

PROMOTION, TENURE, and COMPENSATION PROCEDURES
DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELING, LEADERSHIP, AND SPECIAL EDUCATION
MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

Fall 2013 - Spring 2016

The mission of the Counseling, Leadership, and Special Education (CLSE) Department is to be recognized as a high quality institution in the State of Missouri for the education and training of counselors, educational leaders, and special education professionals. In light of this mission, all faculty activities that advance these goals form the basis for promotion, tenure, and appointment decisions. In addition, these guidelines, and the mission of CLSE, are consistent with the Public Affairs mission of Missouri State University.

Promotion, tenure, and appointment policies of the CLSE department are designed to be consistent with the *MSU Faculty Handbook* and other University policies. In particular, these include policies on the MSU Faculty Roles and Rewards and on Promotion, Tenure, and Faculty Appointment approved by the administration and by the Faculty Senate. This department's policies are also consistent with those of the College of Education mission to create a "Legacy of Learning." In cases of unforeseen conflict, policies shall have priority in the order listed above, with the *MSU Faculty Handbook* policies followed in all cases.

The guidelines and specific procedures contained herein represent the CLSE department's means for implementation of the evaluation processes set forth in the *MSU Faculty Handbook*, especially Section 4. These guidelines apply across the evaluation areas of tenure, promotion, and annual merit review.

I. DEPARTMENT PROMOTION, TENURE, AND COMPENSATION PROCEDURES

a) Committees and Membership

1. *CLSE Department Personnel Committee (PC)*. The CLSE Department Personnel Committee (PC) shall consist of all tenured full-time members of the faculty, regardless of rank, including full-time lecturers with renewable appointments (except for those acting in a university administrative appointment, those who have been officially notified of termination for reasons other than retirement, those who are currently under sanction as defined in the *Faculty handbook* and those upon whose applications the Committee would be acting).
2. *CLSE Promotion, and Tenure Committee (PT)*. A subcommittee, the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PT) shall consist of all tenured faculty within the CLSE Department. Individuals who vote on promotion decisions should be at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires. All tenured faculty are expected to vote on the awarding of tenure, but shall abstain from any evaluation that involves a conflict of interest.
3. *CLSE Promotions Committee (PC)*. The Promotions Committee shall consist of the Personnel Committee reduced by those faculty members of rank below that for which the candidate is applying.
4. *CLSE Compensation Committee (CC)*. Finally, a department Compensation Committee (CC) shall be comprised of a three-person panel elected annually from among the full Personnel Committee, rotating such that no member shall serve for more than three years consecutively. Representatives from the three primary program areas shall be included (i.e., counseling, leadership, and special education).

- b) The precise terms of every appointment, including terms for appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, and annual review shall be stated in the initial appointment contract letter. The conditions of appointment may vary between individuals in the various programs within the CLSE department.
- c) This document is to be reviewed every three years by the faculty in the CLSE department.

- d) Both the initial contract with the University and the annual discussions with the Department head present opportunities for role specialization for each faculty member. Evaluation of a faculty member is to be consistent with the member's role as determined by those factors. Nevertheless, the *MSU Faculty Handbook* clearly requires performance in all of the three traditional areas of teaching, research, and service as a prerequisite to tenure and to promotions. Therefore, roles of those faculty members with an interest in tenure or in promotion must be framed with the Department Head in such a way as to permit demonstration of acceptable levels of performance in all three areas in order to be eligible for consideration for tenure or promotion. Ideally, the decisions regarding individual faculty member role specialization should be discussed among the program area faculty to increase awareness of individual faculty expectations and provide stronger overall support for the entire program.

II. PROCESSES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

All processes shall follow the schedule of and adhere to the deadlines published in the Academic Work Calendar prepared by the Academic Affairs office and distributed at the beginning of the academic year. The candidate's application will be presented to the chair of the PT Committee, who will undertake security of the application. The PT Committee will make the original recommendation in all cases involving promotion, tenure, or appointment.

Schedule for PT Evaluations

1. Every faculty member on probationary or tenure appointment shall be evaluated. Evaluation of probationary appointees shall be conducted early in the second semester of their first year, and toward the end of their third semester, so that there will be a reasonable basis for decisions to reappoint in accordance with the schedule in the MSU and College of Education Policies on Promotion and Tenure and Faculty Evaluation. Evaluation of probationary appointees shall also be conducted during the second semester of their third, fourth and fifth year and during their sixth year.
2. Tenured faculty will be evaluated every year after their first tenured appointment.

Dossier

Probationary faculty members initiate this process by submitting relevant materials to the chair of the departmental personnel committee by a date specified by the committee. The faculty member will assemble a dossier consisting of the following items, some of which are required by the *Faculty Handbook*. This dossier must be submitted by the due date to the department head and cannot be changed once it is submitted, except for additions to the curriculum vita with the approval of the department head. The dossier may include:

- a. Complete updated curriculum vitae (professional in its appearance and appropriately formatted, including listed presentation and publication citations);
- b. Yearly activity summaries;
- c. Professional Statement (should include information regarding the manner in which constructive feedback was addressed in previous years);
- d. Prior department head and faculty evaluations (all past evaluations completed on the candidate by the department head and faculty committees);
- e. Student Course Evaluation Summaries and other teaching evaluation documents;
- f. Copies of scholarly products (e.g., journal articles, papers presented, books, book chapters, grants, completed grant applications)

[Type text]

[Type text]

[Type text]

- g. Any letters that might be requested by the PT Committee from on or off-campus individuals in the discipline, who have been asked to comment on the professional competence of the person being evaluated. Permission to contact these individuals must be granted by the person being evaluated.
- h. For those individuals being considered for tenure, all reappointment letters will be included; for those being considered for promotion, all letters of evaluation since their last promotion will be included.
- i. The above documents may be supplemented by other sources of evaluative information offered by the faculty member.

