

The evaluation of a faculty member is a continuous process that involves the accumulation of relevant data and information that permits intelligent judgments concerning a faculty member's performance. Evaluation procedures are used in the annual review, in the mid-probationary review, in the tenure review, in promotion reviews, and grants for professional leave and sabbatical. At the heart of an effective evaluation system lies the requirement that a faculty member diligently seek self-improvement and that evaluators responsibly interpret results and carefully support comments and recommendations.

## **A. AREAS OF FACULTY EVALUATION**

Faculty performance is evaluated in three areas: teaching, scholarship/creative activity and service. The discussion below provides a general orientation to institutional expectations for performance in each area. A list of artifacts that may be used to demonstrate performance in these areas is located in Section E.

### **1. Teaching**

One of the primary responsibilities of a faculty member at Western involves effective teaching and student interaction through classroom activities, campus involvement, and advising. Successful student learning is the primary goal of effective teaching.

Effective teaching may include, but is not limited to

- Presentation of subject matter in a carefully organized, clear, logical, and competent manner in class presentations, syllabi, teaching resource guides, web materials, posted notes, and other teaching materials
- Creative, challenging, and competent student learning evaluation measures such as examinations, quizzes, writing assignments, and other assignments appropriate for the subject matter
- Appropriate rigor in the assignment of student grades for specific assignments and courses
- Purposeful reflection on practice and student response (qualitative and quantitative) as a means to continued improvement of teaching
- Development of a new course, course preparation, or course component, special pedagogical practices, and/or special tutorial/individualized work
- Performance of duties allied to instruction such as curriculum development, advising, and/or counseling
- Participation in programs that promote instructional development in the discipline
- Sponsorship of student learning opportunities beyond the classroom that are relevant to the discipline such as a film program, a class trip, a campus event, or some similar co-curricular opportunity
- Participation in campus initiatives related to teaching such as learning communities, honors programs, and applied learning
- Meeting teaching requirements established by the department and institution
- Maintaining respect for students

## 2. Scholarship/Creative Activity

Activities fulfilling faculty responsibility for scholarship include not only scientific research and humanistic scholarship but also creative expression in the arts. Faculty must be engaged in ongoing scholarship/creative activity in order to be current and competent in their areas of instruction. Active participation in the ongoing conversation of scholarly/professional communities is expected of all faculty at the postsecondary level.

Scholarly and Creative activities can be divided into four categories. **Scholarship of Discovery** includes basic research or creative expression. **Scholarship of Integration** reviews and/or integrates prior research. **Scholarship of Application** applies current knowledge and innovations to important practices. **Scholarship of Teaching** focuses on the nature and improvement of teaching (Boyer, 1990).

The following criteria, although not exhaustive, help to delineate an activity as scholarly/creative (Diamond, 2002)

- The activity, both process and product (or result), is reviewed and judged to be meritorious and significant by one's peers. (A necessary element for all scholarly activity)
- The activity or work requires a high level of discipline-related expertise
- The activity or work is conducted in a scholarly manner with clear goals, adequate preparation, and appropriate methodology
- The activity or work and its results are appropriately and effectively documented and disseminated. (This reporting should include a reflective critique that addresses the significance of the work, the process that was used, and what was learned)
- The activity or work has significance beyond the individual context. (It breaks new ground or is innovative and can be replicated or elaborated)

## 3. Service

Professional service is a faculty responsibility and an opportunity. Through professional service, a faculty member contributes knowledge, skills, and expertise to activities designed to benefit students, the institution, the discipline/profession, and the community. Faculty members will typically provide service in several of the areas listed below.

### a. Students

Service to students includes activities that go beyond the usual teaching expectations of a faculty member. Service to students may include, but is not limited to

- Serving as a faculty advisor to a student organization
- Providing guidance for a student project not associated with the faculty member's assigned workload
- Providing an out-of-class seminar to students on Academic Affairs topics
- Providing professional advising and mentoring activities such as sponsorship of independent student work

### b. Institution

Institutional Service may include, but is not limited to

- Providing leadership for a committee or an academic unit
- Serving as an elected member of Faculty Senate or as an active member of a Faculty Senate, institutional, or departmental committee
- Representing the institution on a community project or in a partnership project

Service is a responsibility of all regular faculty members. All full-time regular faculty are encouraged to participate in service to the institution through service on faculty senate, the faculty senate executive committee, and/or faculty senate committees. When a faculty member plans to seek a position that includes reassigned time impacting workload assignments, the faculty member should inform the department leader, whether chairperson or dean. This information should be shared as early as possible to give sufficient time for the department to accommodate any schedule or workload assignment changes necessary to maintain appropriate course schedules and other department responsibilities.

**c. Discipline/Profession**

Service to the academic discipline or profession involves faculty activities that focus on disciplinary goals or on enhancing the work of professional organizations. Evidence of service to the discipline or profession may include, but is not limited to

- Participating in accreditation activities
- Editing a professional journal or serving as a peer reviewer or juror
- Organizing a professional conference or a conference panel or event
- Serving as an elected officer of a professional society
- Participating in the work of a professional association

**d. Community**

Service to the community includes activities that contribute to the public good. As citizens, faculty members are encouraged to participate in non-profit organizations that benefit the community. Faculty members have the ability to serve the community through their expertise as educators, scholars, fine or performing artists, administrators, or practitioners. Community service may include, but is not limited

- Giving public presentations or performances
- Participating in economic or community development activities
- Serving as a board member for a community non-profit organization
- Serving as a consultant or evaluating programs, policies or personnel for agencies
- Publishing written or video work in non-academic media outlets

*References*

Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Diamond, R.M. (2002). Defining scholarship for the twenty-first century. In K.J. Zahorski (ed.), *Scholarship in the postmodern era: New venues, new values, new visions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

## B. THE DEPARTMENT EVALUATION FILE

An evaluation file for each faculty member will be kept in the office of the department chairperson. Access to this file is guaranteed only to the individual faculty member, department chairperson, dean, and provost/vice-president for Academic Affairs unless the individual faculty member gives prior written approval. In addition to maintaining files and discharging other assigned responsibilities in the evaluation process, department chairpersons are responsible for making faculty members aware, through department meetings and bulletins, of each individual's responsibility in connection with material to be included in the evaluation file.

