

Missouri Western State University
Faculty Senate Minutes
February 2, 2006
Blum 220

Senators Present: President Mullins (presiding), K. Andrews, Fulton, deGregorio, Gregory, Heider, Hunt, Kriewitz, Noynaert, M. Nandan, S. Nandan, Ottinger

Senators Absent: Chevalier

Non-voting and Ex-Officio Members Present: President Past Senate President Larry Andrews

Guests: Athletic Director Mark Linder; Martin Johnson, Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences; Mark Mikkelson; Steve Griert,

Call to Order: President Phil Mullins called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Approval of January 19, 2006 Minutes: (Fulton/Ottinger) Approved

Approval of Agenda: (Heider/Hunt) Approved

Report from the Senate President:

Phil Mullins reported that he had submitted a request for comments about the Banner system on the faculty listserv. Several faculty members participated, and the comments have been submitted to the administration.

Phil Mullins, Evan Noynaert, and Jeanie Crane will be attending the Missouri Association of Faculty Senates (MAFS) meeting February 6 and 7 in conjunction with Higher Education Day.

Cindy Heider circulated updated committee rosters.

Presentation by Athletic Director Mark Linder

Director Linder presented a series of PowerPoint slides on a proposal to raise student fees for athletics by \$5 per credit hour with a cap at 12 credit hours. The matter is to be voted on by students in March.

The fee would be used immediately to provide several student benefits including free MWSU attire, trips to away athletic events, free admission of a guest, and provision for childcare during athletic events. Eventually the funds would be used to make improvements to Spratt Stadium, the Looney Complex, and construction of a spring sports facility.

The improvements have been endorsed by SGA and other campus organizations. The proposed student fee is in line with other MIAA and regional institutions.

Questions and discussions followed.

This will effectively be a 3% tuition increase. We may also have a regular tuition increase. Our students may not be able to afford these changes. A move that makes the tuition increase smaller means that there are fewer dollars to spread over other needs of the institution such as salary increases and filling faculty positions. If this fee is imposed, will academic programs suffer from lack of resources?

The Looney Complex is shared by the Athletic Department, HPER Department, and Intramural Offices. Will the HPER Department facilities be improved as a part of the overall Looney improvements? If improvements are made to the Looney complex the existing Athletic Department offices would be available for use by HPER.

The Strategic Planning process has suggested that there would be a comprehensive plan to look at campus-wide space and facility needs.

If we look at this as a pure return on investment problem, this looks good. The major concern is how it will be funded.

Director Linder made closing comments. Soliciting off-campus funds is currently limited to Agenstein funding improvements. After Agenstein, Potter Hall funding will become the priority.. This project will not be competing with other campus entities for private donors or state funding.

Mark Mikkelsen presented a report on the Western Institute Research Centers.

The Directors have prepared a list of concerns that must be addressed before we can open active research centers. These concerns are enumerated in Appendix A.

Old Business

SB 01-2006 Motion to amend the *Policy Guide* in accordance with first component of Appendix B. (Fulton/Heider) The motion (1) substitutes “undergraduate” in the *Policy Guide* Faculty Senate Bylaws, p. 255 (and the word “college”) to clarify references to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. (2) The motion also recommends that a global search be done on the remainder of the *Policy Guide* to insert “undergraduate” with “Curriculum Committee” where necessary for clarification (a second document from the Curriculum Committee identifying some *Policy Guide* sections that need changes will be forwarded).

Approved unanimously by voice vote.

New Business

Larry Andrews presented the report from the Grievance Committee. The changes we made a few years ago have greatly improved the grievance process. There were five

serious grievances issues where were all settled by counseling and mediation. This type of resolution was a major goal of the policy revisions. No formal grievances were filed.

Faculty Senate President Phil Mullins presented a report from the ad hoc Peer Review Committee. During the past year the Committee has been working on the three charges given to the Committee last spring. This has included coordinating efforts with the Promotion and Tenure Committee. This report is a mostly a reorganization of the existing sections of the *Policy Guide*. There are also three significant policy changes.