PT Evaluation

After submission of the dossier the PT committee will review the materials and write an evaluative report. External review materials are required, as per *Faculty Handbook*, Section 4.6.3.2, and will be included in the PT committee review. The candidate can assist the committee by identifying potential external reviewers. The Department Head shall not be a participant in the voting or deliberations of the departmental committee.

The written recommendations for promotion or tenure from the PT committee will include the following data and information:

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

*If there is a split vote among the tenured faculty, the minority may file a report, signed by each member of the minority, which will be forwarded with the majority recommendation.

The schedule of evaluations, disposition of written PT recommendations, and the procedures for appeal of PT recommendations follow the procedures approved for the College of Education and the University at large. Data and evidence submitted for merit/market compensation purposes may be used as the basis for PT evaluative processes as well.

Disposition of PT Evaluations

The written PT evaluation will be copied and distributed as follows:

- 1. Original to Department Head for departmental file (PT Committee responsibility)
- 2. Copy to Dean's Office (distributed by the department head)
- 3. Copy to faculty member (distributed by the department head)

(As per the *Faculty Handbook*) The PT committee will make the initial recommendation and forward the recommendation for a one year reappointment, two year reappointment, or for non-reappointment with the dossier of materials to the Department Head, who will then add his or her recommendation and forward both recommendations and the dossier to the Dean. The Dean will make his or her recommendation for annual appointment and notify the Provost of all reappointments and non-reappointments. The Provost may elect to review any annual appointment recommendation. Copies of all three recommendations shall be provided to the candidate. For the purpose of acknowledging that they have been received, the candidate must undersign the recommendations from the committee, the Head/Director, and the Dean before they are forwarded. Signing the recommendation does not imply that the candidate endorses all that is stated therein. The candidate may append a response before the recommendation is forwarded (this response will remain attached throughout the recommendation process). The schedule of annual appointments is in accordance with the AAUP "Standards for Notice of Nonreappointment."

Appeals of PT Recommendations

If the person evaluated for PT believes that the PT evaluation includes inaccurate information or reflects unfair bias, he or she may ask the PT committee for reconsideration. If still not satisfied with the results, the appeal may be taken to Dean of the College of Education.

Responsibility

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

Schedule for Notification of Appointment/Non-Reappointment

First-year faculty: appointed to a second year or notified of non-reappointment by March 1 of the first year.

Second-year faculty: appointed to a third year or notified of non-reappointment by December 15 of the second year of service.

Third-year faculty: appointed to a fourth year or notified of non-reappointment 12 months before expiration of the appointment.

Fourth-year faculty: appointed to a fifth year or notified of non-reappointment 12 months before expiration of the appointment.

Fifth-year faculty: appointed to a sixth year or notified of non-reappointment 12 months before expiration of the appointment.

Sixth-year faculty: tenured or notified of non-reappointment 12 months before expiration of appointment.

Exceptional Record of Accomplishment

As per the Faculty Handbook, Section 3.4.1, individuals with exceptional records of accomplishments may apply for tenure in their fourth or fifth year (as adjusted for credit granted toward tenure upon hire). The earliest any Assistant Professor may apply for tenure is during the third year of probationary status, regardless of the number of years granted toward tenure at the time of hiring. As per the Faculty Handbook, Section 4.6.2, candidates who apply early for tenure may reapply up to and including the final year to apply. Exceptional records of accomplishment are defined as the fulfillment of all requirements for tenure or promotion in a shorter time frame.

III. GUIDELINES FOR TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP AND SERVICEa. **Teaching**

Teaching is defined as course instruction that is conducted under the auspices of MSU. It includes on-campus and off-campus teaching; research advisement in which instruction is the primary objective (directing Seminar projects, membership on CLSE student committees); dissertation committees; preparation of course materials; development of new courses and online courses, procurement and preparation of class and laboratory equipment and supplies; program direction, advisement, paper or project grading and supervision of practice, fieldwork, and internship experiences.

Expected performance [minimum required to be eligible for Tenure consideration] is achieved by:

- Meeting all *Faculty Handbook* teaching responsibility criteria of developing educated persons.
- Providing evidence of effective teaching which includes examples of competence in courses.
- Average student evaluation ratings (on a 5-pt. scale; 3.01-3.5 where 5 is the highest)
(Absence of the overall evaluation average indicated above creates a refutable presumption that performance may be unacceptable. A candidate may rebut this presumption of unacceptability based on other facts and/or circumstances particular to his or her teaching experience.)