### 1. Evaluation Materials to be Included in the Department File

Failure to include any of the following important documents may prevent further review and evaluation of the package.

#### a. A copy of the Departmental Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

#### b. Annual Summaries of Teaching

Updated annual summaries of regular teaching assignments and other specific assigned responsibilities should be included. The template below provides an example of a concise way teaching data can be presented.

COURSE NAME TYPE (Major, GS)	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	GRADE DISTRIBUTION	Student Evaluation Course mean	Number of Responses
ENG 108 GS	19	A=5; B=5; C=3; D=1; F=1; W=4	2.34 ± 0.78	12

#### c. Summaries of Student Evaluations of Faculty

A tabulated summary of student evaluations of faculty will be included in the department file. This summary contains the institutionally generated evaluation data.

#### d. Annual Self-evaluation

Each faculty member should submit to his/her chairperson an annual self-evaluation using the Self Evaluation Form no later than January 22. The self-evaluation should document the faculty member's performance in each of the following areas: teaching, scholarship/creative activity and service (see VII A. "Areas of Faculty Evaluation"). The department chairperson will include a copy of the self-evaluation in the department evaluation file.

#### e. Annual Chairperson/Dean Evaluation

Each faculty member will be formally evaluated by the department chairperson (or, in the case of a department chairperson, the appropriate college/school dean) annually utilizing the Annual Faculty Evaluation Form. The evaluation period will encompass the full calendar year. The form will serve as the faculty member's written evaluation and will be utilized as the basis for the annual review interview. The department chairperson will place a copy of the completed Annual Faculty Evaluation Form in the faculty member's department evaluation file when the form is returned from the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The chairperson will complete the Annual Faculty Evaluation Form, sign it, and discuss the evaluation with the faculty member early in the spring semester. Each faculty member will read, sign, and receive a copy of his or her Annual Faculty Evaluation Form during the meeting with the chairperson.

The faculty member has the right to attach a statement to the form if he or she so desires, before it is forwarded to the appropriate dean. Normally, the chairperson submits the Annual Faculty Evaluation Form and faculty member's Self-Evaluation Form to the school dean by February 15. However, each faculty member will have the opportunity to discuss the chairperson's recommendation, sign, and offer any written rebuttals before the Annual Faculty Evaluation Form is submitted to the dean.

The dean will normally submit the review/evaluation package to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs by February 25. The Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs will complete the Annual Faculty Evaluation Form by the first Friday in April, and a copy will be returned to the faculty member.

The Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs will also submit the review/evaluation recommendations to the President who will make recommendations to the Board of Governors for final disposition. When the President's recommendation differs from the recommendation of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, the faculty member will be notified. If the faculty member believes there are grounds for a grievance, procedures in the *Policy Guide* should be followed.

- Evaluation Code on the Annual Faculty Evaluation Form

The S, M, U evaluation code is defined as follows:

- S - performance from acceptable to superior
- M - performance marginal, need for significant improvement
- U - performance unacceptable

The "S" evaluation will be utilized with the great majority of faculty members across campus. It indicates performance, which ranges from acceptable to superior.

The "M" evaluation denotes marginal performance and indicates the need for significant improvement. Such an evaluation shall be explained by the Department Chairperson on the Annual Faculty Evaluation Form.

The "U" evaluation indicates that the faculty member is performing in a poor and unacceptable manner. This evaluation shall be explained on the Annual Faculty Evaluation Form.

When the "U" evaluation is considered serious enough to jeopardize future employment, the Early Warning Provision (below) will be initiated.

- Early Warning Provision for Faculty

The purpose of the following provision is to make sure that a faculty member with serious shortcomings is made aware of them so that the opportunity for improvement is available.

Faculty members who have been employed full-time at Missouri Western State University for more than two years shall not fail to receive a reappointment

recommendation by the administration because of an unsatisfactory evaluation in teaching, scholarship/creative activity or service unless they have been advised of their shortcomings. The formal early warning shall be issued by the department chairperson, or, in the case of chairperson, by the appropriate dean, in writing on the FACULTY REAPPOINTMENT FORM and incorporated within the formal evaluation process.

A faculty member placed on early warning must demonstrate at the next annual evaluation to the satisfaction of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the department chairperson and dean, that the shortcomings have been remedied and are not likely to reoccur. Failing to do so will result in the termination of a non-tenured faculty member effective at the end of that spring semester, or in the case of a tenured faculty member, will result in a terminal contract for the following academic year.

**f. Departmental Peer Review of Teaching Documentation**

Peer review shall serve as an additional means of evaluating faculty performance in the area of teaching. Although the precise mechanism of peer review is to be specified at the departmental level, the review process shall provide a faculty member with documentation of teaching performance which shall be retained as part of the evaluation file.

Definitions: The probationary period is the period of time from initial hire to the first tenured contract. The promotion period is the period of time between submission of tenure package and subsequent promotion to Professor.

