evaluation score for tenured and tenured-track faculty, and 5-20% for instructors. In recognition that some service commitments involve a greater degree of time and effort, evaluation of service will address both the quantity and the quality of activities.

**Expected Activities**

1. Active and reliable committee and other work as assigned through the departmental office.
2. Representing department at events outside “normal” hours, such as SOAR’s, open houses, Meet MSU Nights, etc., if the faculty member is available;
3. Meeting with prospective students and parents for the purposes of recruiting if the faculty member is available;
4. Attendance at the majority of departmental faculty meetings (if there are no scheduling conflicts);
5. Representing the Department on one College or University standing and/or ad hoc committee, when service opportunities are available;
6. Participation in co-curricular activities that promote the University and its academic programs;
7. Being available (as possible) for membership on senior thesis, capstone or honors thesis committee (not mentor of record)

**Above Expected Activities**

1. Any of the “expected” activities performed at a level that clearly identifies the faculty member as performing above the university norms, such as carrying an extensive committee load.

**Internal Service**

1. Being the chair of a department, college and university committee, task force, etc.
2. A single committee or endeavor that represents an inordinate investment of time;
3. Sponsorship/advisor of student campus organizations;
4. Giving discipline-related presentations to schools/organizations/ coordination of special events;
5. Teaching classes for overload without compensation;
6. Serving as official Faculty Mentor for probationary faculty (untenured tenure-track, or instructor);
7. Equipment maintenance and/or maintenance of departmental instrumentation and/or facilities;
8. Library liaison and acquisitions;
9. Supplies inventorying and acquisition beyond normal lab practice, e.g. for department/course;
10. Laboratory supervision of multiple lab sections (involving other instructors’ sections);
11. Supervision of safety practices and enforcement beyond normal lab practice;
12. Coordination of, or preparation of instructional materials for, multiple sections of lab or lecture which is uncompensated by re-assigned time.
13. Scheduling classes, rooms and instructional assignments
14. Development of activities with local schools for the purposes of advising or recruiting.
15. Coordination of the graduate program
16. Coordination of the departmental seminar series
17. Other activities as defined by agreement with the chair of the department.
18. Mentoring dual credit courses.

**External Service**
1. Evidence of participation in regional engagement as it relates to your discipline or as a representative of MSU
2. Service as officer in local, state and national professional organizations
3. Recruiting activities above the departmental norm.
4. Presenting training for teachers or other professionals
5. Directing a state or regional educational center
6. Judging at science fairs
7. Service on SACS, NCATE, ATMAE or other special accrediting committees
8. Consulting (mainly service)
9. Working with community, state, or federal agencies or organizations in professional capacity
10. Organizing or coordinating a professional meeting
ETM Departmental Criteria for Merit pay increases

Recognizing that teaching should be the primary focus of every faculty member, the final evaluation of each faculty member will be weighted toward teaching.

**Summary Evaluation at the “Above Expected Level”:**
In order to be awarded an overall evaluation of “Above Expected” the faculty member must be evaluated in the “Above Expected” category in two of the three faculty responsibilities, and one of these must be teaching. Two exceptions to this guideline will be considered. The first is when the faculty member’s contribution in scholarship or service is exceptionally meritorious, bringing prestige to the department and the university. In this case, a summary evaluation of “above expected” would be considered. The second exception is when the faculty member has negotiated a shift in their responsibilities (either through PAC-27 or a pre-arranged institutional agreement), such that one of the areas of responsibility is now allocated a higher percentage of their time and they earn an “Above Expected” in that area. For instance, if a faculty member negotiates a reduction in teaching load so that they can serve as president for a year in a national organization, they could earn an overall evaluation of “Above Expected” by being evaluated as “Above Expected” in Scholarship and Service (and “Expected” in Teaching). Under no circumstances will a faculty member be awarded a summary evaluation of “Above Expected” with a teaching evaluation that is “Below Expected”.
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Summary Evaluation Rubric:

The determination of a faculty member’s overall annual/summary evaluation rating is a holistic effort but in general, the following guidelines apply. Table I below summarizes the Department’s expectations.

- Any faculty member rated as below expected in teaching or in both scholarship and service will receive a below expected overall evaluation. In this case, the faculty member will meet with the departmental chair to identify goals for professional growth during the next year.

- To receive an overall rating as expected a faculty member must be rated as expected in two or more areas, one of which must be teaching. A rating of “expected” in an area indicates that the faculty member is meeting the basic expectation for performance and continuing professional growth for faculty members in this department.

- To receive an overall rating as above expected a faculty member must be rated as above expected in at least two areas, and one of these must be in teaching. An overall rating at this level means that activities during the past year demonstrate ongoing professional growth and a contribution to the mission of the department beyond simply meeting the basic requirements of a faculty member in this department.

- Regardless of other ratings, any faculty member who receives a rating of less than expected in any area should target that area for professional growth in their goals for the coming year.
Table I: Expectations for Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Evaluation</th>
<th>Teaching Area Evaluation</th>
<th>Scholarship Area Evaluation</th>
<th>Service Area Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Outstanding:

For the overall performance to be considered *outstanding*, the faculty must attain a rating of “outstanding” in *teaching*, and either *professional achievement* or *professional service*.

**Appeal Process**

To accomplish the goals and objectives of the departmental merit pay plan, the process must be perceived as objective, fair, and equitable. Each faculty member will receive a written evaluation of their performance and the opportunity to discuss the evaluation and merit pay recommendation with the chair. As a result of this discussion, the Department Chair may modify the merit pay evaluation. If there is a continuing disagreement between the Chair and the faculty member relating to the merit pay recommendation, then the faculty member may formally appeal the evaluation/recommendation to a Departmental Appeals Committee within seven days of receiving the evaluation. The Departmental Appeals Committee will consist of three tenured faculty within the department: one chosen by the Chair, one chosen by the faculty member, and the third chosen by the two selected committee members. The Appeals Committee will then review the faculty member’s merit pay portfolio, the Chair’s recommendation, and a summary of the share recommendations made by the Chair for other departmental faculty. Within five days after receiving the appeal, the committee will make a recommendation to the Chair to maintain or change the Chair’s recommendation with written justification. The faculty member will receive a copy of the committee’s recommendation. The Chair may accept or reject the committee’s recommendation. If rejected, all materials will be forwarded to the Dean for a final determination. This final determination will be shared in writing with the Department Chair and faculty member.
This file is intended to make it easier for faculty members to complete the required SELF EVALUATION using the Faculty Evaluation Plan approved by the DKHIS faculty in the Spring 2016. Refer to the official FEP document for specific details.

Save this file to your computer and then complete it as a SELF EVALUATION. Be sure to save a copy of what you eventually submit as an email attachment to me.

Individual faculty members are NOT expected to have an entry for each row of this evaluation. Different faculty members will have opportunities in various measures depending on their disciplines and program designs. For example, some faculty members may not supervise undergraduate research and other faculty members may not have opportunities to write exam items for national certification. It is expected, however, that each faculty member will perform to his/her strengths according to departmental needs and accrue points accordingly. Instructors are only expected to perform in the Teaching Area.

The columns represent levels of activity. They do not indicate “below expected, expected, and above expected” performance levels. Faculty members determined the points assigned for each level of activity (column) when the FEP was adopted last spring. In accordance with PAC-35, if the evaluated component meets the criterion for regional engagement (R.E.), please mark the column at left.

1. Determine the Weight of each Area (Teaching, Scholarship / Professional Development, Service) of your SELF EVALUATION.
2. Indicate your SELF SCORE in the far right column.
3. Type the justification for your SELF SCORE in the gray box marked “Justification.” The gray box should expand to fit whatever your supporting comments are for each section. Include dates for specific activities such as Conferences, SOAR, or Open House, etc. Copies of organization cards are not required, but include membership numbers, etc. Supporting documents (if applicable) can be scanned and attached to the email or submitted in print form in a tabbed binder.
4. Total and record your Points Earned for each Area.
5. Calculate Area Evaluation Score = (Area Weight) X (Points Earned)
6. Email this rating scale as a Word Document attachment to me along with either your scanned documents or with email this rating scale as a Word Document attachment and submit your printed documents in a tabbed binder.
KHIS Teaching Evaluation Rating Scale

Faculty Member: Manuel Probst  
Rank: Associate Professor  
Date: January 10

Teaching Weight (50 – 70%)  
Points Earned  
Teaching Evaluation Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.E. Teaching Component</th>
<th>Rating Score: acceptable for credit ➝ ➝ ➝ ➝ highest rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| University or Department- Approved Evaluations of Faculty by Students  
Note: For highest rating, grade distributions must be included.  
When available, minimum 12 undergraduate students and 8 graduate students in course.  
Two per year required for tenured faculty; all others 4 per year  | 0
Below Average | 3-5
Average | 6-8
Above Average | SELF SCORE
| Peer/Chair Evaluation of Teaching  | 0-1
Below Average | 2
Average | 3
Above Average |
| Student Evaluation of Faculty Advising  
(from advising survey results)  | 1
Below average | 2
Average | 3
Above average |
| Number of Advisees |

Justification:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrate Commitment to Teaching and Highly Effective Practice</th>
<th>Fewer than 25</th>
<th>25-49</th>
<th>50-74</th>
<th>More than 75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(learning process)</td>
<td>0-2: Minimum of one course portfolio which contains syllabus, assignments, exams and student work (names omitted); some higher order student work must be included</td>
<td>3-4: Minimum of two separate course portfolios which contain syllabi, assignments, exams (assignments and exams must require higher order thinking) and student work (names omitted); some higher order student work must be included</td>
<td>5-6: Minimum of three separate course portfolios which contain syllabi, assignments, exams (assignments and exams must require higher order thinking) and student work (names omitted); some higher order student work must be included</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:

Demonstrate Commitment to Teaching and Highly Effective Practice (student outcomes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development/Revision of Course(s) (points awarded per</th>
<th>Fewer than 25</th>
<th>25-49</th>
<th>50-74</th>
<th>More than 75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Significant revision of current course (i.e. change in teaching method from face-to-face to internet or hybrid, creation of new teaching methodologies or new textbook)</td>
<td>New prep of existing course, first time teaching (i.e. take over course recently taught by someone else or creating new course)</td>
<td>Creation of new course (i.e. writing new Type II Course Proposal and preparing launch of new course)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Teaching/Advisement Improvement Activities (e.g. MSU workshops related to teaching and advising)</td>
<td>0.5 points awarded per activity up to a maximum of 3 pts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant and Appropriate Use of Technology</td>
<td>1-3 Faculty should post the syllabus, course materials and faculty contact information on Blackboard. Beyond the expected, document the use of multimedia, creation of multimedia lectures, games, simulations, assignments/lessons, new or additional functions of Bb, clickers, iPads, use of apps, YouTube, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of Undergraduate Research (UGR)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One new or continued UGR student / project</td>
<td>Two or more UGR students / projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of Collaborative Professional Networks</strong> (to augment teaching i.e. establishing/maintaining internships, clinical, and/or practicum sites etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in setting up new sites or establishing rapport with new personnel at an existing site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create/Revise Existing Program Curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing or revising a program curriculum and submitting curriculum changes to appropriate committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Award</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Community 4 State, Multi-state 5 MSU, National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Actions Related to Teaching</strong> (beyond expected requirements)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Teaching uncompensated or low compensated load (0-2 credit hours annual), mentoring 1-3 Early 3 Teaching uncompensated or low compensated load (3 or more hours), teaching &gt;1 off campus; 5 Teaching &gt;3 uncompensated load hours, mentoring &gt;7 EC teachers, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College (EC) teachers; teaching off campus, etc.</td>
<td>mentoring 4-6 EC teachers, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Quality Matters (QM) Certification of Course</th>
<th>One Course</th>
<th>Two Courses</th>
<th>Three or More Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pursuit of Funding to Improve Program Resources</th>
<th>Pursuit of funding to improve teaching in respective programs. Documentation to support funding and its potential impact on students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Competency</th>
<th>Maintain faculty clinical competency by performing work in professional discipline outside of regular work hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Previously Unlisted Teaching Activities</th>
<th>Discretion of Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KHIS Scholarship/Professional Development Evaluation Rating Scale

Faculty Member ______________________________ Rank __________________ Date __________________

Scholarship / Professional Development Weight (50 – 70%) _____________ Points Earned ________

Scholarship / Professional Development Score ____________

R.E. Scholarship / Prof Dev Component Rating Score: acceptable for credit →→→→highest rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer-Reviewed Articles (points awarded per article)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>SELF SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Article</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Under Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SELF SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship / Prof Dev Component</th>
<th>Rating Score: acceptable for credit →→→→highest rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Grant</td>
<td>(Describe personal role in application process and include documentation, budget profile, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Submissions of Application</td>
<td>3-4 Grant Application Under Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 Grant Awarded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| External Grant                   | (Describe personal role in application process and include documentation, budget profile, etc.) |
| 1-3 Submissions of Application   | 4-5 Grant Application Under Revision                     |
| 6-8 Grant Awarded                |                                                          |

| Published Monograph, Entire Textbook, or Electronic Publication as Author or Co-Author (points awarded per publication) | 4-6 Co-Author | 7-10 Author |

SELF SCORE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Published Textbook Chapter(s)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One Chapter</td>
<td>Two Chapters</td>
<td>Three or More Chapters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Non Peer - Reviewed Scholarly Article or Scholarly Work for a Professional Venue - Author or Co-Author (points awarded per article or work) | 1 Submission | 2-4 Publication |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ongoing Research Projects (multi-year funded or IRB-approved research studies)</th>
<th>2-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentation to support score based on the strength of: Venue, Role in Project, Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborative Research Project (results in applied research)</th>
<th>1-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentation to support score based on the strength of: Venue, Role in Project, Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Award</td>
<td>2 Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refereed / Invited Oral Presentation at a Professional Conference (points awarded per presentation)</th>
<th>1 Local</th>
<th>2 State</th>
<th>3 Multi-State</th>
<th>4 National</th>
<th>5 International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(up to a maximum of 24 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation to support score based on the strength of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue, Role in Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poster Presentation at a Professional Conference (points awarded per poster presentation)</th>
<th>1 Local</th>
<th>2 State</th>
<th>3 Multi-State</th>
<th>4 National</th>
<th>5 International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(up to a maximum of 24 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation to support score based on the strength of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue, Role in Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Review of Manuscripts for Professional Discipline Journals                                      | 2       |        |              |           |                |
| Justification:                                                                                  |         |        |              |           |                |

<p>| Review of Professional Discipline Chapters or Textbooks                                        | 2-4     |        |              |           |                |
| Justification:                                                                                  |         |        |              |           |                |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in Faculty Development Activities (e.g. MSU workshops related to scholarship, grants, CITI training, etc.)</th>
<th>1 Activity</th>
<th>2 Two Activities</th>
<th>3 Three or More Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-Day Workshop or Graduate Course (related to your research agenda)</th>
<th>1-6 Documentation to support score based on the strength of: Activities, Time in Workshop or Graduate Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Professional Licensure / Certification</th>
<th>2 One New</th>
<th>4 Two New</th>
<th>6 Three or More New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance of Current Professional Licensure / Certification</th>
<th>1 Maintain current credentials with minimum amount of required continuing education</th>
<th>2 Maintain current credentials with fewer than 10 hours of additional required continuing education</th>
<th>3 Maintain current credentials with more than 10 hours of additional required continuing education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Membership in Professional Organization(s)</strong> (local, state, multi-state, national)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Membership in one local, state or multi-state organization – and no national organization</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership Role in Professional Organization(s)</strong> (local, state, multi-state, or national)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Leadership role in one local, state, or multi-state organization – and no national organization</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attendance at Professional Discipline Conference</strong> (local, state, multi-state, national, international)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>One local or state conference</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Visitor or External Reviewer for National Agency</strong> (points awarded per visit or review)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Writer for a Professional Discipline Certification Exam</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Previously Unlisted Scholarship / Professional Development Activities</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:

Discretion of Chair
KHIS Service Evaluation Rating Scale

Faculty Member _____________________________ Rank __________________ Date ______________

Service Weight (50 – 70%) _____________ Points Earned ________ Service Evaluation Score ____________

R.E. Service Component Rating Score: acceptable for credit →→→→→highest rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Component</th>
<th>1-2 Committees</th>
<th>3-4 Committees</th>
<th>5 or More Committees</th>
<th>SELF SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU University Committee(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SELF SCORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Science Committee(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DKHIS Committee(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Committee(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State, Multi-State, National, or International Committee(s) (including professional learning communities)</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Committees</td>
<td>3-4 Committees</td>
<td>5 or More Committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Officer, Chair, Co-Chair (including professional learning communities)</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(points awarded per activity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Award</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>State, Multi-state</td>
<td>MSU, National</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consulting Related to the Professional Discipline or Specialization (includes workshops or symposia, professional development for schools, invited presentation, advisory board and/or community healthcare agencies)</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>5-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 visits or events</td>
<td>4-6 visits or events</td>
<td>7 or more visits or events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSU or Program Recruitment Activities</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Points Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor or Co-Editor of Peer-Reviewed Professional Discipline Journal</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Grant (Describe personal role in application process and include documentation, budget profile, etc.)</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Role in Program Accreditation or Re-accreditation</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Mentor</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Organization Advisor</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe level of involvement and activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Previously Unlisted Service Activities</th>
<th>1-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretion of Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Department of Mathematics, Computer Science and Physics (MCSP) holds strongly to the belief that its faculty members should be dedicated to the advancement of knowledge through excellence in teaching, continuous professional development and achievement, and service. In accordance with University policies, the department seeks to recognize and reward continual faculty development and excellence in teaching, professional achievement, and service through recommendations for tenure and reappointment, promotion, and annual performance based compensation.

The overall goal of the tenure and reappointment process is to develop and retain faculty with outstanding academic credentials and training, and a commitment to academic excellence in teaching, professional achievement, and service.

The primary purpose of the Faculty Evaluation Process (FEP) within MCSP is to evaluate the performance of the faculty and ultimately to help in the improvement of a faculty member’s performance within the department. Faculty members within the department will be annually evaluated in the categories of Instruction, Professional Achievement, Professional Service, and Reassigned Time Activities.

MCSP reserves the right at any time to modify this departmental FEP with the approval of the Dean of the College of Science and Technology and the Provost. Any revisions to this document will not take effect until January 1 of the following calendar year.

I. EXPECTATIONS

Departmental expectations in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity, and service are described below. The rubrics will be used to determine a Category Score of between 0 and 3 for each of the three areas. Whether an individual is performing at a below expected, expected, above expected, or outstanding level in each of these three areas will be determined by using Table 1 below. For the purposes of this document, “Expected” is the minimum level of performance required by members of the department. The department expects its members to be more than “mediocre”. Therefore “Expected” and “Mediocre” should not be considered synonyms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Score</th>
<th>Level of Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.34 - 3.00</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.67 - 2.33</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 1.66</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 1.00</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Score ranges for each level of performance.

In the category of scholarly activity, in addition to meeting the appropriate category score, an individual must also perform at least one activity from scholarly activities category B or C in order to be considered “Expected, “Above Expected” or “Outstanding” in scholarly activity.

Note: In the following lists of activities considered in the evaluation of Teaching, Scholarly Activity, and Service, some activities may fall under more than one category. For example, writing a grant...
A proposal for a piece of laboratory equipment that will be used both in a teaching laboratory and in scholarly research may be considered either a Scholarly Activity or a Teaching Activity. In such circumstances, the individual being evaluated may choose in which category to place the activity. However, in all circumstances, each activity should be placed in ONLY ONE category for purposes of calculating a category score. Double-counting of an activity is not allowed.

**Evaluation of Teaching** Teaching will be evaluated by using the Teaching Rubric below. All persons being evaluated will be assessed using Student Evaluations, Chair/Peer Evaluations, and additional Teaching Merit Activities.

**Student Evaluations**
Student Evaluation shall be with the University-approved evaluation instrument. Tenured Faculty shall evaluate at least one course per semester. Probationary Faculty and Instructors shall evaluate at least two courses per semester. All persons being evaluated must include the average score of student ratings of all courses evaluated during the evaluation period. The number of points obtained from student evaluation depends on the average score on question “Overall Excellence of Instructor” question of the university evaluation instrument, and on the average score on the remaining evaluation questions of the instrument. The score to be used in the Student evaluation item of the rubric will be the greater of:

The average score on all evaluation questions of the instrument

OR

(The score on the “Overall Excellence of Instructor” question + the average score on all other evaluation questions)/2

**Chair/Peer Evaluation**
All persons being evaluated must include a Peer and/or Department Chair evaluation obtained using the MCSP Peer Teaching Evaluation Rubric. The evaluation must be conducted by the Department Chair or by a tenured MCSP faculty member. Tenured Faculty and Instructors shall have at least one course per year evaluated. Probationary Faculty shall have at least one course per semester evaluated. The number of points from the Peer/Chair evaluation(s) will be determined by the average score of all rated categories on the MCSP Peer Teaching Evaluation Rubric, which evaluates items such as use of a variety of teaching techniques, classroom management, appropriateness of level of instruction, etc.

**Other Teaching Merit Activities**
All persons being evaluated will be assessed on the quantity and quality of additional Teaching Merit Activities according to the Teaching Rubric. The list of Teaching Merit Activities includes activities that enhance the student learning experience in the department. Each person being evaluated shall have evidence of the quantity and quality of merit activities performed.