Above expected performance [minimum required to be eligible for consideration for promotion to Associate] is achieved by exceeding expected performance in at least three ways: including, but not limited to, the following:

- Achieving high student evaluations (on a 5-pt scale; >3.51 where 5 is highest)
- Evidencing engagement in the scholarship of teaching
- Course development activity (e.g., alignment with standards/competencies or updating materials)
- Curriculum development activity
- Support of undergraduate and graduate research efforts
- Student advisement
- Coordination of academic program
- Contribution to the public affairs mission
- Special efforts to bring diversity to students' experiences
- Experiential learning
- Innovative use of instructional technology
- Curriculum/instructional efforts related to accreditation
- Efforts to increase accessibility to education beyond one's typical assignments (e.g., Internet courses)

Excellent performance [Minimum required to be eligible for consideration for promotion to Full or Distinguished Full] is achieved by:

- Meeting above expected performance in at least five ways, including, but not limited to, those listed above.

Evidence of Quality Teaching Provide evidence/documentation of the following for any of the above levels of performance:

- student evaluations and/or student feedback (50% or less of the evidence provided)
- course syllabi and policy statements
- alignment of courses with standards/competencies identified by the discipline
- samples of assignments
- samples of examinations
- representative samples of work turned in by students
- experiential learning in teaching, as applicable to the discipline
- course or curriculum development
- innovative instructional methods
- development evidence of instructional technology utilization
- on-line course information
- special access opportunities such as distance learning delivery
- providing opportunities for out-of-class application, field work, or service learning
- academic and career advising
- continuing professional education, advanced study, e.g., certificates
- honors and awards for teaching
- written comments by students
- student outcome data related to course objectives and program assessment
- peer evaluations by appropriate program faculty
- publications and presentations related to teaching
- cooperative scholarship with students, including publications, presentations
- direction of theses or special projects
- service on thesis committees
- participation on doctoral committees
- participation in doctoral comprehensive examinations
- department head assessment of
 - the candidate's availability to students
 - collegiality

[Type text]

[Type text]

[Type text]

- participation in curricular development
- appropriate use of instructional technology
- other ways, as identified by the appropriate program faculty

b. Scholarship

Scholarship is defined as research, inquiry and investigation in the fields appropriate to each program within the CLSE department. Specific modes of research include:

Discovery - gaining knowledge of or ascertaining the existence of something previously unknown or unrecognized;

Application - using established knowledge to solve significant problems

Synthesis - bringing knowledge together from disparate sources to produce a whole work that is greater than the sum of its parts;

Criticism - using established values (aesthetic, logical, ethical) to evaluate quality of artifacts (e.g., art, legal decisions, news media); and

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

Both the quantity and the quality of scholarship are to be evaluated. Evidence of quality includes evidence of the perceived quality of journals in which the candidate has published, evidence of citation of the candidate's work by other scholars, and letters of support from recognized scholars in the candidate's discipline. The following standards are offered as guidelines – quality work that is different than the minimums specified can be justified by the level of overall quality of scholarship represented in the faculty member's research accomplishments.

Manuscripts which have been accepted by an editor and are considered “in press” may be counted in the category in which they would occur if they were fully published and the faculty member in so listing a work is committing themselves to make whatever final steps are necessary (e.g., reviewing a proof, signing a copyright contract, etc.) to assure the work does come to publication. For example, a faculty member has obtained a letter from the editor of a national peer reviewed journal stating that their manuscript has been accepted for publication would qualify as “in press” and therefore be counted as a Category A product. However, a faculty member may not count the same work as more than one product in evaluations that are to summarize more than one year's contributions. For example, in a three-year, tenure, or promotion review, a product may be counted only once even though it may have been counted in two successive years (the first as in press and the second as published).

Expected Performance [minimum required to be eligible for Tenure consideration] (since coming to Missouri State University or with credit granted toward tenure when hired)

Must have a minimum of FIVE from Categories A, B, or C.

- At least TWO must be from Category A.
- At least THREE must be from Categories A or B.

Above Expected Performance [minimum required to be eligible for consideration for Promotion to Associate]

Must have a minimum of SIX from Categories A, B, or C.

- At least THREE must be from Category A.
- At least FOUR must be from Category A or B.

Excellent Performance [minimum required to be eligible for consideration for Promotion to Full] (since promotion to Associate)

Must have a minimum of SIX from Categories A, B, or C.

[Type text]

[Type text]

[Type text]

- At least THREE must be from Category A.
- At least FOUR must be from Categories A or B.

Extraordinary Performance [minimum required to be eligible for consideration for Promotion to Distinguished Full] (since promotion to Full)

Must show an **extensive record at this or another institution** throughout one's career, including a minimum of the criteria needed for associate and full professor, meaning EIGHTEEN from Categories A, B, or C.

- At least NINE must be from Category A.
- At least TWELVE must be from Categories A or B.

Must have **original work refereed by credible sources in leading publications/venues at the national and international level**, such as a minimum of At least SIX items in these select Category A areas

- Scholarly/research articles published in international/national peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media
- Author or editor of scholarly book(s).
- External grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media (typically \$10,000+)

Must document scholarship quality which includes a collection (two or more) of the following

- Awards
- Published Journal Rankings in the Applicant's field
- Acceptance rates
- Impact Factors
- Citation Indexes
- Critical Reviews
- Evidence of Leadership Roles in National/International Organizations relative to the area of candidates' expertise or pursuant to their accomplishments

Categories of Scholarly Work

CATEGORY A

- Scholarly/research articles published in international/national peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media
- Student research projects mentored by faculty members resulting in international/national peer-reviewed publications
- Author or editor of scholarly book(s).
- Author or editor of book chapter(s), monograph(s), anthology(ies), published production script(s), either print-based or other electronic media.
- External grant applications that require substantial faculty effort
- External grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media (typically \$10,000+).
- Primary author of NCATE Folio or Professional Organization Folio.