Individual departmental review policies must conform to the following standards:

- 1) They must include peer review during both the probation period (prior to tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor) and during the promotion period (prior to promotion from Associate to full Professor). Peer review after promotion to full Professor is encouraged (and may be valuable in nomination and application for faculty distinction awards) but not required (at the discretion of the department).
- 2) At least one peer review shall be completed prior to the mid-tenure review and a minimum of three reviews shall be required during the probation period as defined above. At least one peer review of teaching is required during the promotion period for promotion to full Professor. Whenever possible, peer evaluations of teaching should be provided by experienced faculty, preferably at or above the current rank of the candidate.
- 3) Departmental peer review procedures must provide the faculty member with clear documentation which must be included in the mid-tenure evaluation package and promotion/tenure evaluation package.
- 4) At least one review during the probationary period must be made by a faculty member other than the chairperson.
- 5) Departments should consider appropriate measures for faculty providing teaching in multiple instructional formats.
- 6) Departmental peer review guidelines must be approved by the Dean of the College or School.

## C. TENURE

### 1. General Tenure Philosophy

Tenure, as a status in higher education, is a means to protect the independent inquiry and the openness of academic discourse of faculty as teacher-scholars. Integral with this freedom of inquiry and openness of discourse are a set of interdependent professional responsibilities, including fidelity and integrity with professional standards and ethical codes of conduct; relevance and context of subject matter in teaching; habitual scholarly engagement with one's field; and collegial decorum in the free exchange of ideas in debate and other forums. In sum, "the freedom to pursue ideas, to raise inconvenient questions, to create an agenda of inquiry that builds on one's imagination and curiosity must be maintained as essential to the work of professoriate...the *quid pro quo* for this autonomy is accountability" (Rice, 1996, p. 27).

Faculty accountability is determined by systematic evaluation of their teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. Faculty evaluation, whether annual or periodic (i.e., event specific related to tenure, promotion, awards, etc.), should begin with self-evaluation and include multiple levels of peer review. This peer review (i.e., departmental, institutional, community, by scholarly/creative peers outside the institution) will be audited by academic administrators to assess the reliability of its results and to minimize any role "faculty rivalries, jealousies and prejudices sometimes play" in peer review (Byrne, 1997, p.12).

The primacy of professional peer review in faculty evaluation and the professional assessment of academic administrators are designed to determine which tenure-track, probationary faculty have earned tenure status through high-quality teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. The Board of Governors grants tenure to faculty whose high-quality performance in these three domains has been documented through peer review. Although some faculty may be hired with tenure or credit toward tenure (identified on the contract), most faculty are awarded tenure only after a tenure review in the sixth year of service. The elements of the tenure review process are specified below (VII E & F).

Tenure, as granted by the Board of Governors at Missouri Western State University, is designed to protect academic freedom and to ensure due process for the termination of a teaching contract. Tenure, as recognized by MWSU, is not designed to protect an incompetent instructor. Tenure assures the tenured faculty member automatic reappointment with the following conditions and exceptions.

- Tenured faculty are subject to the Early Warning Provision (VII. D)
- The services of a faculty member may be terminated immediately for gross immorality or disloyalty to the government of the United States, admitted or proved
- A tenured person denied reappointment shall have the right to a hearing before the Grievance Committee if requested in writing to the chairperson of that committee within thirty (30) days after notification. (See Appendix H, Grievance Procedure for Faculty)

If the faculty member is not granted tenure in the tenure review, he or she will receive a one-year terminal contract in the following year.

#### *References:*

Byrne, J. B (1997). Academic freedom without tenure? New Pathways Working Paper, no. 5. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Rice, R. E. (1996) Making a place for the New American Scholar. New Pathways Working Paper, no. 1. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

## 2. Tenure Processes

### a. Determining Eligibility

Faculty members hired on a tenure-track position commencing after July 1, 2005 are required to have a tenure review in the sixth year. That tenure review coincides with a promotion review. If a candidate is recommended for tenure but is not promoted, he or she is not barred from re-applying for promotion in subsequent years. Tenure status, or the time frame for a tenure review, will appear on the contract. Degree status is not a tenure criterion unless contractually stipulated. If, at the mid-tenure review, a faculty member is found to have already exceeded the university and department requirements for tenure and promotion in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, the department chair may recommend the faculty member be granted promotion and tenure review one year early. This should be the exception, not the norm. This request must be approved by the dean and the provost, and should be documented in the faculty member's personnel file and included in the candidate's promotion and tenure packet. This option does not apply if a faculty member was hired with an accelerated promotion and tenure timetable as part of their initial contract. If a candidate is not granted tenure and/or promotion at the early review, they may resubmit their packet according to the normal timeline.

### b. Delaying Tenure Review

Missouri Western State University strives to provide a supportive environment in which faculty can model lifelong scholarship and engaged citizenship. To aid tenure-track faculty striving to balance such professional demands with personal lives, MWSU recognizes that in some instances, it may be in both the faculty member's and the institution's interest to temporarily stop the tenure clock. Faculty may request to stop the tenure clock for a period of time either in conjunction with or separate from reassignment or leave. Time off the tenure clock may be appropriate for faculty without reassignment of duties or time on leave. Faculty may continue to teach a full load of courses for full pay and benefits with the understanding that the year for tenure review has been pushed back for the duration of the clock stoppage. Faculty may request for the tenure clock to be stopped for a period of time when any of the following circumstances would seriously impair the faculty member's capacity to build a record of accomplishment he or she judges appropriate for professional satisfaction and tenure review:

- Physical or mental illness or other physical condition
- Pregnancy, adoption, foster child placement
- Substantial caregiver responsibility for someone with whom one has an important relationship, including family and household
- Military service or obligations
- Legal concerns (settling estates, divorce, custody deliberations or disputes, civil suits, felony charges)

This list is not exhaustive—rather, the clock may be stopped for a variety of circumstances and conditions that would make it beneficial to the faculty member and the university to adjust the pace and timing of tenure service. The purpose of stopping the tenure clock is not to avoid or delay a difficult tenure decision.