**List of Teaching Merit Activities**
1. Involvement in the development of a new course or new course initiative
2. Teaching off-campus, distance learning, internet, honors, or First-year seminar classes (per course, not per section)
3. Teaching awards and honors
4. Teaching under-enrolled or extra course for reduced or no load credit (per section)
5. Student research advisor – capstone, undergraduate research fellowship, etc. (per student per semester)
The faculty member will choose percentages U%, V%, W% for the corresponding categories of the evaluation for Teaching activities in the Teaching Rubric subject to the following constraints:

- **U and V must each be between 10 and 50% inclusive**
- **U + V must be greater than or equal to 40%**
- **W must be greater than or equal to 20%**
- **U + V + W = 100**

The teaching category score cannot be greater than 3.

**Levels of Performance for Teaching Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Evaluations</th>
<th>0 Below Expected</th>
<th>1 Expected</th>
<th>2 Above Expected</th>
<th>3 Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student evaluations</strong> (U%)</td>
<td>Below 1 standard deviation (S.D.) of mean national IDEA score 0</td>
<td>Within 1 S.D. of mean national IDEA score U% of 1 point</td>
<td>Above 1 S. D. of mean national IDEA score U% of 2 points</td>
<td>Above 2 S. D. of mean national IDEA score U% of 3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer/Chair evaluations (V%)</td>
<td>Average score 0 – 2.25 0</td>
<td>Average score 2.25 – 3.24 V% of 1 point</td>
<td>Average score 3.25 – 4.24 V% of 2 points</td>
<td>Average score 4.25 – 5.00 V% of 3 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Merit Activities</th>
<th>Quantity of Merit Activities (X)</th>
<th>Quality of Merit Activities (Y)</th>
<th>Merit Activity Subscore (W%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Below Expected</td>
<td>Does no additional teaching activities X = 0</td>
<td>Work is of poor quality and/or no incorporation of teaching activities Y = 0</td>
<td>W% of X * Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Expected</td>
<td>Participated in one to two additional teaching activities X = 1</td>
<td>Work is of average quality and/or activities benefit teaching/advising Y = .5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Above Expected</td>
<td>Participated in three additional teaching activities X = 2</td>
<td>Work is of high quality and/or demonstrates incorporation of active and applied learning Y = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Outstanding</td>
<td>Participated in four or more additional teaching activities X = 3</td>
<td>Work is of excellent quality and/or demonstrates significant incorporation of active and applied learning Y = 1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teaching Category Total Score ____________________________ (maximum of 3)**
**Evaluation of Scholarly Activities**

Members of the Department of Mathematics, Computer Science, and Physics are expected as a matter of professional development to participate in scholarly activities that at a minimum keep them updated in their field of expertise. The department deems activities that contribute to the breadth of knowledge in a scientific field as meritorious. Contributions to an area of study can take many forms as outlined below. The department recognizes that not all activities are of equal effort or value. Therefore, the department rates the activity’s level of accomplishment and assigns points according to the List of Scholarly Activities and the Scholarship Rubric below.

- The evaluation of scholarly activities for standing I faculty will be conducted by the Department Chair and it will be based on the List of Scholarly Activities and the Scholarship Rubric below.

- A faculty member is required to submit an annual report to the Department chair as part of the annual evaluation process. The report will include a summary of scholarly activities from each category shown below in the List of Scholarly Activities and the expected total points for these activities according to the Scholarship Rubric shown below. The report should include an explanation for any points above the expected level.

- The Department Chair will consider as part of the decision-making process the quality and significance of such activities to determine any points above the expected level.

- **In addition to meeting the appropriate category score, an individual must also perform at least one activity from scholarly activities category B or C in order to be considered “Expected”, “Above Expected” or “Outstanding” in scholarly activity.**

- It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide the Department Chair with evidence in support of scholarly activities if requested.

**List of Scholarly Activities**

**Category A**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type of Scholarly Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Attending MSU seminars, workshops, or webinars (per two hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attending professional meetings, seminars (national, regional, or state level, per day), online conferences, or webinars (per two hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Professional development courses (per day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Attending statewide workshops (per day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other acceptable scholarly activities as approved by the department chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A maximum of 3 activities from category A may be counted*
**Category B:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type of Scholarly Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Student research supervision including undergraduate student research, documented (per student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Passing a discipline-related course (from an accredited institution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reviewing a book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Minor Consulting work (mainly professional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Reviewing a journal article or conference paper for publication (per article or paper)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Writing an MSU proposal (Co-PI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Having a proposal funded, MSU (Co-PI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Writing an external proposal (minor contributor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Writing an MSU proposal (PI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Having a proposal funded, MSU (PI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Presenting a workshop, mostly original activities (per day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Presenting a poster session (state meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Presenting a paper (state meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Submitting a research paper (state level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Having a research paper published, unrefereed (state level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Having a research paper published, unrefereed (national level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Writing a lab book for local publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Writing a commercial lab book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Serving as an officer in state or regional professional organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Reviewing a proposal (State/National level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Scholarly activities involving regional engagement (per activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Other acceptable scholarly activities as approved by the department chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category C:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type of Scholarly Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Writing an external proposal (Co-PI or major contributor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Writing an external proposal (PI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Having a proposal funded, external (Co-PI)/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Having a proposal funded, external (PI)/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Presenting a poster session (national meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Presenting a paper (national meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Having a research paper published, refereed (state level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Submitting a research paper (national level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Having a research paper published, refereed (national level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Having a book published commercially (first edition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Revising a book for commercial publication (new edition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Writing a book for commercial publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Production of commercial software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Having a commercial lab book published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Extensive consulting work (mainly professional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Serving as an officer in a national professional organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Serving as a program committee member of a national conference or workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Serving as an editorial board member of a scientific journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Other acceptable scholarly activities as approved by the department chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The faculty member will choose percentages X% and Y% for the corresponding measures of the evaluation for scholarly activities in the Scholarship Rubric. Those percentages should be chosen so that 1) each of the percentages, X% and Y%, is between 30% and 70% and 2) the total X%+Y% is equal to 100%.

**Scholarship Rubric**

*Adjusted number of activities (N):*

\[ N = N_A + 1.5 \times N_B + 2 \times N_C \]

where \( N_K \) is the Number of Activities from Category \( K \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity of Activities * (X%)</th>
<th>0 Below Expected</th>
<th>1 Expected</th>
<th>2 Above Expected</th>
<th>3 Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N ≤ 1</td>
<td>X% of 0 points</td>
<td>X% of 1 point</td>
<td>X% of 2 points</td>
<td>X% of 3 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Activities (Y%)</th>
<th>Poor quality</th>
<th>Average quality</th>
<th>High quality</th>
<th>Excellent quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y% of 0 points</td>
<td>Y% of 1 point</td>
<td>Y% of 2 points</td>
<td>Y% of 3 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A maximum of three activities may be counted from category A

Note: In addition to meeting the appropriate category score, an individual must also perform at least one activity from scholarly activities category B or C in order to be considered “Expected”, “Above Expected” or “Outstanding” in scholarly activity.

**Scholarly Activity Category Total Score** __________________________
Evaluation of Service Activities

- Members of the Department of Mathematics, Computer Science, and Physics are expected to provide service. The department recognizes that not all activities are of equal effort or value. Therefore, the department rates the activity’s level of accomplishment and assigns points according to the List of Service Activities and the Service Rubric below.
- The evaluation of service activities for standing I faculty will be conducted by the Department Chair and will be based on the List of Service Activities and the Service Rubric below.
- A faculty member is required to submit an annual report to the Department chair as part of the annual evaluation process. The report will include a summary of service activities and the expected total points for these activities according to the Service Rubric below. The report should include an explanation for any points above the expected level.
- The Department Chair will consider as part of the decision-making process the quality and significance of such activities to determine any points above the expected level.
- It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide the Department Chair with evidence in support of service activities if requested.

List of Service Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Service on a department, college, or university committee, task force, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Service as an officer or leader for a professional organization devoted to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mathematical sciences, computer science, physics, or related field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Service on SACS, NCATE, or other special accrediting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Official advisor or co-advisor to a university recognized student organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervision of an intern, co-op student, or teacher internship student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mentor for a dual credit course in the Early College Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sponsorship of an approved co-curricular activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Performing volunteer service that is not related directly to the faculty member's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>current students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Membership on senior thesis committee (for example, being third faculty grader), but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not directing the research and not as the instructor of the senior thesis course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teaching an underenrolled course needed for student graduation at reduced load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Arrangement and supervision of a field trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Acting as a departmental, college, or university liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Participation in a workshop, conference, clinic, seminar, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Coordination of a workshop, conference, clinic, seminar, in-service training, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Directing a state or regional educational center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Development of a relationship with a professional group in business, industry,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trade education, or government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Consulting (mainly service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Judging at a science fair, science olympiad, or similar competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Participation in a recruiting activity such as Open House, visiting a local school,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Providing service for a university event such as SOAR Day, MPATE Day, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Serving as a mentor for an untenured faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Participating in a peer review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The department member will use the Quantity of activities performed to determine the base Service score X using the first row of the Service Rubric below. The Quality multiplier Y will be determined using the average quality of all service activities claimed. The Service Category Score is then the product X * Y. The service category score cannot be greater than 3.

**Service Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity of Activities (X)</th>
<th>Participates in 1-2 service activities</th>
<th>Participates in 3-5 service activities</th>
<th>Participates in 6-8 service activities</th>
<th>Participates in 9 or more service activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X = 0.5 point</td>
<td>X = 1 point</td>
<td>X = 2 points</td>
<td>X = 3 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality Multiplier Determination**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Activities (Y)</th>
<th>No service is performed or service is of poor quality</th>
<th>Service is of average quality</th>
<th>Service is of high quality and activities make a substantive contribution to the community/discipline/department/university</th>
<th>Service is of excellent quality and activities make a significant contribution to the community/discipline/department/university</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y = 0</td>
<td>Y = 0.5</td>
<td>Y = 1</td>
<td>Y = 1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Service Category Total Score = X * Y:**

(maximum of 3)
II. PERFORMANCE BASED COMPENSATION
For the purposes of Performance-Based Compensation, department members will determine an overall performance score based on their scores in the three individual categories of Teaching, Scholarly activity, and Service using the appropriate table below.

For probationary and tenured faculty,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight (%)</th>
<th>Rating (R)</th>
<th>Evaluation (% x R)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>(Select 40% – 70%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>(Select 10% - 50%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>(Select 10% - 50%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Evaluation Score** (sum of weighted category evaluations) 
Sum of all weights must be 100%

For instructors,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight (%)</th>
<th>Rating (R)</th>
<th>Evaluation (% x R)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>(Select 60% – 100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>(Select 0% - 40%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>(Select 0% - 40%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Evaluation Score** (sum of weighted category evaluations) 
Sum of all weights must be 100%

The level of performance is then determined as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Evaluation Score</th>
<th>Level of Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.34 - 3.00</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.67 - 2.33</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 1.66</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 1.00</td>
<td>Below Expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. GRANTING OF TENURE
In order to be granted tenure at the end of the probationary period, faculty must meet each of the following criteria.