CATEGORY B

- Scholarly/research articles published in regional or state peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media.
- Articles published in major national discipline-based, print-based or electronic media.
- Student research projects mentored by faculty members resulting in state/regional peer-reviewed publications
- Reviews for university self-studies that require substantial faculty effort.
- Primary author, editor, project manager or production specialist of published major educational curriculum material including electronic media.
- National or regional scholarly peer-reviewed conference presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s).

[Type text]

[Type text]

[Type text]

- National or international awards for research

CATEGORY C

- Local/university grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media (typically <\$10,000).
- State and local peer-reviewed conference presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s).
- Nonrefereed publication(s) and electronic media.
- Submissions for publication that have not been accepted for publication.
- Scholarly, creative work(s), and electronic presentation(s) other than electronic media as described above.
- Grant and contract proposal(s) as well as accompanying report(s) emanating from such project(s).
- Student/faculty collaborative research project(s).
- Completed dissertation as Chair of dissertation committee(s)
- Peer Reviewer for journal.
- Research consultant.
- Honors or awards for research.
- Reprints of articles previously published in edited books or referenced journals.
- Preparation of custom texts, reading packages, or ancillary materials for one's own courses.
- Other, as judged by appropriate program faculty.

c. Service

Service includes university and non-university related professional service such as counseling at the University Counseling Center, consulting with community agency and state offices, speech making, attendance at and participation in professional association meetings, being a journal consultant or editor, and contributions to professional conferences and workshops. This category also includes unpaid service to the community. It also includes department, college and university committee work; membership on masters, specialist, and doctoral committees that are external to the department; duties as Department Head, other departmental administrative appointments; and membership on special committees and bodies such as the Graduate Council, the Faculty Senate, or the Institutional Review Board. University Service also includes the advisement of students which is not related to instruction but rather to program completion, guidance in course selection, career objectives, and informal counseling.

As per the Faculty Handbook, Section 4.2.3.2, University Citizenship is of paramount importance. Any faculty member, in order to succeed in the area of service at Missouri State University, must succeed in University Citizenship. Service in the other three areas (Professional Service, Public Service, and Professional Consultation) are not individually prescriptive, they are inclusive of service and may be considered. Success in one or more of these areas is required for tenure and for promotion to Associate Professor. Sustained success in one or more areas is required for promotion to Full Professor. Attained success in service is indicated by active participation; sustained success is defined as active participation in three or more years of a service area (Professional Service, Public Service, and Professional Consultation).

Expected performance [Minimum required to be eligible for Tenure consideration] includes:

- Demonstrated success in University Citizenship as evidenced by contributing fairly to the task of shared governance
- Attained success in one or more additional areas, i.e., Professional Service, Public Service, or Professional Consultation

Above expected performance [Minimum required to be eligible for consideration for promotion to Associate] extends beyond expected performance to include service activities that demonstrates:

- Demonstrated success in University Citizenship as evidenced by contributing fairly to the task of shared governance
- Attained success in one or more areas, i.e., Professional Service, Public Service, or Professional Consultation

Excellent performance [Minimum required to be eligible for consideration for promotion to Full] extends beyond expected performance to include service activities such as:

- Demonstrated success in University Citizenship as evidenced by contributing fairly to the task of shared governance
- **Sustained** success in one or more areas, i.e., Professional Service, Public Service, or Professional Consultation.

Service Area	Examples of Service Activities
<p>1. University Citizenship: serving the University organization and contributing fairly to the task of shared-governance</p>	<p>-Program service (e.g., participation on curriculum revision committee; chair or member of program advisory board; chair or member of accreditation committee; academic adviser at undergraduate or graduate level; faculty search chair committee member; thesis chair or thesis committee member, program coordination duties beyond teaching);</p> <p>-Departmental service (e.g., departmental policy revision committee; space utilization committee; faculty search committee member; department Library representative);</p> <p>-College service (e.g., member of Dean’s faculty advisory committee; chair or member of COE Graduate Program Committee; member of NCATE accreditation committee; faculty, administrator, or staff search committee member)</p> <p>-University service (e.g., chair or member of University committees such as Graduate Council, Library Advisory Committee, University Assessment Committee; administrator or staff search committee member)</p> <p>-Additional service activities (e.g., task force chair or committee member; providing professional development activities; participating in campus discussions, and expanding opportunities for shaping the learning environment); or other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.</p>
<p>2. Professional Service: contributing to professional organizations within the faculty member’s field</p>	<p>-Chairing or serving as a board member or officer of a professional organization at the local, state, national, and/or international levels;</p> <p>-Serving as an editor or member of an editorial board of a professional journal at the state, national, and/or international levels;</p> <p>-Serving as a reviewer or guest reviewer for a professional journal at the state, national, and/or international levels;</p> <p>-Sponsoring an active student organization;</p> <p>-Providing mentoring or advising;</p> <p>-Providing opportunities for student experiences outside the expectations of teaching</p> <p>- Other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.</p>
<p>3. Public Service: serving community, state, national or international public constituents</p>	<p>-Writing op eds or other articles in newspapers or other print media or on television or radio, etc.</p> <p>-Providing presentations to support individuals and groups of individuals in local communities, states, the nation, and other countries</p> <p>-Volunteering for local, community, state, national, and international organizations</p> <p>- Other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.</p>
<p>4. Professional Consultation: providing professional expertise to different individuals or groups</p>	<p>-Providing professional expertise to business, industry, schools, community organizations, and colleagues in other university programs through collaborative projects, presentations, or specific consultations</p> <p>-Providing unpaid consultation services to external constituents within the faculty member’s professional expertise</p>