- A "stop the clock" provision is included for the tenure process.
- Instituting departmental review procedures for Full Professors.
- Measures have been taken to protect the identity of the peer reviewer and also to allow more than one reviewer.

SB-2-2006 Motion to accept the proposals of the *ad hoc* Peer Review Committee as shown in appendix C (Ottinger/S. Nandan) Approved by voice vote.

Cindy Heider distributed a list of proposed members of the interim Graduate Curriculum Committee members. There are currently 8 members, and the Executive Committee is seeking a 9th member. The proposed members are

Kevin Anderson
Kathleen Andrews
Len Archer
Brian Cronk
Konrad Gunderson
Reza Hamzaee
Cindy Heider
Susan Hennessy

Motion to accept the proposed members (Heider/M. Nandan) as presented by Vice President Heider. Approved by voice vote.

Adjourned

Appendix A

Talking Points: Research Policy Issues Western Institute Research Center Directors Spring 2006

- Outside versus Additional Employment Compensation -- Are Western Institute activities considered outside or additional employment? Should faculty be encouraged to be compensated by outside agencies rather than through the Western Institute to avoid the 20% restriction on additional employment?
- Outside versus Additional Employment Effort -- Will faculty who engage in Western Institute projects need to complete an Outside Employment Form? Who will decide whether the amount of effort required for a project is acceptable?
- Compensation for Project Activities -- Can faculty use outside funding sources to purchase reassigned time to conduct research and creative projects? Can faculty use outside funding to be compensated for research and creative projects during the academic year?
- Indirect Cost Policy -- Could there be a meeting be called to discuss a policy for the distribution of indirect (F and A) costs?
- Reassigned Time -- What level of reassigned time is appropriate for research and creative projects? Could a flexible load hour plan be developed?
- Part-time and Overload -- Could the current institutional policy of using one rate of pay for all part-time and overload activity become more flexible?
- Grants Office -- What is the role of the Office of Grants and Sponsored Programs? What faculty support should be expected from the office?
- Publicity -- How should publicity for Western Institute research projects be coordinated?
- Intellectual Property development -- How should IP be valued and how would future income associated with its ownership be assessed? What would be the limitations of IP rights (including term limits, fair use for copyright works)?
- Technology Transfer -- When Western Institute &/or MWSU secure title to Intellectual Property what will be the modality of granting certain rights to interested entrepreneurs and other individuals/companies? How would the revenue stream accruing to WI/MWSU be used (for example invest in research, underwrite operating and administrative costs)? What steps can be taken to encourage commercialization of innovation?

Appendix B

Peer Review Committee Report

February 2, 2006

At the March 10, 2005 Faculty Senate meeting, the Senate gave to the *Ad Hoc* Peer Review Committee (PR) three charges (SR 15-05, 16-05 and 17-05). These were a response to the February 17, 2005 PR report. One of the new charges (SR 15-05) was to prepare *Policy Guide* language necessary to implement an up-or-out tenure system. As everyone knows, the Senate adopted the proposed *Policy Guide* changes later in the spring and the new system was accepted by the President and became institutional policy in this academic year.

At the time PR proposed *Policy Guide* changes to implement an up-or-out tenure policy, the committee acknowledged their proposals did not address all of the matters in the *Policy Guide* discussions of tenure and promotion that needed attention. Last spring's proposals focused on the structure of an up-or-out tenure process and promotion to associate professor. PR indicated that matters concerned with tenure needed to be better integrated with *Policy Guide* discussions of promotion. Such matters fell more directly under the second charge to PR, which involved working with the Promotion and Tenure Committee (P & T) to revise other sections of the *Policy Guide* as well as the Bylaw section concerned with P & T. Although the proposal for an up-or-out tenure policy had been circulated to P & T for criticism, a more extensive revision called for more collaboration with P & T.