Teaching
Continue to achieve teaching effectiveness at or above the expected level as evidenced by portfolio entries, student teaching assessment scores of instruction, and peer/chair evaluation scores of instruction. Relevant portfolio entries should include but are not limited to those suggested in the list of Teaching Merit Activities in part I.

Scholarship
Continue to work at or above the expected level as evidenced by portfolio entries. Relevant portfolio entries should include but are not limited to those suggested in the list of Scholarly Activities in part I.

Service
Continue to work at or above the expected level in professional service as evidenced by portfolio entries. Relevant portfolio entries should include but are not limited to those suggested in the list of Service Activities in part I.

Overall
Demonstrate responsiveness to suggestions for improvement from previous reviews. Even if a faculty member meets the above three criteria, failure to respond to suggestions for improvement from previous reviews can result in the denial of tenure. For example, suppose a faculty member who achieves teaching effectiveness as defined in the Teaching section of Part I received a suggestion during a previous Department Chair review to provide more timely graded feedback to students. Continued failure to provide timely feedback to students after the Department Chair review could be considered grounds for denial of tenure.

IV. CONTRACT RENEWAL AND ANNUAL REVIEW

Contract renewal criteria for probationary faculty
In order to receive contract renewal during the probationary period, faculty must meet each of the following criteria:

Teaching
Continue to achieve teaching effectiveness at or above the expected level, or to demonstrate potential for growth in teaching effectiveness sufficient to achieve tenure as evidenced by portfolio entries, student teaching assessment scores of instruction, and peer/chair evaluation scores of instruction. Relevant portfolio entries should include but are not limited to those suggested in the list of Teaching Merit Activities in part I.

Scholarship
Continue to work at or above the expected level, or to demonstrate potential for growth in professional achievement sufficient to achieve tenure as evidenced by portfolio entries. Relevant portfolio entries should include but are not limited to those suggested in the list of Scholarly Activities in part I.
Service
Continue to work at or above the expected level or to demonstrate potential for growth in professional service sufficient to achieve tenure as evidenced by portfolio entries. Relevant portfolio entries should include but are not limited to those suggested in the list of Service Activities in part I.

Overall
Demonstrate responsiveness to suggestions for improvement from previous reviews. Even if a faculty member meets the above three criteria, failure to respond to suggestions for improvement from previous reviews can result in recommendation of contract non-renewal. For example, suppose a faculty member who achieves teaching effectiveness as defined in the Teaching section of Part I received a suggestion during a previous Department Chair review to provide more timely graded feedback to students. Continued failure to provide timely feedback to students after the Department Chair review could be considered grounds contract non-renewal.

Annual Review of Instructors
In accordance with PAc-34, lecturers and instructors shall be evaluated annually in a manner consistent with tenure-track faculty with the exception that teaching effectiveness will be the primary area of evaluation.

V. PROMOTION

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor
The criteria for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor are the same as the criteria for the granting of tenure. The granting of tenure will automatically be accompanied by the promotion to Associate Professor.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor
The criterion for the promotion from Associate Professor to Professor is that the individual must have an average rating of at least above expected in the majority of the years since the last promotion or in 3 out of the last 5 years.
Example application of MCSP FEP for high-quality teacher

Annual Review for contract renewal of probationary faculty in third year of probationary period

Student Evaluations: Faculty member received average score within 1 standard deviation of the mean IDEA score from students on university student evaluation instrument. This is “Expected”

Peer/Chair Evaluation: Faculty member received average score of 4.1/5 from Department Chair using departmental Peer/Chair evaluation form. This is “Above Expected”

Merit Activities

1. Faculty member advised Senior Capstone student (item 1 on list of Teaching Merit Activities) for one semester. Student had presentation accepted at peer-reviewed national conference and won second place in an undergraduate research competition. This is considered evidence that the quality of the faculty member’s mentorship is “outstanding”

2. Faculty member taught two sections of First Year seminar (item 2). The percentage of students in this section meeting the Student Learning Objectives for First Year Seminar was approximately the same as students in FYS throughout the university. This is considered evidence that the quality of the FYS sections was “Expected”.

3. Faculty member incorporated Regional Engagement (item 7) by having students in her math course tutor area high school students struggling in math. The college students indicate in their reflections that the experience was rewarding and also helped them build confidence in their own math skills. At the end of the semester the class received thank-you notes from the high school students stating that they appreciated the assistance. This is considered evidence that the regional engagement activity quality was “Above Expected”

Thus, the faculty member performed a total of three teaching merit activities, with an overall quality of “Above Expected”.

The faculty-member’s overall teaching score would then be determined using the Levels of Performance Teaching Rubric. This faculty member chose the weights for the various categories to be: Student evaluations 10%, Peer/Chair Evaluations 50%, Merit Activities 40% Quantity of Merit Activities 2 points, Quality of Merit Activities multiplier 1.0. Her Teaching score would then be:

\[10\% \times 1 + 50\% \times 2 + 40\% \times 2 \times 1.0 = 1.9\], which is above expected
Example application of MCSP FEP for low-quality teacher

Annual Review for contract renewal of probationary faculty in third year of probationary period

Student Evaluations: Faculty member received average score within 1 standard deviation of the mean IDEA score from students on university student evaluation instrument. This is “Expected”

Peer/Chair Evaluation: Faculty member received average score of 2/5 from Department Chair using departmental Peer/Chair evaluation form. This is “Below Expected”

Merit Activities

1. Faculty Member advised 10 students as academic advisor (counts as two activities under item 6). Academic advisor evaluation forms indicate advisor was difficult to contact and did not spend individual time with each student. This indicates the quality of the advising is “below expected”

3. Taught an overenrolled section (item 8) of General Education Physics course with 60 students when cap was originally set at 40. Student average in meeting course SLO’s is slightly below average compared to previous years. Because the greater number of students may have slightly influenced student performance on SLO’s, the quality of this overenrolled section is considered to be “fair”.

4. Incorporated Regional Engagement (item 7) into course by arranging for the class to assist a local non-profit organization in a science outreach event one weekend. Feedback from the organization indicates students were not well-prepared for their responsibilities. The small time commitment and lack of student preparation indicate the quality of this Regional Engagement activity is “poor”

Thus, the faculty performed a total of 4 Teaching Merit Activities with an average quality of “poor”. Because the quality multiplier is zero for “poor”, this faculty member will maximize the score by claiming only the one activity that had “fair” quality and not claiming the others.

The faculty-member’s overall teaching score would then be determined using the Levels of Performance Teaching Rubric. This faculty member chose the weights for the various categories to be: Student evaluations 50%, Peer/Chair Evaluations 10%, Merit activities 40% with quantity score 1 and quality multiplier 0.5. His Teaching score would then be:

50% * 1 + 10% * 0 + 40% * 1*0.5 + = 0.7

Using the Expectations Chart on page one, this score corresponds to a Teaching performance of “Below Expected”
Example 1: High-quality Scholarly Activities
Annual Review for contract renewal of probationary faculty in third year of probationary period

1. Faculty member had a proposal funded by MSU (PI). This grant was important for the department research activities. The quality of this activity will be considered “Above Expected”.
2. Faculty member had a research paper published in a national referred journal. The review of the paper indicated that the he paper was excellent. The quality of this activity will be considered “Above Expected”.
3. Faculty had an external grant proposal funded (PI). This grant was important for the department research activities. The quality of this activity will be considered “Above Expected”.

The faculty-member’s overall score in the scholarly activities will be determined using the Scholarship Rubric. This faculty member chose the weights for the various categories to be: 50% Quantity of Merit Activities and 50% Quality of Merit Activities. His score in the scholarly activities will be:

\[ N = 1.5 + 2 \times 2 = 5.5 \]

50% * 3 + 50% * 2 = 2.5

Using the Expectations Chart (page one), this score corresponds to a performance of “Outstanding” in the scholarly activities.

Example 2: Low-quality Scholarly Activities
Annual Review for contract renewal of probationary faculty in third year of probationary period

1. Faculty member attended an MSU seminar. This seminar was related to very basic topics. The quality of this activity will be considered “Below Expected”.
2. Faculty member had a research paper published in an unrefereed state journal. The paper did not show any significant contribution. The quality of this activity will be considered “Below Expected”.

The faculty-member’s overall score in the scholarly activities will be determined using the Scholarship Rubric. This faculty member chose the weights for the various categories to be: 70% Quantity of Merit Activities and 30% Quality of Merit Activities. His score in the scholarly activities will be:

\[ N = 1 + 1.5 = 2.5 \]

70% * 1 + 30% * 0 = 0.7

Using the Expectations Chart (page one), this score corresponds to a performance of “Below Expected” in the scholarly activities.
Example application of MCSP FEP for candidate with strong performance in Service

Annual Review for contract renewal of probationary faculty in third year of probationary period

Service Activities

1. The faculty member served on a department committee (item 1 on list of Service Activities) for the year. This committee was a search committee for an MCSP faculty position, and this faculty member was chair of the committee and put a considerable amount of time and effort into reviewing applications, contacting references, setting up phone interviews with applicants, and making arrangements for everything involved in on-campus interviews.

2. The faculty member served on a college committee (item 1) for the year. This committee was the S and T Curriculum Committee. The faculty member put a considerable amount of time and effort into reviewing several course proposals.

3. The faculty member participated in MPATE Day (item 20). Since this event also involves Regional Engagement (item 30) by providing students from high schools throughout the region with an opportunity to explore STEM concepts outside their classroom experience, it adds an extra point to the activity count. Prior to the event, the faculty member contacted various businesses and succeeded in getting them to contribute funds to help pay for MPATE Day expenses or to donate items to be used as prizes for the MPATE Day competition. The faculty member also conducted an exploration activity during the event.

5. The faculty member wrote a letter of recommendation for a student (item 29). As part of the requirements for the recommendation letter, the faculty member had to observe the student teaching performed by that student for an entire school day and include their observations in the recommendation letter.

Thus, the faculty member performed a total of five service activities, with an overall quality of “excellent”.

The faculty member’s overall service score would then be determined using the Service Rubric. The Service score would then be:

\[ X \times Y = 1 \times 1.5 = 1.5 \]

Using the Expectations Chart on page one, this score corresponds to a Service performance of “Expected”.
Example application of MCSP FEP for candidate with weak performance in Service

Annual Review for contract renewal of probationary faculty in third year of probationary period

Service Activities

1. The faculty member served on a department committee (item 1 on list of Service Activities) for the year. The candidate was often uncooperative and slowed or stalled progress during the committee meetings.

2. The faculty member served on a university committee (item 1) for the year. The faculty member often skipped meetings for no reason and did not do the required work outside of the meetings.

3. The faculty member wrote a letter of recommendation for a student (item 29).

Thus, the faculty member performed a total of three service activities, with an overall quality of “poor”.