Evidence of Service

Candidates should archive various artifacts of their service activities, to include, but not limited to:

- Letters of appreciation from committee chairs, department heads, deans, or organization presidents
- Minutes of meetings in which active participation was demonstrated
- Reports generated by participation in committees or organizations
- Service awards or recognitions
- Other documents appropriate for the type of service rendered.

IV. NON-TENURE TRACK ACADEMIC POSITIONS

[As per the *Faculty Handbook*] Persons who hold non-tenure track positions are given term appointments which automatically terminate upon the expiration of the specified term. Non-tenure track appointments may be given annual or multi-year contacts as determined by the program/department with approval of the Dean and the Provost. No notice of non-reappointment is given, and reemployment of the employee after the conclusion of the contractual term is solely within the discretion of the University. Non-tenure track faculty members are not eligible for tenure, educational leave, or sabbatical leave. With the exception of visiting Professors, time spent in a non-tenure track position does not count towards tenure eligibility if the individual later applies for and is appointed to a tenure-track faculty position. Non-tenure track faculty must be qualified by academic or practical experiences appropriate for the responsibilities assigned. A Master's degree or higher is preferred. All non-tenure track academic positions have the same right to academic freedom accorded tenure-track faculty.

Instructor

An Instructor is appointed to teach full-time and to provide appropriate service, and may participate in research or creative activities. An Instructor may be appointed to an annual or to a multi-year term of up to five years. Contingent upon satisfactory performance reviews, educational needs and continued funding, the Instructor appointment is renewable without constraint of term limits. Instructors shall have earned a terminal degree or possess the degree required for teaching in specific disciplines, have potential or demonstrated teaching ability, and a willingness to serve the academic unit, college, and University. If an Instructor applies for and is appointed to a tenure-track position, the time spent as Instructor at Missouri State University will not count toward the probationary period for tenure and promotion. Instructors on 9-month contracts will receive salary compensation and benefits for 12 months.

Senior Instructor

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

CLSE Criteria for Promotion to Senior Instructor

Instructors are eligible to apply for appointment to Senior Instructor in the fall semester of their 5th year of employment with the university (years of employment need not be consecutive). Number of years is not an entitlement for this promotion, and judgments will be made at all levels based on the standards for excellence in teaching as measured by departmental criteria developed in accord with the *Faculty Handbook* and university criteria. The expectation for promotion at this rank is based on a 12-hour teaching load or its equivalence per semester and at least five years of full-time teaching experience at the university (years of teaching need not be consecutive).

The criteria for reviewing applications for promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor must include these general elements and evidence for each.

Evidence of student success on learning outcomes

- Department head's evaluations of applicant's teaching capability and performance
- Student evaluations, both quantitative and qualitative
- Pre- and post-evaluations to demonstrate an increase in knowledge and skills taught in the specific content area
- Explanation of learning outcomes and successful student assignments or portfolios that are connected to course goals

[Type text]

[Type text]

[Type text]

- Peer reviews documenting student learning outcomes.

Demonstration of the use of effective modalities – experiential learning, collaborative learning, etc.

- Assignments such as hands-on practice with class demonstration
- Peer group work
- Self-analysis of writings and projects in class
- Lecture and discussion techniques
- Online course materials and design
- Use of instructional technologies to present concepts, to facilitative class organization and discussions, and to enhance learning.

Leadership in teaching

- Demonstrate leadership in curriculum development
- Perform advisement duties
- Manage or coordinate grants or programs
- Other factors in the area of service that may indicate commitment and leadership may be included, e.g., evidence of advising to student organizations, engagement in organizing events, conferences, or other activities that contribute to the Missouri State University community.

Contribution to course and curriculum development

- Development of new courses or major revisions to existing courses
- Evaluating and adopting new texts
- Use of technology to enhance learning, e.g., development of an online course

University service

- Service to the university in the form of consistent, active serve on departmental, college, or university committees.
- Community engagement as professional opportunities allow
- Service in professional teaching organizations

Application Process

The teaching portfolio will be submitted to the departmental personnel committee for review in accordance with the dates specified in the tenure and promotion calendar (typically early October). The departmental personnel committee will submit recommendations to the Department Head in accordance with the timelines specified in the Tenure and Promotion Calendar. The Department Head will review all relevant information and make a recommendation to the Dean, who will also conduct a review and forward recommendations to the Provost. The Provost will notify the candidate of approval or non-approval of the appointment to Senior Instructor in writing, with copies to the Department Head and Dean. The Academic department will be responsible for initiating the personnel action forms designating the change of appointment and incremental salary increase.

Portfolio Requirements for Application to Senior Instructor

The following is a general guideline of what your portfolio should include and how it should be organized. Please use separate tabs for items, with the first five items arranged in the order listed. Candidates can contact the Provost's Office for clarification.