In the fall of 2005, PR turned to the project suggested in the second charge (SR-1605) of March 10, 2005: thoroughly integrating the *Policy Guide's* discussion of promotion and tenure. Ultimately, PR decided that the entire *Policy Guide* section on Faculty Evaluation (*PG*, 64-90, which includes promotion and tenure) needed careful reconstruction. The existing Faculty Evaluation section (in which the new up-or-out tenure policy was embedded) is extraordinarily confusing; it seems to have grown into the strange creature it presently is by accretions added over many years. The section does not provide faculty with clear ideas about institutional expectations and evaluation processes (including promotion and tenure evaluation). What PR has done is thoroughly reorganize and rework the Faculty Evaluation section of the *Policy Guide*. The revision is so extensive that it does not make much sense to provide the Senate with a lined out version of the existing section. The attachment is the revised Faculty Evaluation section (which includes promotion and tenure); to compare the old and the new, please print pages 64-90 in the electronic *Policy Guide*.

Senators should be aware that the revised Faculty Evaluation section was given to the P & T Committee in December 2005 and was discussed at the January 18, 2006 P & T Committee meeting that included two PR committee members, Michael Cadden (who was the 2005 P & T chair) and Michael Ottinger (who is also Senate liaison to P & T). In addition to the revised Faculty Evaluation section, Cadden and Ottinger discussed with the P & T Committee a possible set of revisions in the Bylaws that determine the constitution and operation of P & T. Many of the changes in the revised Faculty Evaluation section and the proposed P & T Bylaw section that PR formulated were in fact developed from the 2005 P & T annual report.

In sum, the revised Faculty Evaluation section that PR is presenting as its report is a document that represents collaboration between PR and P & T. Later in the spring in the year-end P & T report, there will be (1) proposals for Bylaw changes and possibly (2) some proposals for clarifying the *Policy Guide* language used to describe different levels of achievement necessary for promotion to different ranks. This material coming from P & T will also represent collaboration between PR and P & T.

Although the proposed revision of the Faculty Evaluation section in the *Policy Guide* is primarily a reorganization, it is worth noting that there are incorporated a few proposed changes in policy. Three are briefly discussed below:

(1) Stop-the-clock tenure clause: PR discussed, in 2004 and 2005, the possibility of a stop-the-clock clause, although PR did not manage to get this together as part of the proposal brought to the Senate in spring 2005. The proposed policy included here is the product of further studies of such policies at sister institutions (what we propose relies heavily on the Truman and NWMSU policies). Both faculty and administrator members of PR think the proposed policy is a sensible addition to our up-or-out policy; P & T has also reviewed and approved this proposed addition (pages 8-9 of Revision).

(2) Revision of external peer review procedure: The existing policy adopted last spring requires tenure candidates to include a minimum of one confidential external peer review. The policy outlines a procedure, involving the candidate and the chair, for soliciting such a review. Further PR discussion of the policy has suggested (1) the existing procedure could make it impossible to protect the identity of the external peer reviewer and (2) it seems likely that candidates may prefer (and it may be to their advantage) to have more than a single confidential external peer review. The section discussing external peer reviews has been modestly revised to (1) assure that the identity of external peer reviewers is protected and (2) to provide that candidates can have one, two or three solicited, confidential external peer reviews that the chairperson adds to the package. (pages 9-10 of Revision).

(3) Addition of departmental promotion committee for review of materials of candidates to the rank of professor: The existing up-or-out tenure policy provides for a departmental committee review of tenure candidates who normally are promoted to associate if they are granted tenure. The revised Faculty Evaluation discussion of promotion requires that a departmental committee also evaluate materials of candidates for professor (page 16 of Revision).