The faculty member’s overall service score would then be determined using the Service Rubric. The Service score would then be:

\[ X*Y = 1*0 = 0 \]

Using the Expectations Chart on page one, this score corresponds to a Service performance of “Below Expected”.

Suppose the faculty member decides to only list the recommendation letter in their list of Service Activities, so that they can raise their overall quality to “average” to increase their score.

The faculty member’s overall service score would then be determined using the Service Rubric. The Service score would then be:

\[ X*Y = 0.5*0.5 = 0.25 \]

Using the Expectations Chart on page one, this score still corresponds to a Service performance of “Below Expected”.
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This document provides the policies and information that govern the following in the Department of Middle Grades & Secondary Education: annual evaluation procedures, tenure, promotion, and evaluation of fixed term faculty.

Morehead State University PAc-30: *Performance-Based Compensation Plan for Faculty* states:

It shall be the policy of Morehead State University to systematically evaluate individual faculty performance by means of a departmental faculty evaluation process which specifies performance expectations in teaching, professional achievement, and service and which is consistent with University guidelines for faculty evaluation. All returning tenured and tenure-track faculty are required to participate in the process of evaluation as specified in their departmental Faculty Evaluation Plan.

Performance-based compensation will be based on the concept that criteria exist in the areas of teaching, professional achievement, and service against which the performance of individual faculty will be compared for evaluation. These criteria will not be a set of fixed universally-applied standards, but a set of flexible standards which will accommodate the unique nature of the disciplines in which faculty teach, engage in professional achievement activities, and serve. The application of the standards should accommodate the specific role of the individual within the department and should recognize the variables which affect opportunities for professional achievement and service.

Morehead State University Pac-35: *Faculty Evaluation Plans* states:

The FEP shall include: A description of other requirements (if any) of the department not already stated in University, college, or school policy for faculty seeking reappointment, tenure, or promotion and for performance-based compensation increases.

**Framework for Evaluation**

Evaluation of faculty in a college of education is a complex multi-dimensional undertaking. It cannot take a one-size-fits-all approach. It must have the flexibility to respond to the following considerations.

1) It must be applicable to individuals at various stages in their careers in a manner that encourages them to make meaningful decisions. Within the context created by some of the other factors outlined here, individual faculty members must be able to decide how to use their time and energy without being penalized because they deviate from some arbitrary standard.

2) The basis for evaluation needs to be responsive to the long-term mission and the current priorities of the academic department. Faculty members in a college of education must be aware that they are part of a collaborative enterprise, which requires them to balance their personal agendas against the needs of the organization.
3) While we are all part of a college of education, we represent a wide array of disciplines. Each of these disciplines has its own set of opportunities and expectations related to professional practice, scholarly productivity, and service to the discipline.

4) Finally, this framework for evaluation must articulate consistent standards of quality that, while responding to the diversity of the faculty, are recognized within the college and across the University.

The framework presented in this document attempts to provide a practical structure for meeting this challenge.

Central to the process outlined in this document is the annual self-evaluation document and the Flexible Workload Agreement (FWA) if applicable developed by each faculty member. In this annual presentation of their activities, faculty members are required to concisely make the case that during the last year they have spent their time in activities that have contributed to their students, their discipline, and the University. In this presentation they should demonstrate a rational decision making process about where they put their time and energy. Based on this, administrators and peers can, within a collegial relationship, evaluate and provide constructive feedback on these efforts. In addition to reviewing activities of the past year, this document calls for the development of a personal growth plan for the next year. Thus, it is that the annual review provides each faculty member with an opportunity to identify benchmarks in an ongoing process of continuous improvement.

The College’s Faculty Evaluation Plan and/or the FWA provides the basic statements of the standards and criteria for evaluating an individual's academic work and as such has direct implications for a number of other processes beyond the annual Performance Based Salary Increase (PBCI) process. However, PBCI is separate from these other processes; and, consequently, meeting or exceeding PBCI criteria does not automatically ensure a favorable tenure or promotion decision. PBCI evaluations are based on annual performance whereas tenure and promotion evaluations are based on the cumulative performance. Importantly the criteria for annual evaluation ratings and the criteria for those used to determine PBCI eligibility should be markedly similar.

The University processes for granting of tenure and promotion to professor uses the criteria outlined within this document as the basis for decision-making. In a similar light, this document provides the criteria and process for post tenure review and evaluation of instructors.

**Tenure**

The process for progress towards tenure is defined in PAc-27. The Department evaluation process is based on the criteria defined in PAc-27 and reflects growth in the criteria identified for annual performance review.

1) The Department Tenure Review Committee will annually evaluate all non-tenured faculty. In compliance with PAc - 27 the Department Tenure Review Committee shall consist of all eligible tenured faculty members in the department.

2) All non-tenured faculty must submit a cumulative contract renewal portfolio annually, as outlined in PAc-27. (Contract renewal is based on the academic year rather than the calendar year.)
3) All probationary faculty members must be observed teaching at least once annually by the chair and/or senior colleagues (as designated and initiated by the chair or the immediate supervisor). The results of these observations must be included in the annual portfolio and in the final application for tenure.

4) As noted below under the discussion of evaluation of teaching (page 9), faculty members are strongly encouraged to seek formal student feedback on the quality of instruction for every course. At the minimum, probationary faculty must provide documentation of this feedback for at least two courses a semester during the probationary period. All course evaluations submitted for annual reviews must likewise be included in the final application for tenure.

5) Over the course of his/her probationary period, a candidate for tenure should have:
   a) Consistently earned above average ratings on evaluation of teaching and have observations by the chair and/or department colleagues that demonstrate high achievement in teaching,
   b) Been active as a scholar as reflected in multiple scholarly presentations at least at the regional level and should have some publications, and
   c) Served on a variety of committees across campus, served in leadership roles, and/or provided significant service to an area school, school district, or other appropriate professional settings.

6) In addition to these achievements non-tenured faculty should have fulfilled basic duties and expectations, which include attending faculty meetings regularly, meeting and starting classes on time, maintaining regular availability to students, advising regularly, and fulfilling various departmental service functions (participating in TEP interviews and assisting in schedule development, for example). Faculty who do not fulfill these duties may not qualify for tenure even if the quantity of work in the annual PBCI portfolio earns them high ratings.

7) All non-tenured faculty shall be allocated one mentor from within or outside the home department. The mentor may or may not be within the discipline area but should be from within the College of Education unless otherwise specified in the FWA. The non-tenured faculty shall retain a mentor until the non-tenured faculty submits their final tenure portfolio. The mentor may be reviewed and/or re-assigned at the request of either the mentor or the non-tenured faculty.

8) The faculty mentor should assist the non-tenured faculty member in the compilation of tenure portfolios. They should meet with the non-tenured faculty before submission of the tenure portfolio and discuss the annual review.

9) The mentor must make written recommendations to the Department Tenure Review Committee based on their discussions with the non-tenured faculty member. The recommendations of the mentor should be available to the non-tenured faculty member before submission to the Department Tenure Review Committee.

10) The Department Tenure Review Committee will review non-tenured faculty portfolios and the recommendations of the Department mentor. They will make one of the following recommendations to the Chair.
   a. The candidate's contract should be renewed and the non-tenured faculty member is on the correct course for consideration of tenure.
   b. The candidate's contract should be renewed, but the candidate is not performing to the level commensurate for consideration of tenure.
c. The candidate's contract should not be renewed.

11) The Chair will write his/her evaluation of the non-tenured faculty member (per PAc 27) and, prior to submitting the report, will meet with each non-tenured faculty member to discuss the evaluation. The Chair’s written evaluation will be made available to the faculty member. After meeting with the faculty member, the chair’s written report will be sent to the Dean along with the portfolio and the recommendation of the Department Tenure Review Committee.

12) The Dean of the College will submit a recommendation to the Provost and Executive Vice-President for Academic Affairs based on the recommendations of the Department Tenure Review Committee and the Chair (PAc 27).

13) If the non-tenured faculty member disagrees with the recommendation of the Department Tenure Review Committee, the Department Chair, and/or the Dean of the college, he/she may submit a letter of response at any point in the process to any of the administrators involved (Pac 27).

Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

1) The Promotion Process is guided by PAc-2 - Promotion Review. The criteria for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor are the same as those for Tenure.

2) Therefore, in compliance with PAc 27, all faculty members awarded tenure by the University Tenure Committee shall automatically be promoted to associate professor.

3) PAc – 1 Academic Titles.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

1) The Promotion Process is guided by PAc – 2: Promotion Review.

2) PAc- 1: Academic Titles

Department Promotion Committee. All faculty applying for promotion must submit a portfolio to the Department Promotion Committee. After reviewing the candidate's portfolio the Department Promotion Committee will make a recommendation to the Chair to support or decline the application for promotion.

Criteria for Promotion. Although successful annual evaluation cannot be the sole determining factor in the decision of the Department’s Promotion Committee to support or decline an application, the criteria defined under the heading of “performance expectations” of this Faculty Evaluation Plan should be used in determining successful professional growth in the areas of teaching, professional achievement, and service as defined in Pac 2.

While the faculty member’s cumulative record of performance may be considered, the focus for this review will be placed on the period since the last promotion.

The College of Education provides a unique service to the schools within the region and collaborates across the University in relation to both curriculum and administrative functions. Given this mission, these services should be reflected in the promotion process. To be promoted to the rank of Professor, a faculty member should have a consistent record (i.e., across at least a 5 year period after promotion to associate professor) of

- Above expected evaluations of teaching,
- Above expected service at the local, state, regional and/or national levels, and
• Professional achievement at the regional and/or state levels with some recognition of his/her scholarship at the national level.

• These standards for promotion should correlate to regular recognition as performing at above expected or outstanding level during time in rank.

Faculty applying for promotion to professor should have fulfilled basic duties and expectations which include fulfilling appropriate classroom responsibilities (i.e. online, face-to-face, etc.), maintaining appropriate availability to students, advising of students, participating in departmental and/or college service, and regularly attending faculty meetings.

**Annual Evaluation Procedures**

The following sections outline the procedures for submission, review, and appeal of annual Performance - Based Compensation Increase (PBCI) reviews within the College of Education.

The sole exception to the review process will be faculty on sabbatical leave. They will receive the same PBCI rating as awarded at the departmental level the previous year.

**Annual Self-Evaluation**

In accordance with University guidelines (PAc: 27), all tenured and tenure track faculty members will prepare and submit the items outlined below by the date designated by the Provost on the annual academic calendar. The annual review is for the calendar year.

**Annual Goals.** Each faculty member should include his or her goals for the previous year on the form provided and indicate if each goal was met. The faculty member may briefly explain the reasons for not meeting any goals in the narrative section of the Annual Productivity Report. The faculty member should indicate goals for the next year on the bottom of the form.

**Annual Productivity Report.** Complete the attached Annual Productivity Report. (See attached example). If the University-approved database has been proven secure and available, each department may choose to complete the report through the University-approved database (e.g. Fac180, etc.). Each faculty member is required to complete the self evaluation located at the top of each section as well as the overall self rating at the end of the Annual Productivity Report. The faculty member should provide a short justification for their self evaluation following the listing of activities. The justification should be provided for each of the three sections on teaching, professional achievement and service.