Please include these items in this order:

1. Application form for Promotion to Senior Instructor
2. Criteria used (department specific)

3. Curriculum Vitae
4. Statement of Philosophy of Teaching
5. Yearly Performance Reviews from Departmental Personnel Committee, Department Head, and Dean (for the current year and the previous four years that are being evaluated). If such reviews are not available for all previous years, other equivalent evidence may be substituted.
6. Please include these items, although not necessarily in this order. Limit your supporting materials to items generated during the five years that are under evaluation.
7. List of courses taught with enrollment numbers
8. Sample syllabi for all courses taught
9. Summary report of student evaluations with samples of students evaluations (do not include all student evaluations, but have available in the event they are requested)
10. Samples of class handouts and other curricular-related materials (e.g., exams, course assignments, etc.)
11. Examples of course and curricular development
12. Other artifacts that may indicate leadership in the area of teaching may be included – e.g., artifacts of curricular development, student learning outcomes, documentation of excellence in advising, utilization of new teaching techniques and delivery methods, attendance at faculty development workshops to improve pedagogy, unsolicited letters or notes from past students, etc.

V. SUMMARY OF PROMOTION AND TENURE QUALIFICATION

This document reflects the MINIMUM requirements for a faculty member to be eligible for consideration for tenure and/or promotion. As such, it does not provide a guarantee that a faculty member will be granted tenure and/or promotion as that decision is based on an overall evaluation of the time period being considered and the presentation of sufficient evidence. The expectations outlined in this document need to be considered in light of individual workload assignments negotiated between the faculty member and the department head which may require modified expectations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Furthermore, in some cases activities may be counted in multiple areas, such as when a faculty member engages in the scholarship of teaching.

VI. CLSE Annual Evaluation and Compensation Guidelines

All faculty members are required to submit annual reports every year and will be evaluated every year. Individual faculty members provide a 3-page or shorter summary (annual activity report) of their activities in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service for the CLSE Compensation Committee. During January of each year, the CLSE Compensation Committee will utilize department evaluation criteria (see below) to conduct reviews of annual reports and will prepare narrative assessments of each faculty member. In addition, each member of the CLSE Compensation Committee will assign a numerical rating on each of the three performance dimensions for each faculty member being reviewed. The CLSE Compensation Committee shall rate each faculty member on each criterion according to the following five categories: Unsatisfactory, Progressing, Satisfactory, Above Expected, and Excellent. The Unsatisfactory level of evaluation is characterized by an absence of evidence, whereas the Progressing level is characterized by inconsistent or minimal evidence.

The written report from the CLSE Compensation Committee shall contain a summary of the evaluation in each of the criterion performance areas (Teaching, Scholarship, Service), in accord with departmental expectations and university guidelines. The report shall be signed by the evaluators. It shall be shared with the faculty member being evaluated, and signed indicating his/her understanding of its contents.

The CLSE Compensation Committee's narrative evaluations and performance rankings will be forwarded to the department head. The department head will review the faculty annual activity reports, the narrative assessments from the CLSE Compensation Committee and ratings provided by the CLSE Compensation Committee. The department head will meet with the CLSE Compensation Committee to discuss the assessments and ratings. The department head will then prepare a composite performance rating that takes into account the percentage weights for each of the three categories of teaching, scholarship, and service agreed upon previously by the faculty member and the department head, consistent with applicable college criteria within the time specified in the compensation calendar.

Information provided to the faculty member by the department head on or before the date specified on the compensation calendar:

1. Copies of the Compensation Committee's narrative reviews and the committee's ratings on the three performance dimensions.
2. The department head's narrative review, ratings on the three performance dimensions and the composite performance rating. The composite rating will be proposed to the dean and the college council of heads for further consideration.
3. If the department head's rating on any of the three performance dimensions differs from that submitted by the CLSE Compensation Committee, the department head will provide a brief written rationale to the faculty member explaining the distinction.

The dean will meet with the department heads and review the ratings provided by each department head (and the narrative assessments as necessary) to determine the final composite rating of each faculty member.

Information provided to the faculty member by the dean on or before the date specified on the compensation calendar:

1. His/her final composite rating.
2. A brief written rationale explaining any differences in ratings between the dean's composite rating and the department head's composite rating, with a copy to the department head.

As per the Faculty Handbook, Section 4.6.4, In years when there will be no performance-based component to salary adjustments, the full-time faculty of a department may, by majority vote, opt to forgo a review by the departmental personnel committee; in those years, the review process shall start with the Department Head.

Faculty Evaluation Rubric for Teaching

Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric matrix below. These examples are only guides for the committee; the final rating shall be a consensus of judgment among the CLSE Compensation Committee members after considering all relevant information.

Unsatisfactory (1)	Progressing (2)	Satisfactory (3)	Above Expected (4)	Excellent (5)
Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in their teaching or persistent evidence of low quality teaching.	Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in their teaching.	Meeting all <i>Faculty Handbook</i> teaching responsibility criteria; Providing effective teaching; Average student evaluation ratings (on a 5-pt. scale; 3.01-3.5 where 5 is the highest).	Exceeding expected performance in at least three ways, including, but not limited to: Achieving high student evaluations (on a 5-pt scale; >3.51 where 5 is highest); Evidencing engagement in the scholarship of teaching; Course development activity (e.g., alignment with standards/competencies or updating materials); Curriculum development activity; Support of graduate research efforts; Student advisement; Coordination of academic program; Contribution to the public affairs mission; Innovative use of instructional technology; Development of internet courses; or Curriculum/instructional efforts related to accreditation.	High student evaluations (on a 5 pt. scale, >4.00 where 5 is the highest); Meeting above expected performance in at least five ways, including, but not limited to, those listed in the Above Expected criteria.