Stopping the tenure clock implies the sequence of events related to tenure should simply be pushed back. Time off the clock before the third-year review should also push back the timing of the third-year review. Those in evaluative roles at both the third-year and tenure review time points will take care to ensure that expectations for faculty members taking time off the clock are not ratcheted up to account for the clock stoppage.



Requests for stopping the clock that are granted will typically be for one academic year. Normally, only one stopping of the tenure clock may be granted to each faculty member unless warranted by extraordinary circumstances.

To make a request to stop the tenure clock, the faculty member should submit his/her request in writing to his/her department chairperson prior to the start of the academic year in question. If a request is submitted after the start of the academic year, it will be reviewed for that year or could be considered for the following academic year. Within two weeks, the department chairperson will have responded to the request in writing by making a recommendation to the college/school dean. In turn, the dean will review the request and respond in writing within two weeks with a recommendation to the Provost.

The Provost has the final authority to approve or deny such requests and should do so in writing to the candidate within two weeks of receiving the dean's recommendation. In order to evaluate the request, additional documentation, such as medical information, may be required. Such information will be treated as confidential in accordance with HIPAA Guidelines.

**c. Levels of Peer Review in the Tenure Process**

*Chairperson Evaluations & Responsibilities:* Annual evaluation interviews by the department chairperson of those on tenure track should address issues related to work toward tenure and reflect the established Departmental Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure. A copy of these Guidelines must be included in the candidate's promotion and tenure evaluation package. Candidates for tenure must have a mid-probationary review in the year specified in their annual faculty contracts. Normally this occurs in the third year (of a six-year probationary period). This review mirrors the tenure application process up to the level of college/school dean. The chairperson is responsible for initiating this review. The review should document a prospective tenure candidate's strengths as well as areas in which additional work should be focused in subsequent years. This documentation should appear on the candidate's annual evaluation form, or as an attachment to it.

*Departmental Review Committee:* Academic departments must have a review committee that provides a recommendation to the department chairperson on tenure and promotion decisions. The department chairperson is responsible for appointing the committee after consultation with tenure and promotion candidates. The committee should be small and members should be tenured colleagues in the same (or allied) disciplines. The department committee should be involved in the mid-probationary review process to assure that mid-probationary review and tenure/promotion processes are aligned. The committee's recommendations must be included in the review that the department chairperson provides to the dean.

*External Peer Reviewers:* The department chairperson and the candidate must confer and agree upon at least two and no more than three scholars/artists outside the institution from whom input on a candidate's scholarly/creative work can be solicited for confidential tenure reviews; A tenure evaluation package must include at least one confidential external review. Candidates are expected to provide the chairperson a brief disclosure statement identifying any knowledge they have of proposed external peer reviewers, which must be included with the tenure and promotion packet. Proposed peer reviewers should not have collaborated with the candidate on any research and should not be former supervisors. The department chairperson will contact the external reviewers and ask for a confidential review focusing on representative scholarly materials selected by the candidate. The confidential review or reviews should be sent directly to the department chairperson and will be

available to others involved in tenure decisions. All submitted confidential peer reviews are added to the tenure evaluation package by the chairperson and removed by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs before materials are returned. A standardized instruction sheet for outside review letters is included in the *Policy Guide*. In addition to specially solicited confidential external reviews, candidates may also submit scholarly/creative materials that already reflect external peer review.

Additional review letters (if any) appraising teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service can also be solicited by the candidate; these too should be sent directly to the department chairperson. The quality of the peer evaluation of scholarship/creative activity and not the number of such evaluations is what is important in the decision-making process. All peer review materials received by the department chairperson should become part of the evaluation package examined by the departmental review committee and others in the chain of review. A standardized instruction sheet for outside review letters is included in the *Policy Guide*.

#### **D. FACULTY PROMOTION: ELIGIBILITY AND PERFORMANCE GUIDELINES**

Tenure-track faculty who are hired at the rank of Instructor will be immediately promoted to Assistant Professor upon verification of the terminal degree in their respective field. (The academic contract salary of the faculty member will be adjusted to reflect the new rank beginning the month following the verification from the faculty member's university/college documenting completion of all requirements for the terminal degree. The educational advancement salary increase will be determined prior to promotion adjustment monies). This promotion will have no bearing on the tenure track status or tenure timeline of the faculty member.

Promotion above the level of Assistant Professor is for the purpose of recognizing achievement in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. Experience, time in rank and preparation minima are not sufficient justification for promotion. Promotion is not automatic, nor will it be regulated by a quota system. Promotions will be contingent upon availability of funds.

As with the tenure application, faculty accountability is determined by systematic evaluation of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. Faculty evaluation, whether annual or periodic, should begin with self-evaluation and include multiple levels of peer review. The elements of the promotion process are specified below (VII E & F).

##### **1. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor**

###### **a. Requirements for promotion consideration**

Normally, a minimum of six years of full-time university teaching experience at the rank of Assistant Professor\* at MWSU is required for promotion to this rank.\*\* However, less time may be required if arrangements have been made at the time of the first tenure track contract among the candidate, chairperson, college/school dean, and provost.

Application for promotion to Associate Professor normally occurs in the sixth year of service at the same time that application for tenure is made. The tenure evaluation package doubles as a promotion evaluation package, although judgments about tenure and promotion remain separate at each level. For promotion consideration, the candidate must

- Have the appropriate terminal degree in which the faculty member holds the appointment, or
- Have at least the MA+30 educational level status with four additional years of full-time university experience at the rank of Assistant Professor at MWSU, or

- Have eight additional years of full-time university experience at the rank of Assistant Professor at MWSU, or
- Have made exceptional contributions to the university or the profession. Exceptional performance must be documented in detail by the candidate and addressed and evaluated by the chairperson and dean.