Faculty should have supporting evidence (i.e. proposals, syllabi, publications, etc.) available for review upon request.

**Departmental Review**

This section outlines two options for annual review at the departmental level: peer and chair review or chair only review. Each department in the college shall determine by majority vote of all tenured and tenure-track faculty which option to use. A department may elect to switch their annual review procedure option as long as any change is approved before the beginning of the calendar year for which that option will apply.
Peer and Chair Review Option.

1) All eligible tenured and tenure track faculty will use the guidelines below and their best professional judgment to evaluate each faculty member’s annual self-evaluation portfolio.

2) If any faculty member deems a colleague's professional activity as below expected in any of the three categories (teaching, scholarship, and service) he/she must accompany this assessment with a concise rationale. The rationale may be anonymous, but must only address the criteria as outlined in this document. These rationales will be available to the Chair and the faculty member concerned.

3) A summary of the results and original evaluation forms will be submitted to the Chair.

4) The chair will prepare a written confirmation and rationale of the rating awarded for each tenured and tenure track faculty by the date designated by the Provost. This report should summarize the material from the peer review. If the chair is aware of information unavailable to the faculty that either will positively or negatively influence the final rating, he or she may consider that. When the chair elects to award a performance rating different from that recommended by the faculty he or she must specifically address this discrepancy in the notice to the individual faculty member.

5) Any faculty member may request a face-to-face meeting with the chair to obtain clarification of the rationale for the assigned rating.

6) Each faculty member who receives an overall rating of “less than expected performance” (see page 19) will meet with the departmental chair to identify areas for professional growth during the next year. The actions identified to address areas of deficiency shall be integrated into the faculty member’s individual plan for professional development (see annual self evaluation, page 5) and should be explicitly addressed in the next year’s self-evaluation. Regardless of other ratings, faculty members who receive a rating of less than expected in any area should target that area for professional growth in their goals for the coming year.

7) If a faculty member disagrees with his/her annual rating, he/she may initiate the Appeal Process outlined on page 9.

8) All materials related to this review, including faculty self-evaluation portfolios, original evaluation forms, and evaluation summaries will remain in the possession of the chair until after the final date for appeal.

Chair Review Option

1) The departmental chair will review the self-evaluation portfolio for all eligible tenured and tenure track faculty using the guidelines below and his/her best professional judgment.

2) This evaluation should use a format similar to that found in the Overall Levels of Performance. The rating in each area should be accompanied by a rationale that integrates both strengths and needs.

3) Faculty overall performance evaluation ratings will be determined using the criteria outlined under “Overall Levels of Performance” on page 19 of this document.

4) The chair will prepare a notice and rationale of the rating given for each tenured and tenure track faculty by the date designated by the Provost.

5) Any faculty member may request a face-to-face meeting with the chair to obtain clarification of the rationale for the assigned rating.
6) Each faculty member who receives an overall rating of “less than expected performance” will meet with the departmental chair to identify areas for professional growth during the next year. The actions identified to address areas of deficiency shall be integrated into the faculty member’s individual plan for professional development (see Annual Self Evaluation, page 5) and should be explicitly addressed in the next year’s self-evaluation. Regardless of other ratings, faculty members who receive a rating of less than expected in any area should target that area for professional growth in their goals for the coming year.

7) If a faculty member disagrees with his/her annual performance rating, he/she may initiate the Appeal Process found on page 9.

8) All materials related to this review, including faculty self-evaluation portfolios, will remain in the possession of the chair until after the final date for appeal.

**College Faculty Evaluation Committee**

**Membership.** The College Faculty Evaluation Committee (CFEC) shall consist of two faculty members elected from and by each department in the college in the fall of the academic year for a one-year term. All voting members of the Committee shall: (1) be full time faculty; (2) be tenured or in a tenure-track position; and (3) have served at least one full year at the University. Chairs and the Dean shall not serve on this committee.

The Committee shall elect their chair from the membership of the Committee by September 15 of the academic year at a first meeting convened by the college Dean.

**Duties/Responsibilities.** This committee is to provide ongoing faculty oversight to the PBCI process by fulfilling the following responsibility:

1) Annually the committee shall review this document and respond to any other authorities such as the President, the Provost, the Dean, or various committees of the Faculty Senate calling for updating or revising this FEP. In this process, it shall be responsible for revising and submitting proposed revisions to the faculty, chairs, Dean, Faculty Senate, and other administrators as necessary, for approval.
Appeals

1) The College of Education Faculty Evaluation Appeals Committee shall be composed of six elected tenured faculty, two representing each of the departments in the College of Education. Each department shall elect their representatives by October 1 of each academic year. The term of service for each member of the PBCI Appeals Committee shall be one year, starting October 1 and ending September 30. There will be no limit on the number of terms a faculty member may serve. Each year the committee shall elect one member as chair. A quorum shall be five members in attendance with at least one representative from each department in attendance. Decisions shall be based upon a majority vote of the committee members in attendance at a committee meeting. Voting shall be by secret ballot. All information will be confidential.

1) The MGSE Faculty Evaluation Appeals Committee shall be composed of three tenured faculty members – one from each of the three departments in the college. The one from MGSE will be elected by faculty in the department, but must not be one of the people appealing his/her rating. The faculty members from the other two departments will be appointed by their respective chairs as needed.

2) If a faculty member disagrees with his/her annual evaluation rating, he/she may request a meeting with the department chair (or next level supervisor) to discuss the evaluation. The purpose of the meeting will be to determine if a satisfactory resolution can be reached through informal discussion. If the appellant and the department chair reach agreement, the chair will within five working days provide for the appellant and the Dean a written description of the agreement.

3) If the disagreement is not satisfactorily resolved, the department chair (or next level supervisor) will indicate within five working days the reasons for not changing the evaluation. Only after this process is complete may the appellant appeal to the MGSE Faculty Evaluation Appeals Committee. To file an appeal, the faculty member must succinctly state in writing the reasons he/she believes the evaluation should be changed. The statement must be filed with the Dean of COE within five working days after receiving the department chair’s written rejection of the informal appeal. The appeal may be based upon procedural or substantive grounds.

4) The department chair will provide copies of the appellant’s annual performance documents, the original evaluation and the written rejection of the informal appeal to the Appeals Committee.

5) The Appeals Committee will meet separately with the appellant and the department chair within 7 working days after the Dean of COE receives a written appeal. The committee will review all pertinent written material and may request additional material if necessary. If the appellant requests a rating of 1, 2, or 3 the committee will, by a majority vote, render a written decision. The decision shall be the final step of this appeal process.

Step 5 shall complete the PBCI appeals process for the College of Education. Appellants who do not accept the decision at the college level may have access to other reviews or appeals if provided by Morehead State University policy.
Performance Expectations

The following sections outline specific guidelines for the evaluation of teaching, professional achievement, and service. Each section contains the following three elements.

1) A narrative introduction that provides a context for the material provided in to the two accompanying tables.

2) A matrix that provides a rubric for synthesizing each faculty member’s activities during the preceding year. The matrix describes the expectation for performance at each of three levels. It then provides an example of what performance at that level might look like. These descriptions are intended to be descriptive not prescriptive.

3) This is followed by a list of relevant activities. Within these lists, individual activities are weighted on a three-level scale that attempts to account for the relative time and effort involved in each activity. This scale of expected, above expected, and outstanding is not intended to negatively reflect on any activity or the efforts of any faculty members. It simply tries to capture the extra effort that is involved in bringing some projects to fruition.

This framework acknowledges various ways in which faculty can contribute to the mission of the college. It suggests that sometimes “lower-rated activities” can indeed trump a “higher-rated activities.” For example, publication of a peer-reviewed journal article has traditionally been a highly valued activity at a University and it should be. Within a school of education a central part of the scholarly enterprise should entail conveying state of the art information to local practitioners. Traditionally, such activities were frequently discounted as “just service” and not contributing to professional achievement. The scale used in this document reflects the fact that a professional development workshop for a local school is valued but less so than the substantial effort involved in bringing an article to press. However, within this framework, an individual faculty member can demonstrate that an ongoing series of well-developed professional workshops certainly merit consideration that equals or exceeds a single publication.

As per Pac-35 requirements, relative weighting of the categories for Teaching, Scholarly Productivity, and Service are as follows:

Teaching 60%; and

A combination of Scholarly Productivity and Service up to 40%.

The weighting of the latter two duties (scholarly productivity and service) shall be determined by the individual faculty, and agreed upon with the department Chair. The total percentage of all three areas must equal 100%.

As cited in Pac-35: If a faculty member is involved in regional engagement, evidence should be provided of how knowledge and resources of the University are being connected to the community, service region, and beyond. This is not a separate category of the FEP, but should be reflected in the faculty member’s teaching, scholarship and service as appropriate.

Teaching

Teaching is central to the role of regional universities like Morehead State. Therefore, the evaluation of teaching is central to the overall evaluation of individual faculty members. The importance of this aspect of evaluation emphasizes that it is not a simple task. The extensive
literature on evaluation of teaching makes it clear that this is one of the greatest challenges facing schools and colleges today. Factors such as student preparation, subject matter, teaching philosophy, level of course, and others make it very difficult to come up with a simple scheme for evaluating teaching.

There seems to be strong consensus that evaluation of effective teaching cannot be reduced to a single number on a form completed by students. Nonetheless, student perspective on the quality of instruction is a critical component in achieving this task. Faculty members are encouraged to systematically collect formal student feedback on every course.

The framework provided in this document tries to avoid the pitfall of reducing evaluation of teaching to a single number. The down side of this decision is that effective evaluation of teaching becomes a much more complex undertaking. Multiple factors have to be considered. These can include student perceptions, student outcomes, peer and administrative review, review of teaching activities and materials, review of tests and other assessments, and an understanding of the faculty member’s individual philosophy of teaching. Like all else in this document, this section is not prescriptive. Individual faculty and departments need to explore innovative ways of effectively evaluating instruction. (Please note: In the examples used in this section reference is made to a T-score on the IDEA evaluation form. This is only an example. It does not imply that this instrument or this score is the standard for evaluation of teaching in the College of Education.)

In addition to what goes on in the classroom, a variety of other factors are directly related to quality of teaching. These can include time and effort devoted to advising, supervising field experience, supervising clinical practice candidates, supervising practica candidates, efforts at program revision, pursuit of external funds to improve program resources or student opportunities, variety of courses taught, the development of expertise related to instruction, efforts at recruitment, and other evidence of commitment to students and teaching. These factors merit serious consideration.

In this college, the task is further complicated by the fact that for many of us pedagogy is our subject matter. This means that for some faculty members the boundary between teaching and professional achievement is less than clear. However, it also means that the modeling of effective pedagogical practice is intrinsic to the role of faculty member in a teacher education program.