Appendix C

VII. FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES

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-term review, in the tenure review, in promotion reviews, and in special reviews such as those for Board of Governors Distinguished Professor awards 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, service, and scholarship/creative activity. 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. 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 and student 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

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

3. 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 on-going 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)

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 chair, dean, and provost/vice-president for academic and student 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

a. 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
ENG 108 GS	19	A=5; B=5; C=3; D=1; F=1; W=4	2.34 ± 0.78

b. 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.

c. Annual Self-evaluation

Each faculty member should submit to his/her chair 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, service, and scholarship/creative activity (see VII A. "Areas of Faculty Evaluation"). The department chair will include a copy of the self-evaluation in the department evaluation file.

d. 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 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 chair 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 and Student 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 and Student Affairs by February 25. The Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student 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 and Student 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 and Student 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 satisfactory
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, service or scholarship/creative activity 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 and Student Affairs, in consultation with the department chair 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.

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, service, and scholarly/creative activity. 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, service, and scholarly/creative activity. 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 insure 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 timeframe for a tenure review, will appear on the contract. Should a faculty member wish to negotiate an earlier tenure review, the faculty member, department chairperson, dean, and the Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs must approve any change in the tenure review date in writing. This agreement will be documented in the faculty member's personnel file.

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 insure 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 chair 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 chair will have responded to the request in writing by making a recommendation to the college 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. Candidates for tenure must have a mid-term review in the third year (of a six year probationary period) that mirrors the tenure application process up to the level of college dean. For faculty who have negotiated an earlier tenure review through credit towards tenure at the time of hire, the mid-term review should occur at the midpoint of their anticipated probationary period. 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 departmental chairperson provides his or her review to the dean but must include the recommendation from the departmental committee. The departmental chairperson is responsible for appointing the departmental committee after consultation with tenure candidates. The committee should be small and members should be tenured colleagues in the same (or allied) disciplines. The departmental committee should also be involved in the mid-term review process to assure that mid-term review and tenure/promotion processes are aligned.

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 packet 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. The department chairperson will contact the external reviewers and ask for a confidential review focusing on representative 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 package by the chairperson and removed by the Provost and VPASA 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, service, and scholarship/creative activity 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 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

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 of the faculty member.

Promotion above the level of Assistant Professor is for the purpose of recognizing achievement in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship/creative activity. 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, service, and scholarly/creative activity. 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**

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, chair, college 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 package doubles as a promotion 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 chair 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, are eligible to apply for Associate in the fifth contract year providing that they have also applied for tenure in the same cycle. 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. Active, constructive service in departmental, institutional, and/or community is expected. The candidate must demonstrate that he or she has kept current with advances in areas of expertise and teaching duties and has shown a continuous significant growth in scholarship/creative activity.

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, 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, service, and scholarship/creative activity must be documented in detail by the candidate and addressed and evaluated by the chair

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 be able to document quality performance in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship/creative activity. 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. High-quality participation in departmental service is required on a regular basis. Evidence of active leadership in departmental and institutional service is expected. In the area of scholarship/creative activity, the faculty member seeking promotion to professor must document a pattern of consistent significant growth since the last promotion. Significant professional service to students, institution, discipline/profession or community must be documented.

The promotion candidate must authorize release of his or her personnel file in the office of the Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student 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, service, and scholarship/creative activity. Candidates should study the discussion of VII. A. Areas of Faculty Evaluation in which the institution's general expectations for teaching, service and scholarship/creative activity are outlined. The candidate should also consult with his or her department regarding the most suitable material to include in his or her evaluation packet. 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 promotion package.

1. Preparation of Evaluation Package

- a. The information should be well organized and include a table of contents.
- b. Where possible, qualitative and quantitative comparisons should be made which will demonstrate the candidate's performance in relation to other departmental and MWSU faculty.
- c. Data presented should be analyzed, explained, and contextualized in terms of teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activity.

- d. Materials must be confined to one three-ring notebook NOT to exceed two inches in thickness. All materials must be easily available without having to remove them from the notebook. A second notebook will be submitted containing ALL student evaluations received during the rating period, or for the most recent five years.
- e. 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.
- f. The candidate must authorize release of materials in his or her personnel faculty file in the office of the Provost/Vice-President for Academic and Student Affairs for use by appropriate committee members. It should be understood that the confidentiality of such file is to be protected and its contents to be used solely for the purpose of making tenure and/or promotion recommendations.