Evidence of Quality Teaching:

- student evaluations and/or student feedback (50% or less of the evidence provided)
- course syllabi and policy statements
- alignment of courses with standards/competencies identified by the discipline
- samples of assignments
- samples of examinations
- representative samples of work turned in by students
- experiential learning in teaching, as applicable to the discipline
- course or curriculum development
- innovative instructional methods
- development evidence of instructional technology utilization
- on-line course information
- special access opportunities such as distance learning delivery
- providing opportunities for out-of-class application, field work, or service learning
- academic and career advising
- continuing professional education, advanced study, e.g., certificates
- honors and awards for teaching
- written comments by students
- student outcome data related to course objectives and program assessment
- peer evaluations by appropriate program faculty
- publications and presentations related to teaching
- cooperative scholarship with students, including publications, presentations
- direction of theses or special projects
- service on thesis committees
- participation on doctoral committees
- participation in doctoral comprehensive examinations
- department head assessment of
 - the candidate's availability to students
 - collegiality
 - participation in curricular development
 - appropriate use of instructional technology
- other ways, as identified by the appropriate program faculty

Faculty Evaluation Rubric for Research/Scholarship

Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric matrix below. These examples are only guides for the committee; the final rating shall be a consensus of judgment among the CLSE Compensation Committee members after considering all relevant information.

Unsatisfactory (1)	Progressing (2)	Satisfactory (3)	Above Expected (4)	Excellent (5)
Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in scholarship.	Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in scholarship.	At least one scholarship product from Category A or B, or at least two scholarship products from any of the Categories, A, B, or C.	At least two scholarship products from Category A or B.	At least two scholarship products from Category A and one scholarship product from B or C.

CATEGORY A

- Scholarly/research articles published in international/national peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media
- Student research projects mentored by faculty members resulting in international/national peer-reviewed publications
- Author or editor of scholarly book(s).
- Author or editor of book chapter(s), monograph(s), anthology(ies), published production script(s), either print-based or other electronic media.
- External grant applications that require substantial faculty effort.
- Principal investigator for external grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media (typically \$10,000+).
- Primary author of NCATE Folio or Professional Organization Folio.

CATEGORY B

- Scholarly/research articles published in regional or state peer-reviewed journals, print-based or electronic media.
- Articles published in major national discipline-based, print-based or electronic media.
- Student research projects mentored by faculty members resulting in state/regional peer-reviewed publications
- Primary author, editor, project manager or production specialist of published major educational curriculum material including electronic media.
- Reviews for university self-studies that require substantial faculty effort.
- National or regional scholarly peer-reviewed conference presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s).
- National or international awards for research

CATEGORY C

- Local/university grant(s) that have been funded and report(s) or product(s) emanating from such funded project(s) including electronic media (typically <\$10,000).
- State and local peer-reviewed conference presentation(s) or conference proceeding(s).
- Nonrefereed publication(s) and electronic media.
- Submissions for publication that have not been accepted for publication.
- Scholarly, creative work(s), and electronic presentation(s) other than electronic media as described above.
- Grant and contract proposal(s) as well as accompanying report(s) emanating from such project(s).
- Student/faculty collaborative research project(s).
- Completed dissertation as Chair of dissertation committee(s)
- Peer Reviewer for journal.
- Research consultant.
- Honors or awards for research.
- Reprints of articles previously published in edited books or referenced journals.
- Preparation of custom texts, reading packages, or ancillary materials for one's own courses.
- Other, as judged by appropriate program faculty.

Faculty Evaluation Rubric for Service

Brief examples of performance for each category are provided in the rubric matrix below. These examples are only guides for the committee; the final rating shall be a consensus of judgment among the CLSE Compensation Committee members after considering all relevant information.

Unsatisfactory (1)	Progressing (2)	Satisfactory (3)	Above Expected (4)	Excellent (5)
Absence of evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in service.	Inconsistent or minimal evidence that faculty member is performing in a Satisfactory manner in service.	Demonstrated success in University Citizenship as evidenced by contributing fairly to the task of shared governance; and attained success in one additional areas, i.e., Professional Service, Public Service, or Professional Consultation	Service extends beyond expected performance to include service activities that demonstrates attained success in one or more areas, i.e., Professional Service, Public Service, or Professional Consultation.	Extends beyond expected performance to include service activities that demonstrate Sustained success in one or more areas, i.e., Professional Service, Public Service, or Professional Consultation.