**Online and ITV course evaluations**

Non-tenured faculty in online and ITV courses shall use departmentally approved teacher evaluation forms through Blackboard delivery in addition to IDEA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Performance for Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-Expected</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty member will consistently deliver effective instruction by using good pedagogical practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of efforts to maintain skills and knowledge needed to stay current in field and delivery of instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence indicates consistent availability and accessibility to students advisees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student feedback on teaching, peer review, and other sources indicate the average level of rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence that a faculty members is attaining this level may include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- IDEA forms or equivalent with scores in the average range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good advisee evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Regular availability to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A series of student evaluations with consistent high ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High ratings on peer reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Authorship of a major program revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good advisee evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Regular availability to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or other comparable activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence that a faculty members is attaining this level may include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Design of new web-based support for classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A grant to support student attendance at conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good advisee evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Regular availability to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or other comparable activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or other comparable activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or other comparable activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Evaluations.</strong> Low average/midrange to average/midrange scores on a student evaluation instrument (For example: average T-score of 37-44 on IDEA form) or other evidence of effective teaching based upon at least two formal observations by peers or administration and/or evidence student outcome data, etc. that demonstrates commitment to teaching and effective practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Additional Considerations/Support Materials Needed when primary teaching evaluation data is below indicated criteria.** Include documentation from the following:  
- Teaching workload (number of different preps, and upper and lower division distribution, number of students, etc.)  
- Participation in workshops to improve teaching  
- Relevant research to improve teaching  

You must also complete **one of the options for Teaching Effectiveness** listed under **Above Expected/Better.** | **Teaching Effectiveness Options:** You must complete **two of the options** below for an Above Expected rating.  
- Participate in teaching/advising development.  
- Teach a new course  
- Show evidence of Regional Engagement. Examples include but not limited to:  
  - Show evidence of quality supervision of clinical practice candidates  
  - Show evidence of quality supervision of field experience candidates  
  - ITV / on-line courses  
  - Participating in workshops for teacher professional development  
  - Participating on state-wide teacher improvement task forces  
  - Demonstrating lessons or instructional techniques in schools  
- Create/revise existing program  
- Create new or revise existing course  
- Develop teaching software  
- Earn a teaching award  
- Secure a teaching grant  
- Administer an ongoing teaching grant  
- Use innovative techniques in existing course, first time being implemented  
- Serve as an academic advisor for students (Registrar’s Record)  
- Written student evaluations linked to course objectives. Include summary info.  
- Include pre-test/post test info. Showing significant student improvement over the course of a semester  
- Video documentation of teaching performance accompanied by plans, goals, etc.  

You must also complete an additional three of the options for Teaching Effectiveness listed under **Above Expected.** | **Additional Support Needed when primary teaching evaluation data are below indicated criteria.** Include documentation for the following two:  
- Explain teaching evaluations material  
- Clarify workload and implications linked to performance  

And 1 or more from the following list:  
- Relevant research (applied instructional research)  
- Participation in teaching improvement activities  
- Develop instructional materials  
- Revise, develop a course

NOTE: It is expected that at all levels of teaching performance, instructors will be available to their students on a regular basis.
- Document significant and appropriate use of technology
- Other comparable teaching activities or outstanding achievement in teaching
- Serving on a Graduate Degree committee, e.g., Masters thesis, Ed.D., Ed.S.
**Professional Achievement**

The area of professional achievement has traditionally been the most clearly defined area in the evaluation of University faculty. Often viewed as synonymous with scholarship, this area of activity is seen as the contribution of the individual to their primary discipline. This typically includes continuing professional development, research, grantsmanship, publications, and presentations. One ongoing source of difficulty for faculty members in colleges of education has been the fact that their area of professional achievement often entails pedagogy. This has led to some difficulty when colleagues from areas other than education review their achievement. As noted above this evaluation can be further complicated because a legitimate area of professional achievement for education faculty can involve working directly with practitioners in public schools. The College of Education defines professional achievement broadly to include a number of activities in which the faculty member is involved. This may include extending academic discourse through original research, communicating scholarly discourse to other professionals through writing and formal scholarly presentations, contributing to public discourse and public education through creative productions and publications, and extending their own expertise through professional development. When the nature of professional association leadership is linked to conference or workshop development for the purpose of contributing to the on-going education of peers, professional association leadership may be included in this category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Performance for Professional Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-Expected</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty member remains current in the field and participates in professional organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence** that a faculty member is attaining this level *may* include:
- Membership in a professional organization
- Attendance at one professional meeting at the state, regional, or national level
- Or other comparable activities

**Evidence** that a faculty member is attaining this level *may* include:
- Meeting the criteria for expected performance and
- Make a peer reviewed presentation to a professional meeting
- Write and submit a scholarly grant
- Provide ongoing technical assistance to a school or district
- Or other comparable activities

**Evidence** that a faculty member is attaining this level *may* include:
- Meeting the criteria for above expected performance and
- Have a scholarly grant funded
- Publish a chapter in an edited text
- Or other comparable activities
## Professional Achievement Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected: Any two of the following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Current membership in a local, state, regional, or national professional organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attending local, state, regional, national, or international professional meetings in your discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Earning CEUs from MSU faculty development workshops or other partial day workshops (for example: training on a specific software or discipline specific software or peripheral)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintaining a unit or departmental Web site (as it meets ADA guidelines and other University requirements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Documented articles submitted for publication, abstracts submitted for grants, or completed grant applications- internal or external (all must contain date of submission and estimated turn-around-time from source);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintain professional licensure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Or equivalent activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Above Expected: Expected plus any two of the following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Either author or co-author publication in a local, state, or regional refereed publication (includes conference proceedings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serve on an editorial board of a journal and/or review manuscripts for journals in your discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serve as reviewer for local, state, or regional refereed conference abstracts, or textbooks in your field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Show evidence of Regional Engagement. Examples include but not limited to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Direct internal or external grant activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Undertake a collaborative project with schools which results in applied research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Author a unit or departmental Web site; course Web site for supplement or solely Internet teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create and implement multimedia for a face-to-face, ITV course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complete workshop related to your professional responsibilities (of one or more days), or other continuing education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do an original, formal presentation of research literature to professional educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Present to Department or Unit meeting, brown bag series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Or equivalent activity or combinations of activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding: Above expected plus any two of the following</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Refereed, or Invited presentation at a local, state, regional, national or international professional organization meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Travel abroad to present to a refereed or invited professional meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create and implement multimedia for an online course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refereed presentation to national or international professional organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Either author or co-author publication in national, international journals (includes ERIC and refereed conference proceedings).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Edit, co-edit, and/or authorship of a book or professional journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Obtain an internally funded grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Obtain an externally funded grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Publish a monograph, textbook, video, or CD-ROM as author or co-author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Receive a prestigious award from MSU or a professional association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Receive a fellowship or faculty research award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Write an invited chapter in a book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complete a graduate or undergraduate course or week long or more workshop related to your professional responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional activities deemed &quot;Above Expected&quot; which relate directly to the mission of the college and University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Or equivalent activity or combinations of activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service

The area of service allows faculty members to demonstrate how they are meeting their responsibilities as professionals to contribute to the institution, their discipline, and the community. As a member of the University community, every faculty member has an obligation to contribute to the effective running of the institution. This document sees this as an important role, but one not limited to what occurs on campus. Traditionally, universities have acknowledged the obligation of faculty as professionals with specialized expertise to contribute to the community beyond the institution. As noted throughout this document, this college places high priority on the need for faculty to be involved with and contribute to the successful running the public schools in our region. So while service cannot overshadow teaching and professional achievement, it plays an important part in how faculty members fulfill their responsibilities. The framework in this document attempts to give faculty members flexibility in determining how they will meet this obligation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Performance for Service</th>
<th>1-Expected</th>
<th>2-Above Expected</th>
<th>3-Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The faculty member demonstrates consistent contribution to several services activities</td>
<td>The faculty member demonstrates substantial contribution to a variety of services activities</td>
<td>The faculty member demonstrates extensive contribution to a range of service activities and fulfills a leadership role.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence that a faculty members is attaining this level may include:</td>
<td>Evidence that a faculty members is attaining this level may include:</td>
<td>Evidence that a faculty members is attaining this level may include:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Service on two departmental committees</td>
<td>• Service at the Expected level and</td>
<td>• Service at the Above Expected level and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Active membership on another college, University, or external committee or</td>
<td>• Additional institutional committee work</td>
<td>• Awarding of a service related grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acting as advisor for a student group</td>
<td>• Service on a high demand committee or the faculty senate</td>
<td>• Leadership role on a major institutional or external committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or other comparable activities</td>
<td>Or other comparable activities</td>
<td>Or other comparable activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any two of the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actively serve on at least one standing department committee;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actively serve on at least one standing college committee;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actively serve on at least one standing University committee; actively serve on at least one ad hoc committee, sub-committee, or commission of the institution;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actively serve on at least one off-campus center committee;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actively serve on at least one KDE or EPSB state committee;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actively serve as chair or secretary of a committee;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actively serve as advisor of a student organization;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participate in a round of TEP interviews;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Undertake a professional presentation for a civic, business, or community organization;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actively participate in community or state service;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participate in other comparable professional service (e.g. off-campus recruiting, off-campus advising, SOAR, open house);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submit a service grant proposal;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other comparable service (or multiple activities within one of the categories above);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meets on regular basis with school administrators;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Or equivalent activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Above Expected:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected plus any two of the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work at a SOAR, open house, MSU night, or career day,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hold an office in a local professional organization,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Speak at local community events,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Present an in-service activity,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serve as a professional consultant,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide additional committee service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Holds office, local professional organization;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do an accreditation visit;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serve on KDE committee;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serve on department committees;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serve on college committees;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hold an office or chair a committee,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Direct a service grant,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organize and implement a workshop, symposium, or conference,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Show evidence of <strong>Regional Engagement</strong>: Examples include but not limited to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;o Participate on a local, regional, or state curriculum committee, &quot;o Work with an intern in the KTIP program &quot;o Conduct a workshop &quot;o Hold office, state professional organization; &quot;o Hold office, regional professional organization;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional committee work,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serve on committees for professional organizations;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chair of committees for professional organizations;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serve on University committees;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serve on faculty senate;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serve as interim chair;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide professional development for schools or community agencies;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Direct service grants;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consult (in field);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serve as program leader;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participates in official University functions such as graduation, etc.;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintains regular availability to students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outstanding:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above expected plus any two of the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actively serve a chair of a committee at MSU;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actively serve as an officer or program chair for a state professional organization;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actively serve as an officer or program chair for a regional professional organization;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actively serve as an officer or program chair for a national professional organization;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actively serve as an officer or program chair for a student organization;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actively serve on a state or national committee related to the profession;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actively participate in national service;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actively participate on a committee that was exceptionally demanding of time and effort (e.g. TEC, Executive council of faculty senate; etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be awarded a service grant proposal;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other comparable service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hold office, national professional organization;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Major contribution to one or more University activities,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership in one or more University activities,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Award for outstanding service,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership role in national, regional, or state professional organization,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consulting in a field related to the faculty's specialization,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Service-related grant,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other meritorious activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serve as interim chair;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Or equivalent activity or combinations of activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides professional services for community outreach activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor tenure - track faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring tenured faculty seeking promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any service related to program, college, university accreditation (e.g., maintenance of website, report writing, APNA, WEAVE, program reviews, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or equivalent activity or combinations of activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Levels of Performance

The determination of a faculty member’s overall annual evaluation rating is a holistic effort but in general, the following guidelines apply.