\*Absence from the position without pay will not be included as time toward promotion. Two years of half-time college teaching experience will be considered as one year of full-time teaching experience.

\*\*Faculty employed by MWSU before July 1, 2005 who already have tenure but have not been promoted to the rank of Associate can apply for promotion at any time.

Faculty hired with credit toward tenure are eligible to apply for promotion to Associate in the year in which they have a tenure review.

### **Performance levels required for promotion to Associate Professor**

The Assistant Professor seeking promotion to Associate Professor must be able to document consistently strong teaching effectiveness. Teaching quality will be compared with other MWSU faculty. The candidate must demonstrate that he or she has shown a continuous significant growth in scholarship/creative activity. Active, constructive service to benefit students, the institution, the discipline/profession and/or community is expected.

## **2. Promotion to Professor**

### ***Requirements for promotion consideration***

A minimum of five years of full-time experience at the rank of Associate Professor at MWSU is required for promotion to this rank.\* Application for promotion can be made during the fifth year of service at the rank of Associate Professor. The appropriate terminal degree in the discipline in which the faculty member holds the appointment is normally required for promotion to the rank of Professor. However, the faculty member who does not have the appropriate terminal degree but who has consistently demonstrated outstanding teaching, has an exceptional scholarly/creative contributions, and who has made exceptional contributions in service to both the institution and discipline/profession, and community, may request consideration for promotion to the rank of Professor based upon these contributions. Exceptional performance in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service must be documented in detail by the candidate and addressed and evaluated by the chairperson and dean. The terminal degree must not be a limiting factor for the candidate being considered on the basis of exceptional performance.

\* Absence from the position without pay will not be included as time toward promotion. Two years of half-time college teaching experience will be considered as one year of full-time teaching experience.

## **Performance levels required for promotion to Professor**

The Associate Professor seeking promotion to Professor must demonstrate quality performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity and service. The faculty member's performance in one area might be outstanding and compensate for a solid but not outstanding performance in another area. Teaching will be compared with other MWSU faculty. The candidate must document high quality teaching, significant professional service to benefit students, the institution, the discipline/profession, and/or the community, and a pattern of consistent significant professional growth. External peer review of scholarly work is not required, unless specified by department guidelines for promotion to Professor.

The promotion candidate must authorize release of his or her personnel file in the office of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs for use by appropriate committee members, it being understood that the confidentiality of such file is to be protected and its contents to be used solely for the purpose of making promotion recommendations.

### **E. PROMOTION/TENURE EVALUATION PACKAGE**

The candidate for promotion and/or tenure will be reviewed according to the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. Candidates should study the discussion of VII. A. Areas of Faculty Evaluation in which the institution's general expectations for teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service are outlined. The candidate should also consult with his or her department regarding the most suitable material to include in his or her evaluation package. A copy of the Departmental Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure must be included in the candidate's evaluation package. It is ultimately the candidate's responsibility to show that he or she is qualified to be promoted/tenured; the candidate should include all relevant information in the evaluation package. Please complete the **Checklist of Items in the Faculty Evaluation Package** (located at the end of the document) and include the Checklist page with the evaluation package.

#### **1. Preparation of Evaluation Package**

- a. The information should be well organized and include a table of contents.
- b. The candidate must include an appropriate curriculum vitae.
- c. A narrative overview, immediately preceding the evaluation sections, should speak to the strengths of the candidate's performance and accomplishments and work to show connections between appropriate aspects of the three evaluation areas – teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service.
- d. Where possible, qualitative and quantitative comparisons should be made that will demonstrate the candidate's performance in relation to other departmental and MWSU faculty.
- e. Data presented should be analyzed, explained, and contextualized in terms of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service.
- f. Materials included in the Axiom packet should be comparable to the amount of paper that would fit in a single three-ring binder not to exceed two inches in thickness. Even though the evaluation packet is electronic, candidates should not include duplicate items or large quantities of material that do not demonstrate the candidate's performance compared to their peers.
- g. Annual faculty self-evaluation forms, Annual Faculty Evaluation Form, midterm evaluations, and chairperson annual evaluation forms must be included for each year of evaluation period.

## 2. Areas Evaluated

### a. Teaching

Candidates must begin this section with a narrative that explains and synthesizes the materials supporting their teaching effectiveness. This is followed by evidence of teaching effectiveness, which may include, but is not limited to the following:

- A narrative explaining the instructor's development as a teacher and his or her application of pedagogical theory
- Syllabi, teaching resource guides, web materials, posted notes, and other teaching materials
- Creative, challenging, and competent student learning evaluation measures such as examinations, quizzes, writing assignments, and other assignments appropriate for the subject matter
- Copies of graded material that shows appropriate rigor and engagement in the assessment of student work
- New course preparation or course component, special pedagogical practices, and/or special tutorial/individualized work
- Curriculum development
- Records of advising, and/or counseling
- Peer evaluations from colleagues
- Letters of support from students
- Evidence of student learning opportunities beyond the classroom that are relevant to the discipline such as a film program, a class trip, a campus event, or some similar co-curricular opportunity
- Documentation showing participation in campus initiatives related to teaching such as learning communities, honors programs, and applied learning
- Documentation showing respect for students
- Departmental Peer Review of Teaching as described in B.1.F. and individual department policies.

### b. Scholarship/Creative Activity

Candidates must begin this section with a narrative that explains and synthesizes the materials supporting their scholarly/creative activity. The materials also must be accompanied by, or show evidence of, some form of peer review.