2. Areas Evaluated

a. Teaching

Evidence of teaching effectiveness 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.

b. 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 and student 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.

c. Scholarship/Creative Activity

All scholarship/creative activity **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.

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.

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 15th, 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 December 1, 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 December 1. At the candidate's request, this written response will become a permanent part of the evaluation package.

By December 1, 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 January 7, 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 January 7. 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 January 7. At the candidate's request, this written response will become a permanent part of the evaluation package.

3. Review and Recommendation: Dean

By February 1, 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 and Student 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 and Student Affairs. This recommendation must be delivered to the faculty candidate's office or mailbox by February 1. 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 and Student Affairs by 4:30 p.m. of the third working day after February 1. 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 February 3, have access to all evaluation materials submitted to the Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student 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 and Student 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. The Chairman of the Promotion/Tenure Committee 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 and Student Affairs. This recommendation must be delivered to the faculty candidate's office or mailbox by April 4. 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 and Student 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 February 3. 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 and Student Affairs.

By May 5, the Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student 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 and Student Affairs and the Promotion/Tenure Committee fail to agree on a promotion/tenure recommendation, the Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs will attempt to resolve the disagreement before making a recommendation to the President. The Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student 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 AY2005-2006 (at which they shall be reviewed), for full-time faculty members:

Assistant Professor	\$2,000
Associate Professor	\$3,500
Professor	\$5,000

SUMMARY OF PROMOTION/TENURE TIMETABLE

FROM	TO	DATE
Candidate	Department Chairperson	October 15
Department Chairperson	Department Committee	October 17
Department Committee	Department Chairperson	December 1
Chairperson	Dean	January 7
Dean	Provost / Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs	February 1
Provost / Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs	Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee	February 3
Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee	Provost / Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs	April 4
Provost / Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs	President	May 5
President	Board of Governors	

Annual Faculty Evaluation Form

Faculty
Department _____

Member _____

The chairperson’s evaluation narrative should be attached to this page. The evaluation code below is defined as follows (refer to the *Policy Guide* for additional detail):

- S** --performance satisfactory
- M**--performance marginal, need for significant improvement
- U**—performance unsatisfactory

Circle One
 S M U

I. Overall Quality of Teaching

- a. met requirements established by the department an institution
- b. demonstrated satisfactory teaching performance
- c. set reasonable standards
- d. maintained respect for students
- e. fulfilled responsibilities as an advisor
- f. handled co-curricular assignments (if applicable)

Comments:

II. Overall Quality of Service

S M U

- a. carried out non-teaching assignments in the department
- b. exerted a positive effort to reach department goals
- c. served on faculty and institutional projects
- d. involved in community projects; local use of scholarly/professional skills

Comments:

III. Overall Quality of Scholarship/Creative Activity

S M U

- a. further education or participation in professional meetings
- b. appropriate travel
- c. papers presented and/or publications/ creative artifacts
- d. other research or grant-related work
- e. disciplinary/professional organizational work

Comments:

 Chairperson’s Signature/ Date

Faculty Member’s Signature/ Date

Annual Contract Recommendation Form

(to be completed by the chairperson)

Check as many as are appropriate:

Faculty Status:

- Tenured faculty member _____
- Tenure track faculty member (<2 years contract)_____
- Tenure track faculty member (>2 year, but <6 years contract)_____
- Non-tenure track faculty member_____

Contract Type:

- Tenured faculty member in good standing (automatically reappointed)_____
- Tenured faculty member under Early Warning _____
- Continuing, probationary (i.e., tenure track), in good standing_____
- Continuing, probationary (i.e., tenure track),, under Early Warning_____
- Terminal contract_____
- One-year contract_____
- Pending, currently under tenure review_____
- Other (as specified below)_____

Faculty Member's Signature /Date

Chairperson's Signature /Date

Comments:

Dean's Signature/Date

Comments:

VPASA's Signature/Date