- To receive an overall rating as distinguished at the college level a faculty member must be rated as outstanding in at least two areas and above expected in the third area. A rating of “distinguished” means that activities during the past year demonstrate significant professional growth, and the highest degree of contribution to the University community and profession, including productivity, leadership, mentoring and modeling exemplary professional behavior.

- To receive an overall rating as outstanding a faculty member must be rated as outstanding in one area and above expected in two areas. This rating means that activities during the past year demonstrate ongoing professional growth, contribution to the mission of the department through high levels of productivity, leadership, mentoring, and modeling exemplary behavior.

- To receive an overall rating as above expected a faculty member must be rated as above expected in at least two areas. An overall rating at this level means that activities during the past year demonstrate ongoing professional growth and a contribution to the mission of the department beyond simply meeting the basic requirements of a faculty member in this department.

- To receive an overall rating as expected a faculty member must be rated as expected in two or more areas. A rating of “expected” in an area indicates that the faculty member is meeting the basic expectation for performance and continuing professional growth for faculty members in this department.

- Any faculty member rated as less than expected in either teaching, professional achievement or service will meet with the departmental chair to identify goals for professional growth during the next year.

- Regardless of other ratings, any faculty member who receives a rating of less than expected in any area should target that area for professional growth in their goals for the coming year.

Related Processes

Post Tenure Review

In compliance with PAc30 all tenured faculty must participate in an annual review. The criteria and the procedures outlined in this document provide a framework for ongoing evaluation of all faculty members after the granting of tenure. Further, this process provides for the development of a personal plan of correction if the tenured faculty member shall receive a less than expected rating in any area of professional activity.
**Instructor Evaluation**

As defined in PAc 34, “Instructors (formerly referred to as fixed-term instructors) are full-time employees contracted with full benefits for a one-year term with a teaching load of no more than 27 credit hours recommended. With the approval of the department chair and college dean, Instructors may have appointments renewed on an annual basis provided there are continued/justified instructional needs, adequate funds, and satisfactory evaluations according to departmental faculty evaluation plans (FEP). While Instructors will be evaluated primarily on teaching, they may provide service on departmental committees.”

Instructors will be evaluated primarily on their teaching by the department Chair (or Chair designee). The Chair (or Chair designee) will observe the instructor’s teaching, examine the teaching portfolio submitted by the instructor (including forms for student feedback on teaching, syllabi, tests and other material providing support for quality teaching) and evaluate his/her performance based upon the same criteria for teaching used in the evaluation of tenure track faculty. A written evaluation will be completed and submitted to the faculty member according to the time schedule set by the University.

Evaluation of Clinical Faculty will be based primarily upon mentorship and teaching, when applicable. The evaluation instrument will be approved by the Department. Evaluation of Clinical Faculty will be completed by the Program Coordinator or Department Chair (or Chair designee).

---

**Guidelines for Annual Productivity Matrix**

**College of Education**

**Morehead State University**

The attached productivity matrix is divided into three areas: Teaching, Professional Achievement, and Service. The matrix is designed to function as your annual vita for PBCI review. Immediately above each section heading you are provided an opportunity to self-rate yourself in that category.

Within each section, identify/cite information pertaining to your performance in that area for the calendar year under review. The information provided in the matrix will be used for evaluation as well as the additional documentation you provide in the review portfolio.

Note: The matrix provides a broad range of activities within each area. Not all individuals will complete every entry. You should complete every section that applies to your personal performance during the year.
Morehead State University College of Education
Annual Productivity Report (Jan. 1-Dec. 31)

**Teaching**

Self-rating in this area (circle one):
Less than Expected  Expected  Above Expected  Outstanding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPRING COURSES</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Evaluation Attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reassigned time for ____ hours. Duties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMER COURSES</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Evaluation Attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reassigned time for ____ hours. Duties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL COURSES</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Evaluation Attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reassigned time for ____ hours. Duties:

**NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS/ PRACTICUM STUDENTS**

*Evaluation MUST be included.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring:</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Summer:</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Fall:</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**DIRECTED STUDY PROJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring:</th>
<th>Summer:</th>
<th>Fall:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**DIRECTED RESEARCH PROJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring:</th>
<th>Summer:</th>
<th>Fall:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LIST EXIT EXAMS / OTHER INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENTS ADMINISTERED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring:</th>
<th>Summer:</th>
<th>Fall:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### IDEA Evaluation of Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>IDEA Item</th>
<th>IDEA Raw T</th>
<th>IDEA Adjusted T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall progress on objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved student attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall excellence of teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall excellence of course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 2</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>IDEA Item</th>
<th>IDEA Raw T</th>
<th>IDEA Adjusted T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall progress on objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved student attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall excellence of teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall excellence of course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 3</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>IDEA Item</th>
<th>IDEA Raw T</th>
<th>IDEA Adjusted T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall progress on objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved student attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall excellence of teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall excellence of course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 4</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>IDEA Item</th>
<th>IDEA Raw T</th>
<th>IDEA Adjusted T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall progress on objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved student attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall excellence of teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall excellence of course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Departmental Approved or Other Evaluation of Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Departmental or Other Course Evaluation Instrument</th>
<th>Overall Item Mean / Scale Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chair / Peer Observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Name of Chair / Peer Observing</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 2</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Name of Chair / Peer Observing</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Teaching Activities (please provide a bulleted list of other activities you would like considered)

Please provide a brief justification of your self-rating for teaching and a concise explanation of any unmet goals in this area last year.
# Professional Achievement

Self-rating in this area (circle one):
- Less than Expected
- Expected
- Above Expected
- Outstanding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Publications</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>APA Reference (authors, titles, journals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refereed articles published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refereed articles in press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refereed articles under review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical reports completed (program evaluations, monographs, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-refereed articles / reviews published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-refereed articles / reviews in press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Books and Book Chapters</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>APA Reference (authors, titles, publishers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books in press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books under contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters in press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters under contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Media (CD-ROM, websites, videos, etc.)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>APA Reference (authors, titles, publishers, URLs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th># of Years</th>
<th>Total Amounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal grants awarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal grants submitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State grants awarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State grants submitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other grants awarded (university, private, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other grants submitted (university, private, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Presentations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentations</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Presentation Title</th>
<th>Conference / Venue</th>
<th>Published in Proceedings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International / national refereed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional refereed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State refereed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Membership in Professional Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership in Professional Organizations</th>
<th>Names of Organizations to Which You Belong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Participation (conferences, workshops, courses, in-service activities)</td>
<td>Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Licensure or Certification (please list)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Professional  Achievement Activities (please provide a bulleted list of other activities you would like considered)**

Please provide a brief justification of your self-rating for Professional Achievement and a concise explanation of any unmet goals in this area last year.
**Service**

Self-rating in this area (circle one):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than Expected</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Above Expected</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association/Committee/Board Service</th>
<th>Office or Type of Service</th>
<th>Association/Committee/Board Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National professional organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional professional organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State professional organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local professional organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State level committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University standing/advisory committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University task forces / ad hoc committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other university service</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State / Community service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School / Agency in-service activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Service Activities** (please provide a bulleted list of other activities you would like considered)

Please provide a brief justification of your self-rating for service and a concise explanation of any unmet goals in this area last year.
### Overall Self-Rating

Based on the rubric below, how would you rate your overall performance? (circle one):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Self-Rating</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Professional Achievement</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Expected, Above Expected, or Outstanding</td>
<td>Expected, Above Expected, or Outstanding</td>
<td>Less-than-expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected, Above Expected, or Outstanding</td>
<td>Less-than-expected</td>
<td>Expected, Above Expected, or Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less-than-expected</td>
<td>Expected, Above Expected, or Outstanding</td>
<td>Expected, Above Expected, or Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above Expected or Outstanding</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected or Outstanding</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above-Expected or Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Above-Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above Expected or Outstanding</td>
<td>Above Expected or Outstanding</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above Expected or Outstanding</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above-Expected or Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected or Outstanding</td>
<td>Above-Expected or Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Above-Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Above-Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Above Expected</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Above-Expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Self-Rating

Based on the rubric below, how would your rate your overall performance? (mark “X” in appropriate box):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than Expected</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Above Expected</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Ratings:

LESS THAN EXPECTED: This overall rating is awarded if performance in any category is less than expected.

EXPECTED: This overall rating is awarded if performance in all category is at the expected level.

ABOVE EXPECTED: This overall rating is awarded if performance in two category is at the above expected level.

OUTSTANDING: This overall rating is awarded if performance in all category is at the above expected level.

MERIT PAY

For the purposes of ranking faculty for merit raises, points will be awarded in the following way:

- Expected Rating in a category = 1 point
- Above Expected Rating in a category = 2 points
- Outstanding Rating in a category = 3 points

Should there be a tie that will affect raises, the following scoring system will be followed to break the tie:
## Points Counted Toward Tie Break in Rankings

### Professional Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Publications</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>APA Reference (authors, titles, journals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refereed articles published</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refereed articles in press</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refereed articles under review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical reports completed (program evaluations, monographs, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-refereed articles / reviews published</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-refereed articles / reviews in press</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Books and Book Chapters</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>APA Reference (authors, titles, publishers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books published</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books in press</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books under contract</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters published</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters in press</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters under contract</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Other Refereed Media (CD-ROM, websites, videos, etc.)         | 1      |                                          |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th># of Years</th>
<th>Total Amounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal grants awarded</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal grants submitted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State grants awarded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State grants submitted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other grants awarded (university, private, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Any funded grant over $300,000 will count 3 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentations</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Presentation Title</th>
<th>Conference / Venue</th>
<th>Published in Proceedings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International / national refereed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional refereed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State refereed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited presentations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-refereed scholarly presentations at state or regional meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association/Committee/Board Service</th>
<th>Office or Type of Service</th>
<th>Association/Committee/Board Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National professional organizations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional professional organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State professional organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local professional organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State level committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Chair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Executive Committee (but not chair)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University standing/advisory committees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University task forces / ad hoc committees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves on 1 or more COE committees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves on 1 or more MGSE committees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school consulting/mentoring/training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>