(i) **Scholarship of Discovery** includes basic research or creative expression. Examples include, but are not limited to the following:

- A published article, monograph, or book that advances understanding (Such artifacts have been reviewed by peers in the publication process)
- Original research presented in an academic paper or other academic venue (Such artifacts have been judged by peers in the review process as worthy of public discussion)
- Artifacts such as poems, paintings, theatrical productions (or other works of original expression) that have been reviewed in a jury process
- A successful grant application for basic research/ scholarly/ creative activity. This does not include travel grants to present at conferences or other grants that do not have a formal application and peer-review process.

(ii) **Scholarship of Integration** includes scholarly work that reviews and/or integrates prior research. Examples include, but are not limited to the following:

- A published article or textbook or a juried presentation that summarizes or synthesizes earlier scholarly work and/or crosses disciplinary boundaries. (Such artifacts have been reviewed by peers in the publication process)
- A published book or software review or a review article. (Such artifacts have been invited/ authorized by or selected by peers for publication)
- Presentations selected for a scholarly/professional meeting which present a critique or frame a position (paper) in a scholarly/professional debate
- Published bibliographies
- Artifacts that are published or presented that provide critical analysis of scholarly projects, artistic exhibits or performances, or museum exhibits
- Successful grant applications for projects that integrate already existing scholarly resources.

(iii) **Scholarship of Application** includes scholarly work that applies current knowledge and innovations to important practices. Examples include, but are not limited to the following:

- artistic exhibits or performances, or museum exhibits
- Publications or juried presentations that focus on applications or practical problems in the field
- Activities to acquire or maintain certification for disciplinary specialties (process should be described)
- Consulting (peer reviewed)
- Successful grant applications for projects that focus on application problems.

(iv) **Scholarship of Teaching** includes scholarship that focuses on the nature and improvement of teaching. Examples include, but are not limited to the following:

- Publications or juried presentations that focus on issues of pedagogy or any aspect of the instructional mission of the institution
- Written studies or reviews (that include a peer review element), which focus on assessment
- Successful grant applications for projects that focus on practical problems linked to any dimension of instruction.

c. **Service**

Candidates must begin this section with a narrative that explains and synthesizes the materials supporting their service.

(i) **Students**

Evidence of service to students may include, but is not limited to the following:

- Examples of student projects not associated with the faculty member's assigned workload
- Notes, slides, and or programs for out-of-class seminars to students on Academic Affairs topics
- Documentation of academic advising (including number of advisees) and mentoring activities such as sponsorship of independent student work.

**(ii) Institution**

Evidence of institutional service may include, but is not limited to the following:

- Documentation showing leadership provided for a committee or an academic unit, such as reports, memos, and so forth
- Documentation showing membership on Faculty Senate or active membership on a Faculty Senate, institutional, or departmental committee, such as bills proposed, assignments completed and so forth
- Documentation of representation of the institution on a community project or in a partnership project.

**(iii) Discipline/Profession**

Evidence of service to the discipline or profession may include, but is not limited to the following:

- Documentation of accreditation activities
- Documentation of professional journal editorship or serving as a peer reviewer or juror
- Documentation of professional conference, panel, or event organization
- Documentation showing elected office in a professional society
- Documentation showing other work in a professional association.

**(iv) Community**

Evidence of community service relevant to one's discipline may include, but is not limited to the following:

- Program from presentations or performances open to the public
- Documentation from economic or community development activities
- Documentation showing service as a board member for a community non-profit organization
- Documentation showing program consultation
- Documentation showing work with area literacy groups
- Written or video work in non-academic media outlets.

*References*

Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Diamond, R.M. (2002). Defining scholarship for the twenty-first century. In K.J. Zahorski (ed.), *Scholarship in the postmodern era: New venues, new values, new visions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

**F. PROMOTION/TENURE TIMETABLE**

**1. Initiation of Procedure**

Promotion and tenure recommendations originate in the department. Both the departmental review committee and the chairperson produce an evaluation in a tenure review. Material prepared for a tenure review serves also as a promotion package for the rank of Associate Professor. Both the departmental committee and the chairperson provide a promotion recommendation as well as a tenure recommendation.

Promotion to the rank of Professor utilizes the same basic procedure outlined for the tenure review/ Associate Professor promotion. That is, a candidate's package is reviewed first by a departmental committee and then by the chairperson. Each produces a promotion recommendation.

## **2. Preparation and Routing of Materials: Candidate and Chairperson**

By October 15, the candidate for promotion/tenure presents his/her evaluation package to the department chairperson.

The departmental committee will provide a copy of the committee evaluation/recommendation and the supporting rationale to the faculty candidate by November 10, the final date by which to give the recommendation to the chairperson. The candidate may respond to the recommendation by the committee by submitting a written response to the department chairperson by 4:30 p.m. no later than the third working day after November 10. At the candidate's request, this written response will become a permanent part of the evaluation package.

By November 10, departmental committee must return the candidate's evaluation package to the department chairperson. The chairperson has the responsibility of evaluating the evidence presented by the faculty member as well as any other material available, placing these materials into a department perspective, and making evaluative judgments in the three areas. By December 1, the chairperson will submit his or her recommendations and the rationale for these recommendations to the dean. The chairperson will provide a copy of the recommendation and the supporting rationale to the faculty candidate at the time the recommendation is submitted to the dean. A copy of the recommendation must be delivered to the faculty candidate's office or mailbox by December 1. The candidate may respond to the chairperson's recommendation. Such response will be submitted in written form to the dean by 4:30 p.m. of the third working day after December 1. At the candidate's request, this written response will become a permanent part of the evaluation package.