Service Area	Examples of Service Activities
1. University Citizenship: serving the University organization and contributing fairly to the task of shared-governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Program service (e.g., participation on curriculum revision committee; chair or member of program advisory board; chair or member of accreditation committee; academic adviser at undergraduate or graduate level; faculty search chair committee member; thesis chair or thesis committee member, program coordination duties beyond teaching); -Departmental service (e.g., departmental policy revision committee; space utilization committee; faculty search committee member; department Library representative); -College service (e.g., member of Dean’s faculty advisory committee; chair or member of COE Graduate Program Committee; member of NCATE accreditation committee; faculty, administrator, or staff search committee member) -University service (e.g., chair or member of University committees such as Graduate Council, Library Advisory Committee, University Assessment Committee; administrator or staff search committee member) -Additional service activities (e.g., task force chair or committee member; providing professional development activities; participating in campus discussions, and expanding opportunities for shaping the learning environment); or other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.
2. Professional Service: contributing to professional organizations within the faculty member’s field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Chairing or serving as a board member or officer of a professional organization at the local, state, national, and/or international levels; -Serving as an editor or member of an editorial board of a professional journal at the state, national, and/or international levels; -Serving as a reviewer or guest reviewer for a professional journal at the state, national, and/or international levels; -Sponsoring an active student organization; -Providing mentoring or advising; -Providing opportunities for student experiences outside the expectations of teaching - Other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.
3. Public Service: serving community, state, national or international public constituents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Writing op eds or other articles in newspapers or other print media or on television or radio, etc. -Providing presentations to support individuals and groups of individuals in local communities, states, the nation, and other countries -Volunteering for local, community, state, national, and international organizations - Other service activities as deemed valuable by appropriate program faculty.
4. Professional Consultation: providing professional expertise to different individuals or groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Providing professional expertise to business, industry, schools, community organizations, and colleagues in other university programs through collaborative projects, presentations, or specific consultations -Providing unpaid consultation services to external constituents within the faculty member’s professional expertise

Appeals of Annual Evaluation Ratings

Only a faculty member's final composite performance rating may be appealed. Faculty will be provided clear information on the salary implications of the composite ratings prior to the deadline for submitting appeals to the department head as specified in the compensation calendar.

A faculty member who is dissatisfied with his/her final composite performance rating should first request a meeting with the department head to discuss the processes and underlying rationales by which the performance rating was determined. After the meeting with the department head, the faculty member may request a formal review of the rating by submitting a written appeal to the department head, stating the reasons for questioning the rating. At the request of the faculty member, the appeal, along with the department head response and other supporting materials, is forwarded to the dean. The dean transmits the appeal to the College Personnel Committee (or the College Compensation Committee, if one exists as a separate subcommittee of the Personnel Committee) for consideration. The College Personnel Committee (or Compensation Subcommittee) will consider the appeal. The committee's review should make use of the department performance criteria, the narrative and ratings from the department personnel committee and the department head, the department head's annual report of accomplishments, and summary descriptive measures (mean, median, mean, etc.) of the ratings of department faculty. If necessary, additional information may be requested by the committee in the process of their deliberations. The college committee will provide a written summary to the dean on the recommended disposition of the appeal.

If the dean makes a decision on the appeal that is different than that recommended by the college committee, the dean must provide a written rationale for that decision. The faculty member may continue to appeal to the Provost, who will review all written documents associated with the appeal.

The Provost may, at his/her discretion, meet with the faculty member. The Provost's decision is final. If the Provost's decision is different from the decision recommended by the college committee, the Provost must provide to the faculty member a written rationale for that decision. Only the performance rating itself can be appealed. Individuals who are successful on appeal will receive the salary increase merited by their revised performance rating. The actual percentage salary increase associated with each performance rating is not subject to appeal. This is the only appeal process to be utilized for appeals of the performance rating. Other grievance procedures, as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*, are not applicable.

At any time, any employee who believes that they have been discriminated against for any reason not related to job performance may consult with the Office for Equity and Diversity.

Performance Parameters for Compensation System

In accord with University compensation guidelines, the faculty members of the Department of Counseling, Leadership, and Special Education have identified the following evaluation weights across three criterion areas (Teaching, Scholarship, Service) for decisions regarding, faculty promotion, tenure status, retention, and compensation.

These parameters do not refer directly to workload or time/effort/percentages, but rather to the weighting of performance dimensions for determining performance ratings; however, as individual faculty parameters are determined by department heads through a process of consultation with faculty, the percentage weights chosen should reflect the roles of individual faculty in fulfilling departmental needs and should also be consistent with any college-specific parameters that have been adopted. Grant activity will be counted in the performance dimension in which the grant/contract work is most applicable --- Teaching, Research, or Service. Performance parameters or "weights" should, as much as possible, reflect faculty assignments. Individuals who are assigned higher teaching loads should have more of their evaluation influenced by the quality of their teaching. Likewise, individuals who are provided with release time for research should be expected to produce more research, both in terms of quality and quantity.

[Type text]

[Type text]

[Type text]

Generally speaking, faculty assignment should reflect the effort that a department is expecting from faculty in each area. Evaluations focus on the outcome of those efforts – the learning that occurs or the research or service produced. Faculty assignments and performance parameters should be negotiated between the department head and the faculty member at the same time.

I. Tenured Faculty -- 9-hour TLE

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

II. Tenured Faculty -- 12-hour TLE

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

III. Probationary Faculty

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

IV. Instructors & Greenwood Faculty

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

For purposes of planning and assessment, teaching one 3-credit course is typically viewed as the equivalent of 20% weight, as appropriate to the situation. Therefore, 3 courses would generally amount to 60% weight for teaching, etc. Other equivalencies are based on the college faculty workload policies.

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