## **3. Review and Recommendation: Dean**

By the first day of Spring classes, the dean will review the materials submitted by the chairperson along with any response by the candidate and will make a recommendation on promotion/tenure, with rationale, to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs along with the candidate's evaluation package. A copy of the recommendation and rationale will be sent to the Promotion/Tenure Committee. The dean will provide a copy of the recommendation and supporting rationale to the candidate at the same time the recommendation is submitted to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. This recommendation must be delivered to the faculty candidate's office or mailbox by the first day of Spring classes. If the candidate wishes to respond to the dean's recommendation, he or she must do so in writing to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs by 4:30 p.m. of the third working day after the first day of Spring classes. At the candidate's request, this written response will become a permanent part of the evaluation package.

## **4. Review and Recommendation: Promotion & Tenure Committee**

The Faculty Promotion/Tenure Committee will, after the fourth day of Spring classes, have access to all evaluation materials submitted to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. Using these materials, the Faculty Promotion/Tenure committee will review the recommendations of the department chairperson and the dean along with any responses submitted by the candidate. By April 4, the Promotion/Tenure Committee's recommendation with supporting rationale, attached to the evaluation materials, will be submitted to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. The recommendation will consist of a yes or no vote by the committee, accompanied by a list of strengths and weaknesses of the candidate and the rationale. If the candidate wishes to respond to the committee's recommendation, he or she must do so in writing to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs by 4:30 p.m. of the third working day after April 4. At the candidate's request, this written response will become a permanent part of the evaluation package.



The candidate has the option of appearing before the subcommittee reviewing his or her evaluation package to briefly discuss materials documented in the evaluation package. Applicants will not have the option of appearing before the entire Promotion/Tenure Committee. No new materials may be introduced. To exercise this option, the candidate must notify the Promotion/Tenure Committee chairperson in writing by the fourth day of Spring classes. The Promotion/Tenure Committee chairperson will contact the subcommittee members who must arrange to meet with the candidate prior to any full committee discussion and/or voting on this candidate.

**5. Review and Recommendation: Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.**

By May 5, the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs will review all promotion/tenure recommendations and any candidate's responses and make recommendations with rationale to the President. Should the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Promotion/Tenure Committee fail to agree on a promotion/tenure recommendation, the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs will attempt to resolve the disagreement before making a recommendation to the President. The Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs will provide a copy of the recommendation and supporting rationale to the candidate at the same time the recommendation is submitted to the President. This recommendation must be delivered to the faculty candidate's office or mailbox by May 5. If the candidate wishes to respond to the committee's recommendation, he or she must do so in writing to the President by 4:30 p.m. of the third working day after May 5. At the candidate's request, this written response will become a permanent part of the evaluation package.

NOTE: During the promotion/tenure cycle, if the university is officially closed on the date materials or responses are due, those items may be submitted on the next official university business day.

**6. President's Recommendation and Board's Approval**

The President's recommendation will be placed before the Board of Governors for final disposition. Promotion granted by the Board will be effective with the next year's contract and will include the following salary adjustments, which shall be in effect through each academic year and are subject to review at the end of the academic year, for full-time faculty members:

Assistant Professor	\$2,000
Associate Professor	\$5,000
Professor	\$7,000

**G. INSTRUCTOR PROMOTION AND RANK**

Definition of terms. The term "Instructor" as used herein is for continuing, full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. It is not to be confused with the rarely used "Instructor" status assigned to tenure-track faculty in a probationary period, typically because they are hired before completing their terminal degree.

Instructors who hold non-tenure-track positions, regardless of academic degree or rank, remain ineligible for tenure. The processes below are for the purposes of promotion only in non-tenure-track, full-time teaching roles. In the event an Instructor of any rank were to apply for and be selected to fill an open tenure-track position, the academic clock toward tenure would begin anew when that former Instructor assumed her or his new duties unless the Administration and candidate negotiate otherwise.

Instructors have two opportunities for promotion:

- Instructor to Advanced Instructor
- Advanced Instructor to Senior Instructor

Applying for promotions is entirely voluntary. Whether or not an Instructor chooses to apply shall have no effect on annual evaluations, teaching assignments, or any aspect of continuing employment.

All timelines for application and review shall follow those already established for faculty promotion in the MWSU Policy Guide.

Preparation of the Evaluation Package will follow that already in the MWSU Policy Guide, although the emphasis will be on teaching, advising, and service, with scholarly expectations less emphasized.

The reviewers will follow the same process, and the candidate will have the same opportunities to respond as those set forth in the MWSU Policy Guide.

Salary increases to accompany promotions granted will follow the protocol stated in the MWSU Policy Guide under “President’s Recommendation and Board’s Approval” with the amounts set at one-half that for tenure-track faculty:

Advanced Instructor	\$2,500
Senior Instructor	\$3,500

1. Promotion from Instructor to Advanced Instructor

a. Requirements for promotion consideration:

A minimum of five years full-time teaching at MWSU is required for promotion to Advanced Instructor. The candidate is eligible to apply in the Fall semester of the fifth contract, though no promotion can take effect until after the fifth full year has been completed. Seeking this promotion is entirely voluntary. Promotion above the level of Instructor is for the purpose of recognizing achievement in the areas of teaching and service, with limited expectations for professional development. Experience, time in rank and preparation minima are not sufficient justification for promotion. Promotion is not automatic, nor will it be regulated by a quota system. Promotions will be contingent upon availability of funds. Faculty evaluation, whether annual or periodic, should begin with self-evaluation and include peer review. The elements of the promotion process are specified below.

- Have Satisfactory annual evaluations for teaching, professional development, and service for the most recent four years
- Teaching quality will be compared with other MWSU faculty members
- Have at least one peer evaluation of teaching
- The candidate must show that he/she has maintained currency in the discipline content
- Have evidence of significant professional development throughout the evaluation period, such as implementation and evaluation of teaching strategies gained at a conference attended; a conference presentation accepted and delivered; or pedagogy workshops delivered to campus colleagues or other peers. At least one professional development activity must be peer-reviewed.
- Have evidence of service to students, the department, university, or community
- The above materials shall be presented in an application packet with an opening narrative stating why the requested promotion is merited.

## 2. Promotion from Advanced Instructor to Senior Instructor

A minimum of five years full-time teaching at MWSU at the rank of Advanced Instructor is required for promotion to Senior Instructor. The candidate is eligible to apply in the Fall semester of the fifth contract at the rank of Advanced Instructor, though no promotion can take effect until after the fifth full year at that rank has been completed. Seeking this promotion is entirely voluntary. Promotion above the level of Instructor is for the purpose of recognizing achievement in the areas of teaching and service, with limited expectations for professional development. Experience, time in rank and preparation minima are not sufficient justification for promotion. Promotion is not automatic, nor will it be regulated by a quota system. Promotions will be contingent upon availability of funds. Faculty evaluation, whether annual or periodic, should begin with self-evaluation and include peer review. The elements of the promotion process are specified below.

- Have Satisfactory annual evaluations for teaching, professional development, and service
- The Candidate must document high quality teaching and teaching quality will be compared with other MWSU faculty members
- Have at least one peer evaluation of teaching conducted at rank
- The candidate must show that he/she has maintained currency in the discipline content
- Have evidence of significant professional development throughout the evaluation period, such as implementation and evaluation of teaching strategies gained at a conference attended; a conference presentation accepted and delivered; or pedagogy workshops delivered to campus colleagues or other peers. At least one professional development activity must be peer-reviewed.
- Have evidence of high quality service to benefit students, the department and beyond to university and/or community
- The candidate must document evidence of leadership. Examples could include chairing a committee, serving on Faculty Senate, submitting a curriculum proposal, or writing a grant
- The above materials shall be presented in an application packet with an opening narrative stating why the requested promotion is merited.

In the event a candidate is denied a promotion at any level, that candidate is advised to consult with her or his department chairperson and the departmental committee who reviewed the candidate's packet.

**SUMMARY OF PROMOTION/TENURE TIMETABLE**

<b>FROM</b>	<b>TO</b>	<b>DATE</b>
Candidate	Department Chairperson	October 15
Peer Reviewers – recommendation letters	Department Chairperson	October 17
Department Chairperson	Department Committee	October 17
Department Committee	Department Chairperson	November 10
Chairperson	Dean and Candidate	December 1
Candidate	Dean (response to Chairperson’s recommendation - optional)	December 4
Dean	Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and Candidate	The first day of Spring classes
Candidate	Request to P&T Chairperson to Appear Before Subcommittee (optional)	The fourth day of Spring classes
Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs	Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee	The fourth day of Spring classes
Candidate	Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs (response to Dean’s recommendation - optional)	The fourth day of Spring classes
Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee	Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and Candidate	April 4
Candidate	Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs (response to Committee’s recommendation - optional)	April 7
Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs	President and Candidate	May 5
Candidate	President (response to Provost/VP’s recommendation - optional)	May 8
President	Board of Governors	

(July 2010)

**Cover Sheet for Promotion / Tenure Recommendations**

Name of applicant: \_\_\_\_\_

*To the applicant:* **This form should be given to colleagues who are able to comment on your qualifications for Promotion / Tenure.** For the convenience of the person making this recommendation, you should include a stamped envelope addressed to the **appropriate department chairperson:**

Missouri Western State University  
4525 Downs Drive  
St. Joseph, MO 64507

\_\_\_\_\_ I waive my right to review this recommendation.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of applicant

\_\_\_\_\_ I do not waive my right to review this recommendation.

---

**To be completed by the person providing the recommendation:**

Promotion is for the purpose of recognizing excellence in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship/creative activity.

Tenure, as a status in higher education, is a means to protect the independent inquiry and the openness of academic discourse of faculty as teacher-scholars. Tenure also provides stability to the professoriate as a vocation.

Please provide a written evaluation of the quality and distinction of the candidate's teaching, or scholarship/creative activity, or professional service. If this candidate's area of expertise is different from your own or you do not have enough experience working with the candidate so that you can render a current and concrete assessment, please indicate that on the form and return it so that the candidate might find others in a better position to judge his or her professional accomplishments. Thank you.

Name of recommender: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of recommender: \_\_\_\_\_

Position of recommender: \_\_\_\_\_

Institutional affiliation: \_\_\_\_\_

Address of recommender: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone number: \_\_\_\_\_

**Recommender, please return this form and your separate letter of recommendation to the appropriate department chairperson by October 17.**

# Checklist of Items in the Faculty Evaluation Package

Name of Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_

- \_\_\_\_\_ Table of Contents
- \_\_\_\_\_ Curriculum Vitae
- \_\_\_\_\_ Department Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
- \_\_\_\_\_ All student evaluations during the review period
- \_\_\_\_\_ Annual self-evaluations during the review period
- \_\_\_\_\_ Annual Chairperson and Dean Evaluations
- \_\_\_\_\_ Mid-tenure review letters from department committee, chairperson, and dean (if applying for tenure)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Documentation of approval for accelerated evaluation (if applicable) and/or “stop the clock” approval.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Peer review of teaching
  - Three for tenure/promotion to Associate Professor
  - One for promotion to full Professor
- \_\_\_\_\_ External peer review of scholarly/creative activity (applies only to candidates for tenure; not required for promotion to full Professor). The Chairperson adds this review to the package. It is removed by the Provost’s office prior to being returned to the candidate.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Narrative overview preceding each evaluation section
- \_\_\_\_\_ Teaching artifacts
- \_\_\_\_\_ Scholarship/Creative activity artifacts
- \_\_\_\_\_ Service artifacts

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Applicant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Department Mentor or Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date